Guido Morbelli

I Convegni di Chania (Creta) della

Associazione Europea
delle Scuole d'Architettura
(EAAE / AEEA)

con un'Appendice
contenente i testi dei principali documenti europei
sull'educazione superiore in generale
e architettonica in particolare

gennaio 2006

I Convegni di Chania

L'EAAE / AEEA (*European Association for Architectural Education / Association Euro-péenne pour l'Enseignement de l'Architecture*) è un'organizzazione internazionale senza fini di lucro che si propone di promuovere lo scambio di persone e d'idee nel campo dell'educazione architettonica e della ricerca. Il suo scopo istituzionale è quello di "migliorare la base di conoscenza e la qualità dell'educazione architettonica e della progettazione urbana"

Fondata nel 1975, l'EAAE è cresciuta fino al punto di diventare un'istituzione riconosciuta, che è giunta a ricoprire un ruolo sempre più essenziale nell'aprire una prospettiva europea tanto agli educatori nel campo dell'architettura quanto agli enti governativi interessati.

Ha compiuto un salto di qualità nel 2001, creando la rete *European Network of Heads of Schools of Architecture* (ENHSA), inserita nel programma Socrates/Erasmus e pertanto riconosciuta e finanziata dall'Unione Europea.

Annovera fra i propri soci 140 scuole di Architettura appartenenti a una trentina di Paesi europei, forti di 5000 docenti titolari d'insegnamento e più di 120.000 studenti (vedi elenco e cartina). Si tratta sempre di scuole superiori, universitarie e non, pubbliche e private, che offrono diplomi dal livello *undergraduate* ("laurea triennale" in Italia) al livello *doctoral* ("dottorato" in Italia).

L'EAAE offre il contesto nell'ambito del quale i suoi soci possono trovare informazioni sulle altre scuole e affronta una serie di temi rilevanti in convegni, laboratori e scuole estive per giovani docenti. La sua banca dati è a disposizione delle istituzioni associate.

Ha organizzato tutti gli anni, dal 1998 a oggi e sempre a Chania o Hania (isola di Creta, Grecia), un convegno aperto ai Responsabili (Presidi, Direttori o loro rappresentanti), solitamente molto partecipato. La Facoltà di Architettura di Torino vi ha sempre presenziato: alle edizioni del 1998 e 1999 ancora come unica Facoltà, alle successive come I e II Facoltà.

Il primo "Convegno dei Presidi e dei coordinatori dei *curricula* delle Scuole d'architettura europee" fu ospitato dal Centro per l'Architettura Mediterranea nel suggestivo – anche se un po' buio – contesto di un antico cantiere navale della Repubblica veneta. In tale occasione fu presentata la prima sintesi dei rapporti nazionali sull'educazione architettonica di sedici Paesi europei, che fu discussa dai partecipanti. I vari rapporti erano stati compilati e coordinati dall'EAAE e dal Politecnico di Milano, facendo ricorso a un finanziamento del Programma Socrates, nell'ambito della rete tematica del 1995-96. Il Programma mirava a una diagnosi dei problemi incontrati dalle Scuole di Architettura e a una definizione dei metodi e dei criteri di valutazione in base ai quali la valutazione stessa poteva verificarsi. Il convegno fu ritenuto particolarmente fruttuoso: dopo la decisione unanime dei partecipanti di proseguire sulla strada intrapresa, gli fecero pertanto seguito altri convegni che si tennero sempre nella Sede del Centro per l'Architettura Mediterranea, ospitato dal 2002 nel vecchio Arsenale veneziano, piacevolmente restaurato e molto accogliente.

Quella che segue è una sintesi dei sei Convegni ai quali ho partecipato dal 2000 in poi (cioè a partire dal terzo) come rappresentante della II Facoltà su delega della sua Preside, Prof. Vera Comoli.

Il tema del terzo Convegno (2-5 settembre 2000) era **Verso un'educazione architettonica sensibile (*Towards a ResponsiveArchitectural Education*)**

Si proponeva di concentrare l'attenzione dei partecipanti sulle iniziative politiche, manageriali e accademiche che le Scuole avrebbero dovuto intraprendere allo scopo di:

- rispondere alla domanda formativa mediante un profilo didattico orientato in senso critico, internazionale e interdisciplinare;
- predeterminare una direzione sicura verso forme di pratiche architettoniche professionali in continua evoluzione, ma assicurare anche la necessità di un'educazione ampia e profonda, in grado di far fronte alle nuove forme e direzioni di tirocinio professionale continuamente emergenti;
- essere in grado, in quanto istituzioni accademiche, di sviluppare meccanismi di valutazione essenziali, allo scopo di rispondere adeguatamente a tali continui mutamenti.
-

I temi da discutere furono quindi raggruppati in cinque sessioni:
1. *Verso un'educazione architettonica sensibile: la Scuola nel suo contesto / l'insegnamento dei metodi e dei materiali costruttivi" (in collaborazione col CEMBUREAU)*
2. *Verso un'educazione architettonica sensibile: problemi e questioni*
3. *Verso un'educazione architettonica sensibile: risposte e pratiche*
4. *Verso un'educazione architettonica sensibile: la questione della valutazione, dell'omologazione e dell'accreditamento*
5. *La creazione della rete dei Responsabili delle Scuole d'Architettura europee*

Il contesto istituzionale dell'educazione europea in campo architettonico
Nel numero del giugno 2001 del *News sheet* dell'EAAE il Presidente *pro tempore*, Herman Neuckermans, offriva, pochi mesi prima dell'importante Convegno del settembre successivo, un corposo e utile compendio delle iniziative europee nel campo dell'educazione architettonica, che riporto succintamente.

La direttiva europea sull'Architettura e il Comitato consultivo
La direttiva europea per il settore dell'Architettura (85/384/CEE) del 10 giugno 1985 fornì specificazioni circa la formazione e l'addestramento desiderabili da parte delle Scuole di Architettura. Insediò a tale scopo, con la direttiva 85/385/CEE, un Comitato consultivo che produsse, per ogni Stato membro, una lista delle scuole abilitate a conferire diplomi che dessero accesso alla professione nelle 15 nazioni dell'UE. Tale Comitato era costituito da tre membri per nazione, 45 in tutto.
Furono costituiti, nell'ambito del Comitato, due gruppi di lavoro: uno sui diplomi, l'altro sull'educazione.
Il gruppo sui diplomi, presieduto all'epoca da James Horan, doveva esaminare le candidature delle scuole che facevano domanda di riconoscimento europeo ed era controllato da due o tre funzionari della UE. Doveva poi stendere un rapporto e sottoporlo all'approvazione del Comitato consultivo.
Il gruppo sull'educazione, presieduto da John O'Reilly, era invece composto da un esperto per nazione. Doveva stendere rapporti su soggetti specifici, come il tirocinio, la ricerca in Architettura, il modello formativo delle scuole ecc.
Il Comitato avanzò proposte concernenti, per esempio, la durata degli studi, i contenuti pedagogico/formativi, la formazione dei docenti, il tirocinio e l'accesso alla professione. La suddetta Direttiva descrisse, nel Capo 5, le misure intese a facilitare l'effettiva osservanza del diritto alla libera circolazione delle persone e dei servizi all'interno dell'Unione europea.
La Commissione europea pubblicò una diecina d'0anni dopo, nel 1996, un rapporto noto come SLIM (*Simpler Legislation in Its Internal Market*) sul mutuo riconoscimento dei diplomi. Il suo scopo era di pervenire a una forma di semplificazione che puntasse al riesame delle

strutture e dei meccanismi delle sette direttive settoriali esistenti, relative ai medici, alle infermiere, ai veterinari, ai dentisti, alle levatrici, agli architetti e ai farmacisti.

UNESCO/UIA/ACE

Sempre nel 1996 l'UNESCO e l'UIA (*Union Internationale des Architectes*) decisero di elaborare congiuntamente un documento sull'educazione degli architetti. Affidarono a dieci esperti mondiali il compito di elaborare tale documento, che fu reso pubblico nello stesso 1996 in occasione del Convegno internazionale dell'UIA a Barcellona. Tanto questo documento quanto l'accordo di Pechino del 1999 incorporarono quei requisiti fondamentali per un architetto, in termini di conoscenza, capacità e abilità, che dovevano essere conosciuti a fondo mediante l'educazione e il tirocinio, così com'erano stati elencati nella Direttiva 85/384/CEE:

- Abilità tecnica ed estetica nella progettazione architettonica
- Conoscenza adeguata della storia, delle teorie dell'architettura e delle scienze umane
- Conoscenza delle belle arti e del loro influsso sulla progettazione architettonica
- Conoscenza adeguata della progettazione urbana e della pianificazione urbanistica
- Comprensione dei rapporti fra le persone e gli edifici e fra gli edifici e il loro ambiente
- Conoscenza adeguata dei mezzi atti a realizzare una progettazione sostenibile
- Conoscenza della professione di architetto e del ruolo dell'architetto nella società
- Comprensione dei metodi d'indagine atti alla preparazione di *brief* di progetto
- Comprensione della progettazione strutturale, della scienza delle costruzioni e dei problemi ingegneristici connessi con la progettazione degli edifici
- Conoscenza dei problemi fisici, delle tecnologie e della funzione degli edifici capaci di assicurare condizioni confortevoli al loro interno e di proteggerli dal clima
- Capacità progettuali necessarie a soddisfare le richieste degli utenti, compatibilmente coi costi e coi regolamenti edilizi
- Conoscenza adeguata delle industrie, delle organizzazioni, dei regolamenti e delle procedure comportate dal trasferimento dei concetti progettuali in costruzioni e dall'integrazione dei piani nella pianificazione complessiva
- Conoscenza adeguata del finanziamento e della gestione dei progetti, nonché del controllo dei costi

 Le due istituzioni decisero di costituire un Comitato di omologazione basato sul documento in questione, affidando a 17 esperti mondiali il compito di identificare le scuole conformi ai suoi requisiti allo scopo di promuovere la qualità delle scuole e di sensibilizzare le autorità competenti nei confronti dell'importanza socio-culturale della pratica architettonica.

L'ACE (*Architects' Council of Europe*) è l'associazione europea che si occupa degli Architetti e della loro professione, mantenendo ottimi rapporti col Comitato consultivo. Per quanto non abbia un'autorità legale, agisce come portavoce degli architetti in tutta l'Europa. Rappresentando le associazioni professionali nazionali, l'ACE è di fatto un membro dell'UIA.

L'Area Europea dell'Educazione Superiore (Sorbona, Bologna, Praga)
La dichiarazione congiunta dei Ministri europei dell'Educazione, convenuti a Bologna nel giugno del 1999, rappresentò il punto di partenza per la creazione, a un anno di distanza dell'accordo della Sorbona, dell'"Area Europea dell'Educazione Superiore" (*European Higher Education Area*) entro il 2010. Mirava a promuovere la mobilità degli studenti, dei docenti, dei ricercatori e del personale amministrativo in modo da trarre beneficio della ricchezza di valori democratici esistente in Europa, della sua diversità di cultura e di linguaggi e della diversità dei suoi sistemi adottati per l'educazione superiore. Furono accettati sei obiettivi:

- 1. Adozione di un sistema di titoli accademici facilmente leggibile e confrontabile
- 2. Adozione di un sistema basato essenzialmente su due cicli principali
- 3. Istituzione di un sistema di crediti
- 4. Promozione della mobilità
- 5. Promozione della cooperazione europea circa la garanzia della qualità
- 6. Promozione della dimensione europea dell'educazione superiore

La chiave di volta dell'accordo era l'adozione di una struttura omogenea da parte di tutto il sistema europeo dell'educazione superiore:
"Si adotterà un sistema basato essenzialmente su due cicli principali, *undergraduate* e *graduate*. L'accesso al secondo ciclo richiederà il felice completamento del primo ciclo di studi, di durata almeno triennale. Il titolo rilasciato al suo termine sarà rilevante, agli effetti del mercato del lavoro europeo, come livello di qualificazione appropriato. Il secondo ciclo porterà al titolo di *master* e/o di dottore, come già avviene in molti Paesi europei."
Quasi tutte le istituzioni coinvolte nell'educazione dell'architetto – in particolare l'UIA e l'ACE - richiedono, a coloro che ambiscano a praticare la professione di architetto, di seguire un *curriculum* di almeno 5 anni; sono anche persuase che un *curriculum* di tre anni sia troppo breve e che, per esercitare la professione, occorrano almeno cinque anni di studi seguiti da almeno due anni di tirocinio. Il *Charter for Architectural Education and Architectural Practice*, approvato a Barcellona nel 1996, aveva già richiesto cinque anni di studi seguiti da almeno tre anni di tirocinio professionale. Un'opinione diffusa era inoltre che i cinque anni di studi non dovessero essere semplicemente la somma di un corso triennale orientato al disegno seguito da due anni di corso *master*, ma che il corso triennale dovesse contenere fin dall'inizio l'insegnamento dei fondamenti dell'architettura, intesa come disciplina autonoma.

La valutazione della qualità
A partire dagli anni Ottanta, le istituzioni dell'educazione superiore furono sempre più sollecitate a dimostrare la propria qualità e a garantirla sotto la pressione di una società che richiedeva sempre più che cosa ricevesse in cambio dei propri investimenti nel settore. Quest'evoluzione in senso economicistico seguì la corrente principale del controllo di qualità, pienamente espressa nell'ISO-9000, che aveva impersonato a lungo la tradizione contemporanea del mondo industriale,
Dal momento che il modello industriale, più "orientato alla procedura" non appariva applicabile in quanto tale all'educazione superiore, che era più "orientata ai contenuti", furono sviluppati strumenti specifici per il controllo e la valutazione della qualità nel mondo dell'educazione, nell'ambito delle agenzie dell'*European Network of Quality Assurance* (ENQA) istituito dalla UE.
Esso consiste, generalmente parlando, di una **valutazione esterna** da parte di una commissione di valutatori (*peer*) indipendenti, che conducono una supervisione dell'istituzione in oggetto. Alla base di tale valutazione c'è il **rapporto di auto-analisi** prodotto dall'istituzione stessa, seguito da un'audizione *in situ*. Gli ingredienti di tale rapporto sono:
- 1. La formulazione del documento di missione dell'istituzione: i suoi scopi, i suoi fini e i risultati attesi
- 2. Gli *input* oppure i vincoli mediante i quali il documento di missione dev'essere realizzato (personale, studenti, finanziamenti, servizi…)
- 3. L'analisi delle attività educative
- 4. Una valutazione delle attività di ricerca, se realizzabile.

