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2.1 Understanding HE today

European universities in the second half of the 20th century: *from elite to mass higher education.*

The ‘pride’ of universities today: their *historical roots, research performance and their international context.*

Higher education today: what is/are its purpose(s)?
- preparing students for life as active citizens in a democratic society
- preparing students for their future careers
- enabling their personal development
- creating and maintaining a broad, advanced knowledge base and stimulating research and innovation

(London Communiqué, 2007)
2.2 National vs. European HE

Three sorts of ‘Europeanness’ of universities: (a) Middle Ages, (b) 19th – 20th Century; (c) the late 20th Century. National (higher) education systems = the children of nation states.

Since the 19th Century, particular features of individual national education systems have traditionally been jealously guarded.

A lesson learnt: unconnected and incompatible education systems do not merely hinder individuals but obstruct political, economic and cultural co-operation.

Internationalisation of HE as the first step: not ‘menacing’.
2.3 The European Union HE agenda

The ‘new European story’ started after World War II with coal and iron, and then continued to atomic energy and the economy at large; finally common political bodies. For a long time there was no direct reference to education or culture in the legal treaties of the Communities. The Maastricht Treaty of 1992: the subsidiarity principle but, nevertheless, a step beyond the traditional form of international co-operation in education.

1985–1987: ‘Erasmus’ as a push forward. – An objective need for greater and more direct co-operation was growing rapidly after a fall of the Berlin Wall.

A call »to engage in the endeavour to create a European area of higher education« (Sorbonne Declaration, 1998).
2.4 The ‘Bologna’ Countries (2009)
2.5 ‘Lisbon’ vs. ‘Bologna’


‘Bologna’: aiming at building a »common European HE Area«; voluntary; no ‘supra-national’ body.

‘Lisbon’: aiming at »the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world« and supported by a strong transnational organisation.

Two agendas are partly overlapping – but also different.

»Europe is not only that of the Euro, of the banks and the economy« but »it must be a Europe of knowledge as well« (Sorbonne Declaration, 1998).
2.6 The European HE: ‘full range of purposes’

The challenge of today: how could universities become ‘better’ and how could they improve ‘performance’ in the new circumstances characterised by globalisation?

Two important questions: how do we understand the term ‘globalisation’ and what do we understand by ‘Europe’?

The term ‘globalisation’ has slowly turned from a promise to a menace. – And ‘Europe’ has obviously got tired.

»A monocausal and economistic view« (U. Beck) to HE: neoliberal reduction of HE to one purpose.

A need to critically respond ‘a monocausal view’ and draw a ‘whole picture’: recognising ‘full range of purposes’ and to consider HE in a triangle of economy, politics and culture.
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3.1.1 Educational achievements in the population

Chart A1.3. Population that has attained at least tertiary education (2006)
Percentage, by age group

Source: OECD.
3.1.2 Entry into tertiary education (type A, B)

Source: OECD.
3.1.3.1 Expenditure - tertiary education

Chart B1.2. Annual expenditure on educational institutions per student for all services, by level of education (2005)

In equivalent USD converted using PPPs, based on full-time equivalents

Expenditure per student
(equivalent USD converted using PPPs)

Source: OECD.
3.1.3.2 Expenditure – over the duration of studies

Chart B1.5. Cumulative expenditure on educational institutions per student over the average duration of tertiary studies (2005)
Annual expenditure on educational institutions per student multiplied by the average duration of studies, in equivalent USD converted using PPPs

In equivalent USD converted using PPPs

OECD average

Source: OECD.
3.1.3.3 Changes in expenditure 2000 - 2005

Chart B1.8. Changes between 2000 and 2005 in expenditure on educational institutions per tertiary student compared with GDP per capita
(2005 constant USD and 2005 constant PPPs)

Source: OECD.
3.1.4.1 Gender composition – new entrants by field

Chart A2.5. Proportion of females in new entrants at the tertiary level, by field of education (2006)

Source: OECD.
3.1.5.1 Type-A graduation rates by gender

Chart A3.1. Tertiary-type A graduation rates by gender in 2006 (first-time graduation)
The chart shows the number of students completing tertiary-type A programmes for the first time in 2006 by gender, as a percentage of the relevant group.

