

**REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP
„MALIMPLEMENTATION OF BOLOGNA – REFORMS“
At the
ESI B SUMMER CAMP PIOMBINO
Saturday 24th July 2004**

Chairs:

Caroline Gisiger	VSS-UNES	caroline.gisiger@stud.unilu.ch
Lea Brunnerr	VSS/ESIB-COCO	lea@esib.org

Participants:

Franz-Dominik Imhof	VSS-UNES	fdi@students.unibe.ch
H. Sif Aubell	StL	sifaa@mix.hive.no
Sebastian Makovka	FZS	sebus@wtal.de
Alice le Bihan	UNEF	alice.lbg@club-internet.fr
Mathjaz Rust		rustm@klub-kgs.si
Mila Jeudy	UNEF	mila_jeudy@yahoo.fr
J.- Baptiste Prevost	UNEF	jbprevost@unef.fr
Germain Filoche	UNEF	rougermain@hotmail.com
Bastian Baumann	ESIB-BPC	bastian@esib.org
Francesca Rubino	UDU	frurino@yahoo.it

"Malimplementation" of Bologna Declaration and the Bologna Process

The Bologna-reforms have now proceeded to a degree that makes it possible to compare the heterogeneous status of implementation in most of the member countries of the process. The Berlin Ministerial Conference came to the same reasoning and is planning to make a mid-term stocktaking on the issues quality assurance, two-cycle system, recognition of degrees and periods of studies.¹

STUDENT PERSPECTIVE:

We did not focus mainly on the stocktaking process, but put our attention on the important changes in HEI and national HE systems brought by the reform processes in general. The Bologna Process has generated a reform dynamic in the Bologna member States and even in other countries that are not member of the process.

¹ Also relevant for the progress of the implementation:

- quality assurance (networks, criteria, methodologies),
- two cycle system (in particular referring to the labour market)
- doctoral studies
- transparency mechanisms (diploma supplement, ECTS, recognition)
- development of qualification frameworks
- higher education autonomy, including] student participation
- student participation
- the development of joint degrees (legal framework and curricula)

This dynamic resulted in legal changes within the HE sector in several countries. Given the heterogenous situation in Europe, the reforms have also **indirect implications** not directly linked with the topics mentioned in the documents on the european level.

The level of achievements, aims, priorities, dangers, hopes and fears related to the reform with all its implications it has on HE varies a lot from country to country, from HEI to HEI.

We focussed on the **student perspective** of the reform processes; Many NUS's have already complained, that the reform process is actually heading in a direction, that awakes their concerns, that ministries and HEI are heading in a wrong direction and **mix Bologna reform objectives with other reforms, not linked with the Bologna objectives.**

In the first session we asked the participants about the situation of reforms in their respective countries. The participants defined three topics that are at the time discussed in their student unions in relation to ongoing reforms and grouped them in several fields of themes:

- Tuition fees
 - Introduction of fees or increasing tuition fees
 - Introduction or higher fees for long-time students
 - Introduction or higher fees for MA students
 - Introduction or higher fees for foreign students
 - Differences in study financing (grants/loans) for BA and MA students
- Students rights in general
 - less possibilities of repetition of exams
 - grading system, compensation of marks
 - legal status or competences of the student union
- De-democratisation of HEI
 - In the institution's decision bodies
 - On the national level (non-HEI bodies at the top of decision making process)
- Selection and *numerus clausus* measures
 - introduction of assessment years
 - numerus clausus* for MA programs
 - quotas for foreign students in BA/MA programs
- Curriculum development
 - Discrimination of part-time students
 - Certain number of minimum ECT-Points to be absolved during semester
- Autonomy of the HEI
 - Financial autonomy- linked with the tuition fee issue
 - Democratisation (stronger rectorate, managerial university)

These measures are not all already introduced in the countries, but they are discussed and the students are partaking in the discussions.

The WS tried to define the misleading term of "Malimplementation" and give it a concrete meaning. We found three different definitions:

1. WRONG IMPLEMENTATION

This happens, when the objectives of Bologna and its tools are not correctly understood. It also occurs, if the objectives and tools are lazily implemented (just parts of a measure) or the legal frameworks are incomplete or made in a rush under time pressure. Other aspects that have to be taken into account, like for example the social dimension, are neglected.