Accreditamento/Omologazione/Riconoscimento e Registrazione

Al giorno d'oggi, l'accreditamento dei sistemi educativi non è una pratica tradizionalmente diffusa in tutta l'Europa. Negli USA l'accreditamento da parte delle organizzazioni professionali è ben nota a partire dal 19° secolo L'Europa occidentale e quella orientale sono però a conoscenza del sistema di valutazione e di certificazione della qualità, cioè di "quel processo che stabilisce se un programma formativo soddisfi o meno un determinato standard di risultati" e che implica "l'accettazione di uno specifico grado di programma educativo capace di fornire al laureato una preparazione sufficiente a iniziare o proseguire una carriera professionale".

In Europa, con l'eccezione del Regno Unito, dove il RIBA è ancora l'organismo di accreditamento, esso sta oggi esso sta acquistando un riconoscimento formale sempre maggiore, basato sulla valutazione esterna. Dopo Bologna, questo modello di qualificazione avrà conseguenze tanto nazionali quanto internazionali.

Inoltre, l'Europa presenta oggi una moltitudine di accessi alla professione d'architetto; ad esempio, in alcune nazioni i laureati possono praticare immediatamente dopo la laurea, in altre viene loro richiesto di portare a termine un periodo d'internato. Un rapida occhiata all'attuale situazione europea per quanto riguarda l'accesso alla professione mostra il quadro seguente:

Danimarca
- Il titolo di "architetto" non è tutelato;
- Non c'è alcun accreditamento dei diplomi; il titolo dei laureati "candidati in architettura" è garantito dallo Stato;
- Gli studenti si laureano dopo cinque anni di studi; i laureati possono praticare immediatamente dopo la laurea, anche senza diventare membri dell'Associazione Accademica Danese degli Architetti (MAA); tuttavia, commissioni istituite dallo Stato richiedono una certificazione dell'esperienza professionale;
- La situazione è simile anche in Svezia, in Norvegia e in Finlandia.

Francia
- Il titolo di "architetto" è tutelato e, a seguito del passaggio al 3+2 imposto dal Ministero della Cultura nel 2005, sono in corso molte variazioni al vecchio sistema 2+2+2 immediatamente professionalizzante;
- I laureati, per iscriversi all'Ordine degli Architetti, debbono effettuare un periodo di tirocinio;
- I programmi sono accreditati per cicli da parte di un comitato formato da docenti, professionisti e professori universitari.

Germania
- Il diploma è certificato dallo Stato per le *Technische Universität* e per le *Fachhochschule*;
- I laureati ricevono il titolo accademico di *Diplom Ingenieur* o *Ingenieur*;
- Il titolo di "architetto" è tutelato;
- Solo dopo 1 o 2 anni di praticantato e la presentazione alla *Architektenkammer* si ha diritto al titolo di Architetto e si è ammessi alla pratica professionale;
- La durata ufficiale degli studi è di 5 anni (ma in realtà mediamente 6,5 anni) nelle TU e da 4 a 4,5 anni nelle FH;

Paesi Bassi
- Il diploma garantisce l'accesso diretto alla professione
- La professione non è tutelata, ma lo è il titolo di "architetto"

- Non c'è accreditamento; il controllo esterno della qualità delle scuole è esercitato ogni 3 anni per la formazione e sempre ogni 3 anni per la ricerca; la procedura non ha nulla a che fare con la professione;
- Il programma di studi soddisfa i requisiti fondamentali richiesti all'architetto, così come sono stati espressi nell'accordo dell'UIA.

Spagna
- L'unico modo di diventare architetti è laurearsi in una scuola di architettura, sia in un'università statale sia in una privata riconosciuta
- I laureati possono intraprendere la loro pratica professionale subito dopo la laurea
- Il titolo di "architetto" è tutelato; solo i laureati in una scuola di architettura possono chiamarsi "architetti".

Regno Unito
- L'accesso alla professione di architetto avviene in tre fasi, tutte gestite dal *Royal Institute of British Architects* (RIBA, l'istituzione professionale riconosciuta): un corso di *Bachelor* di 3 anni (fase 1), un anno di pratica professionale seguito da 2 anni di "diploma in architettura" (fase2) e quindi da almeno un altro anno di pratica. I laureati possono quindi sostenere l'esame finale della fase 3 (esame scritto e orale di pratica professionale, che permette loro di iscriversi al RIBA e di registrarsi nell'*Architects Registration Board* (ARB, l'Albo statale), e pertanto di potersi chiamare "architetti"; il titolo è protetto, ma non lo è la funzione, che è libera;
- RIBA e ARB controllano insieme le 30 scuole di architettura del Regno Unito, che riesaminano ogni 5 anni concentrandosi sulla qualità degli studenti; il processo è detto *validation* (validazione, omologazione), in antitesi ad "accreditamento";
- Il RIBA effettua anche servizi di omologazione/validazione a livello internazionale, in 20 nazioni di tutto il mondo.

Il tema del quarto Convegno (1-4 settembre 2001) era **Meditazioni sul futuro dell'educazione architettonica alla luce della dichiarazione di Bologna (*Speculating the future of Architectural Education in the Light of the Bologna Declaration*).**
Fu articolato nelle seguenti sessioni:
1. *Lo stato dell'arte dell'educazione architettonica in Europa*
2. *L'educazione degli Architetti nel contesto della Dichiarazione di Bologna: tendenze, questioni, critiche e risposte*
3. *Il ruolo professionale dell'Architetto nel mercato europeo del lavoro e la Dichiarazione di Bologna*
4. *La diversità dell'educazione architettonica in Europa e la convergenza dettata dalla Dichiarazione di Bologna*
5. *Come procederanno le Scuole di Architettura alla luce della Dichiarazione di Bologna?*

I primi quattro convegni, tenuti fra il 1998 e il 2001, costituirono un contesto continuo di dialogo e di scambio d'informazioni. Possono essere sintetizzati alcuni punti cruciali delle discussioni tenute in tali occasioni fra le diverse scuole europee.
Uno era il fatto che l'interesse aumentasse man mano che si manifestavano nuovi elementi di discussione, in relazione al modo e alla misura nella quale il nuovo contesto istituzionale sollecitava le Scuole di Architettura a introdurre cambiamenti. Un altro era il fatto che le Scuole europee sottolineassero la necessità di un dialogo sistematico e analitico fra di loro, allo scopo di permettere alle nuove tendenze di emergere e ai vincoli imposti dai contesti locali sociali,

culturali e legali di essere conosciuti. Il terzo punto era il fatto che le scuole europee diventassero sempre più consapevoli della necessità di confrontarsi insieme sul proprio futuro e di procedere alla ristrutturazione dei propri *curricula* col massimo grado di convergenza mentale e di concordia operativa. Il quarto e ultimo punto era la constatazione dell'esistenza di una forte domanda, da parte delle Scuole, di raccolta e di diffusione più sistematica e analitica d'informazioni sull'educazione architettonica in Europa.

Furono stretti, a conclusione dei dibattiti tenuti nei primi quattro anni, vari accordi fra le Scuole presenti. I più importanti di essi stabilirono:

- che lo *European Credit Tranfer System* (ECTS) fosse di vitale importanza per lo sviluppo della mobilità studentesca, l'organizzazione dei crediti ECTS e la flessibilità dei programmi di studi, necessaria per la conservazione di una polifonia pedagogica e culturale, considerata una caratteristica molto importante dell'educazione architettonica in Europa;
- che gli studi che conducevano al Diploma in Architettura, che assicurava a sua volta l'accesso alla professione di Architetto, dovessero durare almeno cinque anni e corrispondessero a 300 crediti ECTS, corrispondenti al livello formativo di Master;
- che il perseguimento di una gamma di capacità confrontabile e flessibile mettesse ogni Scuola di Architettura nelle condizioni di decidere e organizzare i propri studi tanto secondo un programma unitario quanto secondo un programma suddiviso in due cicli (rispettivamente 3+2 oppure 180 e 120 crediti), il primo dei quali non potesse permettere da solo l'accesso alla professione di architetto;
- che lo sviluppo di un sistema di valutazione "accademica" e di controllo di qualità dei programmi di studi nel contesto della comunità accademica, adattabile alle necessità dell'educazione architettonica e rispettoso del pluralismo esistente, assumesse una particolare importanza.

I partecipanti al Convegno del 2001 concordarono sul fatto che i Convegni dell'AEEA dovessero andare al di là del loro carattere iniziale che, a causa delle restrizioni finanziarie e dell'insicurezza circa la loro natura esplorativa (agivano infatti come esperimenti-pilota, mediante i quali si saggiava la reale necessità di incontri del genere) si limitava a offrire la possibilità di comunicare e di scambiare le idee, per imprimere invece un impatto più significativo all'educazione architettonica in Europa.

In altre parole, dovevano prevedere un numero di attività e di iniziative le quali, in armonia con le nuove politiche di convergenza in campo didattico, aiutassero le Scuole di Architettura a modellare e attuare un modello di educazione architettonica europea adatto al mondo contemporaneo. La creazione, su proposta dell'Università Aristotele di Tessalonica, dell'*European Network of Heads of Schools of Architecture* (ENHSA, Rete europea dei Responsabili delle Scuole di Architettura) nell'ambito del Programma Socrates/Erasmus e pertanto finanziata dall'Unione Europea, fu un effetto di tale decisione.

I Responsabili e i Coordinatori dei programmi accademici sarebbero stati dunque tenuti a coordinare, in armonia con tale progetto, una serie di attività intraprese da un corpo docente appropriato. Ci si attendeva, in tal modo, che il contributo di ogni Scuola fosse più sostanziale ed efficace e che l'impatto delle iniziative della Rete fosse più diretto. Il punto cruciale del Progetto AEEA/ENHSA era l'educazione architettonica. Perseguiva lo scopo di aiutare le Scuole di Architettura europee nel loro sforzo di seguire con atteggiamento creativo le dinamiche della convergenza europea, allo scopo di definire i profili contemporanei dell'educazione architettonica europea e di sviluppare iniziative per adattare a loro i propri *curricula*. Per raggiungere tale scopo, il Progetto avrebbe perseguito:

- la raccolta, l'elaborazione e la diffusione dei dati e delle informazioni, allo scopo di aiutare i processi decisionali riguardanti la ristrutturazione dei *curricula*;
- l'elaborazione di proposte riguardanti il periodo didattico adeguato e il contenuto degli studi di aree disciplinari specifiche, come la progettazione, la teoria e la storia, la tecnologia architettonica e la progettazione urbana;
- il sostegno della coerenza delle Scuole di Architettura al fine di realizzare una migliore cooperazione accademica e una gestione più efficace dei problemi accademici, nella prospettiva di riforme appropriate;
- la raccolta e la diffusione di pratiche educative e di metodi pedagogici nuovi;
- la cooperazione con altre organizzazioni internazionali (UIA, ACE, ECAADE, Comitato consultivo dell'Unione Europea sull'educazione e il tirocinio nel campo dell'Architettura) e con istituzioni professionali indirizzate all'adozione di politiche nel campo dell'educazione architettonica in Europa.

Il Convegno si conclude con l'approvazione della "Dichiarazione di Chania", riportata nell'Appendice.
Richard Foqué, membro del Consiglio direttivo dell'Associazione, espresse qualche mese dopo, sul numero 61 del *News sheet* dell'Associazione, alcune valutazioni di un certo rilievo sul convegno.
Sotto il profilo *politico*, il convegno di Bologna era una realtà: tutti i ministri europei dell'educazione si erano impegnati a mettere in pratica le sue deliberazioni. La dichiarazione di Chania aveva tuttavia sottolineato la forte volontà di conservare l'autonomia e la diversità esistenti: un pregio dell'Europa era infatti la sua cultura sfaccettata, che doveva necessariamente riflettersi sull'Area europea dell'educazione. Era chiaro inoltre che l'EAAE doveva giocare un ruolo importante nel processo decisionale, quando si trattava di mettere in pratica la Dichiarazione di Bologna a proposito dell'educazione architettonica.
Dal punto di vista *pragmatico*, la sfida lanciata all'EAAE era di tradurre quelle intenzioni in una strategia pratica. Era chiaro ai più che Bologna rappresentasse una cornice che permetteva una grande libertà di migliorare e aggiornare i programmi educativi delle scuole europee, compatibile con l'evoluzione in atto in campo pedagogico.
Per quanto riguardava il mondo *professionale*, la Dichiarazione non incideva sulla responsabilità degli architetti e sulla loro integrità professionale; occorreva però approfittare delle opportunità offerte riformando il programma educativo. Si era infatti osservato più di una volta, nel corso dei convegni di Chania, che non bisognava concentrarsi soltanto sulla formazione di architetti capaci e preparati in modo convenzionale in cinque anni, ma rendersi conto che il mercato del lavoro richiedeva un'ampia gamma di profili professionali nel campo dell'architettura, introducendo pertanto un *curriculum* interdisciplinare e concentrandosi su settori scientifici più specialistici, come l'urbanistica, la tecnologia edilizia, la sostenibilità, l'ecologia ecc. Si poteva pertanto distinguere fra due tipi d'accreditamento: uno "professionale/governativo", l'altro "accademico". Il primo avrebbe dovuto indagare fino a che punto il *curriculum* obbedisse alla Direttiva europea e ai criteri fissati dagli Ordini professionali, il secondo occuparsi della qualità del programma educativo, confrontando il documento di missione delle scuole con la rispondenza dei loro *curricula*.
Dal punto di vista *filosofico*, occorreva rimarcare che, in una società nella quale la conoscenza e l'esperienza mutavano rapidamente, la nozione che "l'educazione era quanto rimaneva quando si fosse dimenticato tutto ciò che si era appreso" assumeva grande rilievo. Ciò stava a significare che fosse più efficace acquisire attitudini e strumenti per l'attività di risoluzione dei problemi, piuttosto che una conoscenza diffusa di discipline diverse.