Source: OECD.
3.1.5.2 Growth in new entrants and graduates

Chart A3.2: Tertiary-type A graduation rates in 1995, 2000 and 2006 (first-time graduation)

Source: OECD.
3.1.5.3 The gap between access and graduation

**Figure D.2c:** Completion rates (%), ISCED 5A (at least first 5A programme) — 2005

Note: EL, ES, EL, CY, LT, MT, TR, MK: 2004 data.
Source: OECD.
3.1.5.4 Science graduates

Chart A3.6. Number of tertiary science graduates per 100 000 employed 25-to-34-year-olds (2006)

Number of graduates

Source: OECD.
3.1.6 International graduates in total output

Chart A3.4. Proportion of international and foreign graduates in total graduate output, by type of tertiary education (2006)

Source: OECD.
3.2.1 HE mobility within Europe – foreign students
3.2.2 HE mobility within Europe – students abroad
3.3.1 The HE and labour market: unemployment

Figure D.3b: Unemployment rate of tertiary education graduates (ISCED 5-6) aged 20–34, by sex and number of years since graduation (%) — 2003–2007, cumulated

Eurostat; EU-LFS (Labour Force Survey)
3.3.2 The matching of tertiary education to skilled jobs

*Chart A1.7.* Relationship between the matching of tertiary education (5A/6) to skilled jobs and the difference between skilled jobs and the proportion of tertiary educated in the economy.

Proportion of tertiary 5A/6 in skilled jobs, percentage

Source: OECD.
3.3.3 The vertical mismatch (ISCED 5-6)

Figure D.5d: Qualifications mismatch as reported by employed graduates with more or less 5 years of experience since leaving higher education, by type of mismatch (horizontal, vertical, or both), %, ISCED 5A second degree — 2005

Note: Countries are sorted in ascending order by exact match. BE: data not reported due to a low return rate.
Source: Reflex, 2005.
3.3.4 Employability of the ‘Bologna 1st cycle’

Figure 10. Measures taken to ensure that first cycle graduates are able to pursue careers in the public service (number of countries giving each answer)

The results are shown in Fig. 10. It should be noted that some countries may not have fully understood this question, especially the concept of “equal footing”. The results should therefore be interpreted with caution. The vast majority of countries stated that first-cycle graduates are indeed able to pursue careers in the public service on an equal footing with other graduates. Some countries however mentioned that the job descriptions of some higher public service professions corresponded to higher Bologna cycles and might thus not be open to first-cycle graduates.
3.4.1 Boom in the internationalisation of HE

Box C3.1. Long term growth in the number of students enrolled outside their country of citizenship

Growth in internationalisation of tertiary education (1975-2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>0.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>0.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.9M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OECD and UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

Data on foreign enrolment worldwide comes from both the OECD and the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS). UIS provided the data on all countries for 1975-1995 and most of the partner countries for 2000 and 2006. The OECD provided the data on OECD countries and the other partner countries in 2000 and 2006. Both sources use similar definitions, thus making their combination possible. Missing data were imputed with the closest data reports to ensure that breaks in data coverage do not result in breaks in time series.