DEFINITION: "Measures of implementation are taken, that prove to be inefficient to achieve the objectives of the reform."

2. MALIMPLEMENTATION

This happens, when the Bologna objectives are linked with other aims by pressure groups and stakeholders. There is always a political or ideological interpretation of the objectives behind. The objectives are in fact interpreted against the underlying core goals.

DEFINITION: "Measures of implementation are taken, that bypass the objectives of the Bologna Process with specific political and /or academic aims."

3. ABUSIVE IMPLEMENTATION

This happens, when reform objectives that have nothing to do with "Bologna" are linked with it.

DEFINITION: "The Bologna Process is used as a pretext/legitimation for measures that have nothing to do with "Bologna".

As a last part we gave some action lines for students and students unions, first it is important to rise awareness for the ongoing reforms and give the students reference points; it is about giving more or less technical information.

- Collecting a list of what happens in other countries/ other universities
- Give clear definitions, so the people know what they talk about
- Draft checklists, so the representatives know quickly where the interest points lie

As a next step, there have to be clear ideas about the conception of HE; that means what values and what meaning HE has to have. The students have to make clear, what their objectives are, and then, how they fill the objectives with content and concrete actions.

ESIB Summer Camp, 22nd – 26th of July, Piombino, Tuscany, Italy

Minutes of the Workshop: „Perspectives of students involvement in civil society” proposed by Bernhard Leubolt and Johannes Schimmerl (ÖH)

Participants: Koen, Koen, Jurjen (LSVb), Anne (fzs), Marzia (EC), Antonio (UDU), Angie, Bernhard, Johannes (ÖH)

First part of the WS: Experiences of cooperation between NUSes and NGOs or civil society actors not only connected to education - Review of the experiences of the NUSes present:

LSVb (Netherlands):

There are 2 main platforms that connect various NGOs in the Netherlands.

There is the leftish platform against the government of Balkanende. This platform includes various groups ranging from anarchist organisations, Greenpeace, international Socialists and grassroots organisations. They are doing mainly demonstrations, mobilise for different actions and try to start a public debate about different social issues.

The other platform is called “New Dialog” and is mainly based on the trade unions. This network is more or less an informal one and is doing hardly any direct action. They mainly focus on dialogs with politicians, journalists, HEI, agricultural players, etc. New Dialog can be regarded as an lobbying platform.

LSVb is involved in both networks and has therefore somehow an unique position within the Dutch NGO community.

The planned Dutch Social Forum (NSF) is more or less an outcome of discussion and partly joint work between these two platforms after the ESF in Paris.

LSVb is trying to think broader than just educational politics and is therefore involved in both platforms as well as in the NSF. Their aim for the NSF is to establish a self-reflecting social forum in the Netherlands. Maybe LSVb will be asked to join the steering group of the NSF but that is not quite clear yet. Inside LSVb right now there is a discussion going on whether to push forward the NSF or to stay on the sideline of this process. Depending on the outcome of this discussion their effort put into the NSF will be outlined.

Opportunities for LSVb of being part of the NSF:

- Networking to other organizations
- Show social face stand out
- Get people active there
- Get broader
- Cooperate with other organizations

ÖH (Austria)

The Austrian Social Forum (ASF) started right after the ESF in Florence. In June 2003, the first ASF took place, last June the second one did. ÖH is more or less one of the main players in the Austrian social forum process, most of the meetings took place at ÖH's office, they

offered lots of workshops at both ASF and helped quite a lot at organising the two events as well as at organising the Austrian's delegations journey to both ESFs.

The main changes that took place between the first and the second version of the ASF were the following ones. In Austria, they were mainly reflecting about the way events took place at Social Forums as well as about people just sitting on the stage and telling their version of the story instead of involving a broader part of the participants into the discussions.

At the second ASF, there were hardly any plenaries but two other kinds of discussion forums.