Sotto il profilo *pedagogico*, la realizzazione dell'Area europea dell'educazione superiore induceva a migliorare, attualizzare ed eventualmente anche trasformare radicalmente i vari *curricula*. Era allora necessario, per raggiungere l'obiettivo, che tutti i membri delle varie Facoltà stringessero un accordo comune sul documento di missione delle scuole e sulla volontà di apportare i cambiamenti necessari per assecondare tale missione. Era promettente che il convegno di Chania avesse fatto registrare il consenso generale sul fatto che l'educazione di un Architetto in Europa richiedesse almeno 300 crediti ECTS distribuiti su di un periodo di 5 anni.

Venendo alla *partecipazione*, anche se non si era discusso apertamente sulla necessità di coinvolgere e di responsabilizzare docenti e studenti circa lo sviluppo di una strategia attuativa di successo, era evidente che essa fosse una condizione vitale perché l'operazione avesse successo. Era inoltre chiaro che il sistema dei crediti ECTS avrebbe migliorato la mobilità degli studenti, dei docenti e delle attività di ricerca e che sarebbe diventato presto non solo un comune denominatore ma anche, se coordinato a dovere, uno strumento molto utile per rinnovare e rendere più flessibili i *curricula*. Avrebbe inoltre facilitato il varo di progetti di ricerca internazionali, favorendo un discorso di carattere architettonico approfondito e globale.

Quanto poi alla *promozione*, il suddetto processo di miglioramento della qualità attraverso la creazione di reti e la collaborazione reciproca avrebbe dovuto essere sostenuto da un sistema di scambi d'informazioni bene organizzato. Passi iniziali in tale direzione erano stati il rinato *News Sheet* dell'EAAE, il giornale dello STOA, la pubblicazione degli Atti delle conferenze, il premio EAAE e la guida dell'EAAE alle scuole europee.

Venendo infine all'*azione politica*, era cosa ben nota che nella società post-moderna l'uso adeguato dei *mass-media* fosse importante al fine di realizzare i propri scopi. Occorreva allora essere presenti ai vari *forum* ufficiali e all'interno dei centri decisionali dei vari Stati membri, nonché della stessa Unione europea.

Il quinto Convegno (4-7 settembre 2002) fu pertanto organizzato sotto l'egida dell'ENHSA.

Il tema generale era: **Verso uno spazio comune dell'educazione superiore nel campo dell'Architettura in Europa (*Towards a Common European Higher Education Space in Architecture*)**.

Nel documento introduttivo si sottolineava il fatto che gli incontri precedenti avessero mostrato come la prospettiva di uno spazio comune europeo per l'educazione architettonica avesse fatto emergere la necessità di organizzare il dibattito in quattro sezioni tematiche fortemente collegate, nell'ambito delle quali le Scuole d'Architettura fossero invitate a rispondere ai relativi quesiti e a dare corpo, con le loro risposte, alle proprie scelte politiche future.

Il Convegno costituì in gran parte la prosecuzione di quello precedente, centrato – come abbiamo già visto, sulla dichiarazione di Bologna del 1999 - ponendo soprattutto l'accento sui punti che avevano condotto alle importanti affermazioni raccolte nella Dichiarazione di Chania del 2001: l'importanza e il ruolo che la polifonia culturale europea doveva interpretare ai fini della creazione di un'area integrata dell'educazione architettonica in Europa, la necessità di conservare la durata quinquennale dell'educazione architettonica, la necessità dello sviluppo di un sistema europeo di valutazione accademica e la garanzia della qualità dei programmi europei nella comunità accademica.

Il Convegno, che a differenza del precedente non si concluse con alcuna dichiarazione unanime, si preoccupò soprattutto di definire il ruolo futuro dell'EAAE e degli incontri annuali dei Presidi che costituivano una sua importante attività. Questo carattere "riflessivo" rappresentò il segnale che la cosiddetta "Area europea dell'educazione superiore" stava diventando una

realtà nel caso della formazione architettonica. S'incominciavano peraltro a riconoscere e a identificare gli ostacoli che si sarebbero trovati sul cammino dell'Associazione, i più urgenti dei quali erano proprio i temi delle quattro sessioni del Convegno.

1. *Il curriculum per l'educazione architettonica nell'ambito dello spazio comune europeo dell'educazione superiore*

Fu chiaro fin dall'inizio che la differenziazione dei *curricula* dipendesse dalla tipologia delle scuole, sia che essa fosse centrata sulla progettazione architettonica come nelle scuole di architettura, oppure su materie tecniche come in quelle d'ingegneria. Inoltre, la struttura del *curriculum* dipendeva molto dal suo orientamento in senso generalistico oppure specialistico. Un importante aspetto positivo prospettato dalla dichiarazione di Bologna era infatti l'ambizione di produrre *curricula* flessibili, costruiti mediante i moduli dell'ECTS e la distinzione fra i due livelli del *Bachelor* (Laurea) e del *Master* (Laurea magistrale).

Si sottolineò, nelle conclusioni, l'importanza dei seguenti problemi: 1) gli aspetti centrali della formazione del *Bachelor* e del *Master*; 2) le possibili materie comuni del *curriculum* degli studi; 3) i *curricula* e i profili delle scuole; 4) l'aspetto scientifico delle discipline e il ruolo dei dottorati (PhD).

2. *Il controllo della qualità e la valutazione accademica dei programmi formativi in Architettura nello spazio europeo dell'educazione superiore*

Un'opinione abbastanza condivisa da alcuni relatori fu che: 1) la mobilità fosse necessaria tanto per gli studenti quanto per i docenti allo scopo di sviluppare un sistema di riferimenti culturali più ampio; 2) il confronto con culture e con contesti sociali ed educativi diversi arricchisse lo sviluppo personale e culturale; 3) che ci si stesse muovendo da uno spazio di portata nazionale verso uno spazio di portata europea.

Secondo loro i vantaggi del sistema di scambi, percepiti soprattutto dagli studenti, erano: 1) i mutui benefici offerti dal vivere in un ambiente culturale e accademico diverso; 2) una fresca immissione di contenuti e di metodi, a livello tanto degli studenti quanto dei docenti; 3) una miglior comprensione della posizione della propria scuola all'interno del contesto internazionale; 4) la creazione di reti; 5) una generazione di studenti più maturi e più orientati in senso internazionale; 6) il miglioramento delle conoscenze linguistiche; 7) il confronto con nuovi approcci all'educazione architettonica; 8) lo sviluppo di un maggior spirito critico e di un sistema più ampio di riferimenti personali.

Gli svantaggi, percepiti soprattutto dai docenti, sarebbero invece stati: 1) le diverse interpretazioni del sistema ECTS da parte delle varie scuole; 2) la difficoltà di comprendere i programmi e i sistemi accademici di ciascuna; 3) le barriere linguistiche; 4) l'incompatibilità dei calendari accademici; 5) i differenti sistemi di valutazione e di votazione; 6) le difficoltà del *Learning Agreement* e della trasmissione dei verbali d'esame; 7) la mancanza di fiducia nel programma della scuola ospitante e l'esistenza di una seconda valutazione da parte di un'altra commissione d'esame; 8) la creazione di una "via di fuga" per gli studenti più deboli; 9) i problemi di collocazione degli studenti ospiti al livello giusto; 10) le possibili difficoltà finanziarie da parte di alcuni studenti.

I partecipanti alla sessione presentarono i seguenti suggerimenti conclusivi: 1) pervenire a un'attuazione generalizzata della struttura e dei valori del sistema ECTS; 2) promuovere un sistema unificato di collocazione degli studenti; 3) realizzare *curricula* più confrontabili e trasparenti 4) avere maggior fiducia nei rapporti di collaborazione reciproca.

3. Scambio e collaborazione fra le Scuole d'Architettura nello spazio europeo dell'educazione superiore;

La sessione fu interamente occupata dalla presentazione dei risultati della ricerca commissionata dall'*Architectural Registration Board* di Londra e condotta da Lawrence Johnstone (Belfast, UK) e da Koenraad Van Cleempoel (Antwerp, Belgio) sul tema "I rapporti fra l'educazione architettonica, l'internato e la competenza nella pratica professionale". L'obiettivo principale consisteva nell'individuazione della varietà, all'interno dell'Unione Europea, delle condizioni d'ingresso nelle Istituzioni che regolavano la pratica dell'architettura. Era stato anche costruito, nell'ambito della ricerca, un *database* in *Excel* con informazioni basilari ma sistematiche e consistenti su tutte le scuole di Architettura dell'Unione ed erano state anche spiegate le differenze esistenti fra le Istituzioni pubbliche regolatrici (come gli Ordini nazionali) e quelle private (come il RIBA).

4. Lo spazio europeo dell'educazione superiore in Architettura e il contesto professionale e istituzionale

Katia Baltzaki (Grecia) introdusse la sessione presentando una valutazione preliminare dei risultati del questionario su "L'attuazione delle procedure di auto-valutazione nelle Scuole d'Architettura europee", ricordando che nel 2001 l'EAAE s'era dichiarata desiderosa di partecipare ai sistemi di garanzia e di valutazione della qualità.

La raccolta dei questionari era ancora in corso ma, sulla base di quelli già esaminati si poteva avanzare l'ipotesi che la maggioranza delle scuole avessero già attuato, o intendessero attuare, procedure di auto-valutazione. In ogni caso, l'idea che l'auto-valutazione costituisse la chiave per migliorare la propria posizione ara universalmente riconosciuta, mentre i metodi adottati in proposito variavano notevolmente e pareva che non ci fosse alcun contesto comune.

5. Proposte di azioni e strategie future

Constantin Spiridonidis, organizzatore del convegno, aprì la discussione finale affermando che fosse giunto il momento d'incominciare a lavorare in modo diverso dal passato. Occorreva, giunti oramai al quinto incontro adottando sempre la stessa metodologia, definire la missione dei convegni dei Presidi. La prima motivazione della domanda di finanziamento all'Unione Europea era stata proprio la collocazione dell'educazione architettonica nell'ambito dell'Area europea dell'educazione superiore. Occorreva, se si voleva creare la necessaria trasparenza per giungere a quel traguardo, esporre una metodologia consistente. Pertanto, il metodo appropriato era quello spiegato all'inizio del convegno: l'istituzione di gruppi di lavoro.

Dopo aver discusso varie proposte, si finì per adottare quella del futuro Presidente (fino al 2003), l'irlandese James Horan, che propose la costituzione di cinque gruppi che avrebbero lavorato su altrettante tematiche: 1) professione ed educazione; 2) valutazione; 3) *curriculum*; 4) scambio e mobilità; 5) dottorati.

Il tema del sesto Convegno (3-6 settembre 2003) era **La modellazione dell'area europea dell'educazione superiore in Architettura in Europa (*Shaping the European Higher Architectural Education Area*)**.

Si prendeva atto, nel documento introduttivo, del fatto che la prospettiva della creazione dello spazio europeo per l'educazione superiore giustificasse la sua suddivisione in quattro sezioni tematiche fondamentali, strettamente correlate (e, come si può notare, molto simili ai temi proposti da Horan l'anno precedente), alle cui problematiche le Scuole di Architettura erano tenute a fornire contributi appropriati. Esse potevano essere codificate ricorrendo a quattro termini generici: Curriculum, Scambi/Mobilità, Professione e Valutazione, che sarebbero stati appunto i temi dell'incontro.

Il Convegno propose un approccio alla discussione più rigoroso di quello adottato in precedenza, tentando di affrontare i quattro argomenti chiave mediante una struttura organizzativa diversa: i rappresentanti delle Scuole che avevano accettato nel 2002 di animare i quattro gruppi di lavoro - accollandosene uno ciascuna - e avevano poi lavorato alla preparazione dell'evento, avrebbero aperto le sessioni del Convegno presentando il frutto della loro preparazione, consistente nell'informazione raccolta grazie all'indagine condotta con questionari inviati alle diverse Scuole europee.

Ciò avrebbe dovuto condurre a una presentazione più sistematica e affidabile dello stato dell'arte circa il punto di vista delle varie Scuole nei loro confronti., producendo una rassegna consistente delle tendenze e delle dinamiche manifestatesi fino ad allora e indicando le potenzialità o le possibili difficoltà degli approcci posti in essere dalle Scuole, nello sforzo di generare un' "Area Europea dell'Educazione Superiore in Architettura" accettabile.

Il lavoro dei partecipanti al Convegno fu pertanto suddiviso nelle seguenti quattro sessioni, presentate insieme col succinto commento introduttivo dei gruppi di lavoro citati poc'anzi:

1. *La modellazione del curriculum dell'area europea dell'educazione superiore in Architettura.*

Era emerso nel corso del Convegno del 2002 che ci fosse una divergenza significativa circa le priorità contemplate dai *curricula* delle varie Scuole, i loro metodi formativi e i diplomi conferiti. Si era pertanto convenuto che dovesse essere fissata una base comune, sulla quale sarebbe stato modellato successivamente il profilo di ogni Scuola.

Divenne dunque evidente che fosse maturata la necessità di: 1) costruire una conoscenza di base più sistematica delle differenze, delle dinamiche e dello stato dell'arte dell'educazione architettonica, in relazione ai vari tipi di studi *undergraduate* e *postgraduate*; 2) identificare le tipologie dei diplomi in architettura conferiti dalle varie istituzioni e le loro caratteristiche; 3) individuare le direzioni scelte dalle Scuole di architettura che avessero modificato recentemente i propri *curricula*, nonché le proprie priorità; 4) articolare le intenzioni delle Scuole che inveve non avessero modificato i propri *curricula*; 5) esaminare la possibilità di raggruppamenti costruttivi di varie Scuole sulla base delle loro affinità o differenze.

Furono evidenziati, nel corso della discussione, alcuni aspetti rilevanti delle Scuole europee.

Innanzitutto, le Scuole erano piccole. Molte di esse avevano meno di 500 studenti e tre quarti delle Scuole che avevano contribuito all'inchiesta ne avevano meno di 1.000. Era comune a molte il fatto che la loro formazione all'architettura consistesse di programmi *Bachelor* e *Master* (3+2), senza che proponessero però un curriculum standard per il Master.