Source: OECD.
3.4.2 Foreign students by country of destination

Chart C3.2. Distribution of foreign students in tertiary education, by country of destination (2006)

Percentage of foreign tertiary students reported to the OECD who are enrolled in each country of destination

- United States 20.0%
- United Kingdom 11.3%
- France 8.5%
- Japan 4.4%
- Australia 6.3%
- Canada 5.1%
- Russia 2.6%
- New Zealand 2.3%
- South Africa 1.8%
- Spain 1.7%
- Italy 1.7%
- Sweden 1.4%
- Belgium 1.6%
- Malaysia 1.4%
- Switzerland 1.3%
- Austria 1.3%
- Netherlands 1.2%
- Other OECD countries 6.3%
- Other partner countries 10.7%

Source: OECD.
3.4.3 The percentage of international students

Chart C3.1. Student mobility in tertiary education (2006)
This chart shows the percentage of international students in tertiary enrolments.
According to country-specific immigration legislations and data availability constraints, student mobility is either defined on the basis of students’ country of residence or the country where students received their prior education.
### 3.5.1 The attractiveness of the EHEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘Europe 1’*</th>
<th>‘Europe 2’*</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>19.430.382</td>
<td>18.916.234</td>
<td>12.853.627</td>
<td>1.012.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign students</td>
<td>1.117.735</td>
<td>600.634</td>
<td>583.323</td>
<td>179.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign in %</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - ‘Europe 1’ = EURODATA and non-EURODATA Origins
* - ‘Europe 2’ = non-EURODATA Origins only

Source: ACA Report, 2006
### 3.5.2 Foreign students in European countries

Table 1.4: Foreign tertiary students in EURODATA countries 2002/03 *(ACA 2006)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EURODATA countries</th>
<th>All tertiary students</th>
<th>All foreign students</th>
<th>Foreign %</th>
<th>EURODATA countries %</th>
<th>Other European %</th>
<th>Non-European countries %</th>
<th>10 most frequent nation. of students %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT Austria</td>
<td>229 802</td>
<td>31 101</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ Czech Rep.</td>
<td>287 001</td>
<td>10 338</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK Denmark</td>
<td>201 746</td>
<td>18 120</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE Estonia</td>
<td>63 625</td>
<td>1 090</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI Finland</td>
<td>291 664</td>
<td>7 361</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR Greece</td>
<td>561 457</td>
<td>12 456</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU Hungary</td>
<td>390 453</td>
<td>12 226</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV Latvia</td>
<td>118 944</td>
<td>2 390</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL Netherland</td>
<td>526 767</td>
<td>20 531</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Sweden</td>
<td>414 657</td>
<td>32 469</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI Slovenia</td>
<td>101 458</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK Slovakia</td>
<td>158 089</td>
<td>1 651</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19 430 382</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 117 735</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.3 What do European universities plan?

(From Trends V Report, 2007)

International regions of interest

In which areas would your institution most like to enhance its attractiveness?

- **EU** 86% (T3 91%) -
- **Eastern Europe** 62% (T3 62%)
- **Asia** 58% (T3 40%) +
- **US/Canada** 50% (T3 57%) -
- **Latin America** 32% (T3 32%)
- **Africa** 26% (T3 24%) +
- **Arab world** 21% (T3 16%) +
- **Australia** 20% (T3 23%) -
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4.1 Quality in European HE

Co-operation, competition and attractiveness depends on quality: it is about \textit{mutual trust}.

Development of quality assurance (QA) 1999-2009:

- »European co-operation in quality assurance (Bologna, 1999)«;
- European Network QA (ENQA, 2000);
- Standards and guidelines for QA in the EHEA (2005);
- Guidelines for Quality Provision in Cross-border HE (UNESCO & OECD, 2005);
- European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR; 2008).

There is an obvious \textbf{strength} of the emerging common EHEA – Europe has succeeded in establishing framework conditions of its own QA system, hopefully not ‘biased by national stakes’. – Problems reported in implementation may represent risks and \textbf{weaknesses}.
4.2 European overarching Qualification Framework

Bologna, 1999: »a system essentially based on two main cycles – within the first decade of the first millennium.«

Development toward European QF:
- national frameworks of comparable and compatible qualifications – in terms of workload, level, learning outcomes, competences and profile (Berlin, 2003);
- adoption of »the overarching framework for qualifications in the EHEA« (Bergen, 2005);
- the »central element of the promotion of European higher education in a global context« (London, 2007);
- »We aim at having them implemented by 2012« (Leuven, 2009).

