

**FROM BOLOGNA TO BERLIN 1999-2003:
THE INITIAL STEPS OF THE BOLOGNA PROCESS
AND CREATION OF THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA**

by

Timothy Scott Thompson

Bachelor of Arts, Lake Forest College, 1973

Master of Science, State University of New York College at Buffalo, 1978

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
School of Education in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2011

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

This dissertation was presented

by

Timothy Scott Thompson

It was defended on

May 12, 2011

and approved by

Dr. William E. Bickel, Professor, Department of Administrative and Policy Studies

Dr. Glenn Nelson, Associate Professor Emeritus, Department of

Administrative and Policy Studies

Dr. Alberta M. Sbragia, Professor, Department of Political Science

Dissertation Advisor: Dr. John C. Weidman, Professor, Department of

Administrative and Policy Studies

Copyright © by Timothy Scott Thompson

2011

**FROM BOLOGNA TO BERLIN 1999-2003: THE INITIAL STEPS OF THE BOLOGNA
PROCESS AND CREATION OF THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA**

Timothy Scott Thompson, PhD

University of Pittsburgh, 2011

The processes of European integration and the forming of the European Union begun at the end of World War II did not include education as part of that agenda. As revealed in a review of the literature, education came into the process through indirect means. The processes of European integration and the forming of the European Union have fostered processes that have influence domestic policies. Characterized as Europeanization, those processes have influenced and are at the root of European nations forming an intergovernmental cross-border agreement in 1999 to change their higher education systems. Known as the Bologna Declaration, the reforms called for focus on six objectives and include a key principle of European integration, mobility.

This dissertation focuses on reviewing the antecedents to the Bologna Process, the direct influences of the Bologna Declaration, and the reports prepared for the 2003 Berlin follow-up meeting that are statements of the progress toward the implementation of the six objectives of the Bologna Declaration. This review suggests that the key instruments of change, harmonization of higher education, and the building of the European Higher Education Area are the first four objectives of the Bologna Process: 1) a system of easily readable and comparable degrees; 2) a system based on two main cycles: undergraduate and graduate; 3) a system of credits, and; 4) the

promotion of mobility. Further, the Bologna Declaration represents a process of the Europeanization of higher education. The findings suggest that by 2003 while in the majority nations articulate commitments to the Bologna Process and progress toward the implementation of policy changes, what steps were taken to achieve the four main objectives of the Bologna process depend on the degree to which nations carry out the reforms called for in the Bologna Declaration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	XI
ACRONYMS.....	XII
A BRIEF ANNOTATED TIMELINE OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION.....	XVI
A BRIEF ANNOTATED TIMELINE OF EDUCATION, EUROPEAN INTEGRATION, AND THE BOLOGNA PROCESS.....	XVIII
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.0 CONCEPTUALIZING AND THEORIZING EUROPEAN INTEGRATION....	14
2.1 CONCEPTUALIZING THE EUROPEAN UNION	14
2.2 THEORIZING EUROPEAN INTEGRATION.....	19
3.0 AN OVERVIEW OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION	22
3.1 THE EUROPEAN COAL AND STEEL COMMUNITY	27
3.2 THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY - THE SINGLE EUROPEAN ACT	28
3.3 THE MAASTRICHT TREATY, THE EUROPEAN MONETARY UNION, AND THE EUROPEAN UNION	29
3.4 POST-TEU: ECONOMIC AND MONETARY UNION, ENLARGEMENT, AND THE AMSTERDAM TREATY.....	33
3.5 SUMMARY	34

4.0	EDUCATION AND EUROPEAN INTEGRATION	37
4.1	THE ERASMUS PROGRAM	48
4.2	THE INSTRUMENTS OF CHANGE AND THEIR ANTECEDENTS.....	50
4.3	THE DIPLOMA SUPPLEMENT	52
4.4	EUROPEAN CREDIT TRANSFER AND ACCUMULATION SCHEME (ECTS)	55
4.5	SUMMARY	57
5.0	THE BOLOGNA DECLARATION AND THE BOLOGNA PROCESS.....	60
5.1	SUMMARY	65
6.0	APPROACH TO ANALYSIS	67
7.0	THE 2003 BERLIN FOLLOW-UP MEETING COUNTRY REPORTS.....	69
7.1	AUSTRIA	70
7.2	BELGIUM – FLEMISH COMMUNITY	72
7.3	BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA.....	73
7.4	BULGARIA.....	75
7.5	CROATIA	76
7.6	CYPRUS	77
7.7	CZECH REPUBLIC	78
7.8	DENMARK	80
7.9	ESTONIA	81
7.10	FINLAND	83
7.11	FRANCE.....	85
7.12	GERMANY	86

7.13	GREECE	88
7.14	THE HOLY SEE.....	89
7.15	HUNGARY.....	91
7.16	ICELAND.....	93
7.17	IRELAND.....	95
7.18	ITALY.....	97
7.19	LATVIA.....	98
7.20	LIECHTENSTEIN	100
7.21	LITHUANIA	101
7.22	LUXEMBOURG.....	104
7.23	MALTA	105
7.24	THE NETHERLANDS	106
7.25	NORWAY.....	107
7.26	POLAND	109
7.27	PORTUGAL.....	110
7.28	ROMANIA	111
7.29	SERBIA	113
7.30	SLOVAKIA	114
7.31	SLOVENIA	115
7.32	SPAIN	116
7.33	SWEDEN	118
7.34	SWITZERLAND	120
7.35	TURKEY	121

7.36	UNITED KINGDOM	123
7.37	SUMMARY	125
8.0	CONCLUSION.....	131
8.1	DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	135
8.2	POSTSCRIPT	135
	APPENDIX A	137
	APPENDIX B	141
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	144

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. EU Member States in 2003 and Signatories to the Bologna Declaration.....	127
Table 2. EU Candidate Countries in 2003 and Signatories to the Bologna Declaration	128
Table 3. In 2003 Other Signatories to the Bologna Declaration.....	129

PREFACE

There are a number of people who must be thanked as they have made it possible to complete this study. First of all, a thank you to my advisor, Dr. John Weidman, for his patience and perseverance as I struggled to balance my professional career with my study and research, which from time to time had to take a back seat for long periods of time. Second, a thank you to all of the faculty with whom I have taken courses, especially Eugenie Potter, for her invaluable encouragement and insight; Vandra Maseman for her encouragement; Tony Eichelberger for his imbedding in me key concepts of research; Don Martin for his wisdom and patience; and Alberta Sbragia for her support of my participation in the ENIC-NARIC Network which brought me to Vilnius in 1999 when I first learned about the Sorbonne Declaration and the meeting that was to take place in Bologna. I must also thank Alberta Sbragia for “turning me on” to the European Union, which in turn led her to hire me in my current position as Associate Director of the European Union Center of Excellence and European Studies Center. In the position of Associate Director, my contact with the European Union became deeper as a result of visits with the president of the European Commission, José Manuel Barroso, in Brussels in 2007 and in 2009 with the Chancellor and the Provost of the University of Pittsburgh, and a 2007 visit with the Prime Minister of Luxembourg, Jean Claude Juncker.

Last, but certainly not least, I thank my wife, Alice Kaylor, and my daughter, Miranda Kaylor Thompson, for their love, patience, and encouragement.

ACRONYMS

AACRAO – American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. A higher education professional association with a portion of its membership and professional activities devoted to international education. A voting member of the National Council on the Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials.

ACE – American Council on Education. A higher education membership advocacy organization with a portion of its activities and interest devoted to international education. A voting member of the National Council on the Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials.

APEC – Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum. A forum for twenty-one Asian countries to address economic cooperation established in 1989.

CEC – National Council on the Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials. An inter-associational body that reviews manuscripts on foreign educational systems and approves placement recommendations for academic qualifications of a foreign educational system.

CEPES – UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education. Inaugurated in Bucharest in 1972 with pan-European coverage that includes North America and Israel. Mission is to promote cooperation, disseminate information and study innovative trends in education, especially student mobility.

CPU – French Conference of University Presidents.

DG – Directorate General. The departments or services of the European Commission.

EC – European Commission. The administrative arm and bureaucracy of the European Union.

ECSC – European Coal and Steel Community. Established in 1952 between Belgium, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands forming a market for coal and steel to facilitate reconstruction after World War II and to bind France and Germany economically as a way to avoid future war.

ECTS – European Credit Transfer and Accumulation Scheme. Under the ERASMUS program of the European Commission, to ensure that periods of study abroad are recognized and accepted as part of the program of studies leading to a degree or qualification at the home institution, a system of assigning credit to units under ECTS was created.

EEC – European Economic Community. The first supranational body formed after the signing of the Treaty of Rome. The precursor of the European Union.

EHEA – European Higher Education Area. Referenced in both the Sorbonne Declaration and Bologna Declaration as a goal for Europe to be accomplished through the harmonization to higher education and a two-tiered degree system.

EMS – European Monetary System. Established in 1979, several countries linked their currencies in an effort to stabilize exchange rates. The EMS was replaced by the European Monetary Union (EMU).

EMU – European Monetary Union. In 1998, eleven of the then fifteen Member States of the EU qualified to join the EMU and adopt a common currency, the Euro.

ENIC- National Education Information Center. Under the provisions of the Lisbon Recognition Convention (1997) each signatory nation must provide a centralized clearinghouse for individuals to access information about the educational system in that country.

ENIC-NARIC Network – A network of the network of ENICs and network of NARICs given the overlap of interests and responsibilities after the signing of the Lisbon Recognition in 1997.

The network meets annually and maintains an active Web site and e-mail list.

ERASMUS – European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students

EU – European Union

EUA – European University Association. Established in 2001, the EUA’s mission is to be the voice of Europe’s universities to influence the outcomes of European level policy debates on various issues.

EUDISED – European Documentation and Information System for Education

EURYDICE – Network for Education Information, Information on Education Systems and Policies in Europe

NAFTA – North American Free Trade Agreement. Trade agreement between Canada, Mexico and the United States signed in 1994.

NARIC – National Academic Recognition Center. Under provisions of the European Union, centers established in each Member State of the EU to resolve issues of recognition of qualifications both academic and professional under provisions that the EU guarantees the free movement of people.

NEIC – National Equivalence Information Center. The Web site created by the U.S. Department of Education after signing the Lisbon Recognition Convention in 1997 as a clearinghouse for information on education in the U.S.

OECD – Organization for European Economic Cooperation and Development. Established in 1947 to manage and run the U.S.-financed Marshall Plan for the reconstruction of Europe after

WWII. Aided the development of economic cooperation based on governments understanding that their economies were interdependent.

OEEC – Organization for European Economic Cooperation. Established in 1948, emerging from the Marshall Plan and the Conference of Sixteen with a goal of establishing a permanent organization to work on recovery and supervise the distribution of aid in Europe.

QMV – Qualified Majority Voting. Voting procedure in the Council of Ministers and European Council where votes by Member States are weighted.

SEA – Single European Act. Agreed in 1986 to launch the single market by the end of 1992 providing for the free movement of all goods and people.

TEC – The Treaty Establishing the European Community. Signed in Rome in 1957 launching the formation of the European Economic Community.

TEU – The Treaty of European Union. Signed in Maastricht in 1993 launching the European Union.

A BRIEF ANNOTATED TIMELINE OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

1952 – The European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) was established between Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. It created a common market in coal and steel; established a pattern of delegation and subordination of power between supranational and national sovereignty. Its institutions included the High Authority, Court of Justice, Council of Ministers, and Common Assembly. These institutions in many respects foreshadowed the subsequent institutions of the European Union.

1957 – Treaty of Rome: The treaty establishing the European Economic Community (EEC). It launched the internal market between Member States. Established common policies in trade and agriculture. Transformation of majority voting to qualified majority voting (QMV), transforming the ability of the European Commission to be a primary actor in setting agendas.

1973 – The EEC enlarged from six to nine by the accession of Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom. Social and environmental policies were implemented.

1979 – First elections to the European Parliament.

1981 – The EEC enlarged from nine to ten with the accession of Greece.

1986 – Single European Act: Launched the single market, with Member States committing to its creation by the end of 1992. The foundational concept of behind the single market is the free movement of all goods and people. The EEC enlarged from ten to twelve with the accession of Portugal and Spain.

1991 – Signing of the Maastricht Treaty: Treaty on European Union (TEU).

1993 – The Treaty on European Union comes into force on November 1, 1993. Launched the European Union (EU). Commits the EU to act only in areas where competence has been given by the treaties and EU decisions taken as close to EU citizens as possible, the concept of subsidiarity. Member States may opt out of specific treaty obligations. Co-decision procedures between the Council and the European Parliament limits the agenda-setting ability of the European Commission. A second treaty, the Treaty on Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) is signed with a commitment to the creation of the European Central Bank by 1999 and a subsequent launching of a single currency.

1995 – The EU enlarged from twelve to fifteen with the accession of Austria, Finland and Sweden.

1997 – Amsterdam Treaty: Cements processes started with the Maastricht Treaty, deepening European integration. The functioning of EU institutions (Council of Ministers, European Court of Justice, European Parliament, and European Commission) echoes the legislatures, bureaucracies and legal systems of nations.

2004 – The EU enlarged from fifteen to twenty-five with the accession of Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia.

2007 – The EU enlarged from twenty-five to twenty-seven with the accession of Bulgaria and Romania.

**A BRIEF ANNOTATED TIMELINE OF EDUCATION, EUROPEAN INTEGRATION,
AND THE BOLOGNA PROCESS**

1952 – 1973 – The initial processes of European integration did not include education as an area of interest or concern.

1973 – Directorate General XII (DG XII): Education was added to research and science policy as an area of responsibility for one of the thirteen commissioners of the European Commission. Responsibility was fairly limited to the improvement of opportunities for movement among Member States.

1974 – The first meeting of the Ministers of Education after EU enlargement to nine Member States. Established the basic principles for cooperation in education at Community (EEC) level. Expressed resolute opposition to the idea of harmonization of education in Europe. Cooperation (and responsibility) in education remained the responsibility of the Member States.

1976 – Resolution and Action Program: Highlighted the dual nature of Community involvement in education – the Community and the European Commission can only offer suggestions or make recommendations. The European Commission established the Community Network for Education Information (EURYDICE) and provided funding for Joint Study Programs.

1981 – Linking of DG XII with DG V: Social Affairs became an area of interest under the new DGV V for Social Policy. The focus was on youth unemployment.

1987 – Launching of the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Student (ERASMUS). ERASMUS provided the financial framework for university-level students to study abroad in another Member State. The program also created the framework for the creation of a European Credit Transfer and Accumulation Scheme (ECTS) so that periods of study in another country would be recognized as part of the degree program at the home institution.

1997 – The Council of Europe and UNESCO offer a joint convention on the mutual recognitions of higher education qualifications. Signed in Lisbon in April 1997. Went into effect in 1999. A provision of the Lisbon Recognition Convention is the provision of a Diploma Supplement that coordinates with the requirements of ECTS. The Lisbon Convention also requires that signatories have a national education information center to serve as a clearinghouse for information on education in that country.

1998 – The Ministers for Education of France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom meet at the Sorbonne to celebrate the 800th anniversary of the university. Ministers draft and sign the Sorbonne Declaration, referencing ECTS, a European area for higher education, the Lisbon Recognition Convention, and noting that a “progressive harmonization of the overall framework of our degrees and cycles can be achieved through strengthening of already existing experience, joint diplomas, pilot initiatives, and dialogue with all concerned.”

1999 – Meeting convened at the University of Bologna with Ministers of Education from most European countries in part in reaction to a call from those countries not included in Sorbonne Declaration to be included. The result of the meeting was the Bologna Declaration. Signatories agreed to meet every two years to follow-up on the progress being made toward the realization of the Bologna Process.

2001 – Prague Bologna Process follow-up meeting.

2003 – Ministerial Bologna Process follow-up meeting in Berlin. Each signatory to the Bologna Declaration was asked to prepare and submit a report on the progress made toward the realization of the European High Education Area. The reports were answers to a set of questions.

2005 – Bergen Bologna Process follow-up meeting.

2007 – London Bologna Process follow-up meeting.

2009 – Leuven Bologna Process follow-up meeting and the first Bologna Policy Forum.

2010 – The second Bologna Policy Forum held in Vienna.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Historically, education has been both parent and child to the developing national state. The national education system as a universal and public institution first emerged in post-revolutionary Europe as an instrument of state formation. It provided a powerful vehicle for the construction and integration of the new nation state and became one of its chief institutional supports. Since then few nations have embarked on independent statehood without recourse to its ideological potential; even older states, at least in periods of war and crisis, have continued to view education as a valuable source of national cohesion and a key tool for economic development. However, the role of the national state is now changing, and with it the place of education. (Green, 1997, p. 1)

The nation-state has been the main unit of political organization and its conceptualization since the Peace of Westphalia. The nation-state has also been “the primary unit for social analysis and educational policy.” (Daun, 2002, p. 33) The sovereignty of the nation-state is one of the defining characteristics of the nation-state (Nugent, 2003). Education also plays a role in defining the nation-state. In post-revolutionary Europe, national education systems emerged as an instrument of forming the state (Green, 1997). “The provision of formal instruction is a universal fact across the modern state system and one that is tied to national political identities and state responsibilities.” (Blitz, 1997, p. 1) Education in Europe has been a sovereign national responsibility. Challenges to the conceptualization and sovereignty of the nation-state emerged in the late twentieth century. Although contested, globalization and regionalism are transforming the nation-state. Education is not immune to the effects of globalization and regionalism (Daun, 2002; Uvalić-Trumbić, 2002). Europeanization, defined as a cross-border dimension in

European affairs, is another challenge to the sovereignty and transformation of national educational systems in Europe as a result of Europeanization.

The purpose of the present research is to review where education has appeared in the process of European integration, or not, as the early years show that education was not part of the process. It reviews the influence of Europeanization on education as evidenced by the Bologna Declaration and the Bologna Process, focusing on the reports prepared by each signatory of the Bologna Declaration in advance of the 2003 Berlin Ministerial meeting addressing what steps had been taken to meet the goals or objectives of the Bologna Declaration. The reports prepared for the 2003 meeting are the data upon which this study is based. Content analysis to answer the question of what steps have been taken to meet the objectives of the Bologna Process.

Regionalism emerged in the latter half of the twentieth century as projects of reorganization of regional space with defined political and economic goals and objectives (Yeates, 2001). A few examples are the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), initiated in 1992, and the Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum (APEC), proposed in 1989. In Europe, regionalism is defined as the process of integration and the forming of the European Union, tracing its origins to 1957 and the signing of the Treaty of Rome. Initially focused on the development of a single market, the European Union represents a transformation of the nation-state, a challenge to the sovereignty of the nation-state, and the formation of a *sui generis* cross-border system of governance.

Broadly defined by Wallace, Europeanization is the “Cross-border” connections, “beyond the state” processes. “Europeanization is...the development and sustaining of systematic European arrangements to manage cross-border connections, such that a European dimension becomes an embedded feature which frames politics and policy within European state.”

(Wallace, 2000, p. 370) Through this definition, inquiry and research is not limited to the member states of the European Union. The focus of research becomes the impact of Europeanization, the “beyond the state” processes, on the “within the state” or domestic processes (Wallace, 2000). One example of a non-EU cross-border connection is the 1997 Lisbon Convention of the Council of Europe and UNESCO regarding the Recognition of Qualifications Concerning Higher Education in the European Region. It is useful to note that this convention reaches beyond just the member states of the EU.

Social policy, including education and education policy, has not been a part of the development of the EU (Blitz, 1997). Education and education policy have not been delegated to or subsumed under the European Union. Education remains a sovereign national responsibility, although the European Commission (EC) has facilitated the development of a European dimension in education through various sponsored programs.

Most scholars of the European Union agree that the Treaty of Rome signed in 1957 (the Treaty Establishing the European Community or TEC) started the formal process of European integration and its main focus has been the creation of an internal market. Education was not specifically mentioned in the Treaty of Rome, although Article 128 relating to training provides an indirect relationship to education (Neave, 1984; Blitz, 1997, 1999). Not until early 1972 did education become an EU area of interest. In 1971 Working Parties were established to gather data on educational issues and establish a need for Community effort in the field of education (Andersen & Eliassen, 2001). In 1973, education for the first time figured as part of a responsibility of a member of the European Commission under Directorate-General (DG) XII, one of the bureaus or departments of the European Commission.

The first Communication to the Council, “Education in the European Community” was presented in 1974, and it elaborated the reasoning for developing co-operation in the Community. (Andersen & Eliassen, 2001, p. 128)

Subsequently, in 1976, the European Commission launched an Action Program in education. Resources were provided for study visits to facilitate understanding of the educational systems in the different member states of the EU. Then in 1987 the European Commission launched the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS). By 1994, a total of 187,637 students had participated in ERASMUS, a significant number given that little intra-European student mobility (study abroad) took place before 1987 (European Commission, 1997). While these programs and initiatives were in the field of education, the ERASMUS program and other European Commission supported programs and initiatives did not represent a delegation of responsibility or authority for education to the European Union, and by extension, the European Commission.

In June of 1999, European Ministers of Education met in Bologna, Italy, a meeting held in response to an earlier summit by the Ministers of Education for France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom convened at the *Université de Sorbonne* in Paris in 1998. The outcome of the meeting in 1999 was the Bologna Declaration. The declaration reiterates the positions taken in 1998 by the four ministers, asserting the central role of European universities in developing the cultural dimension in Europe. The declaration calls for the “creation of the European area of higher education as a key way to promote citizens’ mobility and employability and the continent’s overall development.” (Bologna Declaration, 1999) The declaration advocates specific reforms focusing on a harmonization in the “European higher education system” with the objective of increasing the international competitiveness of European higher education.

Europeanization, broadly defined, is influencing education. Most nations in Europe have agreed to insert a European dimension into their education policies and structures (Andersen & Eliassen, 2001; Olsen, 2002). The 1999 Bologna Declaration and the Bologna Process, with the goal of the harmonization of educational structures by 2010, in words, if not actions, represent a process of Europeanization, a transformation of higher education and a transformation of national sovereignty.

This study draws directly on my involvement in some aspects of both the 1997 joint Council of Europe and UNESCO Lisbon Recognition Convention and the Bologna Process initiated with the signing of the Bologna Declaration in 1999. In the mid-1990s the United States was approached through the U.S. Department of State to participate in the development of a new joint Council of Europe and UNESCO convention on the mutual recognition of academic qualifications in the European Region. The United States was invited to participate given that UNESCO includes the United States in the European Region, as well as Australia, Canada, Israel, and New Zealand. As brief background, several developments in the two international organizations had led to an agreement between the Council of Europe and UNESCO to work together to elaborate a joint convention (Bergen & Uvalić-Trumbić, 1996). The Council of Europe recognized that higher education in Europe had changed since the European higher education conventions of the 1950s and 1960s and those conventions had not been adjusted to reflect those changes. There was also a substantial increase in participation in the European Cultural Convention with forty-four countries having acceded to that convention by the mid-1990s (Bergen & Uvalić-Trumbić, 1996).

The increase in the number of States party to the European Cultural Convention also means that there are no longer any substantial discrepancies between those countries involved in programmes of educational and cultural co-operation of the

Council of Europe and those making up the UNESCO Europe Region. (Bergen & Uvalić-Trumbić, 1996, p. 11)

From the perspective of UNESCO, the 1979 UNESCO Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas, and Degrees Concerning Higher Education in the States Belonging to the Europe Region had served as the only venue for bringing together the countries who had signed the Council of Europe equivalence conventions and the recognition specialists. As a result of the changes in Europe, by 1989 “this particular role was no longer specific to the UNESCO Convention. (Bergen & Uvalić-Trumbić, 1996, p. 11) In addition, with the emergence of the newly independent States, membership of the UNESCO Europe Region grew to forty-nine.

As a result of these developments, the impetus for the Council of Europe and UNESCO to jointly develop a new convention on the recognition of qualifications would benefit all Member States of both of these major international organizations. Another goal emerging from a consideration of a new joint convention was the desire to avoid duplicating efforts. This is reflected in the steps taken in 1994 to establish a joint Council of Europe/UNESCO Network of national centers to provide information on academic mobility and recognition. The Network of European National Information Centers on Academic Recognition and Mobility (ENIC Network) replaced the two separate networks of the two organizations. The ENIC Network works closely and cooperates with the Network of National Academic Recognition Centers of the European Union (NARIC Network) as demonstrated in the annual joint meetings of the ENIC/NARIC Networks. As evidenced by the establishment of the NARICs and the NARIC Network, developments on the part of the European Union augmented the significance of the recognition of qualifications lending further motivation to the development of a joint convention (Bergen & Uvalić-Trumbić, 1996).

Developments in the European Union also enhanced the significance given to the recognition of qualifications. Two General Directives have been issued on the mutual recognition of academic qualifications for professional purposes (*i.e.* access to regulated professions). These apply to the countries of the European Union and the European Economic Area. The Maastricht Treaty explicitly mentions academic recognition as an area of Community action, thus providing a legal basis for Community support in the field. (Bergen & Uvalić-Trumbić, 1996, p. 11)

Starting in 1984, I was an international admission officer for the University of Pittsburgh where my full-time responsibilities focused on the evaluation of foreign academic credentials. In April of 1996 I was contacted by The College Board to be their representative to the National Council on the Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials (CEC). The CEC has been the only inter-organizational body in the U.S. to review publications on foreign educational systems and approve recommendations for the placement of holders of foreign educational qualifications/credentials in academic programs in the U.S. based on the evaluation of their foreign educational credentials. At this time I also served on the national Admissions Section Team of NAFSA: Association of International Educators. While attending a CEC meeting in Phoenix to review manuscripts on Thailand, the People's Republic of China and India, I learned about the invitation to the United States to participate in the development of a new joint Council of Europe/UNESCO convention on mutual recognition of academic qualifications, which by 1996 had had a fifth outline of a draft convention and explanatory report. In Phoenix I also heard about a provision of the convention that signatories have national education information centers or ENICs. I asked to be kept informed of developments and expressed an interest in attending any meetings as I felt that this would be a development that would be of interest to the international admissions community in the U.S. and might have implications for the work of the National Council on the Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials.

Learning of a series of meetings to be held in the fall of 1996 in Washington, D.C. with representatives of various professional organizations such as NAFSA, the American Council on Education (ACE) and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) and with representatives of the State Department and the U.S. Department of Education, particularly the International Office and the National Library of Education, I offered to attend these meetings as I thought it would be useful to have someone from a university and someone who had a working knowledge of the field of foreign credential evaluation. The first meeting focused on a discussion of the Sixth Outline of the Draft Council of Europe/UNESCO Convention and Explanatory Report on the Recognition of Qualifications Concerning Higher Education in the European Region that had been drafted following a meeting of the Editorial Group in September 1996 prepared for the Consultation Meeting of Potential Signatory States to be held at The Hague in late November. That meeting was to be the final opportunity for input and revisions before the Diplomatic Conference scheduled for Lisbon in April 1997. There were also discussions about the possible role of the National Library of Education as a national education information center or ENIC. At a follow-up meeting in D.C. a few weeks later, having reached consensus that the United States could and should participate in the joint convention, the discussion moved to who should attend the Consultation Meeting to be held at The Hague, which turned out to be scheduled to start the day before Thanksgiving. After it was clear that everyone already had plans for Thanksgiving, I said that I could go.