Le Scuole, il loro *curriculum*, l'approccio pedagogico, il rapporto studenti/docenti e il differente accento sul lavoro di *atelier* piuttosto che sulla ricerca erano appunto troppo diversi per varare una titolo accademico standard. La discussione rimase molto aperta: si sostenne infine-

che l'EAAE dovesse cercare di inserire la ricerca architettonica nell'agenda della UE e proporre criteri circa una produzione culturale di carattere scientifico.

2. *La modellazione della valutazione accademica e della certificazione di qualità nell'area europea dell'educazione superiore in architettura*

Il primo tentativo di raccogliere informazioni sulla valutazione aveva rivelato l'anno precedente l'esistenza di sistemi, metodi e procedure polimorfici posti in atto nelle Scuole di Architettura allo scopo di valutare i propri *curricula*. L'AEEA si era già impegnata, con la deliberazione del 2001, a intraprendere iniziative nella direzione dello sviluppo di un sistema di certificazione e di valutazione di qualità modellato sulle necessità dell'educazione architettonica, rispettandone contemporaneamente le diversità.

Come risultato di tali informazioni, la prospettiva della creazione di un sistema europeo di valutazione era una sfida e, nonostante le difficoltà che comportava, valeva la pena di approfondire le ricerche. Il sistema poteva fare riferimento alla valutazione "accademica" dei programmi educativi servendosi d'indagini di valutatori e non della valutazione "professionale/governativa" dei titoli accademici, che portavano all'accreditamento e alla certificazione delle Scuole da parte dei corpi professionali/governativi degli Stati membri.

Era stato proposto un ulteriore lavoro per gettare più luce sulla valutazione, in modo da scoprire qualcosa di più circa i vari metodi adottati dalle medesime per migliorare la qualità del proprio modello formativo. Tale lavoro avrebbe prodotto ulteriori elaborazioni registrando e discutendo i vari metodi adottati dalle Scuole di Architettura e avrebbe valutato la loro efficienza, tenendo altresì conto delle caratteristiche del loro modello formativo nonché della loro diversità sotto il punto di vista della struttura e dell'organizzazione degli studi. Questa registrazione avrebbe anche mirato a identificare gli elementi chiave da sottoporre a valutazione.

Come sempre, il rapporto fra mondo accademico e mondo professionale generò un'animata discussione.

Quanto ai nudi dati statistici, risultò dai questionari che il 15% delle Scuole avesse affermato di non avere rapporti con la professione e il 21% di avere contatti stretti, benché fosse risultato chiaramente che la maggior parte delle Scuole offrisse una formazione architettonica e non quella di un architetto; infine, che il 71% delle Scuole avesse affermato l'importanza della propria indipendenza dalla professione e ciononostante che il contatto e la collaborazione con la professione dovesse essere considerata positivamente.

3. *La modellazione degli scambi e della mobilità nell'area europea dell'educazione superiore in Architettura*

Il Convegno del 2002 aveva rivelato che tutte le Scuole promuovevano la mobilità ed era stato accettato che la mobilità si fosse sviluppata fino ad allora soprattutto sulla base di contatti e di conoscenze personali. Inoltre, le Scuole non avevano ancora adottato indirizzi molto chiari circa gli scambi e la mobilità allo scopo di potenziare i propri *curricula*.

Si convenne che gli scambi costituissero un meccanismo essenziale per la creazione dell'area europea dell'educazione superiore in Architettura e si fece anche notare che l'ECTS fosse un mezzo importante non solo per lo sviluppo della mobilità ma anche della confrontabilità dei diversi contesti educativi. Si suggerì anche le Scuole dovessero adottare strategie chiare nei confronti della mobilità e dello scambio, affinché tali forme di collaborazione avessero un impatto più diretto e efficace sui loro *curricula*.

Era anche necessario comprendere come le Scuole definissero il credito ECTS. Un problema che emergeva era allora se fosse possibile inventare un tipo comune di credito che potesse coprire vari tipi di moduli.

Si concordò sul fatto che lo scambio e la mobilità fra le varie Scuole fosse importante, ma si affermò anche che il "flusso" fra di loro rivestisse una certa importanza. Era anche interessante notare che lo scambio non fosse poi così vitale com'era stato anticipato: il 31% delle Scuole inviava solo il 2% degli studenti ad altre Scuole, mentre la maggioranza (80%) ne inviava meno del 5%. Altre difficoltà nascevano dal fatto che il 60% delle Scuole richiedessero ai loro studenti un lavoro supplementare dopo il loro ritorno.

4. *La modellazione dei rapporti fra l'area europea dell'educazione superiore in Architettura e le istituzioni professionali*

Nel corso del dibattito del 2002 risultò chiaramente che i fondi per l'educazione venissero progressivamente tagliati. Si trattava di un fenomeno che spingeva le Scuole a cercare fondi e pertanto a diventare dipendenti da enti esterni, che potevano giungere a minacciare la loro libertà accademica. Inoltre, il rapporto delle Scuole d'Architettura con le istituzioni professionali stava degenerando in un rapporto di controllo e interferenza della professione nei *curricula* accademici, tale da minacciare la loro indipendenza.

Si convenne che le Scuole dovessero mantenere i loro stretti legami con le istituzioni professionali in modo da seguire certamente le tendenze della professione, però proteggendo e conservando al tempo stesso la propria natura e la propria indipendenza accademica.

Era una questione cruciale, a questo punto, trovare i modi atti a ridefinire le basi di tale relazione a livello europeo, nonché le iniziative che occorresse intraprendere allo scopo di assicurare le condizioni propizie a una felice riuscita dell'Area europea dell'educazione superiore.

La quarta sessione fu piuttosto energica, poiché la discussione sul rapporto fra mondo politico e mondo accademico si fece subito molto accesa. Furono tutti d'accordo sull'importanza e sull'utilità del controllo di qualità come strumento per arrivare a un'educazione di qualità e sull'importanza vitale dell'autovalutazione come strumento di miglioramento della didattica. Molte Scuole avevano peraltro già inaugurato un sistema di gestione della qualità fatto su misura per le loro necessità, vedendolo come un primo passo importante ai fini di un'ulteriore valutazione della qualità stessa. La valutazione esterna era tuttavia considerata ancora con un po' di sospetto e di paura.

Alcuni suggerirono che l'EAAE si trasformasse in uno strumento guida di tale controllo, ma divenne assai chiaro nel corso del dibattito che ogni Paese o Scuola dovesse trovare la propria strada per affrontare questioni del genere. L'Europa nel suo complesso non era stata infatti capace di stabilire un criterio unificato di accreditamento simile a quello degli USA: adottando un apparato del genere, avrebbe smarrito la propria forza e la propria diversità.

Conclusioni e proposte per azioni e strategie future

Ci fu un assenso generale sul fatto che i gruppi di lavoro dovessero continuare a operare allo scopo di chiarire meglio le varie questioni poste sul tappeto.

Partendo dalla constatazione del ruolo dell'EAAE come *forum* d'informazione sull'educazione architettonica in Europa, si sottolineò l'importanza di non distruggere o stemperare la diversità delle varie scuole, che doveva invece essere riconosciuta e apprezzata, perché era proprio la diversità a conferire forza ai loro modelli educativi. L'EAAE non poteva sicuramente imporre una certa identità alle varie scuole, ma definire quel terreno comune che avrebbe costituito la base per altre discussioni essenziali sull'educazione all'architettura.

Quanto alle prime valutazioni sull'avvio in molte scuole del programma 3+2 (Bachelor/Master) alcune questioni erano ancora rimaste senza risposta: si era sempre d'accordo sulla durata quinquennale dei percorsi scolastici, ma ancora lontani da una valutazione esauriente del sistema 3+2.

Il tema del settimo Convegno (4-7 settembre 2004) era: **La modellazione dei *curricula* architettonici per l'area europea dell'educazione superiore (*Shaping Architectural Curricula for the European Higher EducationArea*)**.

Il documento di presentazione specificava che il Convegno stesso si sarebbe concentrato sul *curriculum* e in particolare sulla sua struttura e sul suo programma formativo, dal momento che tali parametri contenevano le risposte al problema della qualità, dell'identità professionale e delle dinamiche della mobilità. La necessità di compatibilità, confrontabilità e concorrenzialità dell'educazione superiore in Europa suggerita dal nuovo contesto politico richiedeva infatti un'informazione affidabile e oggettiva circa le strutture educative e il contenuto degli studi, cioè sui programmi accademici.

Al fine di comprendere meglio i *curricula* delle varie Scuole e di creare le condizioni per poterli confrontare, il settimo Convegno si sarebbe concentrato sui risultati dell'apprendimento e sulle competenze professionali garantite dai *curricula*. Questi erano infatti gli elementi più rilevanti ai fini della progettazione, costruzione e valutazione dei titoli conferiti dalle Scuole di Architettura, dal momento che costituivano i criteri di riferimento da soddisfare. Era allora una questione di vitale importanza discutere e concordare, per quanto riguardava i risultati dell'apprendimento e delle competenze, un ordine gerarchico tale da mettere le Scuole in grado da organizzare i propri *curricula* nel miglior modo possibile.

Il Convegno fu articolato, come al solito, in quattro sessioni, caratterizzate ora da una serie d'interrogativi proposti alla discussione dei rappresentanti delle Scuole:

1. ***Risultati dell'apprendimento e competenze generiche per i nuovi curricula architettonici***

Quale doveva essere il profilo contemporaneo di un laureato in una scuola d'Architettura europea? Quali dovevano essere le sue competenze? Quali le qualificazioni, le competenze e le capacità che tale educazione avrebbe dovuto assicurare loro? Quali erano le più significative? Era possibile mettersi d'accordo su di una gerarchia di tali competenze? Com'era possibile costruire un *curriculum* europeo di ogni scuola senza guardare all'armonizzazione dei suoi programmi di laurea con qualsiasi genere di standard di *curriculum* unificato, prescrittivo o definitivo? Come poteva la discussione sulle competenze e i risultati dell'apprendimento diventare uno strumento adatto a proteggere la ricca eterogeneità dell'educazione architettonica in Europa senza restringere o danneggiare l'indipendenza dell'autorità accademica locale e nazionale?

Fu rimarcato, nel corso della discussione, che le Scuole avessero continuato a mantenere una notevole diversità sotto il profilo degli approcci pedagogici, dell'organizzazione amministrativa e delle dimensioni, tutti imputabili alla disparità culturale comportata dalle molte e diverse realtà nazionali. Certamente la Dichiarazione di Bologna era stata di notevole importanza agli effetti dell'educazione architettonica: lavorando nella direzione di uno scopo comune per l'educazione architettonica, intesa come un programma quinquennale di studi, essa aveva stabilito una pietra di paragone, ma aveva anche messo in chiaro che la forza delle Scuole europee risiedesse proprio nella loro diversità. Ogni Scuola doveva essere capace di stabilire il proprio programma individuale e di plasmare il proprio profilo, ma lo scopo principale doveva rimanere identico per tutte: migliorare la qualità della formazione architettonica e, ciò facendo, migliorare la qualità dell'architettura. Il *curriculum* non doveva essere qualcosa di statico e definitivo ma una direzione di marcia bene identificata, all'interno della quale le Scuole

avrebbero fissato la priorità di alcune aree culturali, conferendo loro uno spazio maggiore nell'ambito delle risorse disponibili.

2. *I risultati dell'apprendimento e le competenze relative alla ricerca in Architettura*

La ricerca era uno dei pilastri principali dell'area dell'istruzione superiore in Europa. Quali erano allora i risultati dello studio e le competenze (ivi compresi i titoli accademici), le capacità, le conoscenze e i contenuti del profilo del ricercatore accademico in Architettura? Che cos'era questo profilo accademico? Quali di tali competenze potevano essere riversate in un *curriculum* triennale? Quali approcci all'insegnamento e all'apprendimento erano adatti ad assicurare i risultati dello studio e le competenze desiderate? Come si potevano valutare i risultati di tali competenze?

Dal momento che veniva accordato un finanziamento sempre maggiore alle scuole che offrissero programmi e producessero lavori di ricerca, la ricerca in campo architettonico era un argomento al quale l'EAAE doveva garantire priorità e attenzione. La ricerca richiedeva spesso diversi tipi di competenze, di modo che le singole istituzioni non erano in grado di trattare da sole l'intero spettro delle esigenze che venivano loro sottoposte. In contrasto con l'insegnamento al livello *undergraduate*, la ricerca aveva allora bisogno di un altro tipo di contesto, caratterizzato dall'impegno solidale delle scuole di architettura e delle altre istituzioni pedagogiche, mentre il mondo professionale aveva bisogno di comprendere la necessità di un lavoro intellettuale a largo spettro. Tutto ciò avrebbe richiesto, nei convegni di Chania, un altro tipo di apertura mentale e una discussione ancora più ampia.

3/4 *I risultati dell'apprendimento e le competenze relative alla professione che "emergeva" dagli studi in Architettura*

Quali erano i risultati dell'apprendimento e le competenze utili a costruire i profili professionali relativi all'educazione architettonica? In che cosa consistevano quei profili? Come si potevano tradurre quelle competenze in contenuti e struttura del *curriculum*? Quali erano le strategie e gli obiettivi di tale traduzione? Quali le priorità e i valori dei risultati dell'apprendimento? Quali approcci all'insegnamento e all'apprendimento erano appropriati ad assicurare i risultati dell'apprendimento e le competenze? Quali metodi di valutazione potevano essere applicati per valutare i risultati di tali competenze? Quali unità didattiche e quali attività dovevano essere create per acquisire i risultati dell'apprendimento definiti?