1. networking forums which should bring different kinds of organisations with different backgrounds together.
2. introduction forums which should bring together all the people working together on a specific topic. In this kind of discussion for a the background of the participants mattered a lot.

Inside ÖH, there have been starting a few discussions after the last ASF. The main questions raised was the question what the ASF does mean to ÖH. As answers were mentioned: media attention, meeting other people and organisations, students organisations should influence the process, mobilising for other organisations actions, connecting different problems in society and get together different organisations dealing with these issues.

UDU (Italy):

The social forum process in Italy started with the G-8 summit in Genua. There are a lot of huge local forums and platforms all over Italy (e.g Genua, north of Italy (mainly dealing with refusal of law), Naples, Calabria, indymedia Italy,...)

The biggest event so far was the ESF in Florence in the year 2002. The main content of the ESF was peace and the fight against war as well as social politics on the national levels. In Italy it is especially difficult to keep the political parties out of the whole process.

fzs (Germany):

Anne is relatively new in fzs and does not have information about the situation in Germany.

Second part of the WS: ESIB and the ESF

The deadline for registering seminars at the ESF in London is at the end of July. All the seminars will be held in one big house in London. The organisers of the ESF have a few problems with organising adequate space for the events at the ESF. Due to this, there will be only 120 speakers at the plenaries. Half of the speakers will be nominated by the organisation committee of the ESF, the other half will be nominated by the national delegations participating at the ESF.

Therefore we see hardly any chance to get speakers at plenaries for ESIB.

The UK teachers association proposed 8 seminars and asked ESIB for help at organising them.

Marzia checked the list of workshops and seminars related to education. It seems as there will be a lot of them take place (at least 40-50).

We decided that we will have at least 2-3 seminar topics, either proposed by ourselves or link with other seminars.

Possible topics could be:

- Lissabon objectives and the role of the EU in HE

- Financing of HE
- Brain drain
- Equality issues

What do we want to get out of the ESF as ESIB?

- Networking: to national organisations from all over Europe should get to know that ESIB is active in this field
- Opening to other youth organisations
- Get contacts to other HE stake holders
- Marzia stresses the fact that the help of the NUSes is needed at the ESF to get some good results out of it for ESIB.

A joint campaign is proposed to get a more targeted aim. We could try to find supporters for this campaign.

A possible topic for this campaign could be Brain Drain. This could be interesting to trade unions and development organizations as well.

The possible chance of this topic could be that we could start a discussion about this topic inside the ESF (We feel that hardly anybody is working on this topic so far). We also could put it in the context of mobility worldwide.

The only problem with starting a campaign on Brain Drain at the ESF we see, is that there are only a few NUSes or people working on the topic right now. So not all NUSes would be involved in this campaign nor would they certainly carry the campaign.

So we suggest to register a seminar with the title “Flow and trade of knowledge” at the ESIB. This seminar should connect the issue of brain drain with the issue of intellectual property rights and the mobility aspect of the whole discussion. The main focus would nevertheless lie on Brain Drain.

The next preparatory meeting for the ESF will take place from the 4.-5. of September in Brussels.

The discussion about the final title of the seminar proposed by ESIB as well as about the other issues we want to try to get speakers at other organisations events was carried on in the workshop of fzs “European Student Unions and the globalisation critics movement” the next day. For the detailed outcomes of the discussion please look at the minutes of fzs’ workshop.

ESI B-Summer Camp 2004 (Piombino, IT)

Quality Assurance, Accreditation and Ranking

Final Report

Chair : Franz-Dominik Imhof (VSS-UNES-USU)

Participants: Jean-Baptist (UNEF)
Sebastian (fzs)
Lea Brunner (VSS-UNES)
Harpa Sif Jarlsdottir Aubell (Stl)
Anne (fzs)
Igor (SSU)
Deliah? (UNEF)
Marie? (UNEF)

The Workshop was divided in two parts, each part was again divided in an input, a group work and a final discussion. In the first part (QA + A) the input (provided by the chair) included an overview about different understanding of Quality Assurance and of different interests behind the concept depending on the involved groups.