Ray Wanner and I (Ray was then a lawyer with the State Department) made up the U.S. Delegation to be accompanied at the meeting by a representative of the U.S. Embassy to the Netherlands. Officially I was a member of the delegation representing the private sector as a consultant. I could not officially represent the U.S. government.

The Consultation Meeting in The Hague was my first experience in an international meeting using simultaneous translation. During the course of the discussions, it became clear to me that in the case of the United States, the competent authority in matters of recognition of academic qualifications was not the federal government or state governments, but institutions (universities and colleges) themselves. Article Two of the draft had been written to reflect the situation in Europe where there are national entities such as Ministries of Education and NARICs with authority to render decisions on the recognition of academic qualifications. Therefore, before the United States could sign the convention scheduled to be signed in Lisbon in April 1997, Article Two would have to be revised. Privately I spoke with Kees Kouwenaar, Chair of the Consultation Meeting, who I had met previously at a seminar in Miami, Florida, expressing my concern that Article Two as written would make it impossible for the U.S. to sign. I suggested that there were in fact three possible cases of entities with competence (and authority) to make decisions on the recognition of qualifications: a national entity, a state or regional entity (as in the case of Canada), or the institution itself (as in the case of the United States). At the luncheon break, I asked for access to a computer and drafted a revision for Article Two to reflect the three possible cases of competence. In the afternoon session, my draft text was introduced for consideration. The text follows:

Section II. The competence of authorities

Article II.1

- 1 Where central authorities of a Party are competent to make decisions in recognition cases, that Party shall be immediately bound by the provisions of this Convention and shall take the necessary measures to ensure the implementation of its provisions on its territory.

Where the competence to make decisions in recognition matters lies with components of the Party, the Party shall furnish one of the depositaries with a brief statement of its constitutional situation or structure at the time of

signature or when depositing its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, or any time thereafter. In such cases, the competent authorities of the components of the Parties so designated shall take the necessary measures to ensure implementation of the provisions of this Convention on their territory.

- 2 Where the competence to make decisions in recognition matters lies with individual higher education institutions or other entities, each Party according to its constitutional situation or structure shall transmit the text of this convention to these institutions or entities and shall take all possible steps to encourage the favourable consideration and application of its provisions.
- 3 The provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the obligations of the Parties under subsequent articles of this Convention. (Lisbon Convention, 1997)

It is with a great deal of personal satisfaction that the proposed revisions to Article II.1 were unanimously accepted by the delegates and became a part of the official text then signed in Lisbon on April 11, 1997 by twenty-eight countries. I was again appointed as a private sector advisor to the official U.S. delegation to the Diplomatic Conference in Lisbon. Then in June 1997, as a follow-up activity to my involvement in the Lisbon Convention, I attended the joint ENIC-NARIC Meeting held in Helsinki, Finland. While the newly signed Lisbon Convention was not the official topic of discussion, almost all of the informal discussions focused on the convention and which countries would ratify the convention.

As I continued to serve on the National Council on the Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials I maintained an interest in the ENIC-NARIC Network as an observer to the Network as only a government employee could officially represent the U.S. Much of the business of the Network is conducted via an e-mail list and I am able to sustain an involvement in the issues of concern through the e-mail communications shared through the e-mail list. I have attended seven of the joint ENIC-NARIC Meetings since 1997, the most memorable being the meeting held in Lithuania in June 1999.

That meeting is memorable because I heard for the first time about the Sorbonne Declaration and about an upcoming “follow-up” meeting to be held in Bologna, Italy immediately after the meeting in Vilnius. Several colleagues from various ENIC-NARIC offices asked if I were going to the meeting in Bologna. I was embarrassed to admit that I knew nothing of the meeting and asked what the meeting was about. It was then that I was told about the Sorbonne Declaration and informed that it was those countries who had not been invited to Paris in 1998 and their wanting to know why they had not been included in the Paris meeting that motivated the Italian Ministry of Education to organize the meeting in Bologna. I also learned that what the Sorbonne Declaration was calling for was a harmonization of the framework or degrees and that European integration must be expanded to be a Europe of knowledge and not just a Europe of banks and economy. When I asked what this all meant, I was told that essentially it was a call to re-organize degrees into a two cycle pattern of an undergraduate cycle followed by a shorter master’s degree at the graduate cycle. As I heard this, what amounted to changing degrees in a country like France, I thought to myself that this is all rhetorical. The French system is so centralized and their degrees so intertwined with a sense of national identity that the French people would never allow such change, recalling the student strikes in 1968 when France called for reforms in higher education. Nevertheless, I thought that the Sorbonne Declaration and the meeting to be held in Bologna would be good to pay attention to and monitor in the coming months and years.

In the following year, as I learned about the outcome of the meeting in Bologna and the Bologna Declaration, while still very skeptical that the nations of Europe would change their degrees and adopt a new Anglo-Saxon model for their degrees structures called for in the Bologna Declaration, I decided that I should learn more about what was going on and see if I

could develop some context for understanding the motivations for these changes. It was then that I decided to look more closely at the European Union and European integration. I also thought that I should focus my research for the doctoral degree on the Bologna Process given that it calls for change in the structure of higher education in Europe because, from discussions with colleagues in international admissions at other universities around the United States, no one seemed to be paying attention to what was happening in Europe. This dissertation is a part of the results of my observations, interest in, and experience related to the Bologna Process from first learning in 1999 about the Sorbonne Declaration and a meeting to take place in Bologna.

The 1998 Sorbonne Joint Declaration, as it is officially titled, was drafted and signed by the ministers of education for France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom on the occasion of the anniversary of the founding of the University of Paris. While the declaration is less than three pages, it puts forward a dramatic call for a harmonization of the “architecture of the European system of higher education. A few keys points of the declaration are:

- The creation of a Europe of knowledge that is complementary to the Europe of the EURO, banks and the economy;
- The creation of a system of education that addresses the major changes that Europe faces based on changing working conditions where education and training throughout life is becoming a necessity;
- The creation of a system of education based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate, utilizing a system of credits and semesters,
- The creation opportunities for multidisciplinary studies, the acquiring of proficiency in other languages, and the acquiring of information technology skills;

- and creating opportunities for students to study for at least one semester at a university outside their country.

The declaration also makes note that a year earlier a convention on the recognition of higher education qualifications was signed in Lisbon, setting out basic principles for the recognition of academic degrees. The declaration concludes by noting that the “reforms” outlined in the Sorbonne Declaration combined with the recognition framework established through the Lisbon recognition convention will enable “European Universities to consolidate Europe’s standing in the world through continuously improved and updated education for its citizens.” (Sorbonne Joint Declaration, 1998)

The next chapter outlines some of the main theories of European integration, the forming of the European Union, as a background to framing and clarifying the theoretical position of this study. The first part of the chapter focuses on conceptualizing the European Union.

2.0 CONCEPTUALIZING AND THEORIZING EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

2.1 CONCEPTUALIZING THE EUROPEAN UNION

A review of the literature on European Integration and education reveals that education has not been a part of the early stages of European integration and remains a national responsibility that has not been delegated to the European Union. Nevertheless, to look more closely at higher education in Europe and not have an understanding of the processes leading to integration and forming of the European Union would be to miss a major part of the influences that have shaped various actions and directions that have taken place in Europe since the end of World War II. This chapter reviews scholarly research on Europe and European affairs in the past two decades that has focused primarily on the process of the forming of the European Union and various conceptualizations and theories that scholars use to understand European integration and the forming of the European Union.

To many, Europe has come to mean the European Union (EU), the collection of states formally admitted to the EU (Olsen, 2002). Much of the research explores the question of what the EU represents. Most agree that the EU represents change or transformation of the nation-state. Discourse on the nation-state tends to revolve around three models, interpretations, or understandings of the nation-state: a Westphalian model, the regulatory model, or a post-modern model (Caporaso, 1996).

At its core, the Westphalian model is the traditional definition of the nation-state. Central to that definition are the concepts of territory, sovereignty, legitimacy (which includes the concept of legitimate violence as offered by Max Weber), and monopoly of governance (Nugent, 2003). Key to this discussion is the concept of sovereignty, the right of authority over domestic affairs. Stated another way, the Westphalian model revolves around the principle of “territoriality and the exclusion of external actors from domestic authority structures.” (Joffe, 1999, p. 122)

...[Sovereignty] is a *right*, a socially recognized capacity to decide on matters within a state’s domestic jurisdiction. As Thomson puts it, “[s]overeignty is the recognition by internal and external actors that the state has exclusive authority to intervene coercively in activities within its territory” (Thomson, 1995, p. 219). There is no legal superior to the state in its internal or external affairs. Internally sovereignty implies non-intervention by ‘outside’ powers, non-interference in domestic affairs. (Caporaso, 1996, p. 35)

Applied to the EU, the imposition of the Westphalian model of the nation-state should reveal a re-creation of the processes of “state-building from the seventeenth through the twentieth centuries.” (Caporaso, 1996, p.35) According to Caporaso, studies of European integration looking to the Westphalian model for understanding of the European Union, its institutions, and policies, come up short. The policies and institutions of the EU are systematically different from those of national governments and its portfolio of functions, responsibilities, activities, and competencies are radically different to the conclusion that the EU is not an infant “national political system waiting to blossom.” (Caporaso, 1996, p. 39)

The regulatory-state conceptualization revolves mainly around those policy areas where the EU has been delegated the control and management of international external affairs, owing much to the work of Magone (Caporaso, 1996). In the regulatory model, the EU reveals significant advances in policy areas relating to the development of the “single market,

competition, technical standards and environment,” but little progress in other areas such as “social policy, labor policy, energy policy and foreign security policy.” (Caporaso, 1996, p. 39) The implication of this model is that the regulatory-state will not resemble the traditional nation-state. “Instead we should expect a political division of labour between Member States, focusing on social and redistributive policy, and the EU, focusing on regulatory policy.” (Caporaso, 1996, p. 41) The weakness of the regulatory model is a democratic deficit in part as a result of the “anti-democratic possibilities of independent regulatory structures” and the weakness of European parties, the strength of specialized interest groups, the under-representation of large unconcentrated groups, the secrecy of the Council, and the unpopular nature of the Commissions and the Court.” (Caporaso, 1996, pp. 41-42) If the importance and significance of the EU were limited to the “regionalization of the European economy,” then the regulatory model might be adequate. “The importance of the EU is only partially captured by a topology of policy-making.” (Caporaso, 1996, p. 44)

A post-modern conceptualization of the state immediately poses problems stemming from the problem of definition. What is post-modernism and what are its key features? Green’s discussion of postmodernism and state education provides a useful starting point for the conceptualization of the nation in post-modern terms. Briefly, postmodernism stresses the nature of reality as fragmentary, heterogeneous and plural, “and the inherently unstable and shifting nature of the subject and individual consciousness.” (Green, 1997, p. 9) In addition, since the 1960s, general theories of contemporary society have changed so dramatically and distinctly that they force a complete “reconceptualization of social organization in advanced capitalist societies.” (Green 1997, p. 9) The post-modern conceptualization of the state starts with a rejection of or moving beyond the traditional definitions of statehood that revolve around

citizenship, sovereignty, legitimacy, and monopoly (which includes legitimate violence) (Caporaso, 1996).

The nation-state system is not just a modern expression of a universal political form organized at the national level. It is a distinctive form of organization based on carving up the world into territorially exclusive enclaves. Sovereignty, in its modern form, is the right to exclude – people, capital, ideas, foreign powers, and so on. (Caporaso, 1996, p. 45)

In the case of the EU, the concept of state at the European level challenges traditional thinking, conceptualizing, and theorizing about the nation-state and political authority, pointedly contrasting with the conceptualization of the state in Westphalian terms as much as it is “abstract, disjointed, increasingly fragmented, not based on stable and coherent coalitions of issues and constituencies, and lacking in a clear public space within which competitive visions of the good life and pursuit of self-interested legislation are discussed and debated.” (Caporaso, 1996, p. 45)

...the European post-modern polity is not easy to describe. Elements of politics and governance occupy different sites (Basel, Brussels, the national capitals, Luxembourg, bilateral meetings among economic and finance ministers), and these sites can change. Process and activity become more important than structure and fixed institutions. The state becomes not so much a thing (which it is not even in domestic contexts) as a set of spatially detached activities, diffused across the Members States but reflecting no principled – let alone constitutional – consideration. (Caporaso, 1996, p. 45)

An aspect of a post-modern conceptualization of the EU as a nation-state reveals the EU as having a weak core (Caporaso, 1996). In this regard, the main political institutions of the EU have limited autonomy and are “thin” in contrast to domestic institutions. Social policy is pointed to as illustrative of the weakness of its core, where it is generally recognized that the EU has made little inroads (Caporaso, 1996). However, a preoccupation with looking to the European Commission as the “core” source for change in social policy has been a mistake.

...the conclusion that EU social policy is weak has more to do with our analytical focus on central political initiatives of the EU and less with the substantive development of social policy. Preoccupation with efforts by the Commission "...to foist an activist 'social dimension' on a reluctant Council has been a mistake" (1995), p.4). Social policy has in fact developed substantially but less as a result of conscious, centrally directed policy, more as a consequence of practical problems stemming from market integration. (Caporaso, 1996, p. 46)

The development of social policy outside or independent of the European Commission will be discussed more fully later in this study.

As Caporaso points out, a weak core does not necessarily imply a weak state. There are many spatial locations of the form of state represented by the EU, and as noted by Marks *et al.*, linking the dispersed nature of state with a concept of multi-level polity (Caporaso, 1996).

Marks *et al.* see two separate logics operating in the EU – the logic of state executive bargaining in the Council of Ministers and the European Council, and the logic of multi-level governance operating through the Court, Parliament and the Commission. (Caporaso, 1996, p. 46)

A multilevel system of governance or polity relies on a concept of interconnectedness, defined as "ongoing interactions among different levels above and below the nation-state." (Caporaso, 1996, p. 47) Defined as "networks of interaction," this approach is identified by Mark *et al.* as multi-level polity (Caporaso, 1996). To a postmodern perspective, this multi-level system of governance and approach to analysis where the EU represents a "fragmentation of political power, the decentering of authority, and the lack of overall coherence in the integration process" is useful as a reflection of the post-modern condition (Caporaso, 1996, p. 49).

2.2 THEORIZING EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

To some, the EU represents an evolved state of international relations. To others, it represents a process by which member states are delegating national sovereignty to the new supranational entity, the EU. Most agree that understanding the EU and European integration requires understanding the complexities of the management of cross-border relations between member states. In this regard, cross-border interactions in Europe are not limited to just the member states of the EU (Olsen, 2002; Wallace, 2000). Cross-border relations in all of Europe are managed through various “transnational regimes and institution-building besides the EU” and there are numerous examples of non-EU European-level institutions (Olsen, 2002). Many policy areas in Europe have not been subsumed under the EU.

To develop an understanding of the dynamic change taking place in Europe, scholars have utilized old, new and borrowed approaches (Jachtenfuchs, Diez, & Jung, 1998; Sandholtz & Stone Sweet, 1998). Some adopt the view that that the forming of the European Union represents a complex set of interactions and there are competing views to explain the integration process. Others argue that the transforming of Europe represents the process of the Europeanization of institutions and domestic structures (Cowles, Caporaso, & Risse, 2001; Olsen, 2002).

Among the different approaches and theories used to explain the process of European integration, two competing theories have appeared to dominate recent discourse (Jachtenfuchs, Diez, & Jung, 1998; Sandholtz & Stone Sweet, 1998). If placed on a continuum, at one end are the intergovernmentalists who argue that the European Union represents an evolved state of inter-governmental bargaining and a distribution of preferences. The intergovernmentalists argue that it is the bargaining that explains integration, representing an

evolved form of international relations. At the other end of the continuum are the neofunctionalists who argue that the European Union represents the creation of a new supranational entity to which member states are relinquishing sovereignty (Sandholtz & Stone Sweet, 1998; Sbragia, 1993).

Another theory used to explain European integration is transaction-based. This theory “implies a coherent answer to the questions, why does integration proceed faster or further in some policy areas than in others?” (Sandholtz & Stone Sweet, 1998, p. 40) From the perspective of inter-national (between member states) interaction and concomitant need for supranational coordination, cooperation, and rules, in sectors where there is a low level of interaction, low levels of supranational coordination, cooperation and rules are required. Conversely, where there are high levels of inter-national interaction, increasing levels of supranational coordination, cooperation, and rules are needed and/or desired (Sandholtz & Stone Sweet, 1998). Applying transaction-based theory to European integration, the road from the Treaty of Rome to the European Union started with the creation of an internal market. Therefore, the European Union has moved farthest toward a supranational entity with regards to the management of that internal market. Trade and investment within the European Union has grown steadily since the creation of the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1957. In turn, this has created a need for greater supranational governance in areas relating to the expansion and maintenance of that market and required as a result of the adoption of the European Monetary Union (EMU) and a common currency, the EURO (Sandholtz & Stone Sweet, 1998; Sbragia, 1993).

Spillover is another theory used in the discourse about European integration.

In a functional sense, spillover was founded on the belief that contemporary economics were based upon a tangle of interrelated sectors. Once one economic

sector could be integrated, the complexity of modern economies would force other sectors into similar structures and developments. More important, perhaps, was the notion of political spillover. This was based on the assumption that once supranational institutions had been set up in one economic sector, interest groups would look to that political level for the realisation of their demands, and that in time the groups would begin to appreciate the value to themselves of integration. And again, because of the nature of the modern economy, these groups would in turn lend their support to pressures for further integration. (Urwin, 1995, p. 55)

In theory, spillover from economic cooperation and integration should lead to greater integration. In addition to economic cooperation, at the start of the process toward integration a “European ambience and presence” was fostered that acted to stimulate other developments (Urwin, 1995, pp. 55-56). Initiatives and interactions created an “atmosphere of mutual confidence” that through working together on specific problems by specific deadlines created conditions and an environment of cooperation that eventually led to the creation of the European Economic Community in 1957 (Urwin, 1995, p. 56).

This study adopts the position that while the process of European integration, the forming of the European Union, has set a macro-level agenda or tone for Europe, it is the complex influences of both European integration and Europeanization that is influencing domestic policy and setting the agenda for domestic change in higher education policy.

The story of the transformation of the nation-state in Europe, regardless of the theoretical perspective chosen to analyze that process, begins with the story of the forming of the European Union. As the process of European integration is widening and deepening as the EU entered the twenty-first century, the next chapter provides a closer look at the history of European integration to provide a context for a later discussion of where education appears in the process of forming the European Union and an analysis of the changes in education called for in the Bologna Declaration.

3.0 AN OVERVIEW OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

To provide a more in depth background to the processes of European integration and the forming of the European Union, this chapter is a review of the literature on the history of European integration. It looks at the history of European integration and the steps taken at various stages in that history that moved toward the forming of the European Union starting with conceptualizations of a unified Europe prior to the twentieth century, ideas and actions taken in the early twentieth century, and actions taken after the end of World War II.

Several histories of European integration note that the idea of a united or integrated Europe is not new nor of the twentieth century (Urwin, 1995; Dinan, 1999). The idea of uniting Europe to overcome political fragmentation can be attributed to range of thinkers, conquerors, and politicians. Military conquests resolving in imperial domination, a forced unification, are credited to Charlemagne, the Hapsburgs, Napoleon, and in the twentieth century, infamously, Adolph Hitler (Urwin, 1995). Further back in history, the Roman Empire provides another image of an integrated Europe, an empire not only able to protect itself from outside influences and invasion, but also able to maintain an internal peace and avoidance of war. However, this concept of unification accepted the rights of princes and ultimate authority residing with an emperor or pope (Urwin, 1995).

A unification of Europe through conquest and domination has not been the only conceptualization of a unified Europe. Among the intellectuals calling for unification and the

demise of sovereign territorial units were William Penn, Jeremy Bentham, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (Urwin, 1995).

The prominent English Quaker, William Penn, was one of the first to argue, in 1693, for a European parliament and the end of the state mosaic in Europe. The theme was sustained by eighteenth century writers: Jeremy Bentham, for instance, reiterated the argument for a European assembly as well as urging the creation of a common army, while Jean-Jacques Rousseau was also in favour of a European federation. (Urwin, 1995, p. 2)

Later in the nineteenth century these ideas were all drawn upon for more detailed and expanded thinking about unification in Europe. Prominent among these was Henri Saint-Simon, who advanced what became his main theme: “peace through a United States of Europe,” a theme echoed in the many peace movements throughout the nineteenth century (Urwin, 1995, p. 3). Of particular importance was the 1849 Paris Peace Congress where the author Victor Hugo proposed that peace could be achieved through unification, marking the first carefully considered proposal for building a unified Europe. However, as few politicians were involved in the congress, the resolutions were not taken very seriously, even though proposals aimed at creating customs unions or free trade areas could be seen as politically advantageous (Urwin, 1995).

The distinction between these two forms of economic structure is important for it proved to be the fundamental dividing line in all debates on European integration and organization through to the present. For that reason it may be useful to spell out the basic distinction...Briefly, in a customs union the member states would belong to a single tariff area where, ideally, there would be no customs duties on goods circulating within the union, though the members would construct a common external boundary where a common tariff would be levied on all imports entering the union from outside. By contrast, a free trade area is a looser concept, with much more limited political implications. There would be no common external tariff, with each member state free to impose its own tariff on goods coming from non-members: the goal was merely to eliminate or reduce internal tariffs, but usually without any compulsion to do so. (Urwin, 1995, p. 3)

However, against a background of an intensification of national identities and sovereignty, as well as the growing imperialist competition among the European nations in the

nineteenth century that culminated in World War I, no proposals for unification took root (Urwin, 1995). As argued by Urwin, with the concept of national self-determination as cornerstone of the new Europe, the “war to end all wars” impeded any movement toward cooperation and integration.

With the disintegration of the old empires of Central and Eastern Europe, the continent had become even more fragmented, with an almost inevitable reinforcement of nationalism. In addition, the defeat of Germany imposed a further instability over and above fragmentation. The hope that had been placed in the newly-established League of Nations also quickly evaporated. New states, jealous of their independence and giving governmental expression to historic national and ethnic rivalries, were not in a mood to accept any diminution of their political and economic freedom. Moreover, the economic problem had been made worse by a reduction of Europe’s economic role in the world: the continent’s foreign trade, as share of the gross national product of the industrialised states of the world, had slumped dramatically. (Urwin, 1995, p. 4)

In the years between World War I and World War II, several initiatives were put forward to create customs agreements. These tended to involve the smaller Western European countries such as Belgium and Luxembourg, and were limited to segments of markets. None of the agreements of this period were successful or long lasting. Nevertheless, a concept of integration and cooperation as the way to a better future survived (Urwin, 1995). Among those arguing for integration was Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, who in 1923 established the Pan-European Union. Among the supporters of the Pan-European Union were several leading politicians including Aristide Briand and Edouard Herriot (future premiers of France), Konrad Adenauer (future chancellor of West Germany), George Pompidou (future leader of France), and Carlos Sforza (future leader of Italy). The latter three were to figure prominently in European integration after 1945 (Urwin, 1995). While advocating for integration as a means to maintaining peace and preventing future wars, the Pan-European Union went further than other ideas on integration or unification by suggesting that integration would allow Europe “to

compete more effectively in the world's economic markets.” (Urwin, 1995, p. 5) However, like earlier proposals, the Union was not able to precipitate any practical results.

Independent of the Pan-European Union, in a speech on European security in 1924, Herriot as prime minister of France, called for the creation of a United States of Europe. Even so, the first official governmental endorsement of a proposal for integration came in 1930 with Briand's circulation of a memorandum to other European governments proposing a plan that would create a “confederal” bond between the people of Europe (Urwin, 1995). However, the economic and political conditions in Europe in the 1930s forced a postponement of further thinking about and any movement toward integration.

Economic depression, the rise of Fascism, and the lengthening shadow of Adolf Hitler led countries to look to their own defences. European integration, in any shape or form, was not to be a serious topic of discussion until the closing stages of World War II. (Urwin, 1995, p. 7)

During World War II, the Resistance kept the idea of a unified Europe alive. At war's end, ideas of integration surfaced out of a desire to bind Germany into the rest of Europe to prevent future wars and a belief that international cooperation and integration was the route to peace and prosperity. Several initiatives became the first steps toward integration. The first post-war program of cooperation focused on economic cooperation and was established in January 1948 as a result of an agreement between Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg, although planning for Benelux economic cooperation through the creation of a common external tariff and abolition of internal customs had started as early as 1944. Then in April 1948, the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) was established, followed in May 1949 by the creation of the Council of Europe. While all are important to the history of European integration and demonstrate increased inter-governmental/inter-national cooperation, Urwin suggests that the OEEC was unique in that it created a framework or climate for

subsequent developments. Briefly, the main focus of OEEC was the European Recovery Program, which was the allocation of funding from the United States for reconstruction under the Marshall Plan where the U.S. did not take responsibility for drawing up the details for the allocation of those funds. As a result, through the OEEC the nations of Europe had to devise a plan for cooperation and that coordination had the effect of establishing “permanent institutional organs.” However, its focus was a customs union and the OEEC did not attempt to move beyond that goal (Urwin, 1995, p. 199). The contribution of the OEEC to European integration was the framework it created for the future, fostering new ways of thinking, and among these was a new understanding that European economies were interdependent and “that they prospered or failed together.” (Urwin, 1995, pp. 21-22) The OEEC lived for twelve years as a European focused organization. In 1960, partially because of the United States’ concern over the division that emerged in Western Europe as a result of the forming of the European Economic Community in 1957, the OEEC was transformed into the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (Urwin, 1996). With this transformation and the inclusion of Canada and the United States into its membership, along with the subsequent membership of Japan in 1964, the new organization had shifted its focus to the international system of economies. As a result, the OECD was no longer central to the history of European integration (Urwin, 1995). Nevertheless, the OEEC had “triggered debate on European integration, but it produced a paucity of tangible results...governments were reluctant to take concrete steps to surrender some of their sovereignty.” (Dinan, 1999, p. 18)

3.1 THE EUROPEAN COAL AND STEEL COMMUNITY

In 1950, Robert Schuman as foreign minister of France proposed putting German and French coal and steel production under the control of a common high authority. In 1952, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands aligned to form the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). The ECSC was designed to foster economic growth and prosperity in the member states through the creation of a common market in coal and steel, key ingredients in the reconstruction of post-war Europe. Adenauer, then chancellor of Germany, saw that shared sovereignty was the way to rehabilitate the world's opinion of Germany (Dinan, 1999). Administration of the ECSC was vested in a High Authority, a nine-member commission representing the different national governments of the ECSC. Jean Monnet, director of the French Economic Planning Office and a key figure in promoting economic integration as the way to assuring peace in Europe, became the president of the High Authority (Urwin, 1995). Under the ECSC a pattern of delegation and subordination of power between supranational and national sovereignty was established that has become characteristic of the European Union.