Nei convegni di Chania, due tipi di argomenti erano sempre stati messi in relazione fra loro. Il primo era consistito nel domandarsi fino a qual punto la formazione architettonica dovesse esser collegata con le domande immediate della professione, l'altro s'era invece soffermato sul mondo accademico e sulla ricerca nel campo dell'architettura. Il rapporto fra accademia e professione era un argomento che alimentava una discussione tuttora in corso, tendente a polarizzarsi attorno alle stesse differenze d'opinione un anno dopo l'altro. Aveva pertanto destato grande soddisfazione fra i delegati delle varie Scuole ascoltare il rapporto fatto dal Presidente James Horan all'Assemblea generale dell'EAAE, nel corso del quale aveva annunciato di essersi messo in contatto con l'*Architects' Council of Europe* (ACE) allo scopo di aprire un dialogo che si sperava portasse nuove idee su ambedue gli aspetti della questione. C'era a tal proposito un consenso generale sul principio di stabilire un collegamento formale fra le due associazioni, nell'ambito del quale era sperabile che si instaurasse un dialogo che andasse oltre le varie opinioni personali.

Prime conclusioni

Un problema che sembrava affliggere molte Scuole era quello di avere un profilo accademico chiaro e, in un futuro che avrebbe richiesto una concorrenza ancora maggiore fra di loro, la necessità di ciascuna di manifestare la propria identità sarebbe stata cruciale. Un profilo curriculare non poteva peraltro consistere tanto di un'immagine o di un programma statici o definitivi, quanto di un indirizzo chiaramente identificabile che prevedesse l'attribuzione di una maggiore priorità a certe discipline e capacità intellettuali.

L'EAAE avrebbe sempre continuato a ricercare vari strumenti capaci sia d'informare sia di attivare i propri associati nel corso dell'anno. Era già confortante e promettente vedere che le reti tematiche appena istituite – la Tecnica delle costruzioni, il Restauro, la Progettazione architettonica e la Progettazione urbana – avevano iniziato a giuocare un ruolo importante come strumento di comunicazione e di lavoro fra le diverse Scuole.

Due temi erano sempre venuti a galla nel corso dei Convegni di Chania. Il primo era fino a che punto l'educazione architettonica potesse correlarsi con le domande immediate della professione, l'altro riguardava il mondo accademico e la ricerca architettonica. Il rapporto fra accademia e professione era oggetto di continua discussione, con la tendenza a polarizzarsi ogni anno attorno agli stessi punti di vista.

La ricerca nel campo dell'Architettura e il modo di definirla tenendo conto di quanto fosse stato considerato più o meno rilevante continuava a restare per molte Scuole un problema aperto. Dal momento che veniva elargito un crescente sostegno finanziario a quelle Scuole che offrissero programmi e producessero lavori di ricerca, si trattava di una questione alla quale l'AEEA doveva garantire la propria attenzione e la propria autorevolezza: accadeva infatti con una certa frequenza che un'istituzione non fosse in grado di affrontare da sola l'intero spettro della domanda. La ricerca richiedeva infatti, al livello *graduate*, un altro tipo di rapporto, vale a dire una forma di solidarietà fra Scuole e altre istituzioni, mentre il mondo professionale doveva comprendere la necessità d'impegnarsi in un lavoro a largo spettro: un tema che non aveva però suscitato una discussione vivace e aperta e che avrebbe richiesto un ulteriore dibattito, molto più approfondito.

Il tema dell'ottavo - e per ora ultimo – Convegno (3 – 6 settembre 2005) è stato **Le posizioni attuali per (in)formare le sfide future (*Present Positions for (in)forming future challenges*)**.

Si richiedeva a ogni Preside la posizione della propria Scuola in relazione alla cornice perennemente mutevole dell'educazione architettonica in Europa, rispondendo in particolare alle seguenti domande:

Qual era la posizione della sua scuola in rapporto al nuovo ambiente politico-sociale dominato dalla domanda di qualità, eccellenza, mobilità, innovazione e ricerca? Come poteva diventare migliore e più competitiva nella nuova Area Europea dell'Educazione Superiore? I risultati dell'apprendimento e le competenze dei laureati corrispondevano all'interpretazione attuale del profilo dell'architetto nel mercato europeo del lavoro? Che cosa facevano le altre scuole? Quali strategie adottavano? Quali priorità fissavano per il loro futuro? Quali iniziative intraprendevano al fine di assicurare una sana sopravvivenza in vista della crescente concorrenza, della progressiva globalizzazione, della crescente centralizzazione e dei minori finanziamenti per l'educazione superiore?

Per sette anni di fila i Presidi convenuti a Chania avevano generato un *milieu* di larga massima per la promozione delle Scuole di Architettura, fornendo un "osservatorio" valido e credibile che aveva valutato le tendenze e le dinamiche della formazione architettonica in Europa.

Essi avevano tentato, in tutti gli incontri precedenti, di registrare le convergenze e le divergenze esistenti fra le varie Scuole in relazione ai principi generali, ai valori e alle priorità da tenere presenti nell'educazione dell'architetto; di tracciare una mappa delle strategie adottate dalle scuole d'architettura per l'organizzazione degli studi, nella prospettiva di plasmare il profilo europeo contemporaneo dell'educazione architettonica; di esaminare la struttura dei *curricula* architettonici proposti in Europa e di circoscrivere le competenze e i risultati dell'apprendimento dei loro laureati; di osservare le differenze dei metodi di valutazione e di accertamento adottati dalle scuole; di indagare il profilo dell'architetto contemporaneo e di esaminare come il modello formativo offerto dalle Scuole fosse in grado di realizzarlo.

Questa grande accumulazione di dati e d'informazione aveva ora bisogno di una *sintesi creativa* che mettesse i Presidi in grado di scoprire quale fosse la posizione delle scuole in relazione alla nuova Area Europea dell'Educazione Superiore in Architettura. C'era bisogno di questa sintesi per vedere dove si collocassero le scuole, in che direzione si muovessero, che cosa dovessero fare e che cosa fosse necessario per il loro futuro nell'ambiente competitivo dell'educazione architettonica europea. Occorreva assolutamente giungere a conclusioni coerenti, che avrebbero aiutato significativamente la presa di decisioni da parte dei Presidi delle Scuole di Architettura.

Il Convegno avrebbe dunque tentato di formulare quella sintesi, concentrandosi su quattro sessioni assiali di dialogo e dibattito. In ogni sessione, docenti e personalità eminenti coinvolte nell'educazione architettonica sarebbero stati invitati a presentare le proprie idee in proposito, basandosi sull'interpretazione degli Atti dei convegni degli ultimi tre anni.

Le quattro sessioni erano le seguenti:

1. *Le sfide emergenti per i profili di un Architetto*

Questa prima sessione avrebbe dovuto tentare una sintesi di tutte le discussioni fatte in passato sul profilo contemporaneo dell'architetto, sulla sua diffusione nell'area europea, sulle nuove condizioni della pratica professionale e del mercato del lavoro, sul retroterra epistemologico, legale e istituzionale dal quale emergevano i profili proposti, nonché sulle forme di collaborazione che le scuole dovevano ridefinire con gli enti professionali ai livelli locali, nazionali e internazionali (come il Consiglio Europeo degli Architetti). Tale sintesi avrebbe dovuto rivelare le tendenze e le dinamiche relative agli sviluppi recenti della professione dell'architetto, nonché le particolarità che caratterizzavano ogni regione europea, aiutando a discutere le iniziative possibili nel futuro, allo scopo di proteggere e preservare quei principi e quei valori che il mondo accademico e professionale avrebbe attribuito al profili dell'architetto europeo.

2. *Le sfide emergenti sul contenuto degli studi in Architettura*

La seconda sessione avrebbe cercato di tracciare una mappa di tutti i vari aspetti del contenuto degli studi di architettura in Europa, così com'erano emersi dai dibattiti tenuti a Chania nei tre anni precedenti. Questa mappa avrebbe dovuto far emergere la gamma delle opinioni sulle principali caratteristiche auspicate per i nuovi *curricula*, sulle varie aree tematiche che avrebbero dovuto contribuire a riformarli, sulla gamma delle competenze che i laureati avrebbero dovuto possedere e sui sentieri pedagogici che avrebbero dovuto battere in modo de modellare i nuovi profili degli architetti. Una volta che fossero stati disponibili tanto un quadro chiaro di questi dati quanto un'informazione aggiornata sulla nuova cornice europea (ad esempio sulla nuova Direttiva sulle qualificazioni), sarebbe stato possibile cercare di collocare le nuove Scuole riformate su di una mappa europea, caratterizzata da un tipo d'organizzazione che potesse aiutarle a rintracciare *partner* più compatibili, allo scopo di stringere associazioni più

fruttuose, intraprendere scambi più fecondi e predisporre protezioni e garanzie più efficaci della loro identità.

3. Le sfide emergenti per il sistema degli studi in architettura

Il sistema degli studi avrebbe dovuto essere il tema centrale del dibattito nella terza sessione.
Nel corso del 2004 s'erano fatti emergere molti aspetti dei vantaggi e degli svantaggi indotti dai diversi sistemi adottati negli studi di architettura in Europa. Erano stati presentati argomenti politici, epistemologici, filosofici e scientifici che rivelavano una polifonia d'idee, concetti e riferimenti.
S'imponeva però la necessità, di fronte alla richiesta imperativa di andare avanti, di un quadro più chiaro dei vari approcci e del loro retroterra culturale. Occorreva comprendere meglio gli altri interlocutori, allo scopo di comprendere meglio se stessi, le proprie preferenze e le proprie strategie educative, che avrebbero strutturato i contenuti degli studi architettonici e assicurato i profili attesi dell'Architetto europeo.

4. Le sfide emergenti per la ricerca e l'innovazione in architettura

Ricerca e innovazione erano due parole chiave all'interno del dibattito contemporaneo sull'educazione architettonica. S'era già cercato di registrare gli impegni di ricerca delle varie Scuole e si stava ora cercando di tracciare una mappa dell'innovazione in tutta l'Europa. Era ora di anticipare una strategia di ricerca più coerente per le scuole europee, ma il potenziamento del loro registro di ricerche poteva essere ottenuto soltanto dopo l'adozione di una strategia coerente, fondata su di un insieme di competenze finalizzate a disegnare il profilo del ricercatore contemporaneo in architettura. Come si potevamo allora assicurare tali competenze? Mediante quali strutture del sistema e del contenuto degli studi? Come poteva la collaborazione reciproca migliorare le attività di ricerca? Quale genere d'iniziative doveva intraprendere la Rete dei Presidi allo scopo di promuovere l'attività di ricerca in Europa?

La sessione conclusiva, prevista dopo l'Assemblea generale e intitolata ***Le sfide emergenti per le azioni collettive dell'educazione architettonica***, avrebbe dovuto tentare di sintetizzare le discussioni intraprese e i suggerimenti avanzati nei giorni precedenti, con l'ambizione di trarne conclusioni utili e costrittive in modo da generare un contesto di accordi sui vari temi e di adottare le decisioni collettive utili per procedere.
Una prima conclusione importante era stata che, più che l'organizzazione didattica o la flessibilità dei *curricula*, la vera chiave della differenziazione delle scuole risiedesse nella robustezza delle loro basi culturali. Era stata inoltre sottolineata la necessità di un approccio mobile e flessibile nei confronti della rimodellazione dei *curricula*, andando nella direzione di una cauta omogeneizzazione dei medesimi. Ciò poteva verificarsi adattando oculatamente, caso per caso, il modello 3+2, anche se, secondo la maggior parte dei Presidi europei, occorreva accettare l'inevitabile diversità fra i vari modelli formativi delle scuole. Essa non avrebbe però dovuto acquistare caratteristiche tanto radicali da frenare la mobilità degli studenti fra le varie scuole. Una ragionevole compromesso fra individualità e mobilità avrebbe potuto allora consistere nella costruzione di modelli formativi differenziati delle lauree magistrali, conservando un triennio costruito per garantire una formazione sostanzialmente equivalente all'interno dei diversi paesi. La mobilità tanto dei docenti quanto degli studenti doveva infatti essere intesa come una forma di arricchimento della formazione architettonica e come una risorsa preziosa per far fronte ai mutamenti della professione di architetto imposti dalla continua evoluzione della società europea.

Appendice

Documenti sull'educazione architettonica e sull'Area europea dell'Educazione Superiore

Pubblicati nell'Appendice del volume
Towards a Common European Higher Architectural Education Area
EAAE – ENHSA, 2002, resi cortesemente disponibili da
Constantin Spiridonidis

Dichiarazione di Chania dell'EAAE sulla
Educazione architettonica nell'Area europea dell'educazione superiore
*
Direttiva 85/384/EEC del Consiglio d'Europa del 10 giugno 1985
sul mutuo riconoscimento dei diplomi, certificati e altri titoli formali
nel settore dell'Architettura
*
Carta dell'UIA e dell'UNESCO sull'educazione architettonica, aprile 1996
*
Accordo dell'UIA sugli standard professionali nella pratica dell'architettura
Principi del professionismo, Pechino 1999
*
Magna Charta Universitatum
Bologna, 18 settembre 1988
*
Dichiarazione congiunta sull'armonizzazione dell'architettura
del sistema europeo dell'educazione superiore
Sorbona, Parigi, 25 maggio 1998
*
L'Area europea dell'educazione superiore
Dichiarazione congiunta dei Ministri dell'Istruzione europei
Bologna, 19 giugno 1999
*
Temi della conferenza di Salamanca sul sistema di Bologna
e Messaggio dalla Convenzione di Salamanca

Dichiarazione degli Studenti
Göteborg, 25 marzo 2001
*
Verso un'Area europea dell'educazione superiore
Comunicato dell'incontro dei Ministri dell'Istruzione europei
Praga, 19 maggio 2001

EAAE Chania Statement 2001
Regarding the Architectural Education
in the European Higher Education Area

The Heads of Schools of Architecture in Europe assembled in the 4th meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture in Hania, Crete from 1 until 4 September 2001, discussed in depth the future of architectural education within the European Higher Education Area and its implications for architectural education. Most of the ideas expressed in the EHEA have since 25 years been the 'raison d'être' of EAAE and the focus of its collective efforts, its conferences, workshops, projects and publications. Today EAAE is representing more than 155 schools of architecture. Having reviewed the EU initiatives so far concerning the profession and education of anarchitect, namely:
1. The Architects' Directive 85/384/CEE (1985) and the advices produced by its advisory
committee
2. The UIA/UNESCO Charter for architectural education (1996)
3. The UIA Accord and Recommendations (1999)
Being informed about the recent state of the art of the Bologna implementation process.
Being fully aware that architectural education can lead to a wide variety of professional and academic careers,
Within the framework of:
The Magna Charta Universitatum, 1988
The Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education, Bologna 1999
The Salamanca Convention of European Higher Education Institutions, 2001
The Student Goteborg declaration, 2001
The Meeting of European Ministers in Charge of Higher Education, Prague 2001

Committed to the exchange of ideas and methods in teaching and research as well asof students and staff among the schools in the prospect of a European Higher Education Area based on diversity and mutual understanding, the Heads of Schools state the following:
1. The studies leading to the diploma of architecture which gives access to the profession of an architect, should be minimum 5 years or 300 ECTS credit points leading to graduate level ('masters'), in order
to meet the achievements listed in the above mentioned documents 1, 2, 3.
2. Following a comparable but flexible qualification framework each school may decide to structure their curriculum as a 5-years integrated (i.e. unbroken) programme or subdivided in two cycles (3+2 years or 180 ECTS + 120 ECTS credit points), in which case the first cycle can not give access to the profession of an architect.
3. EAAE will actively collaborate in developing the ECTS-credit system in their schools and considers this system as the keystone towards mobility of students, modularity, flexibility in the curricula, necessary for the cultural, regional and pedagogical diversity they think to be invaluable for the education in architecture in Europe.
4. EAAE is willing to play a role in the development of a quality assurance and assessment system tailored to the needs of architectural education and respecting its diversity. With respect to this a clear di-

stinction should be made between the 'professional/governmental' assessment of the diploma leading to the accreditation and the validation by the professional/governmental bodies of the member states and the 'academic' assessment of the educational programmes by means of a peer review.