2009: variety of models; implementation of NQF in delay.

At this point, the strengths and weaknesses of the ongoing European HE reforms are put in the sharpest contrast.
4.3 The diversity of European HE

The Europeanisation process in higher education: are convergence and diversification parties in conflict? Harmonisation is not ‘standardisation’ or ‘unification’, but ‘the guiding principle of the orchestra’ (Allègre, 1998). The Bologna reforms as an attempt to promote and not abolish diversities.

Tuning: »convergence and common understanding« does not mean »imposition«.

European diversities (cultural, linguistic, institutional, paradigmatic, etc.) are “our richness” and strengths – but at least in the view of non-European student and staff may at the same time be both, strengths and obstacles.

In this regard, what everyone definitively needs is transparency in diversity.
4.4 Excellence in European HE

Ranking higher education institutions ‘league-table-style’: e.g. ARWU, WUR etc.

Criticism of methodology – but growing media attention!

Position of European HEIs on league tables is not so bad – but what rankings actually measure? What is excellence?

An ‘excellence of excellence’ is dangerous and against the spirit of academia: it is like striving for ‘the truth about the truth’ (as opposed to ‘the pursuit of the truth’).

Yet, the low rankings of European universities in global league tables should be recognised as a weakness. But there are also strengths: increasing EU co-operation leading towards excellence, cases of good practice, etc.
4.5 The ‘social dimension’ of European HE

The ‘social dimension’ – evolution of the concept.

The idea of equity: the »student body within HE should reflect the diversity of Europe’s populations. […] Each participating country will set measurable targets for widening overall participation and increasing participation of underrepresented groups in HE« (Leuven, 2009).

In fact, “student body” today does not reflect “the diversity of Europe’s populations”. Eurostat Report 2009: huge differences across Europe (public support, part-time, etc.).

The ‘social dimension’ of European higher education reflects again both aspects – strengths and weaknesses.

It is a crosscutting part of the Bologna ‘accountability loop’ – the greatest strength of European reforms in HE.
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5.1 Conclusion

The metaphor of the ‘accountability loop’ (Cliff Adelman): the Bologna action lines became supra-national phenomena, and all are glued together in what this monograph calls an ‘accountability loop’.

How should Europe handle globalisation? How to improve its performance from an educational perspective? There is no need to invent a ‘new’ HE reform discourse or invent a ‘new’ policy agenda for Europe. Yet, both ‘Bologna’ and ‘Lisbon’ need a critical analysis of their conceptualisation and implementation. This is not a mere discussion of standards (‘effectiveness’); it is a discussion of values: academic, social, European… Remind that Europe is also a kind of ‘accountability loop’.
5.2 Some policy recommendations

Most of policy recommendation can be taken from the Bologna and Lisbon documents, e.g.: Europe should

- continue to increase participation in and graduation from tertiary education;
- substantially increase mobility of students and staff and enhance ‘organised diversity’ of European HE landscape;
- firmly support HE networking aiming at increasing critical mass and excellence (in teaching and in research);
- implement the ‘EHEA in a Global Context’ Strategy:
- increase investments in tertiary education; and
- take its involvement into the Bologna ‘accountability loop’ as serious as possibly.
5.3 . . . and more

We are living in a period of economic crisis.
We are living in a period of ‘European tiredness’.
‘Europeanisation’ – also in HE – needs a new momentum.

➤ Political and economic targets are not enough; ‘Europe’ is also about culture (in a broadest sense; incl. education).

➤ European reforms should take into account that higher education is important for all three angles of the European ‘triangle’: politics, economy and culture. It is their ‘glue’.

➤ European Higher Education Area has been conceived as ‘pan-European’: the idea can only succeed if it is not narrowed down to one or another sort of ‘small Europe’.

➤ Europe (i.e., EU-46) should overcome extreme disparities not only in its HE systems but also in their performance.