Perhaps it was only because of the narrow range of human activities which fell within the orbit of the ECSC that the member states had been willing to cede potentially substantial powers to the body which was the fundamental supranational element of the new organization. (Urwin, 1995, p. 50)

However, the ECSC High Authority did not wield arbitrary authority. Several checks on its authority were established. Most notably was the creation of a Court of Justice with the power to rule on the "legality of any High Authority action on the basis of complaints submitted by either national governments or industrial enterprise." (Urwin, 1995, p. 51)

While this could be a check upon the High Authority, it could also be a check upon individualistic action by national governments. There could be no appeal against Court's decisions; by rooting the whole ECSC structure in the last resort in the rule of law, the drafters of the treaty introduced a concept which was to be

of tremendous importance for European integration as a whole. (Urwin, 1995, p. 51)

In addition to the Court of Justice, the ECSC also created a Council of Ministers and a Common Assembly. All of these institutions foreshadowed the institutions of the European Union.

The ECSC's economic record was rather mixed, having "struggled in vain to formulate and implement effective pricing and competition policies." (Dinan, 1999, p. 29) From its inception, the ESCS was not "intended to be just an economic body." (Urwin, 1995, p. 55) Monnet and other envisioned that the ECSC was to be the "first unit in an interlocking sectoral integration that would ultimately fulfill the dream of political integration." (Urwin, 1995, p. 55) However, to both Schuman and Monnet, European integration meant predominantly a Franco-German integration.

3.2 THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY - THE SINGLE EUROPEAN ACT

For the purposes of this overview, the next significant date was 1986, which marked the inauguration of the Single European Act (SEA). The SEA launched the single market, committing the member states to the creation of a single internal market by the end of 1992 and extended Community competence to the fields of environmental policy, economic and social cohesion, research and technology policy, and social policy (Dinan, 1999). The SEA grew out of an intergovernmental conference convened in 1985 to consider the future of the European Economic Community and consider revisions to the treaties signed in 1957. This reconsidering

of the Treaty of Rome grew out of a Commission White Paper prepared by Lord Anthony Cockfield.

At one level, the goal of the 1986 conference was to turn back to the original purpose of the Treaty of Rome, which was the creation of a common market and something that the member states had already agreed to in their ratification of the treaty. Therefore, there was nothing extraordinary regarding the purpose and outcomes of the 1985 conference. At another level, the SEA proposed institutional changes that tipped the balance of power away from member states with minority positions toward the Community. The blocking power of member states was reduced through the introduction of qualified majority voting (Urwin, 1995). Previously, all voting was by majority voting, allowing for the veto of a community action by a single member state. This veto power was evidenced by de Gaulle's veto of the membership of the United Kingdom in 1963 and again in 1967. A central tenet of the SEA was the removal of all "barriers and factors which inhibited free movement." (Urwin, 1995, p. 231) This implied the removal of all barriers to the free movement of all goods, and people.

3.3 THE MAASTRICHT TREATY, THE EUROPEAN MONETARY UNION, AND THE EUROPEAN UNION

Nineteen-eighty-nine was an *annus mirabilis*, a 'miracle year' that ushered in the 'New Europe' of the post-Cold War era. It was a year of peaceful revolution that hastened the collapse of communism and led directly to the unification of Germany in 1990 and the disappearance of the Soviet Union in 1991. It was a year in which Europe's future looked bright, with Western Europe fully immersed in the single market program and about to embark on the road to Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) and Central and Eastern Europe embracing liberal democracy. More than any other event, the unexpected breach of the Berlin Wall

on the night of November 9, 1989, symbolized a reunification of the Cold War division and an affirmation of Europe's common destiny. (Dinan, 1999, p. 127)

The optimism initiated by events in 1989 was not long lasting. By 1992, economic recession in Western Europe was widespread; the countries of the former Soviet Union were struggling with the implementation of market reforms and the consolidation of newly created democratic institutions; Germany was struggling with the enormous costs of reunification both socially and financially; and Yugoslavia was immersed in a bitter and violent war that threatened to engulf the other Balkan states (Dinan, 1999). Nevertheless, the implementation of the Treaty of European Union (TEU) in November 1993, formally creating the European Union, moved integration beyond the single market (Dinan, 1999).

In June 1988 the European Council called a group of experts together to discuss what changes were needed to lead to the creation of the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU). Their report was issued in April 1989 and in Madrid in June of that year, the committee's three-stage approach to EMU was endorsed. It was understood that Stage I, "involving greater coordination of member states' macroeconomic policies, the establishment of free capital movement, and membership of all [EU] currencies in the [European Monetary System] (EMS), should begin on July 1, 1990." (Dinan, 1999, p. 128)

In a letter to the president of the European Council, German Chancellor Kohl and French President Mitterand, representing the strength of the Franco-German alliance that had formed, called for an acceleration of the process, linking that need to the events in Central and Eastern Europe. They also called for accelerating the process of achieving Stages II and III of EMU, basing their proposals on the commitment of the Single European Act "to transform relations as a whole among member states into a European Union" (Dinan, 1999, p.133). Their letter

transformed the agenda for the intergovernmental conference on EMU to be held in Rome in December 1990. Two parallel intergovernmental conferences were then held, one on European political union (EPU) with the other on financial integration or EMU. Key points of the agendas for the intergovernmental conferences were “stronger democratic legitimacy; more efficient institutions; unity and cohesion of economic, monetary, and political action; and a common foreign and security policy.” (Dinan, 1999, p. 134)

This call for an acceleration of the process grew out of sense that the positive atmosphere surrounding movement toward an “ever closer union” generated by the events of 1989 had collapsed. The emergent pessimism had been brought on by the war in the Persian Gulf, concern about economic, political and military stability in Central and Eastern Europe, as well as the former Soviet Union. There was also concern about the high cost of German reunification and the automatic addition of former German Democratic Republic (East Germany) to EU membership as a result of reunification, resulting in Germany suddenly representing “27 percent of the [EU’s] GDP and, with 77 million people, 25 percent of its population.” (Dinan, 1999, p. 130)

The two parallel intergovernmental conferences initiated intensive bargaining sessions at the regular end-of-presidency summits. That bargaining resulted in two treaties at the Maastricht summit at the end of the Netherlands’ presidency. The treaties put forward at Maastricht established a new architecture for the EU. Three pillars would form the EU with the European Council capping the three pillars. The Treaty on European Union (TEU), extended EU competence in several areas: “education, training, cohesion, research and development, environment, infrastructure, industry, health, culture, consumer protection, and development cooperation.” (Dinan, 1999, p.146) The second treaty, the treaty on EMU, established the

creation of a European Central Bank in Stage III (to be completed by 1999) and provided for member states opting out of adopting a single currency (Dinan, 1999).

Ratification of the TEU was not a foregone conclusion, although governments and the European Commission assumed ratification based on earlier treaty successes, although Danish rejection of ratification pointed to the increased public awareness and concern about the EU.

Fewer than 30,000 votes had determined the outcome of the Danish referendum. Exhaustive analyses indicated a host of reasons for the result. Some peculiarly Danish, others were common to the [EU]; some were reasonable, others irrational; some were consistent, others contradictory. They included concerns about EMU, about losing national identity, about the role of small states in the [EU], about the Commission's overweening ambition, about the [European Parliament's] EP's increasing power, about the Common Fisheries Policy, about the economic and political impact of German unification, about the possible emergence of a European army, about Germany's ability to buy Danish holiday homes, and about the diminution of environmental and social welfare standards. (Dinan, 1999, p. 149)

To bolster support for ratification, Jacques Delors as president of the European Commission initiated changes that focused on promoting subsidiarity, transparency, and openness (Dinan, 1999). Subsidiarity, a confusing concept and the source of scholarly debate and interpretation, commits the EU to act only in those areas where the EU has been given competence by the treaties. In addition, EU decisions are to be taken as close to EU citizens as possible (Dinan, 1999). These reassurances from the Commission and allowing member states to opt-out of specific treaty obligations, such as Denmark's opting-out of Stage III of EMU, had a positive effect. With a new Danish referendum on May 18, 1993, Denmark agreed to ratification. In October 1993, the German Federal Constitutional Court ruled that the TEU was not in violation of the German constitution. Subsequently, on November 1, 1993, the European Union came into being, marking an obvious turning point in European integration (Dinan, 1999).

Yet there was more continuity than change after the launch of the EU...The greatest challenges confronting the EU in the late 1990s – enlargement, Economic

and Monetary Union (EMU), and popular dissatisfaction with ‘Brussels’- had emerged a decade earlier and had helped shape the TEU... (Dinan, 1999, p. 159)

3.4 POST-TEU: ECONOMIC AND MONETARY UNION, ENLARGEMENT, AND THE AMSTERDAM TREATY

With the creation of the European Union in 1993, movement toward stage II of Economic and Monetary Union was a major concern, but looming larger was the issue of enlargement. Austria, Finland and Sweden became members in 1995, and three years later the EU began negotiations with Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, and Slovenia. Enlargement by ten or more of the smaller and poorer countries in Central and Eastern Europe was seen as potentially creating a profound change in the EU (Dinan, 1999). The issues of EMU and enlargement dominated the 1996-1997 intergovernmental conference.

The 1996-97 intergovernmental conference had been mandated in the TEU, reflecting both unfinished business from Maastricht and that the TEU’s new decision making procedures would need adjustment after a brief shakedown period (Dinan, 1999). Three main areas were targeted for consideration. These were making the EU more relevant to its citizens, for example in such areas human rights, internal security, and the environment; improving efficiency and accountability in the EU; and improving the EU’s ability to act internationally through strengthening the Common Foreign and Security Policy (Dinan, 1999). The Amsterdam Treaty emanating from the 1996-1997 intergovernmental conference formalized a concept of flexibility in compliance with EU policy under specific conditions. The Treaty also designated the EU as an area of freedom, security, and justice (Dinan, 1999). Both of these concepts were important issues as the EU faced the likelihood of enlargement. While EU institutional reform had been

viewed as necessary in the preparations for the intergovernmental conference, the Amsterdam Treaty did not reveal “any political will on the part of the governments to make substantial reform.” (Dinan, 1999, p. 182)

3.5 SUMMARY

The history of the forming of the European Union has taken shape in three epochs. The first period is from 1957 to 1987, with the final years of the first epoch a period characterized as a period of *Eurosclerosis*. The second epoch begins with the ratification of the Single European Act. The third epoch begins with the Maastricht Treaty, with those “foundations cemented at Amsterdam.” (Tsebelis & Garret, 2001, p. 359) To briefly characterize each of the three epochs, the first epoch was a period of legislative gridlock in the European Council with “national vetoes protecting the sovereignty of member states.” (Tsebelis & Garrett, 2001, p. 359) Unanimity in voting in the Council undermined the legislative power of the European Commission. The Commission was furthered weakened by the sparseness of legislation in the Council, in turn giving the Commission little opportunity to exercise its “bureaucratic discretion to implement policy.” (Tsebelis & Garrett, 2001, p. 359)

In contrast, legislation gridlock in the Council facilitated Court activism because only treaty revisions could rein in the Court. The freedom of the Court to interpret the Rome Treaty was thus a primary force propelling European integration (in the first epoch).” (Tsebelis & Garrett, 2001, p. 359)

The second epoch was initiated with the ratification of the Single European Act (SEA). With the implementation of qualified majority voting (QMV), individual governments began a process of giving up national sovereignty as they could no longer unilaterally veto legislation.

The move to QMV also curtailed the Court's discretion to interpret secondary legislation. In addition, QMV gave the Commission new agenda-setting powers. As a result of the "explosion of legislation necessary to accomplish the internal market program by 1992, the Commission was handed many more opportunities to affect outcomes through policy implementation" (Tsebelis, Garrett, 2001, p.359). QMV in effect transformed the Commission into the prime motivator for European integration following the ratification of the Single European Act, "so long as its legislative proposals respected the preferences of the pivotal members of the Council under QMV and the (European) Parliament." (Tsebelis & Garrett, 2001, p. 359)

The third epoch began with the Maastricht Treaty. The European Parliament has become an equal partner with the Council as a result of a reformed co-decision procedure (Tsebelis & Garrett, 2001). By contrast, post-Maastricht, the Commission's agenda-setting ability has become increasingly limited as compared to its increased agenda-setting capabilities post-Single European Act.

But empowering the Parliament in a bicameral legislature has increased the probability of gridlock between it and the Council. Consequently, the discretionary space available to the Commission to implement policy and to the Court to adjudicate disputes has increased. (Tsebelis & Garrett, 2001, p.359)

In the third epoch, Tsebelis and Garrett argue that the four institutions of the European Union (the Council of Ministers, the European Court of Justice, the European Parliament, and the European Commission) have begun to function in roles that echo the legislatures, bureaucracies, and legal systems of "national polities with bicameral legislatures (such as Germany.)." (Tsebelis & Garrett, 2001, p. 359)

With recovery from *Eurosclerosis* as a result of the ratification of the Single European Act, the Maastricht Treaty formally creating the European Union, the EU subsequently "cemented" by the Amsterdam Treaty, and the EU's enlargement to twenty-seven member states

today, the European Union has become increasingly visible. There have been increased levels of EU policy making. The EU is completing the internal market and accepted the institutional reforms of the Single European Act that signaled the qualified majority vote procedure in the Council, thereby increasing the power of the European Parliament. In 1993 the Maastricht Treaty creating the European Union expanded the areas of EU competence as well as the scope of qualified majority voting in the Council, gave the Parliament the ability to veto on types of legislation. “The Maastricht Treaty is a landmark in European integration quite apart from its ambitious plan for a common currency and a European central bank.” (Marks, Hooghe & Black, 1996, p. 342) The Maastricht Treaty also marked the expansion of the EU into new policy areas such as the environment and a whole range of social agendas. By 1997 and the signing of the Amsterdam Treaty, a deepening of integration had taken place. The Amsterdam Treaty extended the use of qualified majority voting and the delegation of powers to the EU and supranational institutions (Pollock, 2001).

The road that European integration has taken since 1989 indicates sustainability and a serious commitment to integration for the future. The process of enlargement of the European Union underscores that commitment. The question of whether the European Union represents the formation of a new supranational entity that is transforming national sovereignty or represents an evolving form of international relations, remains a complex question and subject of scholarly discourse. What is clear is that a social agenda and education were not part of the initial process leading to the formation of the European Union. The next chapter examines in greater depth where education appears in the history of European integration.

4.0 EDUCATION AND EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

As noted earlier, education was not part of the discussions and actions taken in the early stages and years of European integration and the processes of forming the European Union. This chapter is a review of the literature on education and the processes of European integration. As noted in the annotated timeline of education and European integration at the beginning of the dissertation, between 1952 (the forming of the European Coal and Steel Community) and 1973 (the first appearance of education as an area of responsibility for a Directorate General of the European Commission), education and particularly higher education were not included in any of the discussions surrounding the processes of European integration. A review of the literature indicates that the first significant step taken at Community (European Union) level in terms of its overall impact was the creation of the ERASMUS program in 1987 and the launching of the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation Scheme. Subsequent actions such as the Lisbon Recognition Convention (1997) and its concomitant requirement of creating a Diploma Supplement are reviewed as instruments of change.

The appearance of education on the agenda of European integration did not happen early in the journey toward an ever closer union, nor has its appearance been direct. Blitz reviews the history of European integration in his doctoral dissertation in a chapter entitled “The History of Education Cooperation in the European Union.” He starts with the establishment of the European Economic Community (EEC) and the Treaty of Rome to look for evidence of a role or

position of education vis-à-vis the concept and initiation of processes that have moved toward European integration. The only relationship that Blitz finds between the start of European integration and education are some very general references to education in Jean Monnet's memoirs where he expresses a concern about access to education. Blitz finds another connection to education in the creation of the European University Institute in Florence. However, while he finds no mention of education surrounding the establishment of the EEC or the development of the Treaty of Rome, his analysis is that education was not simply overlooked. Education was omitted from open consideration through rational consideration – "education was left by the wayside." (Blitz, 1997, pp. 39-41)

In spite of the agreement on the European University Institute, there could be little doubt that education was inessential in the original EEC. Publications such as the Documents on the History of European Integration, which chronicle the debates between interest groups, political parties, and national leaders over the design of Post War Europe, record that the crucial negotiations focused almost exclusively on economic programs, federalist objectives, and the need to preserve peace. These sentiments were expressed by intellectuals, journalists, political parties, and pressure groups in all the initial Member States and across the board...The aim of creating an ever closer union of peoples, as first formally documented in the ECSC Treaty of 1951, was to be done through economic channels. (Blitz, 1997, pp. 40-41)

In spite of having been "left by the wayside" in the negotiations leading to the Treaty of Rome, Blitz argues that education was brought to the agenda of integration "through the back door as an adjunct to training which receives specific mention under Article 128 of the EEC Treaty." (Blitz, 1997, p. 42) A *de facto* European educational policy evolved out of a need to establish and insure certain basic freedoms articulated in the Treaty of Rome, which calls for the removal of barriers to the free movement of "citizens of Europe" within Europe. However, European cultural and social issues did not appear on the agenda of European integration until after the 1969 Hague Conference and the departure of Charles de Gaulle (Blitz, 1997).

Yet, neither education nor training were specifically mentioned at the Hague. It was only later that the final communiqué of the Hague Conference was studied and used as a precedent for subsequent elaboration. Literally, the final communiqué simply recalled under Point Four, the simple need to safeguard in Europe ‘an exceptional vague humanistic message, was used as a means of introducing education onto the political agenda. It is now cited in the preamble of every educational policy statement. (Blitz, 19997, pp. 32-43)

In *The EEC and Education* published in 1984, Guy Neave provides a useful and colorful picture of where education stood on the agenda of European integration before the Hague meeting.

The twelve years from 1957 to 1969 were a period when education remained a taboo subject within the corridors of the European Community. Indeed, Member States seem to have adopted toward education the same attitude that the French politician, Leon Gambetta, once suggested his compatriots adopt towards the loss of Alsace Lorraine in 1871: “Think about it always. But speak of it – never! (Neave, 1984, p. 6)

Neave offers two explanations for the “strange silence” regarding education. One is that education was really the proper domain of a larger body or grouping of European states, such as existed in the Council of Europe. The other is that education is linked to national sovereignty and therefore any interventions in areas not specifically covered by the Treaty of Rome would immediately become a very sensitive issue. Also, Neave points out that de Gaulle saw education as completely a matter of national sovereignty, explaining in part why the consideration of European integration within a larger cultural context did not occur until after de Gaulle’s departure (Neave, 1984).

The Council of Ministers for Education did meet for the first time in 1971, where they issued a resolution calling for a defining of a European cultural model to mirror European integration and at the same time offer some guidelines on vocational training in a European context.

Considering that the ultimate aim being in fact to define a European model of culture correlating with European integration, it is first necessary to establish a framework enabling that aim to be achieved, in accordance with procedures that are sufficiently flexible to ensure both that the necessary links with the [European] Community are established and that all opportunities for appropriate cooperation with other European states remain open...(Educational Policy Statements, 1987, p. 11). (Blitz, 1997, p. 43)

The purposes of it was seen as providing,...'the population as a whole with the opportunities for general and vocational education, further education and lifelong education which will adequately allow individuals to develop their personality and to follow a skilled occupation in an economy of which the needs are constantly changing (Bulletin of the European Communities, 1974, p. 5). (Blitz, 1997, p. 43)

The resolution and the guidelines articulated a clear interest in a European area or agenda for education even though expressed in the general terms of a human right in keeping with the Treaty of Rome and the Single European Act. While expressing a desire for cooperation in education, it can be argued that the Ministers' expressions offered little in the way of establishing a European education policy. Nevertheless, the 1971 meeting and resolution were important for two reasons: general education, ignored in the Treaty of Rome, is mentioned for the first time; and perhaps more important, the 1971 meeting gave expression to the idea that "the future of the European Community, and educational policy in particular, did not lie in economic expansion alone." (Neave, 1984, p. 7; Blitz, 1997, p. 44)

Following the 1971 meeting a working party of senior official was set up to examine the feasibility of cooperation in education. In 1972, the European Commission asked Professor Henri Janne, former Minister of Education for Belgium, to review areas where there might be future action programs in education (Neave, 1985, p.7).

The Janne Report, 'For a Community Policy on Education' was presented in February 1973. Strictly speaking, it is not a formal expression of Community policy, though some have pointed out that it stands as the only published statement that one might equate with a blueprint for action...The Janne Report, which was the summation of discussions held between some 35 leading experts in

the field, started from two premises. The first took as its point of departure that an irreversible recognition of an education dimension of Europe had begun and that this initial movement led to an education policy at European Community level...The second reiterated the view already noted by the first meeting of the Ministers of Education, namely that the Treaty of Rome could be interpreted in such a way that those clauses dealing with vocational training could be extended to cover a rather wider ambit. 'The Treaty of Rome,' Janne noted, 'postulates taking over the whole problem of the training of young people and adults as far as it is related to the needs of optimum economic development'...Amongst those matters touched upon in the report were education with a European dimension, foreign language teaching, mutual recognition of school leaving certificates, and the development of permanent education, the latter being particularly stressed. The Janne Report provided an important intellectual impetus to the long range discussion of possible areas of action. (Neave, 1984, pp. 8-9)

The Janne Report facilitated the incorporation of education as an element of integration, breaking its "taboo" (Neave, 1984).

Education was included with research and science policy in 1973 under the Directorate General XII, marking the first time education appeared as a responsibility for one of the thirteen commissioners of the European Commission. "Education in the European Community," a communication circulated in March 1974, outlined a number of issues that may be viewed as the beginning of action in the area of education at Community level. Neave notes three main areas of concern or interest in the communication: improvement of opportunities for movement among member states; the provision of education to the children of immigrant workers; and the development of a European dimension in education, to include foreign language instruction, the study of Europe, and a strengthening of cooperation in higher education (Neave, 1984). These areas of concern or interest were presented to the Ministers of Education in June 1974, the first meeting since the enlarging of the Community to nine member states. The resolution resulting from that meeting established the framework for cooperation at Community level, but more important, established the basic principles for cooperation in education. As Neave points out,

Even at this early stage of discussion, the Commission...set its face resolutely against using the principle of 'harmonisation' in the educational arena. This emerges clearly in the three principles on which future cooperation in the field of education was to be grounded. (Neave, 1984, p. 9)

Briefly, the three principles are:

- 1) It is recognized that every citizen has the right to education. Within this principle is also the notion upholding the autonomy of education while recognizing a need to bring "education, training and employment systems more closely in tune with one another,"
- 2) The diversity and unique characteristics of Member States educational systems must be preserved making it inevitable that varying patterns of power, responsibility and control will exist and require safeguarding. Harmonization of education is not the end in itself;
- 3) "If cooperation was to involve the statement of specific objectives as part of Community policy, then the manner in which they were achieved was to remain firmly the responsibility of the individual Member State." (Neave, 1984, pp. 9-10)

However broad in scope, these basic principles and the subsequent formation of an *ad hoc* Education Committee, became the basis for the first specific Community level action in education. The Community Education Action Program adopted by resolution on February 9, 1976 sets out a series of actions to be undertaken by the member states as well as by the Community (Neave, 1984).

...a series of pilot projects to evaluate and compare teaching methods for migrant children, efforts to increase understanding between Member States of each others systems of education, with provision for study visits to assist in this directed at administrators in school systems, higher education whether at local or regional level. The development of a "European dimension" in the thinking of both pupils and teachers was also seen as especially relevant. The programme accordingly made provision for studies to be made on extending the practice of recognizing periods spent abroad as part of the individual's educational experience. And the possibility for teachers to spend part of their career abroad was touched upon. In the sphere of higher education, the Community was to undertake measures intended to strengthen contacts between individual establishments, whilst other measures such as mutual recognition of academic qualifications were to be investigated. The teaching of foreign languages also formed an essential part of the Action Programme. In this field the programme envisaged actions at Community level to organize meetings between organizers and researchers in this area. (Neave, 1984, pp. 10-11)

In a significant way the 1976 Resolution and the Action Program mark a beginning of involvement of the European Union in the area of education and “it set down, even today, the principle foundation for research, action and development between the Community and the Member States.” (Neave, 1984, p. 11) However, there is a dual nature to that involvement. The duality is that while the European Commission may offer suggestions, they are only suggestions. The Member States are free to adopt or ignore the suggestions or recommendations of the Commission.

...the notion of the ‘dual’ nature...springs from the need to stress the voluntary agreement entered into by the Ministers of Education of Member States to discuss matters pertaining to education. Thus, if Community level action is agreed upon by Ministers, they reserve the right to draw up policy within the framework of their own countries. As in other areas of Community activity, the Council of Ministers acts as the highest executive and legislative authority, but the fact that Ministers of Education meet does not imply that their discussions have implications for Community level activity. (Neave, 1984, p. 13)

In addition to establishing education as an element of Community concern and/or activity and the initiation of an Action Program, the 1976 Resolution placed the Education Committee on a “regular and permanent footing,” giving the committee as its main task the oversight of the Action Program (Neave, 1984, p. 14). It also holds a unique place within EU (Community) structures:

The Education Committee has a unique place in Community structures. Procedurally, it operates along lines usually associated with the Council of Ministers. This is reflected in the composition which is drawn from representatives of the...Member States and Commission officials. Delegations from Member States are nominated from the national Ministries of Education or...in keeping with the particular way in which education is organized in those two countries...Like the Chairmanship of the Council of Ministers, that of the Education Committee rotates every six months and is held by the country currently presiding over the Council. Its secretariat is drawn from the staff of the Council Secretariat. If, from a procedural point of view, the Education Committee follows the pattern set down in the Council of Ministers, its existence

serves to underline once again, the voluntary nature of the agreement by Ministers of Education to work together on a continuing basis that, formally, remains outside the legal framework of the Council of Ministers. (Neave, 1984, p. 14)

In 1981, DG XII, the Directorate-General for Education, Science and Research, and DG V, Directorate-General for Social Affairs, were linked under a new Directorate-General V for Social Policy and under the Commissioner for Social Policy, bringing together education and training under one Directorate-General and allowing for a closer link between the planning of education measures and training initiatives. This reorganization was deemed necessary as a result of an existing crisis in youth unemployment in the Community. Neave argues that the significance of this reorganization and the Education Committee responses acted to “move education from the periphery to the centre of the Community’s preoccupations.” (Neave, 1984, p. 17) It is against this background that I now want to turn to two other Community initiatives: the Community’s Network for Education Information (EURYDICE) and the Community’s programs for student mobility.