The EAAE will install a representative committee at European level and will present its result and proposals regarding the evaluation of the two cycles before the end of the year 2002. The Heads of School underline their commitment to further elaborate and contribute to the development of the European Higher Education Area.

Hania, 4 September 2001
The Heads of Schools of Architecture in Europe

EUROPEAN COUNCIL DIRECTIVE of 10 June 1985

on the mutual recognition of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications in architecture, including measures to facilitate the effective exercise of the right of establishment and freedom to provide services. (85/384/EEC) Chapters I and II

CHAPTER I

SCOPE

Article 1
1. This Directive shall apply to activities in the field of architecture.
2. the purposes of this Directive, activities in the field of architecture shall be those activities usually pursued under the professional title of architect.

CHAPTER II

DIPLOMAS, CERTIFICATES AND OTHER EVIDENCE OF FORMAL QUALIFICATIONS ENABLING THE HOLDER TO TAKE UP ACTIVITIES IN THE FIELD OF ARCHITECTURE UNDER THE PROFESSIONAL TITLE OF ARCHITECT

Article 2
Each Member State shall recognize the diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications acquired as a result of education and training fulfilling the requirements of Articles 3 and 4 and awarded to nationals of Member States by other Member States, by giving such diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications, as regards the right to take up activities referred to in Article 1 and pursue them under the professional title of architect pursuant to Article 23 (1), the same effect in its territory as those awarded by the Member State itself.

Article 3
Education and training leading to diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications referred to in Article 2 shall be provided through courses of studies at university level concerned principally with architecture. Such studies shall be balanced between the theoretical and practical aspects of architectural training and shall ensure the acquisition of:
1. an ability to create architectural designs that satisfy both aesthetic and technicalrequirements,
2. an adequate knowledge of the history and theories of architecture and the related arts, technologies and human sciences,
3. a knowledge of the fine arts as an influence on the quality of architectural design,
4. an adequate knowledge of urban design, planning and the skills involved in the planning process,
5. an understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and between buildings and their environment, and of the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale,
6. an understanding of the profession of architecture and the role of the architect in society, in particular in preparing briefs that take account of social factors,
7. an understanding of the methods of investigation and preparation of the brief for a design project,
8. an understanding of the structural design, constructional and engineering problems associated with building design,
9. an adequate knowledge of physical problems and technologies and of the function of buildings so as to provide them with internal conditions of comfort and protection against the climate,
10. the necessary design skills to meet building users' requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations,
11. an adequate knowledge of the industries, organizations, regulations and procedures involved in translating design concepts into buildings and integrating plans into overall planning.

Article 4

1. The education and training referred to in Article 2 must satisfy the requirements defined in Article 3 and also the following conditions:

(a) the total length of education and training shall consist of a minimum of either four years of full-time studies at a university or comparable educational establishment, or at least six years of study at a university or comparable educational establishment of which at least three must be full time;

(b) such education and training shall be concluded by successful completion of an examination of degree standard.

Notwithstanding the first subparagraph, recognition under Article 2 shall also be accorded to the training given over three years in the 'Fachhochschulen' in the Federal Republic of Germany in the form in which it exists at the time of notification of this Directive and in so far as it satisfies the requirements laid down in Article 3, giving access to the activities referred to in Article 1 in that Member State with the professional title of architect, provided that such training is supplemented by a four-year period of professional experience in the Federal Republic of Germany sanctioned by a certificate issued by the professional body on whose list the architect wishing to benefit from the provisions of this Directive is registered. The body shall previously have established that the work carried out by the architect concerned in the field of architecture constitutes conclusive proof of the practical application of all the knowledge referred to in Article 3. The certificate shall be issued according to the same procedure as that which applies to registration on the list of architects. On the basis of the experience gained and bearing in mind developments in architectural training, the Commission shall, eight years after the end of the period specified in the first subparagraph of Article 31 (1), submit a report to the Council on the application of this derogation and the appropriate proposals on which the Council shall decide in accordance with the procedures laid down by the Treaty within a period of six months.

2. Recognition under Article 2 shall also be accorded to education and training which, as part of a social betterment scheme or a part-time university course, conforms to the requirements of Article 3 and leads to an examination in architecture successfully completed by persons who have been employed in architecture for not less than seven years under the supervision of an architect or firm of architects. This examination must be of degree standard and be equivalent to the final examination referred to in paragraph 1 (b).

Article 5

1. Nationals of a Member State authorized to hold the professional title of architect pursuant to a law giving the competent authority of a Member State the possibility of conferring this title on nationals of Member States who have particularly distinguished themselves by their achievements in the field of architecture shall be considered as meeting the requirements laid down for the pursuit of architectural activities under the professional title of architect. In the case of those persons referred to in paragraph 1, a certificate issued by the Member State of which the holder is a national, or from which he comes, shall constitute proof of the status of architect.

Article 6

Certificates issued by the competent authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany attesting the equivalence of qualifications awarded after 8 May 1945 by the competent authorities of the German Democratic Republic with the formal qualifications referred to in Article 2 shall be recognized under the conditions laid down in that Article.

Article 7

1. Each Member State shall communicate as soon as possible, simultaneously to the other Member States and to the Commission, the list of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications which are awarded within its territory and which meet the criteria laid down in Articles 3 and 4, together with the establishments and authorities awarding them. The first list shall be sent within 12 months of notification of this Directive. Each Member State shall likewise communicate any amendments made as regards the diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications which are awarded within its territory, in particular those which no longer meet the requirements of Articles 3 and 4. For information purposes, the lists and the updating thereof shall be published by the Commission in the Official Journal of the European Communities after expiry of a three-month period following their communication. However, in the cases referred to in Article 8, the publication of a diploma, certificate or other evidence of formal qualifications shall be deferred. Consolidated lists shall be published periodically by the Commission.

Article 8

If a Member State or the Commission has doubts as to whether a diploma, certificate or other evidence of formal qualifications meets the criteria laid down in Articles 3 and 4, the Commission shall bring the matter before the Advisory Committee on Education and Training in the Field of Architecture within three months of communication pursuant to Article 7 (1). The Committee shall deliver its opinion within three months. The diploma, certificate or other evidence of formal qualifications shall be published within the three months following delivery of the opinion or expiry of the deadline for delivery thereof except in the following two cases:

- where the awarding Member State amends the communication made pursuant to Article 7 (1) or
- where a Member State or the Commission implements Articles 169 or 170 of the Treaty

with a view to bringing the matter before the Court of Justice of the European Communities.

Article 9

1. The Advisory Committee may be consulted by a Member State or the Commission whenever a Member State or the Commission has doubts as to whether a diploma, certificate or other evidence of formal qualifications included on one of the lists published in the Official Journal of the European Communities still meets the requirements of Articles 3 and 4. The Committee shall deliver its opinion within three months.

The Commission shall withdraw a diploma from one of the lists published in the Official Journal of the European Communities either in agreement with the Member State concerned or following a ruling by the Court of Justice.

http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/archive/index./TXTG - 31985L0384 - bas-cen.htm

U.I.A. WORK PROGRAMME "Education"
UIA / UNESCO CHARTER FOR ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION
April 1996

We, the architects, concerned by the future development of architecture in a fast changing world, believe that everything, influencing the way in which the built environment is made, used, furnished, landscaped and maintained, belongs to the domain of the architects.

We, being responsible for the improvement of the education of future architects to enablethem to work for a sustainable development in every cultural heritage, declare:

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

That the new era will bring with it grave and complex challenges with respect to social and functional degradation of many human settlements, characterized by a shortage of housing and urban services for millions of inhabitants and by the increasing exclusion of the designer from projects with a social content. This makes it essential for projects and research conducted in academic institutions to formulate new solutions for the present and the future:

1. That architecture, the quality of buildings, the way they relate to their surroundings, the respect for the natural and built environment as well as the collective and individual cultural heritage are matters of public concern.

2. That there is, consequently, public interest to ensure that architects are able to understand and to give practical expression to the needs of individuals, social groups and communities, regarding spatial planning, design organisation, construction of buildings as well as conservation and enhancement of the built heritage, the protection of the natural balance and rational utilisation of available resources.

3. That methods of education and training for architects are very varied; this constitutes a cultural richness which should be preserved.

4. That, nevertheless it is prudent to provide a common ground for future action, not only in the pedagogical methods used, but also with the aim of achieving an appropriate elevated level, by establishing criteria which permit countries, schools and professional organizations to evaluate and improve the education given to the future architects.

5. That the increasing mobility of architects between the different countries calls for a mutual recognition or validation of individual diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualification.

6. That the mutual recognition of diplomas, certificates or other evidence of formal qualification to practise in the field of architecture has to be founded in objective criteria, guaranteeing that holders of such qualifications have received and maintain the kind of training called for in this charter.

7. That the vision of the future world, cultivated in architectural schools, should include the following goals:

- a decent quality of life for all the inhabitants of human settlements
- a technological application which respects the people' social, cultural and aesthetic needs of people
- an ecologically balanced and sustainable development of the built environment
- an architecture which is valued as the property and responsibility of everyone.

II. EDUCATION AND OBJECTIVES

Since architecture is created in a field of tension between reason, emotion and intuition, architectural education should be regarded as the manifestation of the ability to conceptualize, coordinate and execute the idea of building rooted in human tradition.

1. Architecture is an interdisciplinary field that comprises several major components: humanities, social and physical sciences, technology and the creative arts. Architectural education is available at Universities, Polytechnics et Academies. The education leading to formal qualifications and permitting professionals to practise in the field of architecture has to be guaranteed to be at university level with architecture as the main subject.

2. The basic goal is to develop the architect as a generalist able to resolve potential contradictions between different requirements, giving form to the society's and the individual's environmental needs.

3. Architectural education involves the acquisition of the following:

- an ability to create architectural designs that satisfy both aesthetic and technical requirements,

- an adequate knowledge of the history and theories of architecture and the related arts, technologies and human sciences,
- a knowledge of the fine arts as an influence on the quality of architectural design,
- an adequate knowledge of urban design, planning and the skills involved in the planning process,
- an understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and between buildings and their environment, and of the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale,
- an understanding of the profession of architecture and the role of the architect in society, in particular in preparing briefs that take account of social factors,
- an understanding of the methods of investigation and preparation of the brief for a design project,
- an understanding of the structural design, constructional and engineering problems associated with building design,
- an adequate knowledge of physical problems and technologies and of the function of buildings so as to provide them with internal conditions of comfort and protection against the climate,
- the necessary design skills to meet building users' requirements within the

constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations,
- an adequate knowledge of the industries, organisations, regulations and procedures involved in translating design concepts into buildings and integrating plans into overall planning.

4. Architectural students should be made critically aware of the political and financial motivations behind clients' briefs and building regulations in order to foster an ethical framework for decision making within the built environment. Young architects should be encouraged to assume responsibilities as professionals within society.

5. Educational programs should promote architectural design which considers the cost of future maintenance, also taking into account that, unlike traditional construction methods with low maintenance materials, some contemporary, experimental and unproved industrial systems and materials require constant and expensive maintenance.

6. The balanced acquisition of knowledge and skills cited in point 3. requires a long period of maturation ; the period of studies in architecture should always be not less than five years of full-time studies in a university or an equivalent institution, plus two years experience in an architectural practice. At least one year must be devoted to professional practice following the conclusion of academic studies.

The training should be formalised by an examination at the end of the programme of studies, the principal part being an individual presentation and defence of an architectural project demonstrating the acquired knowledge and concomitant skills. For this purpose, juries should include practising architects and teachers from otherschools, and if possible, from other countries.

7. In order to benefit from the wide variety of teaching methods, exchange programmes for teachers, and students at advanced level, will be desirable. Ideally final projects should be shared among schools as a means of facilitating comparison between results and self-evaluation of teaching establishments, through a system of international awards and exhibitions.

8. Issues related to the architecture and the environment should be introduced as part of a general education at schools, because an early awareness of architecture is important to both future architects and users of buildings.

9. Systems for continuing education must be set up for architects; architectural education should never be considered as a closed process.

III. CRITERIA FOR ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION

In order to achieve the above mentioned goals, the following aspects should be taken into account:

1. Educational establishments are advised to create systems for self-evaluation and peer-review conducted at regular intervals, including in the review panel, teachers from other schools and practising architects.

2. Each teaching institution must adjust the number of students according to its teaching capacity. Criteria for the selection of students shall be in relation to the aptitudes required for a successful training in architecture and will be applied by means of an appropriate selection process, organised by the schools at the point of entry in theprogramme.