The this part of the workshop was to focus on the understanding and the interests of QA by Students Unions and especially on the question which criterias for QA could promote the SUs' and NUSes' interests.

Therefore we listed in group work criterias which seemed to us useful to be promoted by SU's for QA (We neglected useful criterias which we thought would already be pushed by other in QA involved groups, like research facilities (pushed by professors and economy), employability (pushed by economy) etc.). Following criterias where (among others) named:

- Quality of tutorials and exercises (P)
- Library (P, I)
- "facilities" in general (I)
- appropriate (working) space (I)
- Information (P, I)
- Coaching (P)
- usefulness of courses (P)
- Contact to teaching staff / Mood in Institute (P)
- Qualification of teaching staff, scientific (P)
- Qualification of teaching staff, pädagogical (P)
- developing / motivating study programm (P)
- structural participation of students (P, I)
- are students remarks considered (P)
- students financing (I)
- possibility for fast study (P)

For clearer understanding we divided the criterias in such concerning the programm level (P) and such concerning the institutional level (I)

Then we tried to figure out for both levels (P and I) the three criterias we thought would be most important to promote as student representatives and, after a long discussion, came to the following conclusion (Some of the above mentioned criterias where melted in to one or renamed):

Programm level:

- How is the teaching staff hired and are pädagogical skills considered in the process?

- Are there structures and instruments for students feedback and is it taken into account?
- Is the curricula developing and motivating for the students and efficient structured?

Institutional level:

- Is there transparent and sufficient information about the university, the programm and the possibilities of the students (information culture)?
- Social dimension: Are the services affordable and consumable for all students, is it for everyone with the sufficient qualification possible to study, regardless his financial background?
- How are the students structural involved in the institutional bodies.

The second part, mainly concerning rankings and their criterias, started like the first with a short introduction. In the group work we discussed mainly about usefulness of rankings (all agreed that they are not usefull nor desirable) and if students unions should, despiting the fact, that rankings are against students interests, nevertheless try to influence the methods by promoting criterias. We didn't find a common position on that question. We stated, that most of the rankings promote misleading criterias or are focused on less important points. Some of the group stressed, that ranking will be a powerful instrument to change higher education systems and that therefore SUs should try to manipulate them for their goals, other argumented, that participating would only strenghten their (bad) influence.

The workshop took three and a half hour.

Finally I would like to use this opportunity to thank UDU for hosting us in this very nice enviroment and especially Marzia for organizing and being so charming.

Liebefeld BE (CH), 20.08.2004/Franz-Dominik Imhof

ESI B Summer Camp 2004

July 22-26, Piombino, Italy

Angelika Striedinger, OH

Women in University and Research

Workshop report

The workshop was filled with lively and interesting, though sometimes not that goal-oriented discussions.

Unfortunately, almost only the “usual suspects” were present, meaning only organisations that are aware of the existing problems – only the participants from Estonia presented controversial standpoints in some discussions.

some central points of the discussions:

- none of the present organisations (except OH and SSU) runs projects on gender issues or has gender work institutionalised
- gender activities are in general seen as one duty of student organisations though
- especially organisations from southern countries find role models in their every-day organisation-life
- in most countries, women are underrepresented in higher positions in universities and research (esp. Italy and Austria), women mostly quit their academic career earlier than men
- reasons for that mentioned are: fraternities; role models; financial, cultural and social background; lack of social services (child care)

possible/ needed activities within ESIB mentioned:

- get statistics and data and exchange them
- find out problems, name them, raise the issue, run awareness campaigns, discussions, activities
- exchange best-practise-examples for activities in the gender-field
- use existing handbooks by ESIB (e.g. equality handbook)
- exchange contacts of people active in the gender field in the organisations, put them on the ESIB-webpage
- make organisations and parts of organisations become active on this issue
- initialise joint projects of the ESIB-NUSs

Those points mentioned are mainly suggestions for the equality working group currently hosted by NUSUK, but in general they are ideas for every NUS to get active on gender issues. The workshop gave quite a clear picture of the fact that ESIB needs a group/person to take care of this issue, as especially work on gender issues are something which doesn't happen automatically.