Briefly, EURYDICE was established after the 1976 Resolution in recognizing that sharing information about national educational systems among the Member States was desirable if not necessary in achieving cooperation. After several meetings to explore how to develop and utilize a network of information centers and a trial run in 1979, the network became operational in 1980. The network was designed to provide fast access to information on educational policy in the Member States and at Community level through four types of services: the analysis of current documentation including overviews of policy topics; the setting up and maintaining of a data base to serve both Member States and the Community; the providing of abstracts of educational periodicals; and the joint management the European Documentation and Information System for Education (EUDISED), otherwise known as the European Education Thesaurus,

initially developed by the Council of Europe to classify and provide retrieval of educational information (Neave, 1984). While EURYDICE was a significant initiative growing out of the 1976 Resolution, Blitz notes that the '76 Resolution and the Education Committee meeting in 1977 influenced other Action Programs that expanded the visibility of education in the Community where the impact was not felt until some ten years later (Blitz, 1997). These are the Action Programs that eventually led to the transnational mobility of students in Europe.

As a result of some key rulings of the European Court of Justice, several pilot projects were launched in the 1980s that led to actions in education.

These pilot projects aimed to increase transnational exchange and communication between university students, teachers, and industry. On the basis of the Court's rulings in 1985 (Gravier), 1988 (Blazot) and 1989 (Erasmus), there was considerable activity on the part of the European Commission and the member-states to re-examine the relationship of education to the economic designs of the Single Market Plan. This was especially evident in the organization of special conferences (Malaga, 1989; Siena, 1990) called by the Commission to consider the recognition of university qualifications from thirteen educational systems. (Blitz, 1997, p. 47)

Transnational student mobility Action Programs became very visible and publicized, especially the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS) program. Briefly, ERASMUS provides for a network of cooperation between universities, provides financial support for students participating in programs, and fosters programs or mechanisms for the recognition of study at institutions in other countries. To give an idea of the level of participation, by 1996 ERASMUS had over 170,000 student participants, a significant increase given that the number before the initiation of the Action Programs had been .05 (Blitz, 1997). However, while all of the Action Programs stemming from the 1976 Resolution mark the emergence of education as an important area of concern for the European Union, it is the issue of recognition of periods of study and the recognition of academic

qualifications obtained in another country that became highlighted as a result of the Maastricht Treaty in 1993.

In the 1980s and during the European Commission presidency of Jacques Delors, education gradually became more institutionalized within the Commission. The position was that education was not only central to the Single Market, in terms of transnational cooperation, education could be used as a force to “go beyond the Treaty of Rome” to encourage a positive integration (Blitz, 1997, p. 54).

This was not done through the kind of harmonizing programs that we saw in the 1970s but rather through a model more suited to the styles of Mitrany and Deutsch. The politicization of education represented a sharp break with the past. Indeed the designs promoted in the pre-Maastricht period challenged the hands-off policy of the 1970s where education was discussed as a right, having little real application...education occupied an increasingly important function in the construction of a unified Europe...transnational cooperation in education was essential not only to produce a competitive work force but, also in the creation of socio-psychological community. (Blitz, 1997, p. 54)

As noted by Blitz in his interview with Hywell Jones, former Director of the Task Force on Education and training, education appeared in the Maastricht Treaty as a result of Delors’ adoption of the position that education would be “co-owned.”

...by setting their sights low, Delors and his staff were finally able to introduce education into the Treaty framework. Jones insists that they did so by declaring that education was a matter of ‘co-ownership’ and one that the Commission would not steal from the Member States. (Blitz, 1997, p. 55)

The wording that ended up in Article 26 of the Maastricht Treaty is somewhat less specific in capturing a sense of a “co-ownership” of education between the Member States and the European Commission:

The Community shall contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging co-operation between Member States and, if necessary, by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organization of educational systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity. (Blitz, 1997, p. 56)

As noted by Blitz, the working understanding of the role of education was that the Commission would give “added value” where Member States remained in control. Another outcome of Maastricht was that education and vocational training were separated, where Article 126 offered cooperation in education and Article 127 granting the Community greater power over vocational education (Blitz, 1997).

In a report entitled *Activities in the fields of education, training and youth 1994-96* published in 1998 by DG XXII, the Directorate-General at that time with responsibility for activities related to education, training and youth, the following appears in the Introduction:

From the perspective of the free movement of people, provisions have been introduced to encourage the mutual recognition of diplomas and qualifications (DG XV); activities in the fields of education, training and youth also include broadly based reflections on the remaining obstacles to transnational mobility. (EC, 1998, p. 7)

Later in the text it is explained that a Council Directive was issued in 1998 concerning a general system of recognition of higher education diplomas. The report expands to a discussion of other Commission activities and positions relating to the “transparency and recognition of qualifications in unregulated sectors,” and “recognition for academic purposes.” (EC, 1998, p. 7) In commenting on collaboration with other organizations, the report makes note of the Commission’s cooperation in the development of the Joint Council of Europe and UNESCO Convention on the Recognition of Higher Education Qualifications Concerning Higher Education in the European Region (the Lisbon Convention), signed in 1997, subsequently put into force in 1999 when the required number of signatory States ratified the joint convention. That convention replaced the previous five Council of Europe conventions on higher education and the UNESCO Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees concerning Higher Education in the States belonging to the Europe Region. While the Directive underscores

the usefulness and desirability of the recognition conventions as important cross-border agreements and the role that they play in ensuring mobility of European citizens, it does not signal a delegation of national authority in education.

4.1 THE ERASMUS PROGRAM

As noted above, 1976 marked the beginning of a series of actions regarding education. The first Action program initiated was the Joint Study Program designed “to support cooperation between departments of higher education institutions in different EC (European Community) Member States, and to improve conditions of student mobility.” (The ERASMUS Experience). The Joint Study Program was funded for ten years and while it supported student mobility in only a very limited way, the program did generate a “significant body of relevant experience in the field of practical co-operation between universities,” providing the foundation for the development of ERASMUS (Teichler & Maiworm, 1997). Growing out of that experience, ERASMUS was launched in 1987. Five objectives formed the reasons behind the promotion of student mobility and greater university cooperation.

- (i) to achieve a significant increase in the number of students from universities...spending an integrated period of study in another Member State, in order that the Community may draw upon an adequate pool of manpower with firsthand experience of economic and social aspects of other Member States, while ensuring equality of opportunity for male and female students as regards participation in such mobility;
- (ii) to promote broad and intensive co-operation between universities in all Member States;
- (iii) to harness the full intellectual potential of the universities in the Community by means by increased mobility of teaching staff, thereby improving the quality of

the education and training provided by the universities with a view to securing the competitiveness of the Community in the world market;

- (iv) to strengthen the interaction between citizens in different Member States with a view to consolidating the concept of a People's Europe;
- (v) to ensure the development of a pool of graduates with direct experience in intra-Community co-operation thereby creating a basis upon which intensified co-operation in the economic and social sectors can develop at Community level.

(Teichler & Maiworm, 1997)

According to a report prepared in 1996 on the first seven years of ERASMUS, the number of students participating in ERASMUS grew from a total of 3,244 students in 1987/88 to 554,379 students in 1993/94. In its conclusions, the report notes that “temporary student mobility has become a regular feature of higher education in Europe, and dedicated academic and administrative measures for Europeanisation and internationalization of higher education are generally viewed now as essential for dynamic institution of higher education.” (Teichler & Maiworm, 1997)

ERASMUS clearly increased the number of students spending part of their studies in another country in Europe. Through student mobility, ERASMUS also fulfilled components of the Treaty of Rome: “to advance the creation of a common market based on the free movement of goods, capital, services and persons in Europe.” (Blitz, 1997) In regards to the Treaty of Rome and ERASMUS facilitating the movement of people, the decision to initiate ERASMUS, as well as the stated goals of the project, underscore the idea that education programs were designed to contribute to the formation of the single market. This relationship is cited in the decisions to renew the action schemes, where it is noted that “education could not be divorced from global competitiveness and that education and training had an ‘overriding importance’ in protecting the security of Europe and its citizens.” (Blitz, 1997, p. 51) Echoes of this conceptualization of the role that education plays in the development of the single market are heard again in the Bologna Declaration in 1999.

While education was not part of the process leading to the eventual formation of the European Union, the inclusion of education as an area of interest of the European Commission in 1973 and its subsequent Action Programs are two examples of spillover of the main agenda of European integration to areas beyond the processes and institutions forming the European Union.

ERASMUS and other EU Action Programs in education, as well as initiatives such as the Lisbon Convention, provide a background and context for the new cross-border initiatives represented by the Sorbonne Declaration and the Bologna Declaration. This is underscored by the appearance on the official Web site for the Bologna Process listing the Lisbon Convention as one of the main documents of the Bologna Process. The changes initiated by ERASMUS and the Lisbon Convention reveal a landscape that in the 1980s of almost no student mobility within Europe. By 1999 and the signing of the Bologna Declaration, student mobility within Europe had grown to 107,666 students studying in another country in Europe in the 1999/2000 academic year (European Commission, [on-line]). As mentioned, these programs and initiatives, as well as strides made in European integration, provide background and context, as well as set the stage, for the emergence of the Sorbonne Declaration and the subsequent Bologna Declaration.

4.2 THE INSTRUMENTS OF CHANGE AND THEIR ANTECEDENTS

Prior to the advent of education coming into the process of European integration and the subsequent developments leading to ERASMUS, several European initiatives aided the development of cross-border interactions and student mobility within Europe. Most of these initiatives, dating from the 1950s, are related to the issue of academic recognition as a means to promoting student mobility in Europe (Hildebrand, 1996, p.39; Neave, 1984, p. 84). This was

also driven in part through the creation of the single market and the pressure to have a common qualifications framework for all professions and occupation. Much of the work on academic recognition fell under the work of the Council of Europe and the development of three different conventions: 1) European Convention No.15 on the Equivalence of Diplomas leading to Admission to Universities (1953), with its Protocol, European Convention No. 49; 2) European Convention No. 21 on The Equivalence of Periods of University Study (1956); and 3) European Convention No.32 on the Academic Recognition of University Qualifications (1959). These conventions and subsequent follow-up activities regarding their implementation led to the Council of Europe setting up information centers in each country in 1976 and forming a network of those centers. Each center was known as a National Equivalence Information Center (NEIC) and the Council of Europe initiated annual meetings of all of the centers in the network. Over the years through the forming of working parties to deal with issues arising from the various conventions and their implementation, several initiatives such as the creation of the *Guide to Higher Education Systems and Qualifications* in 1994 and an earlier document entitled *Principles of Good Practice in Academic Recognition Procedures in Higher Education* in 1991, guided the Council of Europe to convene a conference in Malta in 1994 to address the theme of Recognition of Higher Education Qualifications: Challenges for the Next decade (Hildebrand, 1996, p. 40). The context for the 1994 Malta conference represented the convergence of activity by the Council of Europe on academic recognition and concurrent work by UNESCO.

UNESCO's involvement in matters concerning academic recognition dates primarily from 1979 and the adoption of the Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas, and Degrees concerning Higher Education in the States belonging to the Europe Region. That convention required signatory states to create a National Information Body (NIB). By 1992, it became

apparent to both UNESCO and the Council of Europe that the NEIC (by 1992 known as the European National Information Centers on Recognition and Mobility – ENIC) network and the NIB network were in many respects duplicating efforts. The two networks were merged in 1994 with the creation of the ENIC network.

Further cooperation was initiated with the suggestion by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe to the Director-General of UNESCO to cooperate in the drafting of a new convention to replace the existing conventions. (Hildebrand, 1996, p. 41) The result was that the secretariats of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg, France and the UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education (CEPES) in Bucharest, Romania, worked together to formulate a new convention on academic recognition. The convention was completed and signed in 1997 in Lisbon and came into force in 1999 with the ratification by the requisite number of signatory states. Of importance to subsequent developments in student mobility is the provision in the Lisbon Convention for the creation and use of a Diploma Supplement as a means to facilitate academic recognition and as an instrument of student mobility.

4.3 THE DIPLOMA SUPPLEMENT

The key element of European integration, as well as the forming and functioning of the European Union, is mobility – the mobility of goods, services, and people. Education and educational qualifications become issues when people begin to move within Europe, either for education or employment. The joint Council of Europe and UNESCO Convention established a framework for dealing with cross-border issues regarding education and qualifications. The Diploma Supplement outlined in the Lisbon Convention became a key instrument in issues of the mobility

of education and qualifications. The best way to describe the Diploma Supplement and its function is to turn to student mobility in the United States.

For many decades in the United States, students enrolled at one institution in the U.S. could take classes (often in the summer) at another institution and have the work completed at the second institution accepted (recognized) at the home institution. The instruments of that recognition process are the student academic transcript that represents both the assigning of a grade and awarding of semester or quarter hour credits, the course catalogue (bulletin) and/or course syllabus, and information about the institution such as its standing with one of the regional accrediting bodies. The production and availability to students and institutions of this information enables the home institution to recognize and accept the work at the second institution, and more important, accept the work completed at the second institution as part of the program of studies for the degree that is awarded by the home institution. The same has applied to students who start their studies at one institution and then transfer to another institution to complete a degree. The instruments of the transfer of academic credit outlined above have provided transparency and facilitated student mobility in the United States.

Dating from 1989 when first introduced through the UNESCO Europe Region Convention, the Diploma Supplement is designed to provide explanations of the contents of a diploma (academic qualification) in the context of the educational system within which the diploma was awarded. The need for a Diploma Supplement grew in part from problems stemming from the translation and evaluation of academic qualifications where distinctions between translation and evaluation are difficult. Little used or understood by institutions in Europe subsequent to its inauguration in 1989, by the time of the drafting of the joint Council of Europe and UNESCO Lisbon Convention in the early 1990s, the Diploma Supplement had

become an important instrument of academic recognition and student mobility. The Explanatory Report of the Lisbon Convention offers the following description of the Diploma Supplement:

The UNESCO/Council of Europe Diploma Supplement is generally considered a useful tool for promoting the transparency of higher education qualifications, and measures have been taken to encourage the use of the Diploma Supplement on a larger scale.

The Diploma Supplement explains the contents and form of the qualifications delivered by higher education institutions. It does not replace or modify those qualifications. Rather, the Diploma Supplement seeks to explain the qualifications in an internationally understandable form. The Diploma Supplement is therefore useful to higher education institutions in their relations with partner institutions in other countries, e.g., in the framework of student exchanges. The ENIC Network should periodically review the Diploma Supplement with a view to updating its content and facilitating its use. (Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region: Explanatory Report, Council of Europe, ETS No. 165, p. 23.)

There are eight sections to the Diploma Supplement. They include the following:

- 1) Information Identifying the Holder of the Qualification
- 2) Information Identifying the Qualification
- 3) Information of the Level of the Qualification
- 4) Information on the Contents and Results Gained
- 5) Information on the Function of Qualification
- 6) Additional Information
- 7) Certification of the Supplement (who issued it, their name, date, etc.)
- 8) Information on the National Higher Education System

The Diploma Supplement represents an important step in student mobility and the recognition of academic qualification. From a practical stand point and personal experience of more than twenty-one years as an international admission officer and foreign credential evaluator, providing this information about a diploma or academic qualification is a critical component of achieving an understanding of what that diploma or qualifications means in the system that provided the qualification. With only a diploma to work with, the logical list of questions other than the name of the person who was awarded the qualification (diploma), the

name of the qualification (diploma), and perhaps the institution or body awarding the qualification (diploma) are the elements of the Diploma Supplement.

The Diploma Supplement is just one of the instruments of student mobility within Europe.

4.4 EUROPEAN CREDIT TRANSFER AND ACCUMULATION SCHEME (ECTS)

In 1983 under the direction of the Council of Ministers of the European Community, a network of information centers was established where the individual centers were known as National Academic Recognition Centers (NARIC). With the launching of ERASMUS in 1987, the NARICs and the NARIC network became a part of the ERASMUS program. The main function of the NARICs within the ERASMUS program was to provide information and when necessary, resolve issues relating to the recognition of diplomas and/or studies completed in another country, the latter being the main reason for ERASMUS (Hildebrand, 1996).

The guiding principle or rule of the ERASMUS program was that study completed in another country lasting between three and twelve months be fully recognized by the home institution. In practice, in the early years of ERASMUS especially, the process of recognition (accepting transfer credit, to use terminology familiar in the U.S.), was in many cases not granted at the home institution. This was not a surprising situation given the general lack of experience in student mobility and transfer credit within Europe (Hildebrand, 1996).

In an attempt to address aspects of the problem surrounding transfer credit and its recognition by the home institution, in 1989 the ERASMUS program launched a pilot project,

the European Community Course Credit Transfer Scheme, subsequently shortened to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation Scheme (ECTS) (Hildebrand, 1996). The pilot project ran from 1989 to 1990 with 84 institutions participating in the pilot. In 1992 the pilot was increased to include 145 institutions and the five subject areas of business administration, chemistry, history, mechanical engineering, and medicine (Hildebrand, 1996). The pilot program was extended several times since 1992 and was enhanced by the European Commission through establishing and facilitating ECTS promoters who were responsible for meeting with institutions in their respective countries to provide information on ECTS and encourage the implementation of its use (Hildebrand, 1996).

As an instrument of student mobility, ECTS functions as a credit system where a full-time academic year study load is assigned sixty credits. This makes a half-year full-time study load worth thirty credits (Hildebrand, 1996). Institutions who participate in ECTS agree to assign credits to their programs of study breaking them down into small units, or what is known in the U.S. as a course with course credit expressed in terms of semester or quarter credits. The key elements of ECTS are:

- 1) Institutions (departments/programs) using ECTS are required to provide information on course contents, level, and workload;
- 2) Provide a transcript of record containing all of the information on credits and grades assigned to the student;
- 3) Create an ECTS learning agreement arranged between the sending and receiving institutions;
- 4) Provide ECTS coordinators at the institution and/or department who are responsible for the administration of ECTS and any transfer negotiations.

Both the Diploma Supplement and ECTS are important instruments of change and student mobility in Europe. Stemming from the Council of Europe and UNESCO's engagement in issues of academic recognition dating from the 1950s, the Diploma Supplement as a provision

of the Lisbon Convention provides a necessary framework for student mobility across Europe. ERASMUS, under the guidance of the European Commission and growing out of the experience gained in the Joint Study Program, facilitated mobility, providing the financial infrastructure needed to allow student mobility. ECTS, also under the guidance of the European Commission through the NARIC network provided a system of accounting for student mobility. All of these elements combine to provide a background for the development of the Sorbonne Declaration in 1998 and the Bologna Declaration in 1999.

4.5 SUMMARY

This chapter has focused on the appearance of education in the process of European integration and subsequent instruments of change. The appearance of education in conjunction with the training appearing in Article 128 of the EEC Treaty supports basic freedoms and the removal of barriers to free movement. As argued by Neave, any further involvement in education or education policy would have become a very sensitive issue. Education was a matter of national sovereignty. Later discussions of education remained of a general nature and focused mainly on education as a human right. Then a Ministers' meeting in 1971 gave voice to the idea that integration did not rest solely with economic integration. The result was an exploration of how cooperation in education could be accomplished. Following in 1973, the Janne Report and a subsequent inclusion of education under Directorate General XII led to the 1974 communication, "Education in the European Community", outlining three main issues of concern regarding education: movement among member states; education for the children of immigrant workers; and providing a European dimension in education. However, the introduction of these issues and

the incorporation of education as an area of concern under a Directorate General of European Commission did not introduce the concept of a harmonization of education among member states. Instead, cooperation in education and any action programs launched by the European Commission were guided by three principles: 1) the autonomy of the education in the members states while at the same time recognizing a need for that education, training and employment to be more in tune with each other; 2) the preservation of the diversity and uniqueness of educational systems; and 3) specific European level objectives regarding education were to be the absolute responsibility of the member states (Neave, 1984, pp. 9-10).

Then in the 1980's, DG XII and DG V were merged under a new DG V for Social Policy, forging a link between planning for education and training initiatives. This merger acted to bring education and training more to the forefront. Also in the 1980's, several pilot projects to increase transnational student exchange were launched. The most important was the ERASMUS Project which provided funding and infrastructure for student mobility. From its first year in 1987/88 to 1993/94, student mobility had grown from 3,244 to 554,379.

In addition to the funding and infrastructure needed to facilitate student mobility, several other initiatives lent their support to the mechanics of transnational student mobility. These include the 1997 Lisbon Recognition Convention; the Diploma Supplement; the National Education Information Centers (ENICs); the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation Scheme (ECTS); and the National Academic Recognition Centers (NARICs). In response to increased levels of educational and cultural activity between countries in Europe and the European Region (as defined by UNESCO), the Council of Europe and UNESCO jointly developed a convention to deal with issues concerning the recognition of academic diplomas across borders. The new convention bound ratifying countries to recognize academic diplomas

unless substantial differences could be found between the diploma presented for recognition and a comparable diploma awarded in the receiving country. The legal framework represented by the Lisbon Recognition Convention enhances the guiding principle of mobility in Europe. The Convention also required the establishment of National Education Information Centers (ENICs). The ENICs provide a critical source or clearinghouse for information on educational systems ranging from the degrees offered in a country to the recognition status of institutions. The Lisbon Recognition Convention also established the requirement that academic institutions provide a Diploma Supplement. The Diploma Supplement gives transparency to the documentation of academic coursework of periods of study. It requires a range of information on student academic accomplishment that in turn facilitates the transfer of credit, an important component of student mobility.

Under provisions for the EU's ERASMUS Program, the existing National Academic Recognition Centers (NARICs) were incorporated into the program to deal with issues arising from the process of recognizing diplomas and/or periods of study. The ERASMUS Program also launched the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation Scheme (ECTS). ECTS required that periods of study be documented in uniform periods of time and stated as credits.

The increased cooperation in education evidenced by all of the combined actions detailed provide an important background for the next chapter in the story of the emergence of education in the process of European integration – the Bologna Process.

5.0 THE BOLOGNA DECLARATION AND THE BOLOGNA PROCESS

The Bologna Declaration is on all agendas: all countries have established a unit or forum to explain and discuss its content and implications. It serves as a new source of dialogue between Ministries and higher education institutions, and between sub-sectors of higher education. (Haug & Tauch, 2001, p. 3)

...the Bologna Process is fundamentally inter-governmental, its decision-making is non-binding. It does not directly address the transformation of the national higher education settings within Europe. It does not try to modify the status of universities. It does not aim to transform state-university relationships, nor the management of the academic profession. It does not state how to allocate budgets. Its aim is to change the 'products' of higher education (degrees, etc.) by transforming the process of higher education. (Corbett, 2006, p. 9)

A discussion of the appearance of the Bologna Declaration and the subsequent Bologna Process must start with a reiteration that the provision of education in Europe has been a national sovereign responsibility. Policy-making and regulation in education remains a national responsibility. As a cross-border agreement regarding higher education and calling for the creation of the European Higher Education Area, the Bologna Declaration appeared on the agenda of all signatory countries (Haug & Tauch, 2001). This chapter is a review of the antecedents to and the launching of the Bologna Process following the signing of the Bologna Declaration in 1999.

In terms of education, the European Union's role had been primarily the launching of ERASMUS in 1987 and in 1995 with the creation of the instruments to directly involve higher education institutions in student mobility through institutional contracts. (Froment, 2003)

Nevertheless, European Commission programs of cooperation in education, especially ERASMUS, coincide with the goals and objectives of the Bologna Process. This was acknowledged in 2001 in Prague when the Commission was invited to become a full member of the Bologna Follow-Up Group. (European Commission, 2003)

As background, the origins of the Bologna Process may be traced to a report and a meeting. The report was the Attali report prepared for the French government by the Attali Commission. The report was in response to a 1997 challenge from Claude Allègre, French Minister of National Education, Research and Technology. The report focused on the challenges facing French higher education. It concluded with offering a European model for higher education as a way forward for France and underscored three challenges facing French higher education: an increasing demand for higher education; a diversification in the field of study; and the ever increasing cost of higher education. The report also noted a danger to society in allowing higher education to fall completely under the competitiveness of the market where only those who can pay will have access and where only programs offering financial return will be offered. In summary, the report highlighted that the solution to the challenges facing French higher education rested in developing an overall harmonization of education in Europe. The assertion was that there can be no mobility of goods, services and people where there is also no possibility of comparison of the value of degrees of the citizens of the countries in the European Union.

The meeting took place in May of 1998. With the assistance of the French Conference of University Presidents (CPU), a meeting was organized to mark the 800th anniversary of the *Université de Sorbonne*. The Ministers of Education for France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom were invited to the meeting. The conclusion of their meeting was the Sorbonne

Declaration calling for a harmonization “of the architecture of the European higher education system,” noting that the potential attractiveness of higher education in Europe would depend on the “readability” of its degrees and educational system. The Sorbonne Declaration went further by articulating a need for a system of two cycles, undergraduate and graduate (Sorbonne Declaration, 1998).

Then in June 1999, thirty countries (31 signatories if the Flemish Speaking Community and the French Speaking Community of Belgium are counted separately) endorsed a declaration in Bologna echoing and expanding the major points of the Sorbonne Declaration. The Bologna Declaration asserted six key points:

- 1) the European higher education system will be transparent and understandable and mainly arranged in a two-tier system of undergraduate (‘bachelor’) and postgraduate (‘master’) degrees;
- 2) degrees/diplomas earned in one part of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) will be accordingly recognized in other parts of the EHEA, both for further studies and for the labour market;
- 3) graduates will be employable throughout the European labour market;
- 4) students and teachers will be able to move freely within the EHEA and they will be able to effectively exercise this opportunity;
- 5) lifelong learning will no longer be isolated from higher education; knowledge and skills acquired through lifelong learning will be crafted towards degrees/qualifications, and modules of higher education courses will be used effectively by lifelong learners;
- 6) European higher education will be sought after on the world market. (Bergen, 2003, pp. 55-56)

The Bologna Declaration also mentioned the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) and the Diploma Supplement, vehicles for achieving the six goals of the Bologna Declaration (Bergen, 2003). The inclusion of ECTS and the Diploma Supplement in the Bologna Declaration drew on existing instruments provided through ERASMUS and the 1997 Lisbon Convention, as noted earlier. The harmonization of higher education was to be accomplished

through actions such as the adoption of an Anglo-Saxon model for the structure of degree programs (Haug & Kirstein, 1999; Bologna Declaration, 1999).

In 2001, two years after the signing of the Bologna Declaration, European Ministers of Education met in Prague to measure and take stock of the progress toward the agenda of the Bologna Process. By the meeting in 2001, Croatia, Cyprus, and Turkey had signed the Bologna Declaration. The communiqué of the thirty-three signatories present in Prague reinforced the commitment to the implementation of the Bologna Declaration, the creating of the European Higher Education Area by 2010. They also reiterated the six objectives or action lines of the Bologna process:

- 1) adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees;
- 2) adoption of a system based on two main cycles: undergraduate and graduate;
- 3) establishment of a system of credits;
- 4) promotion of mobility, student and teacher;
- 5) promotion of European level cooperation in quality assurance; and
- 6) promotion of a European dimension in higher education.