3. Modern personalised computer technology and the development of specialised software make it imperative to teach the use of computers in all aspects of architectural education. Adequate laboratories, facilities for research, advanced studies, information and data exchanges for new technologies should be provided at schools ofarchitecture.

4. The creation of a network, on a world-wide basis, for the exchange of information, teachers and senior students, is necessary in order to promote a common understanding and to raise the level of architectural education.

5. Continuous interaction between practice and teaching of architecture must be encouraged and protected.

6. Research should be regarded as an inherent activity of architectural teachers. This architectural research must be founded on project work, construction methods, as well as academic disciplines. Specific review panels are to be created to evaluate architectural research and architects must be included in the general evaluation research commissions.

6. Design project work must be a synthesis of acquired knowledge and concomitant skills. The architectural curriculum should include the subjects referred to under the educational objectives (Section II.3.) of this charter. Individual project work with direct teacher / student dialogue must form a substantial part of the learning period and occupy half of the curriculum.

CONCLUSION

This Charter was created on the initiative of the UIA and UNESCO, with the ability of being applied by any architectural school on the international and national levels. We hope that this Charter could be used for the creation of a global network of architectural education within which individual achievements can be shared by all.

We hope that this Charter, in its appeal to the whole world, can help in the understanding that architectural education constitutes both the socio-cultural and professional challenge of the contemporary world, and needs the guarantee of protection, development and urgent action.

http://www.uia-architectes.org/texte/summary/p2b1.html

UIA Accord on Recommended International Standards of Professionalism inArchitectural Practice

Principles of Professionalism
Beijing, June 1999

Members of the architectural profession are dedicated to standards of professionalism, integrity, and competence, and thereby bring to society unique skills and aptitudes essential to the sustainable development of the built environment and the welfare of their societies and cultures. Principles of professionalism are established in legislation, as
well as in codes of ethics and regulations defining professional conduct:

Expertise : Architects possess a systematic body of knowledge, skills, and theory developed through education, graduate and post-graduate training, and experience. The process of architectural education, training, and examination is structured to assure the public that when an architect is engaged to perform professional services, that architect has met acceptable standards enabling proper performance of those services. Furthermore, members of most professional societies of architects and indeed, the UIA, are charged to maintain and advance their knowledge of the art and science of architecture, to respect the body of architectural accomplishment, and to contribute to its growth.

Autonomy : Architects provide objective expert advice to the client and/or the users. Architects are charged to uphold the ideal that learned and uncompromised professional judgment should take precedence over any other motive in the pursuit of the art and science of architecture.

Architects are also charged to embrace the spirit and letter of the laws governing their professional affairs and to thoughtfully consider the social and environmental impact of their professional activities.

Commitment : Architects bring a high level of selfless dedication to the work done on behalf of their clients and society. Members of the profession are charged to serve their clients in a competent and professional manner and to exercise unprejudiced and unbiased judgment on their behalf.

Accountability : Architects are aware of their responsibility for the independent and, if necessary, critical advice provided to their clients and for the effects of their work on society and the environment. Architects undertake to perform professional services onlywhen they, together with those whom they may engage as consultants, are qualified by education, training, and/or experience in the specific technical areas involved.

The UIA, through the programs of its national sections and the Professional Practice Commission, seeks to establish principles of professionalism and professional standards in the interest of public health, safety, welfare, and culture, and supports the position that interrecognition of standards of professionalism and competence is in the public interest as well as in the interest of maintaining the credibility of the profession.

The principles and standards of the UIA are aimed at the thorough education and practical training of architects so that they are able to fulfil their fundamental professional requirements. These standards recognize different national educational traditions and,therefore, allow for factors of equivalency.

http://www.uia-architectes.org/texte/summary/p2b1.html

The Magna Charta of University
Signed in Bologna, 18 September 1988

Preamble

The undersigned Rectors of European Universities, gathered in Bologna for the ninth centenary of the oldest University in Europe, four years before the definitive abolition of boundaries between the countries of the European Community; looking forward to farreaching co-operation between all European nations and believing that peoples and
States should become more than ever aware of the part that universities will be called upon to play in a changing and increasingly international society,
Consider -
1. that at the approaching end of this millennium the future of mankind depends largely on cultural, scientific and technical development; and that this is built up in centres of culture, knowledge and research as represented by true universities;
2. that the universities' task of spreading knowledge among the younger generations implies that ,in today's world, they must also serve society as a whole; and that the cultural, social and economic future of society requires, in particular, a considerable investment in continuing education;
3. that universities must give future generations education and training that will teach them, and through them others, to respect the great harmonies of their natural environment and of life itself.
The undersigned Rectors of European universities proclaim to all States and to the conscience of all nations the fundamental principles which must, now and always, support the vocation of universities.

Fundamental principles

1. The university is an autonomous institution at the heart of societies differently organized because of geography and historical heritage; it produces, examines, appraises and hands down culture by research and teaching. To meet the needs of the world around it, its research and teaching must be morally and intellectually independent of all
political authority and economic power.
2. Teaching and research in universities must be inseparable if their tuition is not to lag behind changing needs, the demands of society, and advances in scientific knowledge.
3. Freedom in research and training is the fundamental principle of university life, and governments and universities, each as far as in them lies, must ensure respect for this fundamental requirement.
Rejecting intolerance and always open to dialogue, a university is an ideal meetingground for teachers capable of imparting their knowledge and well equipped to develop it by research and innovation and students entitled, able and willing to enrich their minds with that knowledge
4.   A university is the trustee of the European humanist tradition; its constant care is to attain universal! knowledge to fulfil its vocation it transcends geographical and political frontiers, and affirms the vital need for different cultures to know and influence each other.

The means

To attain these goals by following such principles calls for effective means, suitable to
present conditions.
1. To preserve freedom in research and teaching, the instruments appropriate to realize that freedom must be made available to all members of the university community.
2. Recruitment of teachers, and regulation of their status, must obey the principle that research is inseparable from teaching.
3. Each university must - with due allowance for particular circumstances - ensure that its students' freedoms are safeguarded, and that they enjoy conditions in which they can acquire the culture and training which it is their purpose to possess.
4. Universities - particularly in Europe - regard the mutual exchange of information and documentation, and frequent joint projects for the advancement of learning, as essential to the steady progress of knowledge.

Therefore, as in the earliest years of their history, they encourage mobility among teachers and students; furthermore, they consider a general policy of equivalent status, titles, examinations (without prejudice to national diplomas) and award of scholarships essential to the fulfilment of their mission in the conditions prevailing today.

The undersigned Rectors, on behalf of their Universities, undertake to do everything in their power to encourage each State, as well as the supranational organizations concerned, to mould their policy sedulously on this Magna Carta, which expresses the universities' unanimous desire freely determined and declared.

http://www2.unibo.it/avl/charta/charta.htm

Sorbonne Declaration
Joint Declaration on Harmonisation of the Architecture of the European Higher Education System

Paris, Sorbonne, 25 May 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 millennium ago. Our four countries boast some of the oldest, which 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 barreers 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.

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 autonomouswork.

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 strenghthen 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.

Claude Allègre, Luigi Berlinguer, Tessa Blackstone, Jürgen Ruettgers
Claude Allègre
Minister of National Education, Research and Technology
(France)
Luigi Berlinguer
Minister of Public Education, Universities and Research
(Italy)
Tessa Blackstone
Minister of Higher Education
(United Kingdom)
Jürgen Ruettgers
Minister of Education, Science, Research and Technology
(Germany)
"The countries signing this Declaration undertake to encourage changes in the architecture of their higher education systems to facilitate mutual recognition of qualifications, while continuing to uphold the benefits of their specific national features,…" (extract from the Sorbonne Declaration of the 24-25 May 1998.
The main objectives of the Declaration are :
- to facilitate student mobility within Europe and their integration in the European labour
market,
- to introduce greater flexibility in higher education systems, especially by encouraging
cooperation between institutions,
- to facilitate continuing education and the recognition of study periods in Europe,
- to improve the readability of higher education qualifications in Europe
-
http://www.sup.adc.education.fr/europedu/gb/vert/declaration.html
http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de

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 technologicaldimensions.

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

The 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 world-wide 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 nonhigher 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 competences 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
(Dermnark)
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)
280
Appendix
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 KOKEK
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)

Themes of the Salamanca Conference on the Bologna Process
29-30 March 2001

Documents and Notes for discussion groups

The present material concerns the preperation for the Salamanca Conference and constitutes an interesting framework of questions and issues on the anticipation of the under-construction European Higher Education Area. This material originally appeared on the conference site www.salamanca2001.org which is at present inactive.

Theme 1 : Freedom with responsibility: Empowering the universities
Pointers for the discussion

- If they want to take the future into their own hands, higher education institutions need to anticipate change that would otherwise be forced upon them. An opportunity like the Salamanca Convention arises seldom.
- Universities need and want autonomy. In many countries in Europe, over-regulation inhibits progress and innovation and constitutes a serious handicap in the European and worldwide environment. Universities request the power to plan their own futures, striking the right balance between autonomy and responsibility and between diversity and organisation.
- Institutions are prepared to take fresh initiatives now, in all areas where they have the power to do so. A lot can be achieved, in particular in the area of curriculum design and renovation and for the recognition of studies abroad.
- Significant progress towards the European Higher Education Area can be achieved in Europe through subject-based cooperation and networks.
- More effective self-organisation at the European level is an imperative both in the university and in the college/polytechnic sector.

Autonomy and accountability

Autonomy and freedom are values endorsed by the Magna Charta Universitatum. An Observatory to oversee the implementation of the principles of the Magna Charta has been established by the CRE-Association of European Universities and the University of Bologna. Higher education institutions are thus taking responsibility for the preservation of their core values - as well as their adaptation to changing times. When the pace of change accelerates, institutions need even more the autonomy to steer their course of action.
Accountability is the counterpoint to autonomy and institutions have to prove that they provide a wide range of services in addition to their core mission of education and research. The responsibility of higher education in Europe, as a public service, has traditionally been heavy and it has become more complex: for example, to reflect critically upon the development of society, in an increasingly global context, or to create a sense of European citizenship. These, and ethical issues, for instance, demand a leadership role from higher education institutions. As preparation for the Bologna conference, a report on Trends in Learning Structures identified a trend across the continent in giving institutions more autonomy in relation to curricula. But, when universities are responsible for the degrees that they award, higher education institutions present in Bologna recognised that this right "equalled a responsibility requiring acceptance of an πexternal quality assurance system." Quality assessment, with a focus on responsibility towards the learner, is now generally accepted as an essential part of accountability.
In the face of demands to assume increasing responsibilities, higher education must keep its distinctive characteristics, and different types of institutions should cover the breadth of responsibilities. Sometimes, it is other parts of the education chain that share, or should assume entirely, the responsibility for an issue. Institutions need regular dialogue with state authorities to maintain the balance between their freedom and autonomy and their responsibility and accountability to society.
Reflecting on how hard it is to reconcile aspirations for higher education policy and institutions on different levels, a Finnish ministry representative has remarked that: "the only way we can cope with the situation is to strengthen institutional autonomy. This would allow the institutions to genuinely work on their individual profiles; they need to

define the role they want to play in the national and international higher education communities. Such profile building is credible and sustainable only if the institutions can do it themselves without interference from the government." Higher education institutions must be free to make strategic choices, to concentrate on their core areas, to develop individual identities, to choose their partners, and to position themselves to compete to deliver quality education, research and services.

Dialogue with partners

Being more autonomous should help universities be more confident in their interaction with partners. For example, they may envisage installing a regular dialogue with the government or local business community, with a rolling agenda of issues, including an
annual review, rather than occasional discussion with sporadic meetings, sometimes linked to crises. Institutions may then explain their plans for their future and their constraints.
There is a challenge for institutions to operate effective networks at different levels. The "vast majority of higher education institutions cater forπlocal needs. Growing contacts to their national and international partners andπacademic exchange will not basically affect their local mission, butπdevelop their European and/or international dimensions".
Some institutions see themselves as regional or cross-border and develop an extensive network for their services. Others build global networks in their fields of academic strength, sometimes involving industry and trying to establish educational benchmarks from which they may establish a brand name. At its most sophisticated, such a network can develop joint products, combine marketing efforts and provide entirely new services. But, the present competencies of most higher education networks are more limited.

Freedom to compete

The most significant consequence of increased institutional autonomy should be improved teaching, research and related services. The freedom to compete implies the right for institutions to design their curricula, determine their research priorities and implement their action plans for innovation. In order to guarantee the quality of their activities, institutions are responsible for designing strategies. These strategies differ according to individual missions but, to be implemented successfully, they generally require autonomy in financial, personnel and operational matters.
Signs of such autonomy are, for example:
- the transfer of property and infrastructure from the state to the institution
- transparent lump sum funding from government, allowing the university to implement its strategic choices.
- institutions being able to generate, spend to generate and retain income, without prejudicing their state grant
- the freedom to charge tuition fees and set their level
- institutions deciding the employment terms and salaries of staff.
Other areas where the issue of autonomy is at stake include:
- the regulation of student places (number and selection of students)
- external representation on the institution's governing body.
True autonomy and accountability make more demands on institutions and on their leadership. If institutions do not demonstrate their capacity and willingness to plan their futures, explain the constraints on their action, engage dialogue and find help for solutions to those constraints, they are not using the power of autonomy, nor showing responsibility.

Future scenario

The European Higher Education Area will be composed of multiple networks for different purposes. Institutional and subject-based networks and associations will be used to achieve research excellence, to exchange ideas and experience connected with using information and communication technologies (ICT) in education, etc.. Different networking patterns are already emerging The networks will increasingly contain partners from outside higher education, e.g., a network on using ICT innovatively will integrate the multimedia business sector, ICT companies, publishers, ministries and associations.

Points for reflection

Autonomy and accountability
- Should all types of higher education institutions bear the same sorts of responsibilities?
- Can institutions demand total autonomy and unlimited state funding?

• Are higher education institutions using the Bologna process to examine their curricula in the light of today's requirements (the demand for more choice within higher education - updated content, alternative learning paths, new methods of teaching and learning, a European dimension, etc.) ?