In Prague, the Ministers added three areas of interest to the original six action lines articulated in the Bologna Declaration. They were 1) lifelong learning, 2) higher education institutions and students, and 3) the promotion of the attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area.

Then in September 2003, four years after the signing of the Bologna Declaration, a second follow-up meeting was held in Berlin to review the progress achieved since the 2001 meeting in Prague. By the 2003 meeting, Albania, Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Holy See, Russia,

Serbia and Montenegro, and “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” had signed the Bologna Declaration, bringing the total number of signatories to forty.

The Bologna Declaration is a cross-border agreement of cooperation among sovereign nations of Europe, with some signatories Member States of the European Union, others not. Central to the question of the delegation of sovereignty is the degree to which individual European nations maintain or give up control over policy areas. The other question is the degree to which external forces such as globalization, regionalism, and/or Europeanization influence domestic policy making in individual nations. I take the position that the aligning of domestic structures and policies in education to a European framework as outlined in the Bologna Declaration represents a Europeanization of education. The reference of the European higher education system in the Bologna Declaration underscores this concept.

Among the six objectives of the Bologna Process is the promotion of student mobility. As noted earlier, mobility is a key element in the forming of the single market, of European integration, and the forming of the European Union. In terms of education, student mobility is not a new concept or idea within higher education around the world. By contrast, student mobility within Europe was not a reality, or extremely limited, at the time ERASMUS was introduced in 1987. A key element of student mobility is the transferability and recognition of periods of study in another country. A key instrument of student mobility is a system for defining periods of study in terms of units or credits and the system adopted for defining periods of study is ECTS.

Also among the objectives of the Bologna Process are the instruments for the creation of the European Higher Education Area: 1) a system of easily readable, comparable and transparent degrees; and 2) a system based on two main cycles: undergraduate and graduate.

As the signatories of the Bologna Declaration approached the Berlin conference in 2003, each signatory to the Bologna Declaration was asked to prepare a report on the progress made toward the six objectives of the Bologna Process. Of the six objectives of the Bologna Declaration noted above, I argue that the key elements for the creation of the European Higher Education Area and main instruments of student mobility are contained in the first four objectives of the Bologna Process,

- 1) adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees;
- 2) adoption of a system based on two main cycles: undergraduate and graduate;
- 3) establishment of a system of credits, and;
- 4) promotion of mobility, student and teacher

Therefore, the responses of the signatories as to progress made toward the first four objectives should reveal the steps that have been taken toward those objectives. The next chapter looks at information culled from the reports prepared by the signatories of the Bologna Process that were prepared prior to the 2003 Berlin meeting. The reports are statements of the progress toward the implementation of the six objectives of the Bologna Declaration.

5.1 SUMMARY

The intergovernmental agreement that is the Bologna Declaration and its six objectives, whether in reaction to or an echo of the processes of European integration, represents the entrance of higher education to the processes of Europeanization. Evidence of this is found in both the original signing of the Bologna Declaration in 1999 and the in the reports from the follow-up meetings in Prague in 2001 and again in Berlin in 2003. The next chapter takes a closer look at

the individual country reports prepared for the Berlin follow-up meeting. As mentioned, the reports are statements of the progress toward the implementation of the six Bologna Process objectives.

6.0 APPROACH TO ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the approach to analysis used to address the basic research question of this section: What evidence do the national reports prepared for the 2003 Berlin Ministerial Conference (Bologna Process follow-up meeting) provide as to the steps taken to achieve the four main goals or objectives of the Bologna Process? Through a descriptive review of the literature on the process of European integration and where education appeared (or did not appear) in the process of European integration, I have provided a context for descriptive review of antecedents to the Bologna Declaration, the Bologna Declaration itself, and the subsequent Bologna process. Those descriptive reviews provide a context for a close reading of the reports prepared for the 2003 Berlin Ministerial Conference to analyze the responses to the four questions that address the four goals or objectives of the Bologna Process that are the framework for the creation of the European Higher Education Area. The four goals or objectives reviewed are:

- **Objective One:** *Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees, through the implementation of the Diploma Supplement, in order to promote the employability and the international competitiveness of the European higher education system;*
- **Objective Two:** *Adoption of a system based on two cycles, undergraduate and graduate. Access to the second cycle shall require successful completion of the first cycle studies, lasting a minimum of three years. The degree awarded after the first cycle shall also be*

relevant to the European labour market as an appropriate level of qualification. The second cycle should lead to the master and/or doctorate degree as in many European countries;

- **Objective Three:** *Establishment of a system of credits – such as the ECTS system – as a proper means of promoting widespread student mobility; and*
- **Objective Four:** *Promotion of mobility by overcoming obstacle to the effective exercise of free movement.*

Using content analysis as an approach, three main concepts guided the review of the data, or contents, of the 2003 reports. Three concepts guided the close reading of the reports and provide a framework for the conceptual analysis of the reports and the responses provided to the four objectives. The first concept is based on whether the report is *explicit* in mentioning the objective and provides detail, the detail including but not limited to a description of the actions taken by that country or Ministry to accomplish the objective. The second concept is based on whether the report only *mentions* the objective but does not provide any detail as to actions taken to accomplish the objective. The third concept is based on the objective *not being mentioned* in the report.

After the close reading of the reports and the assigning of a descriptor (*explicit, mentioned, or not mentioned*) to each of the four objectives based on conceptual analysis of the response, the descriptors were then placed into tables according to one of the following membership status in the European Union at the time of the 2003 Berlin Ministerial Conference: Member; Candidate for Membership; or Other. The tables were then reviewed to assess similarities and differences in approaches taken by countries according to EU membership status.

7.0 THE 2003 BERLIN FOLLOW-UP MEETING COUNTRY REPORTS

The following is a summary of my review of the responses to the first four objectives of the Bologna process found in the reports prepared for the 2003 Berlin follow-up meeting prepared by the countries having signed the Bologna Declaration. I argue that the first four objectives articulate best the process and instruments for change:

- 1) adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees;
- 2) adoption of a system based on two main cycles: undergraduate and graduate;
- 3) establishment of a system of credits; and
- 4) promotion of mobility, student and teacher

My review of the reports and the preparation of the following summaries was also guided by the question: What actions toward the implementation of the Bologna objectives do the country reports reveal? In addition, where the country report provided an introduction, I summarized that introduction.

There are two points worth noting. The first is that Austria prepared two reports, one for the university sector of its higher education system and the second for the University of Applied Technology (Fachhochschulen) sector. The second point is that the French Speaking Community of Belgium did not present a report. Belgium is a unique case. As a result of the devolution that has taken place in Belgium, there are now two main communities in Belgium: the French Speaking Community and the Flemish Community. In terms of education, there is a Ministry of Education for the Flemish Community (Flanders) and a Ministry of Education for the French Speaking Community. While both communities in Belgium signed the Bologna

declaration, only the Flemish Community submitted a report for the 2003 Berlin follow-up meeting.

7.1 AUSTRIA

After the Bologna Declaration in 1999, Austria initiated a monitoring project to follow the implementation of the Bologna objectives. The federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture issued a first report in 2001. Therefore, the report of 2003 is the second report. The second report notes that all higher education institutions in Austria, universities and Fachhochschulen (universities of applied sciences), have appointed Bologna coordinators responsible for the promotion of the implementation of the Bologna objectives. As the University sector is distinct from the Fachhochschulen sector in Austria, the Austrian report is divided into two sections for each sector. Responses from the report for the University Sector are presented first.

1. University Sector: Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The Austrian report responds to this question by noting that the introduction of the Diploma Supplement is foreseen by the Universities Act of 2002, the Federal Act on the Organisation of the Universities and their Studies, coming into force in August of 2002. Therefore all universities will issue a Diploma Supplement in German and English upon request.

2. University Sector: Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The Austrian report notes that universities started to offer Bachelor programs in 2000/01. It is also reported that 180 bachelor programs have been adopted. The report goes on to state that the goal is to have 50% of all fields of studies offered as bachelor and master study programs

by 2006 and any new programs must follow the bachelor/master pattern. In addition, universities may not run programs leading to both the diploma (old system) and as a bachelor/master program.

3. University Sector: Establishment of a system of credits:

The Austrian report notes that the implementation of ECTS has been compulsory for bachelor/master studies since 1999. The report also notes that the system of credits (ECTS) was also adopted for the old system (the diploma system) as of October 2002. The goal in Austria is to have fifty percent of all fields of study covered by ECTS by 2003, noting that some universities have already achieved complete adoption of the credit system.

4. University Sector: Promotion of mobility:

The Austrian report notes that in addition to financial aid programs, there are many scholarships available through many sources to facilitate mobility. The report also points out that there is a system of guaranteed academic recognition for study abroad. Changes to contracts have been made making it possible for teachers to be eligible for leaves of absences for teaching and research of up to five years, and up to ten years in certain circumstances.

1. Fachhochschulen Sector: Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The Austrian report omits addressing this question for the Fachhochschulen sector. However, in the final section of the report it is noted that the Fachhochschulen Studies Act prepared for 2004 includes a provision for the supplying of Diploma Supplements to all Fachhochschulen sector graduates.

2. Fachhochschulen Sector: Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The Austrian reports notes that based on an amendment to the Fachhochschulen Studies Act, a legal basis for the introduction of bachelor's and master's study programs has been in place since May of 2002. The first bachelor programs were to start in the 2003-04 academic year and the first master programs to start in the 2004-2005 academic year.

3. Fachhochschulen Sector: Establishment of a system of credits:

The Austrian report notes that ECTS credit points have been allocated to Fachhochschulen study programs since the amendment to the Fachhochschulen Studies Act in 2002.

4. Fachhochschulen Sector: Promotion of mobility:

The Austrian report notes that the financial support and academic recognition available to university sector student is available to Fachhochschulen sector students.

7.2 BELGIUM – FLEMISH COMMUNITY

The Flemish report from the Director General for Higher Education and Scientific Research offers an introduction that notes the adoption of an Act in the Flemish Parliament in April of 2003 provides dramatic reforms in Flemish higher education in response mainly to the expansion of university education in Flanders as well as international developments. The report recognizes the Bologna Declaration as an important catalyst in the process of higher education reform.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The Flemish report notes that the Acts of the Flemish Parliament on the Universities (1991) and the Hogescholen (1994) establish the introduction of the Diploma Supplement.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The Flemish report notes that from the 2004-2005 academic year, the degree structure called for in the Bologna Declaration will be offered, with the older degree structure to be phased out. The report clearly states that the reform is to be the adoption of a two-tier system of a bachelor degree obtained after three years of study and a master degree after another one to two years. The report goes on to state that the goal of the Flemish higher educational system is to have completely replaced the old degree structure with the new by 2011.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The Flemish report notes the 1991 and 1994 introduction of ECTS credits and goes on to state that the bachelor degree is to be 180 ECTS study points and the masters degree to be 60 to 120 ECTS study points. The report also notes that final adoption was expected at the end of 2003.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The Flemish report notes that the 1991 and 1994 Acts of the Flemish Parliament promote student mobility and the anticipation of a final adoption by the Flemish Parliament in 2003.

7.3 BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

The report from Bosnia and Herzegovina, prepared by the Federation Ministry of Education and Science, declares the intention to take the steps necessary to implement the principles and

objectives of the Bologna Declaration. This intention was formally communicated in April of 2002. The report notes that given the different dynamics and structures of universities in the country, each university has produced its own plan and time frame for reform implementation. The report from Bosnia and Herzegovina then provides a report on the status of the Bologna Process for each of the five universities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. What follows is a summary of the five reports.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The reports from the universities in Bosnia and Herzegovina do not address in any detail plans to adopt a system of easily readable and comparable degrees, although Sarajevo University mentions that in its planning processes, procedures will be developed for the introduction of a diploma that will be recognizable and comparable to the diplomas granted elsewhere in Europe.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

None of the reports from the universities in Bosnia and Herzegovina mention a two-cycle system although there is repeated mention of a commitment to the objectives of the Bologna process.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

Each of the reports from the universities in Bosnia and Herzegovina mentions the adoption of ECTS, although presented in general rather than specific terms of implementation.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from the Tuzla University mentions mobility, but limited to institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to the countries in the region that use languages related to the languages spoken in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

7.4 BULGARIA

The report from Bulgaria begins by mentioning the legal initiatives being taken to facilitate the implementation of the Bologna Process, pointing out that the reforms are taken in light of the country's preparation for accession to the European Union.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The Bulgarian report responds to this objective by stating that the actions taken in Bulgaria are mainly focused on providing opportunities for equal access to further studies. The report then describes degrees offered in the non-university and university sectors. The first university degree is described as a four-year program for the degree of Bachelor. The second degree is described as one year after the Bachelor's degree for the Master's degree.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The Bulgarian report addresses this objective by stating that the Bachelor's degree provides basic comprehensive training, giving access to the labor market. The Master's degree is described as oriented toward "in-depth fundamental knowledge."

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The Bulgarian report notes that some institutions utilize ECTS credits and anticipates adoption of ECTS in the 2003 Higher Education Act.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The Bulgarian report notes that Bulgaria ratified the Lisbon Convention on recognition in 2000 and is the key element of mobility for Bulgaria.

7.5 CROATIA

The introduction to the report from Croatia prepared by the Ministry of Sciences and Technology places an emphasis on the acceptance of European standards in higher education to facilitate its inclusion in the European Higher Education Area. This goal was strengthened in 2002 with the government's decision to increase its financial investment by ten percent annually. In addition, the Act on Scientific Activity and Higher Education Adopted in July 2003 provide a legal basis for the adoption of the Bologna process as the basis for educational reform in Croatia.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The Croatian report notes preparations for the adoption of the Diploma Supplement to be issued in both Croatian and English.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The Croatian report notes flexibility in the degree structure of 3+2 or 4+1 to be offered in Croatia, with a majority of the higher education institutions in the 2004 - 2005 academic year and the remainder to be introduced in the 2005 - 2006 academic year.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The Croatian report notes that while there has been an awareness of the ECTS credit system and that some of the Croatian polytechnics introduced systems of credits, a general introduction of the ECTS credit system for Croatia was not planned until the Fall of 2003.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The Croatian report notes that Croatia does not participate in the European mobility programs, but states confidence that Croatia's accession to the European Union will enable Croatia to begin participation.

7.6 CYPRUS

The introduction to the Cyprus report outlines the legal basis for public and private higher education in Cyprus, noting that the University of Cyprus is self-governing and that other public higher education institutions are operated under various ministries. Both sectors are funded through the Ministry of Education. Private institutions are authorized under the Schools of Higher Education Laws and are subject to accreditation by the Council of Educational Evaluation-Accreditation.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Cyprus notes that the competent authority for the evaluation and recognition of degrees is the Cyprus Council for the Recognition of Higher Education Qualifications. The report also notes that Cyprus has ratified the Lisbon Convention and established the mechanism for recognition through the Ministry of Labor and Social Insurance. In the following section of the report it is noted that the Diploma Supplement has been distributed to all sectors and all sectors have expressed a willingness to adopt the Diploma Supplement to replace the official transcript.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Cyprus notes that the system in Cyprus is based on two cycles: undergraduate and graduate. The undergraduate cycle is four years leading to the first university degree (Ptychio). The graduate cycle is eighteen months leading to the Master Degree. The report also notes that all private institutions have adopted an undergraduate framework of four years leading to a Bachelor Degree, with the intermediate qualifications of Certificate (1 year), Diploma (2 year), Higher Diploma (3 year), and Bachelor (4 year).

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Cyprus notes that a system of credits has been adopted by the University of Cyprus and a number of private institutions. The University of Cyprus has implemented a credit system, with a full academic year denoted as 30 credits with 15 credits per semester. The report notes that this gives a ratio of 1:2 since a full academic year in ECTS is 60 credits while a semester is 30 credits.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Cyprus notes that since 1997 Cyprus has participate in the ERAMUS program and considers mobility of students an important factor in furthering European integration.

7.7 CZECH REPUBLIC

The introduction to the report from the Czech Republic notes two sectors of higher education in the Czech Republic, public and private. The report also notes a distinction between tertiary professional studies that lead to diplomas, as differentiated from higher education programs leading to a bachelor degree. The report also notes that both types of education are now officially known as tertiary education. Access to tertiary level studies is also defined as the completion of secondary education leaving examination granting access to tertiary level education. The public sector is partially regulated by the appropriate Ministry, the Ministry of Defense, and the Ministry of the Interior. The development of the private sector was enabled by ACT No. 111/1998, the Higher Education Act. The report also notes that all study programs in the Czech Republic must be accredited.

The report also notes that the legal conditions for the implementation of the Bologna Process are established under the same government act mentioned above and its Amendment No. 147/2001. In addition, the report notes that the implementation of the Bologna Process has become an important part of the long-term planning process of the Ministry and is part of the 2000 government approved National Program of Education in the Czech Republic (White Paper) and the Strategic Development of Tertiary Education for the period 2000 - 2005 issued by the Ministry of Education.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from the Czech Republic notes the legal framework that identifies three levels of high education – bachelor, master, doctoral. The report also notes that the Diploma Supplement is among the documents certifying graduation from a study program in accordance with Act No. 111/1998 noting that the Diploma Supplement will be issued to all graduates on request.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from the Czech Republic notes that the bachelor study programs may be of three or four years in length, followed by a master study program ranging from one to three years in length. The 2000 Transformation and Development Program supports the development of Bachelor degree studies and a restructuring of traditional higher education courses into two stages of bachelor plus master. The report notes that the two stages have been implemented in social sciences, artistic fields, and some natural sciences.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from the Czech Republic notes that there is no legal provision for the adoption of ECTS, although ECTS is generally accepted and established mainly at the public university

type higher education institutions, but mainly under participation in SOCRATES-ERASMUS. The report also notes that a national team has been established in the 2003 – 2004 academic year to consult on ECTS and the Diploma Supplement on a national and international level. The report also notes the challenge to the implementation of ECTS in the more traditional universities.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from the Czech Republic notes that the main obstacle to mobility is funding and that mobility in the Czech Republic has been mainly limited to participation in ERASMUS, the Central European Exchange Program for University Studies (CEEPUS), and bilateral agreements between institutions. The report also notes that the Czech Republic views the ratification of the Lisbon Convention in 2000 as key to facilitating student mobility.

7.8 DENMARK

The Danish report from the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation notes that the Bologna process covers education programs and institutions under various ministries, where each ministry is responsible for the implementation of the objectives of the Bologna Process. The report also notes that to assure that all are included, representatives of the ministries' professional agencies, education institutions and organizations have been participating in a Bologna Follow-Up Group.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The Danish report notes that importance of the Lisbon Convention on recognition of academic qualifications as at the core of mobility. In addition, as of September 2002, the

Diploma Supplement has been obligatory to graduates from higher education programs in Denmark and a common Diploma Supplement Template has been designed for use by all higher education institutions. The report further notes that an agency has been established with responsibility for the assessment of foreign qualifications under the Consolidated Act no. 74 of January 2003 with an appeal board established to address disagreements.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report notes that in 1993 the Danish Government made the decision in principle to implement a Bachelor Degree within the bachelor + master + doctoral degree system. According to Act no. 403/2003, the report notes that it is now statutory and the reform is by in large complete.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The Danish report notes that as of September 2001, it is obligatory to express education units in terms of ECTS credits and made statutory in the University Act.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The Danish report notes participation in the various European student mobility programs and notes that Danish students may use the Danish State study grants to study in other countries. The report also notes a government program to build new student housing with a portion of the space designated for exchange students.

7.9 ESTONIA

The introduction to the Estonian report notes that a working group under the guidance of the Ministry of Education was established. It also notes that the amendments necessary to

implement the Bologna Process were included in the higher education reform plan adopted by the government in 2001, with subsequent amendments such as the Universities Act, the Institutions of Applied Higher Education Act, and the Standards of Higher Education that establishes the a general requirements for studies, curricula, and the academic staff. The report also notes that the efforts toward the Bologna Process have been directed mainly toward the systems of Estonia qualifications and in support of student mobility, while the introduction of accreditation processes and credit points was accomplished in earlier prior to 2001.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The Estonian report notes that there are two branches of higher education: academic and applied higher education. The report notes that extensive reforms were initiated in 1999 and implemented starting in the 2002 - 2003 academic year, which included new curricula and two stages of higher education, the Anglo-Saxon bachelor-master model. The report also notes that by January of 2004 and by regulation of the government, all institutions of higher education are obligated to issue in English a Diploma Supplement to be automatically issued to graduates, except for those students who complete a bachelor's degree and continue in a master's degree at the same institution.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The Estonian report notes that a two-stage system has been implemented as of 2002 with the bachelor's degree (three years) as the first stage and the master's degree (one to two years) as the second stage. The report also notes that the master's degree will be offered in institutions of applied higher education. In addition, the report notes that the master's degree or equivalent qualification is required for admission doctoral studies, which ranges in length from three to four years.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The Estonian report describes the bachelor's degree as being from 180 ECTS to 240 ECTS and the master's degree from 60 to 120 ECTS. The report also notes the goal of converting from the Estonian credit system to the ECTS credit system by September 2006, although all degrees may currently be expressed in terms of ECTS.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The Estonian report notes participation in ERASMUS since 1998 and the awarding of supplementary state benefits to augment the grant from the EU with the goal to increase student participation in mobility. The report also notes the provision of state allocations for doctoral students admitted to programs in other countries that are defined by the government as of strategic importance with the obligation to return to Estonia and become members of the academic staff. The report also notes other short-term grants to support mobility at various levels.

7.10 FINLAND

The report from Finland was prepared by the Ministry of Education and offered no introduction.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The Finnish report notes that by national decrees, all universities and polytechnics are obligated to issue a Diploma Supplement to their students and by recommendation of the Ministry of Education, all institutions are encouraged to use the Diploma Supplement format. The report also notes that Finland is taking steps to ratify the Lisbon Convention on the recognition of academic qualifications.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The Finnish report notes that under reforms initiated in the beginning of the 1990s, the degree bachelor's degree was introduced in almost all fields of study. However, the report notes that a bill is to be introduced in Parliament in the fall of 2003 to reform the university degree structure by August of 2005 implementing a two-tier degree structure with a bachelor's degree to be introduced in all fields of study, with the exception of medical fields, although some medical faculties are adopting the two-tier system. The report notes that the Ministry is providing funding to facilitate the new degree structure. The report also notes that polytechnics may offer bachelor-level degrees in all fields and postgraduate degrees in certain fields.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report notes that a national system of credits was adopted in the 1970s. The system describes one credit as forty hours of student work. The report also notes that the system of credits will be replaced by ECTS in August 2005 at the same time as the implementation of the new degree structure. The report notes that the credits system will apply to both the university and polytechnic sectors.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The Finnish report notes that student mobility is supported through the ability of students' to use their financial aid for study abroad. Additional funding is available for the implementation of EU programs and many institutions offer additional funding to students to facilitate international exchange. The report notes that the Ministry of Education is working with the university and polytechnics to set goals for student exchanges with a goal expressed as having every third Finnish higher education student spending part of their studies abroad. The report notes that in 2001 a national strategy for promoting study in Finland was developed with a

goal of doubling the number of students from other countries by 2010, noting that all institutions offer English-language programs with special funding available to develop English-language education for both domestic and international students. The report notes that the Centre for International Mobility (CIMA) was established in the early 1990s to promote international cooperation.

7.11 FRANCE

The initial remarks to the report from France prepared by Ministry of Youth, National Education and Research provides a brief overview to the Sorbonne/Bologna Process. A second report that summarizes aspects of the first report notes a general target of the 2005-2006 academic year for the implementation of reforms proposed under the 2002 reform legislation.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The French report notes that the Lisbon Convention was ratified in France in October of 1999 and in compliance with its provisions, promotes the widespread use of the Diploma Supplement as a descriptive annex to a diploma in cases of a student wishing to go abroad. The report notes that the requirement of a descriptive annex to a diploma is mentioned in previous texts in France regarding the validation of previous academic and professional learning. The report notes that the use of the Diploma Supplement is compulsory only in cases of student mobility. The report also notes that as of April 2002 the Code of Education adopts the principle of the validation of prior academic learning, which particularly pertains to studies undertaken abroad.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The French report notes that the 2002 higher education reform adopted a new degree structure based on four degrees: *baccalauréat*, the *licence*, a new master's degree, and the doctorate, with a target implementation date of 2005-2006 academic year.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The French report notes that the implementation of ECTS as of April of 2002 where 60 credits equals one year; 180 credits equals a *licence*; and 300 credits equals a master's degree.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The French report notes the development of an Action Plan for mobility developed in 2000. Participation in ERASMUS is noted, with France having more than 18,000 students going to other countries under ERASMUS. Also noted are the various grants available to French students and institutions, especially a provision to provide funding to institutions to cover extra costs associated with providing specific educational services provided within the framework of international cooperation.

7.12 GERMANY

The introduction to the German report outlines the significant steps in the Bologna Process starting with the Sorbonne Declaration in 1998 and looking to the Berlin meeting in 2003. The membership of the European Commission in the Bologna Follow-Up Group is noted as well as the large number of conferences, seminars, and other events that have dealt with the Bologna Process and the creation of the European Higher Education Area. The introduction also notes the correspondence between the goals of the Bologna Process and the goals of the German Federal

Government and the German *Länder* that focus on the modernizing of higher education in Germany and the enhancement of the Germany's international attractiveness as detailed in a 1999 joint declaration by the Federal Government and a follow-up report in 2001.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The German report notes the introduction of the new system consisting of a bachelor's degree and a master's degree, supplementing the traditional system consisting of the *Diplom*, *Magister*, and *Staatsexamen*, which must be accompanied by measures to promote their acceptance by industry and society. The report notes that the introduction of the Diploma Supplement facilitates part of this goal and notes that the German template is available for use by institutions in Germany.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The German report notes the 1998 Framework Act for Higher Education that introduced a two-tier degree structure as a supplement to the traditional one-tier system and notes that the *Länder* have included these provisions in their higher education acts. The report also notes that while 544 Bachelor courses and 367 Master courses have been introduced (as of the 2002 summer semester), this is a modest number for Germany.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The German report notes that the higher education acts of the *Länder* are to provide for the implementation of credit systems and institutions wishing to adopt a Bachelor or Master course must incorporate a modular approach and use a credit system.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The German report addresses this objective by reporting on improvements to the legal conditions by which foreigners wishing to undertake studies or research in Germany have been

improved according to the 1998 Aliens Act with subsequent improvements in 2001. The report also noted the introduction of the Test of German as Foreign Language (TestDaF) and the opportunities provide to study German at institutions in Germany to facilitate the integration of foreign student in German institutions.

7.13 GREECE

The introduction to the Greek report by the Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs offers a description of the higher education system from the reforms initiated in 2001, which consists entirely of public institutions in two sectors: the university sector and the technological sector.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The Greek report notes that due to Greece's failure to ratify the Lisbon Convention, there is no provision for the issuance of the Diploma Supplement. However, the report does note that a new legislative framework is under consideration that may facilitate the ratification of the Lisbon Convention and result in a plan for the adoption and implementation of the Diploma Supplement.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The Greek report notes that the degree structure in Greece is based on two cycles: a first cycle leading to a first degree (four years) and a second cycle leading to a second degree. The report notes that the second cycle is followed by a third degree or "doctorate diploma," although access to the third degree is not necessarily dependent on the completion of the second cycle as the first cycle may give the right of direct access to the doctorate level. The report also notes that

there are no plans to introduce a first degree of less than four years and notes that the Greek government will need to address the problem that will arise regarding the recognition or equivalence of Greek degrees that differ from the first degrees offered under the Bologna Process in other European nations.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The Greek report notes that there is a system of credits in both sectors of the high education in Greece, although there are no characteristics in common with the ECTS credit system. The report notes that ECTS is used when student mobility programs, ERSAMUS and SOCRATES, are involved, but the implementation is left entirely to the discretion of the institutions to define the characteristics of the credits used. However the report does note a plan to begin a discussion about the adoption of ECTS.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The Greek report notes the intention of the Greek government to explore ways to increase the funding for student mobility and the introduction of legislative provisions necessary to overcome obstacles to mobility.

7.14 THE HOLY SEE

The introduction to the report from the Holy See offers an overview of the academic centers that the Holy See bears responsibility, noting that the academic centers are classified by two types: ecclesiastical universities and faculties, and Catholic universities. The introduction notes that the Catholic universities award degrees on the basis of civil authority and the recognition of their degrees is the same as that of the degrees of the civil universities (higher education institutions)

of the country in which they are located. The introduction further notes that Catholic universities are governed by Canon Law; the Apostolic Constitution *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, the ordinances for its local application, the statutes of the institution, and follow the academic legislation and structure of the nations in which they are located. The introduction notes that only the 157 ecclesiastical universities and faculties (and affiliated, aggregated, or incorporated institute) and not the Catholic universities are affected by the Holy See's adherence to the Bologna Declaration, noting as well the common academic legislation found in the Apostolic Constitution *Sapientia Christiana* of 1979, conferring degrees on the authority of the Holy See.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from the Holy See notes the signing of the Lisbon Convention, the participation in the ENIC-NARIC network, that the Conference of rectors of the Pontifical Roman Universities (CRUPR) is a member of the European University Association (EUA).

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from the Holy See notes a three-year cycle of basic studies leading to the canonical Baccalaureate followed by a two-year specialization for the canonical Licentiate, noting that these qualifications are for the holding of offices and tasks in the Catholic Church, noting variations in structure for Theology and Canon Law although the total is five years of study.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from the Holy See notes a variety of credit systems employed by the ecclesiastical institutions, with many of the institutions adapting their system to ECTS, noting as well a willingness to develop a Diploma Supplement.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from the Holy See notes existing mobility within the current system of ecclesiastical institutions, noting the institutional nature of its institutions, and the Holy See's institutions do not participate in SOCRATES mobility programs.

7.15 HUNGARY

The introduction to the Hungarian report notes the importance to Hungary of active participation in the process leading to the formation of European Area of Higher Education and notes structural reforms and plans by the Ministry of Education since the meeting in Prague for introducing comprehensive legislation to provide greater authority for the transformation of the structures of higher education to be suitable to the requirements of the Bologna Process, the distribution of state resources, an expansion of university autonomy, education. The active participation of the Hungarian Rectors' Conference (MRK), the College Directors' Conference (FFK), the Higher Education and Scientific Council (FTT), and the Hungarian Accreditation Committee (MAB) are also noted, as well as the formation of a National Bologna Committee in 2002.

The introduction offers additional information about the Hungarian High Education Act of 2000, noting that the changes in Hungarian Higher Education resulting from the Act will be assisted by Hungarian accession to the European Union. The report then present statistics about higher education, noting also the creation of new regional institutions, the introduction of quality management/improvement systems in all higher education institutions, and a concern for

providing educational opportunities for Hungarian minorities living beyond the Hungarian borders.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The Hungarian report does not address this objective, although it is discussed in the introduction mentioning the Education Act of 2000 and subsequent planning for change. In a separate section, the report does note the implementation of the Diploma Supplement in accordance with the June 2003 law requiring the issuance of a Diploma Supplement at a student's request, and at the student's expense, issued in English. Also in a separate section, the report notes the adoption of the 2001 Recognition Act that is in full harmony with the terminology of the Lisbon Convention.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The Hungarian report notes a 1995 resolution on higher education development, calling for the gradual dissolution of the dual system of colleges and universities into a two-cycle system offering an undergraduate cycle (Bachelor) in every field of study, where successful completion of the first cycle is a prerequisite for admission to the second cycle, studies leading to a Masters Degree. The report notes that completion of the Masters level will give access to third cycle or doctoral studies. The report notes that higher education vocational programs would not lead to a degree, but work completed could be partially transferred into a bachelor's degree program. The report notes an implementation goal of September 2006 and that planning for a new comprehensive higher education act to create the legal framework for these changes has started, as well as comprehensive discussions, development programs, and information campaigns at various levels in Hungary to promote a positive response to the changes.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The Hungarian report notes that a credit system was proposed in 1998, to be introduced in all state institutions and institutions recognized by the state by September 2003, and facilitated by the newly created National Credit Council and Credit Office as well as through computer software created for this purpose. The report notes that ECTS is not used in all higher education institutions due to the low numbers of students in Hungary participating in student mobility programs.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The Hungarian report notes participation in ERSAMUS and supplemental grants and loans, especially for socially disadvantaged students, handicapped students, students studying related to Information Technology, and people undergoing vocational training. The report implies an ongoing promotion of mobility.

7.16 ICELAND

The introduction to the report from Iceland describes higher education in Iceland, noting that there are eight institutions of higher education, with a total enrollment of 11,883 in the autumn of 2001, the admission requirements to higher education, and that 1997 legislation includes provisions for all institutions of higher education to set admission criteria, including the completion of studies abroad as long as they are equivalent to the Icelandic matriculation examinations. The report also notes that the objectives of the Bologna Declaration are in keeping with the developments in higher education and have required no extraordinary changes, although the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture has taken steps to formalize and

strengthen the implementation process. The report notes the formation of an advisory committee to monitor the process, give input, and makes suggestions, especially on laws and regulation that might be required to secure success.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The Icelandic report notes that the university degree system is twofold: the bachelor degree (3-4 years) and the master degree (an additional two years). The report notes that the two cycle system was established in the humanities in 1942 and is now used in the natural sciences, engineering and economics. The report also notes the existence of the traditional parallel candidates degree system where the degree is obtained after four to six years of study, although this traditional system is disappearing and notes that generally the system is based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate.

The report notes the ratification of the Lisbon Convention in 2000 and the positive response to the Diploma Supplement, that the University of Iceland has been entrusted with the promotion of the Diploma Supplement, and the Bologna committee will consider the question of its use in the future.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Iceland incorporates the response to this objective in the above response.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The Icelandic report notes that there is a system of credits in place based on the same principle of the student workload as in the ECTS system, although as a general rule 30 (Icelandic) credits are equivalent to 60 ECTS credits. The report notes that ECTS is used in all

student exchange programs. The report also notes that while ECTS grading is not obligatory, it is being considered by the Ministry.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Iceland notes a long tradition of student mobility, reporting that 16% of all university student study abroad as a regular part of their studies.

7.17 IRELAND

The introduction to the Irish report, prepared by the Department of Education and Sciences, Higher Education-Universities, notes the formation of a national steering group to oversee the implementation of the Bologna Process made up of representatives from the Conference of Irish Universities (CHIU), the Council of Directors of Institutes of Technology (COD), the Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT), the Higher Education Authority (HEA), the Higher Education and Training Awards Council (HETAC), and the National Qualifications Authority of Ireland (NQAI). The introduction also notes plans later in 2003 for a national conference for all stakeholders as a follow-up to the first conference organized in 2001.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The Irish report notes the relevance of the adoption of easily readable and comparable degree to the second objective, but notes that the implementation of this objective primarily concerns the Diploma Supplement. The report notes the establishment of a Diploma Supplement working group to implement the Diploma Supplement as quickly as possible across the university system. The report notes that the committee includes the national coordinator of the Diploma Supplement, representatives of the Further Education and Training Council (FETAC) to

ensure linkage with the implementation of the Certificate Supplement in further education and training considered under the Copenhagen Process relating to vocational education and training, and staff from each university Examination/Registrar's Office.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The Irish report notes in response to this objective a need to recognize a range of standards associated with the completion of the first cycle and that Ireland is working toward the implementation of national framework of qualifications that includes some of the qualifications (awards) under the Bologna Process. The report notes the ten level awards framework for Ireland:

10	Doctoral Degree
9	Masters Degree and Post-graduate Diploma
8	Honours Bachelor Degree and Higher Diploma
7	Ordinary Bachelor Degree
6	Advanced Certificate and Higher Certificate
5	Level 5 Certificate
4/5	Leaving Certificate
4	Level 4 Certificate
3	Level 3 Certificate & Junior Certificate
2	Level 2 Certificate
1	Level 1 Certificate

The report notes that level 7 through 10 awards will be made by the Higher Education and Training Awards Council, the Dublin Institute of Technology, and the universities. The report also notes that the awards are not based on length of studies but are focused on outcomes.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The Irish report notes that the use of ECTS is limited to students participating in ERASMUS and SOCRATES. However, the report notes the establishment of a Technical Advisory Group on Credits with a charge to review existing systems and look at the possibility for the development of a system of credits. The report notes that the National Qualifications

Authority of Ireland has moved toward defining a national approach to credits under a national framework of qualifications.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The Irish report notes the coordination of participation in the EU schemes on mobility (ERASMUS) through the Higher Education Authority and the creation of an Expert Group on Future Skills Needs in 2001 to explore the question of attracting researchers to Ireland.

7.18 ITALY

The Italian report was prepared by the Italian Ministry for Education, Higher Education and Research, Directorate for University Autonomy and Students Unit for International relations and offered no introduction or opening comments.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The Italian report notes that due to the 1999 reform restructuring programs to three levels (first cycle, second cycle, doctorate) allowing for comparability at the European level, this objective of the Bologna Process have been broadly achieved in Italy. The report further notes the implementation of the Diploma Supplement in Italian and a second European language by Ministerial decree in May of 2001, noting also the ratification of the Lisbon Convention in 2002 through legislation that introduced some substantial changes to procedures for academic recognition.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The Italian report notes that Italian universities started to introduce the new two-cycle system with the 2001-2002 academic year with a first cycle consisting of the three years. The

second cycle consisting of two years was introduced in the 2002-2003 academic year. The report notes that these were implemented in accordance with the Bologna Declaration and the Prague Communiqué to create degrees comparable degrees to promote simple, efficient, and fair recognition. The report also notes that in 2002 a database was established in the Ministry of Education, Higher Education, and Research providing information on all of the programs offered by Italian universities.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The Italian report notes that use of credits in Italy is based on ECTS credits and is an essential element of higher education where one university credit corresponds to 25 hours of work and the yearly average workload is 60 credits. The report also notes that the implementation of credits in the Italian system of higher education caused many changes in teaching methods.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The Italian report notes that the July 2003 law supporting the mobility of students through financial support provided by the Ministry to the universities and includes funding supplemental to ERASMUS grants. The report also notes the support of student mobility by the 1999 law allowing the awarding of joint degrees between Italian and foreign universities.

7.19 LATVIA

The introduction to the report from Latvia, prepared by the Secretary General of the Latvian Rectors' Council, offers a detailed description of higher education in Latvia before and after the adoption of the Bologna Declaration in 1999. Noted are the reforms resulting from the 1991

Education Law and the 1995 Law on Higher Education Establishments. The introduction notes the autonomy of higher education institutions, the division into academic and professional higher education sectors, the introduction of bachelor and master degrees in academic higher education, and the introduction of provision for the establishment of private educational institutions. The introduction notes the 1995 law that deepened these reforms and the introduction of measures to establish a system of quality assurance and accreditation under the Council of Europe's legislative reform initiative and in collaboration with its Baltic neighbors, Estonia and Lithuania. The introduction also notes that prior to the Bologna Declaration, Latvia had introduced a credit point system compatible with ECTS and steps had been taken toward the implementation of a Diploma Supplement.

The introduction notes the post-Bologna Declaration amendments in 2000 to the legislation on Latvian Higher Education Establishments that brought a definition of credit points, defined standards for academic and professional higher education, sought to lessen the difference between the academic and professional sectors of higher education, clarified the requirements for research and staff qualifications in university and non-university institutions, and noted that among tasks of a higher education institution is cooperation with foreign higher education institutions, including the exchange of staff and students.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The Latvian report notes a further move to eliminate the split between the academic and professional higher education sectors through the introduction of professional bachelor and master degrees. The report notes that technical preparations are complete for the introduction of the Diploma Supplement with the goal that the Diploma Supplement be issued automatically to all graduates.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The Latvian report notes that the transition to a two-cycle system was started in the early 1990s and that Latvia has a bachelor/master structure in place.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The Latvian report notes that a system of credits was introduced in the early 1990s and the credit point in Latvia represents a workload of 40 hours of full-time study in one week resulting in 40 credit points per study (academic) year. The report also notes that by legislation the duration of programs and individual courses are expressed in credit points and that a formula of multiplying by 1.5 provides a conversion to ECTS credits. The report also notes that the ECTS grading scale has not been adopted, although the use of the ECTS is being considered.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The Latvian report notes slow growth in student mobility under the Bologna Process and the lack of resources is the obstacle to achieving greater progress toward this objective. The report notes that those students who study abroad under SOCRATES have their study periods recognized and credits transferred. The report also notes the difficulty in attracting students from other countries to Latvia.

7.20 LIECHTENSTEIN

The introduction to the report from Liechtenstein, prepared by the Office of Education, notes that its higher education sector was established in 1992 and consists of three officially recognized institutions. The introduction notes that the University of Human Sciences only offers a graduate-level program of studies.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Liechtenstein notes the implementation of the Diploma Supplement, provided in German and English, at two of the three institutions, with its development at the third institution.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Liechtenstein notes that a system of bachelor's/master's is in place with the bachelor's degree a three-year course (with one exception that is to change in the near future to a three-year course) and the master's degree at least three semesters.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Liechtenstein notes that the two institutions offering bachelor's degree courses document completed course modules as credits under the provisions of ECTS. The report also notes that the University of Human Sciences does not document courses as ECTS credits as the only programs offered are master's degree courses.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Liechtenstein notes that student mobility is taken seriously and ERASMUS is of great importance to student mobility. The report notes government funding to support mobility and that periods of study aboard are fully recognized pending a prior written agreement between the student and the institution in Liechtenstein.

7.21 LITHUANIA

The introduction to the report from Lithuania provides an overview of the development of higher education starting with the reforms of 1990, the Law on Research and Higher Education (1991),

and the Law on Higher Education (2002) that highlight the principles of autonomy, academic freedom and the integration of research and higher education. The introduction notes that the reforms also brought about the implementation of a three level systems of higher education; a system for measuring the amount of study based on credits; the promotion of student exchange; a ten-point grading scale; a quality assurance system based on external assessment; an updating of the content of education; and the introduction of flexibility into the higher education system. The introduction also notes the establishment of the Center for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (LCQAHE) in 1996 and the establishment of two private higher education institutions in 1999.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Lithuania notes the organization of higher education into three levels: First level – undergraduate bachelor programs; Second level – master’s and specialized professional programs; and Third level – residency programs, doctoral studies, and post-graduate art studies. The report notes that higher education programs are offered at universities and non-university institutions where the programs at non-university institutions are professional programs. The report notes that undergraduate university studies are four- year programs, while non-university professional programs are not less than three years. The report notes that master’s degree programs are one to two year programs, and some integrated program combine first and second level university studies and lead directly to the master’s degree. The report notes that the third level programs, doctoral or post-graduate studies, are three to four year programs. The report notes that a working group has been established to prepare legislation for the introduction of the Diploma Supplement with the expectation that it will be implemented in 2004. The report also notes Lithuania’s ratification of the UNESCO Convention on the

Recognition of Studies, Diploma and Degrees Concerning Higher Education in the European Region, 1979 (ratified in Lithuania in 1997); the European Council Convention on the Equivalence of Diplomas Leading to Admission to Universities, 1953 (ratified in Lithuania in 1997), and the Lisbon Convention, 1997 (ratified in Lithuania in 1999).

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

This objective is addressed in the section above.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Lithuania notes a national system of credits based on a student workload of 40 hours per week, an academic year consists of 40 credits, and a multiplying conversion formula of 1.5 gives an equivalent amount of ECTS. The report notes that a bachelor's degree of four years length in 160 national credits (240 ECTS), although a range for first cycle programs of 140 national credits (210 ECTS) to 180 national credits (270 ECTS) is permitted; masters' degree programs may range from 60 national credits (90 ECTS) to 80 national credits (120 ECTS). The report also notes that ECTS credits are used in student exchange programs.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Lithuania notes the favorable conditions for mobility as a result of participation in various international conventions, declarations, treaties, and agreements as well as the participation in various programs that support mobility such as ERASMUS and SOCRATES. The report notes the reciprocal arrangements for students to participate in state-funded programs and the increasing number of programs offered in English.

7.22 LUXEMBOURG

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Luxembourg, prepared by the *Ministère de la Culture, de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche*, notes that prior to 2003, higher education in Luxembourg was limited to two years of first cycle studies and degree completion required study in another country. The report notes that as of July 2003, the Université du Luxembourg was established utilizing the Bologna criteria and will have a degree structure of bachelor, master, and doctor. The report notes that the combined bachelor and master level may not exceed five years.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Luxembourg does not specifically address this objective.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Luxembourg notes that curricula of the university are designed based on ECTS and range from 180 to 204 ECTS.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Luxembourg notes that mobility is compulsory as each student is required to have study period abroad. The report notes that staff mobility, the law provides for visiting professors, the development of joint degrees (the report noting the country's dependence on joint degrees with other countries for the development of its higher education system), and the absence of a nationality clause regarding the hiring of new staff. The report also notes that courses will be bilingual, with the choice between French, German, and English.

7.23 MALTA

The introduction to the report from Malta offers a general overview of the Bologna Process, noting its importance to Malta and that Malta has been an active participant.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Malta addresses this objective by noting that the University of Malta does not have the capacity to implement the Diploma Supplement, although once its software system is in place it will begin planning for the introduction of the Diploma Supplement.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Malta does not address this objective in its report.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Malta notes that the University of Malta has used a credit system since the 1970s, that ECTS is used to facilitate participation in ERASMUS, and in June 2002, the University of Malta Senate decided that all credits would be assessed in ECTS terms starting in the 2003-2004 academic year.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Malta notes various support for mobility ranging from the establishment of the SOCRATES Office in 2003 to the provision of resources for students and researchers to participate international programs and projects.

7.24 THE NETHERLANDS

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from the Netherlands notes that the Diploma Supplement as a suitable instrument for the providing clarity on degrees and degree structure in the educational system, but notes that use of the Diploma Supplement is not obligatory in the Netherlands. The report notes efforts to promote the use of the Diploma Supplement.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from the Netherlands notes the introduction of a bachelor-master's structure in 2002 with a system of accreditation implemented at the same time where a program will be accredited as academic or higher professional. The report notes that universities have converted most of their one-cycle programs to bachelor and master programs where an academic bachelor degree requires 180 ECTS and a higher professional requires 240 ECTS, the distinction based on the higher professional education designed for entry to the labor market whereas the academic bachelor degree designed for entry to the master program. The report notes the master's degree requires 60 ECTS except for engineering, agriculture, life sciences, natural sciences and dentistry that require 120 ECTS, and medicine that requires 180 ECTS.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from the Netherlands notes the introduction of the ECTS compatible system in 2002 where a study load for an academic year is defined as 60 credits, corresponding to 1680 hours of study. The report also notes that Dutch institutions are redesigning their curricula in ECTS credit with a target date of September 2004. .

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from the Netherlands notes the barrier to foreigners studying, competing an internship, teaching, or conducting research resulting from Dutch immigration procedures. The report notes that the issue is under consideration by a team of experts. The report also notes that ECTS and the Diploma Supplement are in use and that recognition of study abroad will become an important issue as the Netherlands moves from a one-cycle to two-cycle system.

7.25 NORWAY

The introduction to the report from Norway notes that the legal changes necessary to fully implement the Bologna Declaration have been made and most of the elements have been implemented.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Norway notes that the introduction of the new degree structure will make degrees from higher education institutions in Norway more comparable to other European institutions. The report also notes the ratification of the Lisbon Convention in 1999 and the implementation of the Diploma Supplement in 2002 where Norwegian institutions are obligated to issue the Diploma to all graduates upon request.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Norway notes the introduction of a new degree structure based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate. The report notes the structure consisting of a lower degree of three years (bachelor), a higher degree after a further two years (master), and a further three years of study for the ph.d. (philosophae doctor). The report notes that the bachelor's

degree consists of 180 credits and the master's degree encompassing 120 credits, although there are some master degrees of a year and a half carrying 90 credits. The report notes the exclusion from the changes of degrees in medicine, theology, psychology, and veterinary medicine which will remain one cycle programs and retain their Latin titles starting with *candidata/candidatus*. The report also notes that while most institutions have implemented these changes, all institutions are obligated to incorporate the new structure starting in the 2003-2004 academic year.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Norway notes that the former system of credits assigning 20 credits per year has been replaced by 60 credits for one academic year and a new standardized grading system scale descending from A to E. The report notes that both the credit system and grading scale are equivalent to those used in ECTS. The report also notes that to facilitate student mobility between higher education institutions in Norway, degrees may be conferred on the basis of studies at a combination of institutions.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Norway notes that the aims of the Quality Reform of higher education in Norway and the aims of the Bologna Process are identical and reinforce each other. The report notes that institutions are working on their international strategies and are encouraged to participate in European and international education and research programs. The report notes that the Norwegian government has decided that all students are entitled to study abroad and that institutions must arrange for this. The report notes that to attract students from other countries that the number of academic courses offered in English be increased and that the funding formula for higher education institutions has incorporated measures to promote

internationalization by receiving money from the government for each incoming and outgoing student.

7.26 POLAND

The introduction to the report from Poland offers an overview to the legal basis for the provision of higher education and recent changes in Polish higher education. Noted is Article 70 of the Polish Constitution and four principle acts that provide the basis for the functioning of higher education: the 1990 Act on Higher Education; the 1990 Act on Titles and Degree; the 1991 Act on Establishing the Committee for Scientific Research, and the 1997 Act on Higher Vocational Schools. The introduction notes the principle of institutional autonomy, the conditions for the establishment of non-state higher education institutions, and institutional finance and funding (the charging of fees) as among recent aspects of higher education in Poland that have changed.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Poland notes the importance of the Diploma Supplement to providing objective and thorough information on the type of studies completed, the content, and the status (recognition) of those studies and notes the introduction of legislation to require the implementation of the Diploma Supplement in the 2003-2004 academic year.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Poland notes that there are no special projects to finance activities relating to the adoption of a new degree structure, but suggests that through contacts such as SOCRATES/ERASMUS, institutions/individuals may develop a better understanding.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Poland notes that a credit system based on ECTS is being designed for Poland.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Poland notes that Poland became a participant in SOCRATES in 1998, building on earlier experience with the TEMPUS project. The report provides several tables of figures on the number of students participating in SOCRATES/ERSAMUS and in which countries.

7.27 PORTUGAL

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Portugal notes that the law on education is under discussion in Parliament with a plan to adopt a first cycle degree for both the university and polytechnic sectors of four years, with the retention of the current master and doctoral degrees. The report notes that matters of recognition are dealt with under the provisions of the Lisbon Convention and proposals for the implementation of the Diploma Supplement are being discussed, noting also that some institutions are using the Diploma Supplement.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Portugal implies response to this objective in the above response.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Portugal notes that a system of credits has been in existence in Portugal for more than twenty years and used by a majority of institutions and courses. The report notes

that a transition to ECTS is underway, noting that many institutions will operate both systems during the transition period.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Portugal notes participation in the European Union mobility programs.

7.28 ROMANIA

The introduction to the report from Romania, prepared by the Ministry of Education, Research, and Youth, General Division for Higher Education, offers an overview of higher education reform in Romania from 1989 and the complex transition to a market economy and democracy. The introduction notes the adoption of a new constitution in 1991 and subsequent laws affecting education: the Law of Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions and Recognition of Diplomas (1993); the Law on Education (1995); and the Statute on Teaching Staff (1997). The introduction notes subsidiary legislation on the rights of graduates of private education to sit for graduation examinations at accredited state-owned higher education institutions and the creation of Romanian university extension abroad. The introduction notes a list of the main changes in higher education that include the definition of long-term and short-term programs, which includes a distinction between universities and university colleges; introducing flexibility in programs of study; setting of national standards for institution accreditation; provisions for internal and external evaluation of study programs by the National Council for Academic Evaluation and Accreditation (created in 1993 and under the authority of the Romanian Parliament); the introduction of a transferable credit system; changes in the financing of higher education; a provision to allow public institutions to accept fee paying students; and a

diversification of the scholarship system. The introduction notes that the changes have been influenced by the increasing number of public and private institutions of higher education, noting that in 1989 there were 30 institutions and in 2001 there were 141 institution, where 57 are public institutions and 84 are private. The introduction also notes that the existence of both short-term and long-term programs of study in Romania has created an environment favorable to the implementation of the objectives of the Bologna Process.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Romania notes the ratification of the Lisbon Convention (1998) and the subsequent introduction of the Diploma Supplement that any graduate may request.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Romania notes that in discussion within the National Council of Rectors the adoption of two-cycle system will likely occur in the 2004-2005 academic year, the first cycle leading to the title of Bachelor (180-240 credit points) and the second cycle leading to the title of Master (120-160 credit points). The report notes a third cycle leading to the title of doctor in science, with a master's degree required for admission.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Romania notes planning for full compatibility of the national systems of credits introduced in the 1998-1999 academic year with ECTS, noting a sequence of 180, 240, 300, and 360 credits corresponding to 3, 4, 5 or 6 years, where 60 credits is the average for an academic year.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Romania notes participation in the European student mobility programs (TEMPUS, ERASMUS, CEEPUS); the creation of the National Office for Student Grants

Abroad in 1998 to manage the government's support for Romanian students as well as the grants from bilateral agreements; and the National Council for Recognition of Diplomas to provide recognition for periods of study in other countries.

7.29 SERBIA

The introduction to the report from Serbia, prepared by the Ministry of Education and Sport, Division for Higher Education, notes the goal of Ministry to establish a higher education system in accordance with the objectives of the Bologna Process, noting the review and analysis of the status of higher education that in January of 2003 began a process of formulating a new Higher Education Law and a reform of higher education that is aimed for completion in September of 2009.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Serbia notes the printing and distribution of a handbook on the Diploma Supplement in December of 2002.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Serbia notes that a first degree is awarded after completing between 180 and 240 ECTS, a second degree may be an applied master (a total of 300 ECTS) or an academic master (a total of 300 to 360 ECTS), and a doctoral degree (PhD) is awarded after completing a total of 420 to 480 ECTS.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Serbia defines degrees in terms of ECTS the printing and distribution of a handbook on ECTS.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Serbia does not address this objective.

7.30 SLOVAKIA

The introduction to the report from Slovakia offers basic information on higher education, noting that there are 24 higher education institutions (nineteen public, four state-owned, one private); in 2002 the Ministry of Education in cooperation with the institution established a list of accredited study programs and institutions may admit students to pursue only accredited study programs; and also in 2002, a new Higher Education Act was adopted to provide a legal framework for the implementation of all components of the Bologna Declaration in Slovakia, a legislative follow-up to The Strategy of the Further Development of Higher Education for the 21st Century approved by the government in 2000.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Slovakia notes the defining of study program at three and the issuance of the Diploma Supplement starting in September 2005 to all graduates at all three levels in accordance with the 2002 Higher Education Act.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Slovakia notes that higher education in Slovakia is based on two cycles: the first cycle (first level) in the Bachelor study programs (three to four years) leading to the degree *bakalár*; the second cycle (second level) in the master, engineer, and doctoral study programs (one to three years after the first cycle) leading to the degree *magister* or *inžinier*; and the third level in the PhD study programs.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Slovakia notes that the 2002 Higher Education Act makes the use of a credit system based on ECTS compulsory for all institutions and the anticipation of full compliance by September of 2005.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Slovakia notes that academic mobility is organized through international programs (ERASMUS/SOCRATES, CEEPUS) and agreements between Slovakian and foreign institutions.

7.31 SLOVENIA

The introduction to the report from Slovenia notes the restructuring of higher education in Slovenia with the 1993 Higher Education Act, noting the autonomy of institutions, transparency, and the establishment of public and private institutions as among the principles established.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Slovenia notes the Diploma Supplement as a mandatory component of the diploma certificate in the 1999 Higher Education Act.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Slovenia notes that a decision as to how to address this objective has not been decided.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Slovenia notes the introduction of a credit system in 1998 for postgraduate studies, subsequently extended to undergraduate studies, and noting that the credits

used by institutions were modeled on ECTS. The report also notes that in 2003 the Higher Education Council decided to prepare a National Credit Systems to remedy inconsistencies.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Slovenia notes the importance of international cooperation to Slovenia and participation in mobility programs (TEMPUS, ERASMUS/SOCRATES, CEEPUS), noting the use of the Diploma Supplement and ECTS as decisive and crucial to the encouragement of international exchanges in Europe.

7.32 SPAIN

The introduction to the report from Spain, prepared by the General Directorate of Universities of the Department (Ministry) of Education, Culture, and Sports, notes the Organic Law on Universities of 2001 as constituting the framework for channeling national university policy toward full integration in the European sphere, establishing the promotion of mobility of students, professors, and researchers; state financing of programs and the adoption of the measures necessary to promote integration in the European Higher Education Area; the inclusion of the Diploma Supplement in official degrees; the adoption of the European credits system; and the authorization to hire professors from EU Member States to work in Spanish universities. The introduction notes the development of a Framework Document in February 2003 that outlines specific measures to be introduced for the development and implementation of the Bologna Process in Spain, providing a timetable and noting four special action items: the European credit system; the degree structure; the Diploma Supplement; and quality assurance. The introduction also notes that in the transition to the new system, both the new and current degrees will be valid;

that the implementation of the Diploma Supplement has been approved; and the adoption of the credits system anticipated in September 2003.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Spain notes the implementation of the Diploma Supplement beginning in the 2003-2004 academic year, issued to all valid official degree throughout the national territory and specifies other aspects of the Diploma Supplement such as content of the documentation.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Spain notes the planning for the restructuring of higher education into two cycles, a first cycle or level leading to an undergraduate degree, and a second, graduate level, leading to a Master's and Doctorate degree. The report notes that the undergraduate degree will consist of between 180 to 240 credits, the Master's degree will consist of between 60 and 120 credits, and programs of study leading to the doctorate consisting of at least 90 credits.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Spain notes that a credit system was introduced in Spain in 1983 with credit defined in terms of the number of teaching hours. The report notes that under the Framework Document, the definition is established where credit is defined as the volume of work the student must complete to reach the educational objective and establishes ECTS system and an official system for university degrees.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Spain notes that mobility is a legal obligation under the Organic Law on Universities, supported with State financing. The report notes participation in mobility programs such as ERASMUS and the provision of supplemental scholarships from the national budget for

education. The report also notes the legal provision for the hiring of foreign faculty and the promotion of mobility professors within the European Higher Education Area.

7.33 SWEDEN

The introduction to the report from Sweden notes that the report is a joint report from the Ministry of Education and Science, the National Agency for Higher Education, the Association of Swedish Higher Education (the Swedish rectors' conference), and the Swedish National Students' Union. The introduction notes the appointment by the Ministry of Education and Science of a project group in 2002 to review aspects of university degrees in Sweden, paying particular attention to the level and status of the master degree, the translation of degree titles, and address the adaptation of the Swedish credit system and grading scale to the European systems (ECTS), noting that an interim report was presented in March 2003 and that the government will consider proposals when the final report is submitted. The introduction also noted the appointment of a state commission to review the issue of doctoral studies as relating to the educational systems in other countries and the Bologna Process, as well as a seminar conducted in May 2003 on the development of joint degrees that included an international survey on joint degrees. .

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Sweden noted the 2001 legislation that implemented the appending of a Diploma Supplement in English and free of charge to all degree certificates as of January of 2003, containing as far as possible ECTS data. The report also noted the ratification of the Lisbon Convention in August of 2001.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Sweden notes the division of the Swedish degree systems into general and professional degrees, listing various degrees, including the amount of credits for the degree in terms of the Swedish credit point system and ECTS: *högskoleexamen*, 2 years of full-time study, 80 credit points, 120 ECTS; *kandidatexamen*, 3 years of full-time study, 120 credit points, 180 ECTS; *magisterexamen*, 4 years of full-time study, 160 credit points, 240 ECTS; *licentiatexamen*, 2 years of full-time study after a minimum of 3 years of full-time study; and *doctorexamen*, 4 years of full-time study after a minimum of 3 years of full-time study. The report notes the review by the state commission to clarify the position of degrees in Sweden in relation to the Bologna Declaration.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Sweden notes the use of a credit system in Sweden compatible with ECTS where one week of full-time study is equal to one credit point and one academic year equals 40 credits points, with a degree built upon the accumulation of credits. The report notes the use of ECTS in exchange programs and a wider use of ECTS in Sweden is under consideration. The report also notes that the ECTS grading scale is not frequently used in Sweden.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Sweden notes an active effort at broadening the recruitment of students to Sweden, the financial support systems for its students that allows study abroad, the role of the National Agency for Higher Education in the evaluation of study abroad and recognition of foreign diplomas, as well as the reports commissioned to analyze the decline in participation in

ERASMUS and the legal rights of ERASMUS students in Sweden. The report also notes the increasing offering of programs in English to both national and international students.

7.34 SWITZERLAND

In a general remarks section, the report from Switzerland notes the formation of a steering committee made up of representatives of the three sectors of Swiss higher education institutions, the universities, the universities of applied sciences (*Fachhochschulen* or FH), and the new schools of education (*Paedagogische Hochschulen*), noting a two-tiered national and institutional regulatory structure for each sector and that each sector had begun processes for the implementation of reforms of the Bologna Declaration.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Switzerland notes that in the university sector plans for the development of a national system for the simplification and unification of the designations for diplomas and the approval in January of 2002 of plans for the introduction of the Diploma Supplement. The report notes in the *Fachhochschulen* sector the introduction of the Diploma Supplement for all graduates beginning in the Fall of 2000.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Switzerland notes for each sector a bachelor's degree program (180 credits) and a master's degree program (90 – 120 credits).

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Switzerland notes that a credit system in keeping with ECTS will be introduced in the university and *Fachhochschulen* sectors, but noting that ECTS are already in use in the *Paedagogische Hochschulen* sector.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Switzerland notes that in the university sector that a furthering of mobility through national and international promotional and scholarship programs goes back to the early 1990s and anticipates an expansion of mobility under the Bologna Process. The report notes an underdevelopment of mobility in the *Fachhochschulen* sector due mainly to the rigidity of the program structures, anticipating that the implementation of the bachelor's-master's degree structure will increase mobility and will be seeking ways to promote mobility. The report notes that in the *Paedagogische Hochschulen* sector, the promotion of mobility was simplified with the introduction of ECTS and the institutions are creating a network of teacher education institution in Europe and beyond.

7.35 TURKEY

The introduction to the report from Turkey notes that authority and autonomy of the Council for Higher Education ((YÖK) for all higher education, public and private, and the centralized nature of the higher education system in Turkey, reflected in the Higher Education Law No. 2547. The introduction also notes the main institutions of higher education, access to higher education, and offers information about the fees for students, making note that foreign students pay three times more than Turkish students.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from Turkey notes the development of a common university version of the Diploma Supplement and its scheduled introduction in the 2003-2004 academic year.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from Turkey notes that the structure in Turkey is a two-tier system: undergraduate and graduate, with the undergraduate level consisting of the first stage university level qualifications. The report notes the Associate Degree, a full-time two-year university program; the Bachelor's degree, a four-year university program; and degrees in Dentistry, Veterinary Medicine, and Medicine awarded after five years of university study. The report notes the master's degree as the second stage university level qualification followed by the Doctorate degree as the third stage university level qualification. The report also notes that the degree structure of Turkish higher education is already in line with the Bologna Declaration.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from Turkey notes use of a credit system in Turkey, resembling North American universities, that each course is allotted a predetermined number of credit hours, and that rules and procedures for credit transfer are regulated by an Article of the Higher Education Law, where students who have completed at least one academic year abroad have the right to transfer to an equivalent program at a Turkish university. The report also notes that with participation in the ERAMUS/SOCRATES mobility programs, most institutions have converted their credit systems into ECTS credits.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from Turkey notes the importance of mobility to Turkish universities and the general encouragement of the mobility of academic staff and students, noting that many

universities have exchange programs. The report notes the creation of the Turkish National Agency for EU mobility programs in 2002 to prepare to meet the requirements of participation in the EU programs, planned to start in the 2004-2005 academic year.

7.36 UNITED KINGDOM

The introduction to the report from the United Kingdom notes that under devolved administration in the United Kingdom (U.K.), the responsibility for higher education policy in England rests with the Department of Education and Skills (DfES) and with the various education departments for Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland, noting that while many of the high level objectives are similar, policies, practices, and priorities vary in the U.K. and the DfES has the overall policy lead on Bologna issues on the behalf of the U.K. The introduction notes the establishment of a Policy Forum to enable government and stakeholders across the U.K. to share information about the Bologna Process, noting as well various meetings with a variety of representatives to address issues related to the Bologna Process.

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees:

The report from the U.K. notes the ratification of the Lisbon Convention in 2003 and the assistance to the U.K. by the work of the U.K. National Academic Recognition Information Center, contracted by the U.K. government to provide a national service on the comparability of awards from other countries; planning for the adoption of a national framework for higher education qualifications noting *The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* and the separate *Framework for Scottish Higher Education Qualifications*, with descriptors that meet the requirements of easily readable and comparable

criterion of the Bologna Declaration. The report notes the proposal in the U.K. of the introduction of a Higher Education Progress File to include a transcript and personal development plan, and the subsequent plan to use the transcript (the record of student achievement) as the Diploma Supplement. The report notes the establishment of the Progress File Implementation Group that established guidelines for the implementation of the transcript, also noting that a survey revealed that most institutions had introduced the transcript at the undergraduate level with the implementation at the postgraduate level at various stages of development. The report noted that some higher education institutions had introduced the Diploma Supplement. The report also noted the development of the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework and the expectation that the data categories will exceed the expectations of the Bologna Declaration.

2. Adoption of a system based on two cycles:

The report from the U.K. notes that a two-cycle system is a traditional and integral part of the systems of higher education in the U.K. and therefore not requiring any structural arrangements as the structure is broadly in line with the Bologna Process. The report also notes concern about the integrated first degree courses in the U.K. that lead directly to a Masters level award will fit or will be accommodated by the Bologna Process.

3. Establishment of a system of credits:

The report from the U.K. notes that while credit accumulation and transfer systems have existed for a significant period in the U.K., that report does not indicate plans for the implementation of a credit system in the U.K. The report notes the qualification frameworks in the U.K. are based on holistic outcomes, viewing credits as a useful tool to measure the volume and level of learning acquired, not as an end in itself. The report does note the Scottish Credit

and Qualifications Framework with the anticipation that all higher education qualifications should be credit-rated applies by the 2003-2004 academic year.

4. Promotion of mobility:

The report from the U.K. notes the commitment to mobility and plans to make it easier for non-EU students to study in the U.K. through streamlining visa arrangements; providing better information to potential students about the study opportunities; making it easier for international students to combine study with work; and expanding the scholarship scheme. The report also notes the commissioning of a study of U.K. students' international mobility.

7.37 SUMMARY

To provide an additional summary of the thirty-seven reports prepared for the Berlin Follow-Up meeting in 2003, I have created charts to indicate the response, or non-response in some cases, in each report to the first four objectives of the Bologna Process. The objectives chosen relate to student mobility and the instruments of students mobility, the Diploma Supplement and ECTS, as well as the new element of change or reform introduced in the Bologna Declaration, the adoption of a system of higher education based on two cycles. These four objectives are:

- 1) **Objective One:** Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees, through the implementation of the Diploma Supplement, in order to promote the employability and the international competitiveness of the European higher education system;
- 2) **Objective Two:** Adoption of a system based on two cycles, undergraduate and graduate. Access to the second cycle shall require successful completion of first cycle studies, lasting a minimum of three years. The degree awarded after the first cycle shall also be relevant to the European labour market as an appropriate level of qualification. The second cycle should lead to the master and/or doctorate degree as in many European countries;

- 3) **Objective Three:** Establishment of a system of credits – such as the ECTS system – as a proper means of promoting widespread student mobility; and
- 4) **Objective Four:** Promotion of mobility by overcoming obstacles to the effective exercise of free movement

In those instances where the report explicitly mentions the objective as incorporated under regulations or provisions of a Ministry of Education or other national body, or where there are explicitly states plans for the implementation of the objective, or the report explicitly states that the objective has been implemented, then I have noted the report as “explicit.” In cases where the objective is only mentioned and does not explicitly state a plan to implement the objective, then I have noted that the report “mentions” the objective. In cases where the report does not mention the objective, I have noted that the objective is “not mentioned.”

To create a shortcut to my analysis of the reports, I have created three charts for three different groupings of countries who have signed the Bologna Declaration prior to the Berlin Follow-Up meeting in 2003:

Table One - Signatories to the Bologna Declaration who are Member States of the European Union;

Table Two - European Union candidate countries as of 2003 who have signed the Bologna Declaration; and

Table Three - signatories to the Bologna Declaration who are not Member States or candidate countries for joining European Union as of 2003.

Table 1. EU Member States in 2003 and Signatories to the Bologna Declaration

	Objective One	Objective Two	Objective Three	Objective Four
Austria – Univ.	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit
Austria – Fach.	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit
Flanders	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit
Denmark	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit
Finland	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit
France	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit
Germany	Explicit	Mentions	Mentions	Mentions
Greece	Mentions	Mentions	Mentions	Mentions
Ireland	Mentions	Mentions	Mentions	Mentions
Italy	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Mentions
Luxembourg	Explicit	Not mentioned	Explicit	Mentions
Netherlands	Mentions	Explicit	Explicit	Mentions
Portugal	Mentions	Mentions	Mentions	Mentions
Spain	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit
Sweden	Explicit	Mentions	Mentions	Mentions
United Kingdom	Explicit	Explicit	Mentions	Explicit
Totals	E: 12 M: 4 N: 0	E: 10 M: 4 N: 1	E: 10 M: 6 N: 0	E: 8 M: 8 N: 0

E= Explicit M= Mentions N= Not Mentioned

Table 2. EU Candidate Countries in 2003 and Signatories to the Bologna Declaration

	Objective One	Objective Two	Objective Three	Objective Four
Bulgaria	Not mentioned	Not mentioned	Explicit	Not mentioned
Croatia	Explicit	Explicit	Not mentioned	Not mentioned
Cyprus	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit
Czech Republic	Explicit	Explicit	Mentions	Mentions
Estonia	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit
Hungary	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Mentions
Latvia	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Mentions
Lithuania	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Mentions
Malta	Mentions	Not mentioned	Explicit	Mentions
Poland	Explicit	Not mentioned	Mentions	Mentions
Romania	Mentions	Explicit	Explicit	Mentions
Slovakia	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit
Slovenia	Mentions	Mentions	Mentions	Mentions
Turkey	Mentions	Explicit	Mentions	Explicit
Totals	E: 9 M: 4 N: 1	E: 10 M: 1 N: 3	E: 9 M: 3 N: 1	E: 4 M: 8 N: 2

E= Explicit M= Mentions N= Not Mentioned

Table 3. In 2003 Other Signatories to the Bologna Declaration

	Objective One	Objective Two	Objective Three	Objective Four
Bosnia/Herz.	Not mentioned	Not mentioned	Mentions	Not mentioned
Holy See	Mentions	Mentions	Mentions	Mentions
Iceland	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Mentions
Liechtenstein	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Mentions
Norway	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit	Explicit
Serbia	Mentions	Not mentioned	Mentions	Not mentioned
Switzerland	Mentions	Mentions	Explicit	Mentions
Totals	E: 3 M: 3 N: 1	E: 3 M: 2 N: 2	E: 4 M: 3 N: 0	E: 1 M: 4 E: 2

E= Explicit M= Mentions N= Not Mentioned

For Objective One, the adoption of easily readable and comparable degrees, my analysis is that of the thirty-seven reports, only Bulgaria and Bosnia-Herzegovina did not mention that objective. For Objective Two, the adoption of a two-tiered cycle of degrees, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Bulgaria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Serbia do not mention action toward meeting objective two. For Objective Three, the establishment of a system of credits, only Croatia does not mention action to meet this objective. For Objective Four, the promotion of mobility, Bulgaria, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Serbia are the only countries who do not mention this objective. In summary, the majority of the signatory countries of the Bologna Declaration indicate in the 2003 country reports that either action has been taken toward the implementation of a Bologna objective, or indicate how that objective was being dealt with in the country. For

example, the report from the Czech Republic addresses Objective Three by stating that while there was no legal provision for adopting ECTS as a credit system, ECTS was generally accepted as a result of student participation in ERASMUS.

It is not surprising that the reports of the Member States of the EU, with a few exceptions, indicate plans to meet the objectives of the Bologna Process. Most of those countries have been engaged in the processes of European integration for some time, whether through meeting the requirements of membership in the EU, or long histories of inter-governmental interaction and/or cooperation. The responses from the candidate countries for EU membership are a bit perplexing. In 2003, Bulgaria was preparing to meet the requirements for membership in the EU. Since education is not part of meeting candidacy requirements, perhaps the government of Bulgaria was too preoccupied with preparing for membership in the EU. Another explanation may be that the communist legacy or imprint on its educational system made it harder for Bulgaria to contemplate making progress in meeting the objectives of the Bologna Process. That would be a fascinating area for further research. Similarly, research on the relationship of education, the Bologna Process, and the processes of accession to the EU for Croatia, Romania and Turkey would be interesting topics for further research.

The reports from Group Three are also interesting. It is reasonable to think that Iceland, Liechtenstein, and Norway are closely aligned to the reports of the EU Member States given the close relationship those countries have to their EU neighbors. But that does not explain Switzerland's responses. Again, the relationship and/or attitudes of the countries in Group Three to European integration and the processes of Europeanization would be interesting areas for further research.

8.0 CONCLUSION

To be certain, the discussion of Europeanization and domestic change has just begun. Whether or not Europeanization will ultimately lead to structural convergence is open to debate. Whether or not it will finally transcend the nation-state is also a matter of contention. (Cowles, M., Caporaso, J. and Risse, T., 2001, p. 237)

During the 2001-2003 period, several factors have been pushing the signatory partners of “Bologna” towards a more substantial commitment to the process. They have been preparing and implementing substantial reforms in their higher education systems. (Report to the Ministers of Education of the signatory countries, 2003, p. 12)

If the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) is to become a reality, it has to evolve from governmental intention and legislation to institutional structures and processes, able to provide for the intense exchange and mutual cooperation necessary for such a cohesive area. (Reichert, S. and Tauch, C., 2004, p. 36)

In chapter two, against a background of three different conceptualizations of the nation-state and their relationship to European integration and the building of the European Union, I adopted the position that the process of European integration and the forming of the European Union has established a set of “influences” characterized as a Europeanization that in turn influence domestic policy, borrowing and adapting from the work of Cowles, Caporaso, and Risse. The review of the history of the forming of the European Union in chapter three underscores the tension between sovereignty and the reaction to the impulse to take action to avoid future war. The path to the avoidance of war was through economic integration. The subsequent movement to the forming of the EEC in 1957 established that the forming of the common market also

required at the same time a broader political integration, pointing as well to an emergent awareness of Europe as an entity. As also noted in chapter three, the post-Maastricht era of integration began to see the institutions of the EU echoing the governmental processes of the individual Member States.

As noted in chapter four and pointed out in the work by Blitz, education came to the process of European integration indirectly. The European Commission's education initiatives such as the action programs of the 1970's and the development of the student mobility program, ERASMUS, show an engagement in education. That engagement did not represent a delegation of competency to the European Union in the area of education. Education remained a policy area for individual nations.

If we accept the argument that Europeanization has influenced domestic policy, we can expect to find that countries have changed or adapted their domestic policies. My research shows that the intergovernmental agreement that is the Bologna Declaration brings a European dimension to higher education. The objectives of the Bologna Declaration and the Bologna Process are a blueprint for change in higher education in individual countries. Both the Bologna Declaration of 1999, and its antecedent the Sorbonne Declaration of 1998, acknowledge that the processes of European integration had "become increasingly concrete and (a) relevant reality for the Union and its citizens" (Bologna Declaration, 1999). The declaration also underscores the guiding principle of European integration, mobility. Mobility provides a link to European integration and the processes of forming the European Union. My particular focus on the four objectives, reveal that the voluntary action of committing to the Bologna objectives represents the influence of Europeanization on education and educational policy. I argue that the instruments of change and the influence of Europeanization are found in the first four objectives

of the Bologna Declaration. The reference in the first objective to the “European higher education system” underscores this idea.

My research and findings show that the reports prepared for the 2003 Berlin follow-up meeting offer, in the majority, statements of commitment or re-commitment and progress toward the implementation of the reforms represented by the first four objectives of the Bologna Process, to the principles of mobility and the building of the Europe of Knowledge and the creation of the European Higher Education Area by the countries signing the Bologna Declaration by the 2003 Berlin follow-up meeting. To reiterate, the first four objectives are: the adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees; the adoption of a system based on two main cycles: undergraduate and graduate; the establishment of a system of credits, and; the promotion of mobility, student and teacher. My research and findings reveal that the processes of Europeanization represented by the Bologna Declaration and the Bologna Process have at a minimum rhetorically influenced domestic policy in education. My research and findings reveal that the process is incomplete. The answer to the question of does the cross-border agreement in education that is the Bologna Declaration represent a furthering of the transformation of sovereignty will rest with the degree to which the reforms called for in the Bologna Declaration will be implemented and completed. The answer also lies in the degree to which institutions and national Ministries of Education set and implement their policies and make changes in keeping with the goals and objectives of the Bologna Process and the degree to which institutions become *European* institutions.

As noted earlier in this discussion, key to one conceptualization of the sovereignty of nations is the right or authority over internal affairs. While education may have come to the agenda of European integration through the “back door,” the Member States of the European

Union and the other countries that have signed the Bologna Declaration and engaged in the Bologna Process have not delegated authority over education to European-level institutions, i.e., the European Commission or the European Parliament. However, the references in both the Sorbonne Declaration and the Bologna Declaration to “the creation of the European area of higher education as a key way to promote citizens’ mobility and employability and the continent’s overall development,” at least at a rhetorical level clearly links higher education to the processes that were involved in the creation of the internal market. Applying transaction-based theory to the Bologna Process, I would anticipate a growing need for “greater supranational governance” in the area of higher education. My research indicates that the Bologna Process and the actions of signatories to the Bologna Declaration are not moving toward the creation of a Ministry of Education for Europe. The reports from the Berlin follow-up meeting reveal that to varying degrees a majority of the signatories of the Bologna Declaration indicate planning to meet four of the objectives of the Bologna Declaration. Whether the Bologna Process is best understood by utilizing one of the various theories of European integration noted in chapter two will depend on the degree to which the objectives of the Bologna Process are in fact accomplished. It will also depend upon the degree to which there is a need for inter-governmental or supranational structures or institutions to accomplish and oversee the objectives of the Bologna Process. Only the future will reveal whether or not the cross-border agreement known as the Bologna Declaration represented the beginning and furthering of a transformation of sovereignty.

8.1 DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The intergovernmental process represented by the Bologna Declaration does represent the influence of Europeanization on domestic education policy. Further research is needed at national levels to reveal what actual changes have been made both at national policy levels and at institutional levels. Further research will also reveal to what extent the first four objectives of the Bologna Process have been accomplished: a system of easily readable and comparable degrees; a system based on two main cycles: undergraduate and graduate; a system of credits, and; the promotion of mobility. All four of these areas should be fruitful areas for further research on the transformation of education and the influences of Europeanization on domestic policy.

8.2 POSTSCRIPT

The focus of this dissertation is on the initial steps of the Bologna Process from the meeting and the Declaration signed in 1999 and the reports prepared in advance of the 2003 Ministerial Conference held in Berlin (the Berlin follow-up meeting). As noted in the title of this study, the period from 1999 to 2003 represents the initial steps in the Bologna Process. As noted in the annotated timeline of the Bologna Declaration and the Bologna Process found at the front of this dissertation, there have been follow-up meetings every two years with meetings in Bergen in 2005, London in 2007, and Leuven in 2009. Also at Leuven in 2009 was the first Bologna Policy Forum followed by the second Bologna Policy Forum in Vienna in 2010. In addition, there have been numerous meetings, symposia, and conferences held to review and discuss the

Bologna Process. At the official Bologna Process Web site (<http://www.ehea.info/>), twenty-six meetings or conferences are listed as taking place between February 2001 and February 2005, including the seminar held in Riga, Latvia in December 2004 entitled “Improving the Recognition System of Degrees and periods of Study” where I presented a paper entitled “Observations on the United States as Stakeholder in the Bologna Process.”

Among the objectives of the Bologna Process has been the launching of the European Higher Education Area by 2010. The official Web site of the Bologna Process offers the following:

As far as implementation is concerned, progress over the years has been uneven, as can be seen from the various stocktaking exercises. This shows that the reforms of the Bologna Process must still be furthered, in order to ensure more comparable, compatible and coherent systems of higher education in Europe. (<http://www.ehea.info/article-details.aspx?ArticleId=3>)

While the implementation of the reforms of the Bologna Process may be uneven, progress has been made as evidenced by the number of universities in Europe that have adopted both the instruments of change (Diploma Supplement and ECTS) and new bachelor’s degrees (three-year) and master’s degrees (two-year). An important milestone in the Bologna Process will be the Ministerial Conference to take place in Bucharest, Romania in April of 2012 followed by the third Bologna Policy Forum. The reports from that meeting may give greater insight into the progress that has been made to achieving the objectives of the Bologna Process and the creation of the European Higher Education Area.

APPENDIX A

THE BOLOGNA DECLARATION

The European Higher Education Area

Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education

Convened in Bologna on the 19th of June 1999

The European process, thanks to the extraordinary achievements of the last few years, has become an increasingly concrete and relevant reality for the Union and its citizens. Enlargement prospects together with deepening relations with other European countries provide even wider dimensions to that reality. Meanwhile, we are witnessing a growing awareness in large parts of the political and academic world and in public opinion of the need to establish a more complete and far-reaching Europe, in particular building upon and strengthening its intellectual, cultural, social and scientific and technological dimensions.

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 competencies 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 importance of education and educational co-operation in the development and strengthening of stable, peaceful and democratic societies is universally acknowledged as paramount, the more so in view of the situation in South East Europe.

The Sorbonne declaration of 25th of May 1998, which was underpinned by these considerations, stressed the Universities' central role in developing European cultural dimensions. It emphasised the creation of the European area of higher education as a key way to promote citizens' mobility and employability and the Continent's overall development.

Several European countries have accepted the invitation to commit themselves to achieving the objectives set out in the declaration, by signing it or expressing their agreement in principle. The direction taken by several higher education reforms launched in the meantime in Europe has proved many Governments' determination to act.

European higher education institutions, for their part, have accepted the challenge and taken up a main role in constructing the European area of higher education, also in the wake of the fundamental principles laid down in the Bologna Magna Charta Universitatum of 1988. This is of the highest importance, given that Universities' independence and autonomy ensure that higher education and research systems continuously adapt to changing needs, society's demands and advances in scientific knowledge.

The course has been set in the right direction and with meaningful purpose. The achievement of greater compatibility and comparability of the systems of higher education nevertheless requires continual momentum in order to be fully accomplished. We need to support it through promoting concrete measures to achieve tangible forward steps. The 18th June meeting saw participation by authoritative experts and scholars from all our countries and provides us with very useful suggestions on the initiatives to be taken.

We must in particular look at the objective of increasing the international competitiveness of the European system of higher education. The vitality and efficiency of any civilisation can be measured by the appeal that its culture has for other countries. We need to ensure that the European higher education system acquires a worldwide degree of attraction equal to our extraordinary cultural and scientific traditions.

While affirming our support to the general principles laid down in the Sorbonne declaration, we engage in co-ordinating our policies to reach in the short term, and in any case within the first decade of the third millennium, the following objectives, which we consider to be of primary relevance in order to establish the European area of higher education and to promote the European system of higher education world-wide:

- Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees, also through the implementation of the Diploma Supplement, in order to promote European citizens employability and the international competitiveness of the European higher education system
- Adoption of a system essentially based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate. Access to the second cycle shall require successful completion of first cycle studies, lasting a minimum of three years. The degree awarded after the first cycle shall also be relevant to the European labour market as an appropriate level of qualification. The second cycle should lead to the master and/or doctorate degree as in many European countries.
- Establishment of a system of credits - such as in the ECTS system - as a proper means of promoting the most widespread student mobility. Credits could also be acquired in non-higher education contexts, including lifelong learning, provided they are recognised by receiving Universities concerned.
- Promotion of mobility by overcoming obstacles to the effective exercise of free movement with particular attention to:

- for students, access to study and training opportunities and to related services

- for teachers, researchers and administrative staff, recognition and valorisation of periods spent in a European context researching, teaching and training, without prejudicing their statutory rights.

- Promotion of European co-operation in quality assurance with a view to developing comparable criteria and methodologies
- Promotion of the necessary European dimensions in higher education, particularly with regards to curricular development, inter-institutional co-operation, mobility schemes and integrated programmes of study, training and research.

We hereby undertake to attain these objectives - within the framework of our institutional competencies and taking full respect of the diversity of cultures, languages, national education systems and of University autonomy - to consolidate the European area of higher education. To that end, we will pursue the ways of intergovernmental co-operation, together with those of non-governmental European organisations with competence on higher education. We expect Universities again to respond promptly and positively and to contribute actively to the success of our endeavour.

Convinced that the establishment of the European area of higher education requires constant support, supervision and adaptation to the continuously evolving needs, we decide to meet again within two years in order to assess the progress achieved and the new steps to be taken.

Caspar EINEM Minister of Science and Transport (Austria)	Gerard SCHMIT Director General of French Community Ministry for Higher Education and Research (Belgium)
Jan ADE Director General Ministry of the Flemish Community Department of Education (Belgium)	Anna Mmia TOTOMANOVA Vice Minister of Education and Science (Bulgaria)
Eduard ZEMAN Minister of Education, Youth and Sport (Czech Republic)	Margrethe VESTAGER Minister of Education (Denmark)
Tonis LUKAS Minister of Education (Estonia)	Maija RASK Minister of Education and Science (Finland)
Claude ALLEGRE Minister of National Education, Research and Technology (France)	Wolf-Michael CATENHUSEN Parliamentary State Secretary Federal Ministry of Education and Research (Germany)

Ute ERDSIEK-RAVE Minister of Education, Science, Research And Culture of the Land Scheswig-Holstein (Permanent Conference of the Ministers of Culture of the German Länders)	Gherassimos ARSENIS Minister of Public Education and Religious Affairs (Greece)
Adam KISS Deputy State Secretary for Higher Education and Science (Hungary)	Gudridur SIGURDARDOTTIR Secretary General Ministry of Education, Science and Culture (Iceland)
Pat DOWLING Principal Officer Ministry for Education and Science (Ireland)	Ortensio ZECCHINO Minister of University and Scientific And Technological Research (Italy)
Tatiana KOKE State Minister of Higher Education and Science (Latvia)	Kornelijus PLATELIS Minister of Education and Science (Lithuania)
Erna HENNICOT-SCHOEPGES Minister of National Education and Vocational Training (Luxembourg)	Louis GALEA Minister of Education (Malta)
Loek HERMANS Minister of Education, Culture and Science (the Netherlands)	Jon LILLETUN Minister of Education, Research and Church Affairs (Norway)
Wilibald WINKLER Under Secretary of State of National Education (Poland)	Eduardo Marçal GRILO Minister of Education (Portugal)
Andrei MARGA Minister of National Education (Romania)	Milan FTACNIK Minister of Education (Slovak Republic)
Pavel ZGAGA State Secretary for Higher Education (Slovenia)	D.Jorge FERNANDEZ DIAZ Secretary of State of Education, Universities, Research and Development (Spain)
Agneta BLADH State Secretary for Education and Science (Sweden)	Charles KLEIBER State Secretary for Science and Research (Swiss Confederation)
Baroness Tessa BLACKSTONE of Stoke Newington Minister of State for Education and Employment (United Kingdom)	

APPENDIX B

THE SORBONNE DECLARATION

Sorbonne Joint Declaration

Joint declaration on harmonisation of the architecture of the European
higher education system

by the four Ministers in charge for France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom
Paris, the Sorbonne, May 25 1998

The European process has very recently moved some extremely important steps ahead. Relevant as they are, they should not make one forget that Europe is not only that of the Euro, of the banks and the economy: it must be a Europe of knowledge as well. We must strengthen and build upon the intellectual, cultural, social and technical dimensions of our continent. These have to a large extent been shaped by its universities, which continue to play a pivotal role for their development.

Universities were born in Europe, some three-quarters of a millenium ago. Our four countries boast some of the oldest, who are celebrating important anniversaries around now, as the University of Paris is doing today. In those times, students and academics would freely circulate and rapidly disseminate knowledge throughout the continent. Nowadays, too many of our students still graduate without having had the benefit of a study period outside of national boundaries.

We are heading for a period of major change in education and working conditions, to a diversification of courses of professional careers with education and training throughout life becoming a clear obligation. We owe our students, and our society at large, a higher education system in which they are given the best opportunities to seek and find their own area of excellence.

An open European area for higher learning carries a wealth of positive perspectives, of course respecting our diversities, but requires on the other hand continuous efforts to remove barriers

and to develop a framework for teaching and learning, which would enhance mobility and an ever closer cooperation.

The international recognition and attractive potential of our systems are directly related to their external and internal readabilities. A system, in which two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate, should be recognized for international comparison and equivalence, seems to emerge.

Much of the originality and flexibility in this system will be achieved through the use of credits (such as in the ECTS scheme) and semesters. This will allow for validation of these acquired credits for those who choose initial or continued education in different European universities and wish to be able to acquire degrees in due time throughout life. Indeed, students should be able to enter the academic world at any time in their professional life and from diverse backgrounds.

Undergraduates should have access to a diversity of programmes, including opportunities for multidisciplinary studies, development of a proficiency in languages and the ability to use new information technologies.

International recognition of the first cycle degree as an appropriate level of qualification is important for the success of this endeavour, in which we wish to make our higher education schemes clear to all.

In the graduate cycle there would be a choice between a shorter master's degree and a longer doctor's degree, with possibilities to transfer from one to the other. In both graduate degrees, appropriate emphasis would be placed on research and autonomous work.

At both undergraduate and graduate level, students would be encouraged to spend at least one semester in universities outside their own country. At the same time, more teaching and research staff should be working in European countries other than their own. The fast growing support of the European Union, for the mobility of students and teachers should be employed to the full.

Most countries, not only within Europe, have become fully conscious of the need to foster such evolution. The conferences of European rectors, University presidents, and groups of experts and academics in our respective countries have engaged in widespread thinking along these lines.

A convention, recognising higher education qualifications in the academic field within Europe, was agreed on last year in Lisbon. The convention set a number of basic requirements and acknowledged that individual countries could engage in an even more constructive scheme. Standing by these conclusions, one can build on them and go further. There is already much common ground for the mutual recognition of higher education degrees for professional purposes through the respective directives of the European Union.

Our governments, nevertheless, continue to have a significant role to play to these ends, by encouraging ways in which acquired knowledge can be validated and respective degrees can be better recognised. We expect this to promote further inter-university agreements. Progressive harmonisation of the overall framework of our degrees and cycles can be achieved through

strengthening of already existing experience, joint diplomas, pilot initiatives, and dialogue with all concerned.

We hereby commit ourselves to encouraging a common frame of reference, aimed at improving external recognition and facilitating student mobility as well as employability. The anniversary of the University of Paris, today here in the Sorbonne, offers us a solemn opportunity to engage in the endeavour to create a European area of higher education, where national identities and common interests can interact and strengthen each other for the benefit of Europe, of its students, and more generally of its citizens. We call on other Member States of the Union and other European countries to join us in this objective and on all European Universities to consolidate Europe's standing in the world through continuously improved and updated education for its citizens.

Signatures:

Claude ALLEGRE Minister for National Education, Research and Technology (France)

Luigi BERLINGUER Minister for Public Instruction, University and Research (Italy)

Tessa BLACKSTONE Minister for Higher Education (United Kingdom)

Jürgen RÜTTGERS Minister for Education, Sciences, Research and Technology (Germany)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Altbach, P. (1998). *Comparative higher education: Knowledge, the university, and development*. Greenwich, Connecticut: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Andersen, S., & Eliassen, K. (Eds.). (2001). *Making policy in Europe*. London, U.K.: Sage Publications.
- Anderson, J. (1999). *Regional integration and democracy: Expanding on the European experience*. Lanham, Maryland: Roman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Ash, M. (Ed.). (1997). *German universities past and future*. Providence, Rhode Island: Berghahn Books.
- Atkinson, T. (2002). Social inclusion and the European Union. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 40 (4), 625-643.
- Attali, J. (1998). Pour un modèle européen d'enseignement supérieur. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.education.gouv.fr/forum/attali1.htm>.
- Banchoff, T. (2002). Institutions, inertia and European Union research policy. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 40 (1), 1-21.
- Bellamy, R. & Castiglione, D. (1997). Building the union: The nature of sovereignty in the political architecture of Europe. *Law and Philosophy*. 16, 421-445.
- Bergen, S. (Ed.). (2003). *Recognition issues in the Bologna process*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Bergen, S. & Uvalić-Trumbić, S. (1996). Academic recognition of diplomas: National quality and international norms. *Higher Education in Europe*. 21 (4), 9-21.
- Blitz, B. (1997). *International cooperation and the limits of educational integration in the European Union*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 9837066)
- Blitz, B. (1999). Professional mobility and qualifications in the European Union. *Comparative Education Review*. 43 (3), 311-331.

- Börzel, T. (2002). Pace-setting, foot-dragging, and fence-sitting: Member state responses to Europeanization. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 40 (2), 193-214.
- Brock, C. & Tulasiewicz, W. (Eds.). (1994). *Education in a single Europe*. London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Bulmer, S. (1994). The governance of the European Union: A new institutionalist approach. *Journal of Public Policy*. 13 (3), 351-379.
- Bulmer, S. & Burch, M. (1998). Organizing for Europe: Whitehall, the British state and European Union. *Public Administration*. 76, 601-628.
- Burley, A. & Mattli, W. (1993). Europe before the court: A political theory of legal integration. *International Organization*. 47, 41-76.
- Caporaso, J. (1996). The European Union and forms of state: Westphalian, regulatory or post-modern? *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 34(1), 29-49.
- Chan, W. (2004). International cooperation in higher education: Theory and practice. *Journal of Studies in International Education*. 8 (1), 32-55.
- Chapman, D. & Austin, A. (Eds.). (2002). *Higher education in the developing world: Changing contexts and institutional responses*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Checkel, J. (2001). From meta- to substantive theory? Social constructivism and the study of Europe. *European Union Politics*. 2 (2), 219-226.
- Clark, B. (1997). Common problems and adaptive responses in the universities of the world: Organizing for change. *Higher Education Policy*. 10 (3/4), 291-295.
- Complementarity and the relationship between community actions and objectives of higher education institutions in Europe: Final Report, May, 1996*. Retrieved from <http://europa.eu.int>
- Corbett, A. (2006). *Higher education as a form of European integration: How novel is the Bologna process?*, Working Paper No. 15, December 2006. Retrieved from <http://www.arena.uio.no>.
- Council of Europe. (1997). *Convention on the recognition of qualifications concerning higher education in the European region*.
- Cowles, M., Caporaso, J. & Risse, T. (Eds.). (2001). *Transforming Europe*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Daun, H. Ed.). (2002). *Educational restructuring in the context of globalization and national policy*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

- The dialogue of universities with their stakeholders: Comparisons between different regions of Europe.* Retrieved from <http://europa.eu.int>
- Dill, D. (1997). Higher education markets and public policy. *Higher Education Policy*. 10 (3/4), 167-185.
- Dinan, D. (1999). *Ever closer union: An introduction to European integration*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Egeberg, M. & Trondal, J. (1999). Differentiated integration in Europe: The case of EEA Country, Norway. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 37 (1), 133-142.
- European Commission. (1998). *Activities in the fields of education, training and youth 1994-96*.
- European Commission. (1998). *Green paper: The obstacles to transnational mobility*.
- European Commission. (1997). *Socrates 1995-99*.
- European Commission. (2003). *Berlin conference of European higher education ministers: 'Realising the European Higher Education Area' Contributions of the European Commission, Berlin, 18/19, September 2003*.
- European Commission. (2003). *Bologna Process between Prague and Berlin: Report of the Ministers of Education of the signatory countries, Berlin, September 2003*.
- European Commission. (2003). *Realising the European Education Area: Communiqué of the conference of ministers responsible for higher education in Berlin on 19 September 2003*.
- Field, J. (1998). *European dimensions: Education, training and the European Union*. London, U.K.: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Froment, E. (2003). The European higher education area: A new framework for the development of higher education. *Higher Education in Europe*. 28 (1), 27-31.
- Goldman, K. (2001). *Transforming the European nation-state*. London, U.K.: Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Gornitzka, A. & Maassen, P. (2000). Hybrid steering approaches with respect to European higher education. *Higher Education Policy*. 13, 267-285.
- Gornitzka, A. & Maassen, P. (2000). National policies concerning the economic role of higher education. *Higher Education Policy*. 13, 225-230.
- Green, A. (1997). *Education, globalization and the nation state*. London, U.K.: Macmillan Press, Ltd.
- Green, A. (1990). *Education and state formation: The rise of education systems in England, France and the USA*. London, U.K.: Macmillan Press, Ltd.

- Gundara, J. & Jacobs, S. (Eds.). (2000). *Intercultural Europe*. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Haigh, A. (1970). *A ministry of education for Europe*. London, U.K.: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd.
- Haugh, G. & Kirsten, J. (1999). *Trends in learning structures in higher education*. Retrieved from <http://www.rks.dk/trends1.htm>.
- Haugh, G. & Tauch, C. (2001). *Trends in learning structures in higher education (II)*. Retrieved from <http://www.opf.fi/publications/trends2/>.
- Hettne, B. (2002). The Europeanisation of Europe: Endogenous and exogenous dimensions. *European Integration*. 24 (4), 325-340.
- Heyneman, S. (1998). The transition from party/state to open democracy: The role of education." *International Journal of Educational Development*. 18 (1), 21-40.
- Hildebrand, M. (1996). Academic recognition of diplomas: National quality and international norms. *Higher Education in Europe*. 21 (4), 39-49.
- Hooghe, L. (1999). Supranational activists or intergovernmental agents? Explaining the orientations of senior Commission officials toward European integration. *Comparative Political Studies*. 32 (4), 435-463.
- Hurrell, A. & Menon, A. (1996). Politics like any other? Comparative politics, international relations and the study of the EU. *West European Politics*. 19 (2) 386-402.
- Husén, T., Tuijnman, A., & Halls, W. (1992). *Schooling in modern European society*. Oxford, U.K.: Pergamon Press.
- Jabko, N. (1999). In the name of the Market: How the European Commission paved the way for monetary union. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 6 (3), 475-495.
- Jachtenfuchs, M, Diez, T., & Jung, S. (1998). Which Europe? Conflicting models of a legitimate European political order. *European Journal of International Relations*. 4 (4), 409-445.
- Joffe, J. (1999). Rethinking the Nation-State: The Many Meanings of Sovereignty. *Foreign Affairs*. 78 (6), 122-127.
- Johnson, D. & Turner, C. (1997). *Trans-European networks: The political economy of integrating Europe's infrastructure*. London, U.K.: MacMillan Press, Ltd.
- Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education Convened in Bologna*. Retrieved from <http://www.murst.it/convengni/bologna99/dichiarazione/english.htm>
- Joint declaration on harmonisation of the architecture of the European higher education system*. Retrieved from <http://www.europedu.org/gb/vert/declarationmid.html>

- Jones, B. & Keating, M. (Eds.). (1995). *The European Union and the regions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jongbloed, B., Maassen, P., & Neave, G. (Eds.). (1999). *From the eye of the storm: Higher education's changing institutions*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Jørgensen, K. (Ed.). (1997). *Reflective approaches to European governance*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Jupille, J., Caporaso, J., & Checkel, J. (2003). Integrating institutions: Rationalism, constructivism, and the study of the European Union. *Comparative Political Studies*. 36 (1/2), 7- 40.
- Keeling, R. (2006). The Bologna process and the Lisbon research agenda: the European Commission's expanding role in higher education discourse. *European Journal of Education*. 41 (2), 203-223.
- Kehm, B., Maiworm, F., Over, A., Reisz, R., Steuba, W., & Teichler, U. (1997). *Integrating Europe through co-operation among universities*. London, U.K.: Jessica Kingsley.
- Keohane, R. & Hoffman, S. (Eds.). (1991). *The new European community: Decisionmaking and institutional change*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Kirk, G. & Glaister, R. (Eds.). (1992). *Scottish education and the European community*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. & Henkel, M. (2000). *Transforming higher education: A comparative study*. London, U.K.: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Laffan, B. (1998). The European Union: A distinctive model of internationalization. *Journal of European Policy*. 5 (2), 235-253.
- Laffan, B. (1992). *Integration and co-operation in Europe*. London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Lingens, H. (Ed.). (2003). Editor's introduction. *European Education*. 35 (2), 3-15.
- Lodge, J. (Ed.). (1983). *Institutions and policies of the European Community*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Maertens, M. (1997). *European integration and sub-state nationalism: Flanders, Scotland, and the EU*. Unpublished master's thesis, McGill University, Canada.
- Magone, J. (2003). *Regional institutions and governance in the European Union*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.
- Magone, J. (1994). The rise of the regulatory state in Europe. *West European Politics*. 17 (3), 77-101.

- Maiworm, F., Steube, W., & Teichler, U. (1988). *Learning in Europe: The ERASMUS experience*. London, U.K.: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- March, J. & Olsen, J. (1983). The new institutionalism: Organizational factors in political life. *American Political Science Review*. 78(3), 734-749.
- Marks, G., Hooghe, L. & Black, K. (1996). European integration from 1980s: State centric v multi-level governance. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 34 (3), 341-378.
- Masemann, V., & Welch, A., (Eds.). (1997). *Tradition, modernity and post-modernity in comparative education*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Moravcsik, A. (2001). Bringing constructivist integration theory out of the clouds: Has it landed yet? *European Union Politics*. 2 (2), 226-249.
- Moravcsik, A. (1998). *The choice for Europe: Social purpose & state power from Messina to Maastricht*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Moravcsik, A. & Nicolaidis, K. (1999). Explaining the Treaty of Amsterdam: Interest, influence, institutions. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 37 (1), 59-85.
- Moschonas, A. (1998). *Education and training in the European Union*. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- National reports prepared for the 2003 Berlin summit. Retrieved from http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/en/main_documents/index.htm
- Neave, G. (1984). *The EEC and education*. Stroke-on-Trent, U.K.: Trentham Books.
- Neave, G. (2000). The pace of change. *Higher Education Policy*. 13, 199-123.
- Neave, G. & Van Vught, F. (Eds.). (1991). *Prometheus bound: The changing relationship between government and higher education in Western Europe*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Pergamon Press.
- Nugent, N. (2003). *The government and politics of the European Union*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Olsen, J. (2002). The many faces of Europeanization. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 40 (5), 921-952.
- Peck, B. (1998). *Issues in European education*. Commack, New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Pedersen, O. (1997). *The first universities: Studium generale and the origins of university education in Europe*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Pierson, P. (1996). The path to European integration: A historical institutionalist analysis. *Comparative Political Studies*. 29 (2), 123-163.

- Pollack, M. (1997). Delegation, agency, and agenda setting in the European Community. *International Organization*. 51 (1), 99-134.
- Pollack, M. (2001). International relations theory and European integration. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 39 (2), 221-244.
- Pollack, M. (1997). Representing diffuse interests in EC policy-making. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 4 (4), 572-590.
- Reichert, S. & Tauch, C. (2004). Bologna four years later: Steps toward sustainable reform of higher education in Europe. *European Education*. 36 (3), 36-50.
- Reichert, S. & Tauch, C. (2005). European Universities Implementing Bologna. *EUA Trends IV Report*. (Brussels, European Universities Association).
- Rust, V. & Rust, D. (1995). *The unification of German education*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Saarinen, T. (2005). 'Quality' in the Bologna process: from 'competitive edge' to quality assurance techniques. *European Journal of Education*. 40 (2), 189-204.
- Sabloff, P. (Ed.). (1999). *Higher education in the post-communist world: Case studies of eight universities*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Sadlak, J. & Altbach, P. (Eds.). (1997). *Higher education research at the turn of the new century: Structures, issues, and trends*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Sandholtz, W. & Stone Sweet, A. (1998). *European integration and supranational governance*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Sbragia, A. (Ed.). (1992). *Euro-politics: Institutions and policymaking in the "new" European Community*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Schade, A. (2000). A research topic in education law and policy: the development of regionalism and federalism in Europe and their impact on educational policy and administration. *European Journal for Education and Policy*. 4, 25-39.
- Smith, A. (1978). *Joint programmes of study: An instrument of European cooperation in higher education*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Sporn, B. (1999). *Adaptive university structures: An analysis of adaptation to socioeconomic environments of U.S. and European universities*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Stavridis, S., Mossialos, E., Morgan, R., & Mechin, H., (Eds.). (1997). *New challenges to the European Union: Policy and policy-making*. Brookfield, Vermont: Dartmouth Publishing Company.

- Tauch, C. (2004). Almost half-time in the Bologna process – Where do we stand? *European Journal of Education*. 39 (3), 275-288.
- Tausch, A. & Herrmann, P. (2001). *Globalization and European integration*. Huntington, New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Teichler, U. & Maiworm, F. *The ERASMUS experience: Major findings of the ERASMUS evaluation research project*. Retrieved from <http://europa.eu.int>
- Timeseries Erasmus student mobility (number of outgoing student): 1987/88 – 2006/07. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus/doc/stat/table1.pdf>
- Trondal, J. (2002). The Europeanisation of research and higher education policies: Some reflections. *Scandinavian Political Studies*. 25 (4), 333-355.
- Tsebelis, G. & Garrett, G. (2001). The institutional foundations of intergovernmentalism and supranationalism in the European Union. *International Organization*. 55 (2), 357-390.
- Urwin, D. (1995). *The community of Europe: A history of European Integration since 1945*. London: Longman.
- Uvalić-Trumbić, S. (Ed.). (2002). *Globalization and the market in higher education: quality, accreditation and qualifications*. Paris: UNESCO/International Association of Universities.
- van der Wende, M. (2001). The international dimension in national higher education policies: What has changed in Europe in the last five years? *European Journal in Education*. 36 (4), 431-441.
- Vocational Training and Education: European Commission White Paper on education and training (1997). Retrieved from <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c11028.htm>
- Wächter, B. (2004). The Bologna process: developments and prospects. *European Journal of Education*. 39 (3), 265-273.
- Wallace, H. (2001). The changing politics of the European Union: An overview. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 39(4), 581-594.
- Wallace, H. (2000). Europeanization and globalisation: Complementary or contradictory trends? *New Political Economy*. 5(3), 369-382.
- Wallace, H. (1999). Whose Europe is it anyway? The 1998 Stein Rokkan lecture. *European Journal of Political Research*. 35, 287-306.
- Wielemans, W. (2000). European educational policy on shifting sand? *European Journal for Education Law and Policy*. 4, 21-34.
- Yeates, N. (2001). *Globalization & social policy*. London, U.K.: Sage Publication, Ltd.