• How could institutional autonomy be preserved if there were a common European framework for the recognition of qualifications and for quality assurance?

Freedom to compete

• Should decentralisation of power allow institutions to select their students, fix study fees, recruit professors, or diversify salaries? For which categories of students should institutions have the right to request fees?

Would a "non-profit legal entity status" at European level give higher education institutions more freedom in financial, personnel and operational matters?

Theme 2: Employability on the European labour market

Pointers for the discussion

• Students will increasingly demand and enrol for qualifications that can effectively be used throughout the continent. Higher education institutions accept that it is their responsibility to award such qualifications and want to be in a position to do so.

• Higher education systems and institutions that respond to the demand for relevant curricula, flexible learning paths and innovative delivery will attract more students, also from other parts of the world.

• All degrees do not have to be "relevant to the European labour market" (Bologna Declaration) to the same extent and in the same way. In particular, first degrees earned at different institutions may differ in their purpose, orientation and profile. They may, nonetheless, all fit into a transparent and cohesive system of understandable and compatible qualifications.

• Higher education institutions acknowledge the need to build bridges between different types of institutions and with other parts of the education system, so as to improve recognition of learning acquired in different contexts, including non-traditional education.

The type of expectations of higher education and the response In the knowledge economy, wealth depends on the development and application of new knowledge - by workers, among others. Research is creating new jobs more than before, while lifelong learning is perceived as a necessity for all. Expectations of higher education have risen in the areas of knowledge transfer, of producing graduates for work - including for self-employment - and of retraining workers. It is the responsibility of higher education institutions and of governments to meet these expectations.

Previously, the responsibility of universities for their graduates ended at graduation. The growing number of unemployed graduates in the 1970s and 1980s intensified discussion of their "employability". Governments required universities to take responsibility for their students not just by educating them, but also by giving them "transferable" skills to make them more employable. New higher education institutions were created next to universities, which had more of an orientation towards the labour market. Today, governments feel a responsibility to replace the big post-war cohorts of employees now slowly retiring from the labour market, with new graduates - for new types of jobs, including for self-employment
- or with retrained people.

Employers stress that graduates should have "learnt to learn" and that they should thus be able to contribute to the development and application of knowledge required to maintain economic competitive advantage. But, employers are also concerned that their other workers acquire similar skills. Hence, the commitment to lifelong learning, with its implication of knowledge updating and renewal and, sometimes, complete retraining.

If the traditional idea of combining research and teaching and thus encouraging the development of a solid disciplinary and methodological knowledge in the student remains valid, it is expected now too to include the acquisition of skills such as communication or teamwork aptitudes. The transferable skills that graduates are supposed to obtain are supposed to be included in the process of "learning to learn". Universities argue that one of the best ways that they can show responsibility for their graduates is by awarding them qualifications that are recognised to be of high-quality, internationally competitive, including knowledge of research methodologies and how to learn. The general elements in higher education should be emphasised and specialisation would be left to a more advanced academic level or to lifelong learning programmes. Another response to demands for more employable graduates is for institutions to include more multidisciplinarity at the first level of higher education, so that workers can communicate better with specialists from other fields.

Growing professional mobility in Europe

As the economy becomes more global, a European labour market grows more real. Higher education systems and institutions are not just being asked to ensure that the people they are educating are employable, but also that they are employable on a European (or world) scale.

The Sorbonne Declaration in 1998 justified the idea of a European Higher Education Area by saying that it was a key way to promote citizens' employability and mobility - and the continent's overall development. The statement is reiterated in the Bologna Declaration.

Employability and mobility are two different objectives for people, even if a link is made in this context. To be employable is necessary for the person who aspires to travel or not. To be mobile is an additional objective of more citizens now: young people who are conscious that Europe is a continent where national borders are less and less important (due mainly to the achievements of the European Union in many areas, notably in freeing the movement of goods, services, capital, and, to a lesser extent, of people). It is in this last area that action is being sought urgently, not just for the mobility of young students or of recent graduates, but also for workers seeking professional mobility. The prospect of an enlarged European Union adds to the attractiveness of the continent, for people in Europe and for people in other parts of the world, as a space within which people can theoretically gain professional experience in different countries. And, it is partly increased student mobility that has reinforced the idea that studying abroad is one of the most effective means of preparing future graduates for the needs of an increasingly international
professional life.

Those people expecting a higher education experience to make them not just more employable, but also to increase their prospects of employment at European level and success in a competitive labour market are interested to acquire another set of skills.

"The internationalisation of higher education within the EUπreflects the general upgrading of European labour: skilled future professional labour [acquiring] not only formal academic qualifications, but also linguistic and cultural capital".

The labour market is also calling for these kinds of skills when globalised business is giving multi-culturalism a new value and foreign languages, for example, are seen as a way to increase understanding of different cultures.

"It has become very clear that the higher education sector is expected to contribute more to making the European labour market an everyday, effective reality." This has been one of the stimuli for higher education institutions to incorporate external partners more into their consultation procedures or even their governing structures. The use of external examiners from industry in the assessment of courses, the organisation of work placements for students, joint research and the increase in continuing education for workers have also contributed to the improvement of links between institutions and the economy. The dialogue between higher education institutions and their stakeholders
is important, given the high and varied expectations of higher education and the different responses possible. Institutions must develop open-ended strategies, enabling them to preserve a long-term view of disciplinary developments and a shorter-term view of graduates' needs.

The need for flexible learning paths "Higher education should offer opportunities for everyone capable of profiting from degree-level work, with financial support as necessary to ensure access for everyone who can benefit" (G8 Cologne Charter). Widening access to higher education is one of the main motivations for systems and institutions to offer more flexible learning paths. Another stimulus for flexible learning paths is a change in the profile of learners. The diversity in student profiles has resulted in the last two decades in the emergence of a vast range of new study options and combinations, of more flexible and modular design, and more distance learning.

Recognising learning in different contexts

In the context of lifelong (or lifewide) learning and the development of people's employability in Europe, at national and at European level, there is a call to move towards academic and professional recognition of learning acquired in formal and informal learning contexts through the use of mechanisms such as credit accumulation and transfer. For example, higher education institutions must consider whether to award credit for prior and experiential learning. The certification in one way or another of all knowledge and skills acquired until a certain exit-point could help reduce drop-out rates in formal education, which is a worrying financial problem in some European countries, and failure patterns. It could also represent a competitive advantage internationally. But, certification by higher education institutions of skills acquired in some contexts remains a challenge. Employers wish to better understand the qualifications of those applying for jobs and businesses operating globally are requesting qualifications that can be more easily
understood and compared internationally. This is giving impetus to the objective of the Bologna Declaration for European higher education to adopt a framework system of easily understandable and comparable degrees and, within that, to make full use of recognition instruments such as the Diploma Supplement. Extending bridges between sectors
Vocational training, for example, imparts skills attuned to the needs of the labour market and opens up pathways to higher qualifications. But, until now, higher education "required the creation and maintenance of autonomous spaces πand of separate and distinctive institutions. So did research. In contrast, lifelong learning requires theπtranscendence ofπboundaries. So does knowledge production. Both depend uponπever-closer partnerships between different types of institutions and organisationsπ"(Peter Scott). What type of bridges exist and which can be imagined as desirable to the higher education sector from other learning sectors?

Future scenarios

Students expect increasingly to receive a broad higher education that gives them flexibility on the labour market, since they will change jobs more often. They will choose to enrol for qualifications that allow them to work in different countries of Europe.

The demographic trend in Europe is towards an ageing population. The consequences are beginning to be an increase in adult learners and a likely increase in the demand for short masters degree programmes. The latter may also be interpreted as a response to the situation whereby more and more people enter to compete on the labour market

with a first-cycle (bachelors) degree.

Higher education systems and institutions that respond to the demand for flexible learning paths will attract more students, also from other parts of the world.

If the higher education sector is not clear on which learning in different contexts it is recognising, the European Union or another international organisation may pursue the question, perhaps issuing a recommendation or a directive, or drafting a convention. In the United States, where the transparency of qualifications is clearer for employers than in Europe but still not clear enough, a private enterprise "interprets" qualifications of job applicants for companies. If higher education institutions in Europe do not try and render their collective offering more understandable and use instruments being developed like the Diploma Supplement, a similar idea may emerge in Europe.

Points for reflection

- How can all types of higher education institutions organise themselves to respond better to the varied expectations to provide employable graduates with the sort of transferable skills now being requested and to offer lifelong learning? What are the differences between the extra-university and the university sector?
- Who will pay for lifelong learning? The G8-Cologne Charter states that an investment can be expected of government, investing to enhance education and training at all levels; of the private sector, training employees; of individuals, developing their abilities and careers. Are, for example, those companies concerned that their workers acquire additional skills for lifelong learning willing to pay higher education institutions to provide some of those learning experiences?
- The Bologna Declaration states that: "the degree awarded after the first-cycle shall also be relevant to the European labour market as an appropriate level of qualification". But, all degrees should not be professional to the same extent and in the same way. What might a system of differentiated degrees resemble?
- Will higher education institutions - especially universities - recognise and credit learning acquired outside the higher education sector?

Theme 3 : Mobility in the higher education area
Pointers for the discussion

- Students should be able to choose from among the entire range of courses on offer in the European Higher Education Space and mobility should become a central value of European higher education.
- The mobility of students, teachers and graduates is hampered by recurrent obstacles, in particular cumbersome recognition processes. The institutions want to increase significantly mobility of different types, working together to overcome structural obstacles and to free up the European Higher Education Space, by making their education and research programmes easier to understand, by organising the diversity of these programmes and their qualifications, and by using better instruments of academic recognition.
- Better mutual recognition of qualifications in Europe would also promote their better recognition in other world regions, thus enhancing the competitive edge of Europe in the global higher education world.

Mobility as a tool for internationalisation

The European Union (EU) - with governments and institutions - is still aiming to increase the mobility of students, teachers and administrative staff in education - the percentage of mobile higher education students in Europe remains less than 5%.

Mobility is a tool for internationalising institutions, as well for improving European citizens' linguistic and intercultural skills. Mobility has become central to internationalisation policies: the motivation to help people go abroad mixes the collective and individual benefits.

"After a first period of individual student mobility ("free movers") and a second phase of mobility and exchange based on institutional agreements, an internationalisation of academic content and processesπis taking place. That is likely to have a more structural and longer-term impact on the institution itself, whereas the effects of mere mobility and exchange are limited to the individual students". In the early years of the ERASMUSprogramme, it was expected that teaching staff mobility would result in an added European dimension in curricula. But, teachers, if they went abroad at all, stayed for only short periods and the impact on curricula remained small; it was more contact between professors and incoming and returning students that inspired curricular change.

The rationale for mobility of students and teachers has changed somewhat in recent years. Now, in addition to the traditional motivations for moving students, a growing part of international student mobility is increasingly market-driven. Institutions compete to recruit students from other countries, to whom they can sometimes charge tuition fees.

Different types of mobility

The EU programmes have promoted more organised academic exchange. Its purpose was "to deal with diversity and its consequences and complexities, but without pushing for structural changes in the national systems" (Haug, 1999).

"Vertical" mobility - when a student obtains a qualification in one institution and moves to another institution to obtain a second - and "free movers" could function better if fewer structural obstacles existed.

The National Union of Students in Europe (ESIB) has called for equal treatment under national law for this kind of mobile student (rights to health care, accommodation etc., if not domestic grant support).

Inter-university collaboration has traditionally taken the form of physical mobility. Virtual mobility is slowly becoming a viable alternative, sometimes to complement physical mobility, as more creative ways of using technology to internationalise education emerge.

And, transnational education, when education moves to the learner rather than the other way around, is expanding dramatically in some disciplines and countries. Under the right conditions, the latter can provide an alternative international education opportunity for students who are not mobile.

These developments are reflected somewhat in the new generation of EU education and training programmes. SOCRATES for higher education maintains the aim of promoting quality education through internationalisation, but has added the objective of including more people - ERASMUS should be less of an opportunity for a privileged minority of students.

Obstacles to mobility and structural improvements

Despite the increase in student mobility in Europe during the last twenty years, the same difficulties of incompatible calendars, credits and degrees persist. The diversity of systems, institutions and qualifications has, in fact, been described as "the single biggest obstacle to more mobility in higher education in Europe." Structural improvements - the setting up of a transparent framework of compatible qualifications, the elimination of regulatory or administrative obstacles, easier access to more complete information and the provision of freer choice - are necessary to improve organised exchange and individual mobility.

In Bologna in 1999, student representatives prioritised increased funding - for higher education in general, and for mobility grants in particular - and highlighted the difficulty of transferring grants and scholarships.

The report on Trends in Learning called for better information and advice to students, through reorienting databases and publications, or by training further careers officers and student counsellors. The European Commission has begun work on an electronic Gateway to the European Learning Area, to provide better public online access to information on learning opportunities throughout Europe.

The European Council in Nice in December 2000 approved a resolution for a Mobility Action Plan, focused on removing remaining barriers to mobility. EU Member States should coordinate the implementation of measures to increase and democratise mobility in Europe. Problems like unequal access to information, financial constraints, inadequate social security cover and career hindrances should be tackled. The main ideas are to:

- Create a portal for accessing information on mobility opportunities
- Examine the interaction of financing possibilities at different levels
- Promote multilinguism
- Train administrative and academic resource staff to give advice on mobility
- Examine the organisation of study programmes into semesters.

The European Association for International Education (EAIE) has called for the introduction of the legal status of "student-trainee" for full-time students who are on internships abroad of six months or less (those staying longer should be considered as workers). A European student-trainee agreement should be developed, detailing the relationship between the student, the home institution and the host institution during the training period. Within it,

all legal formalities should be resolved, e.g. residence permit, health insurance, taxation, professional and personal liability. Although some of the difficulties encountered by mobile research trainees have been resolved, others remain, related mainly to legal formalities. EAIE recommends that universities offer the visiting fellow a "fellowship contract" (based on the principles of education and training), or an employment contract, whichever is more appropriate. In the early 1990s, an evaluation of European research fellowships revealed that around a quarter of fellows had no contract at all. For researchers, teachers and administrative staff, the Bologna Declaration calls for the recognition and valorisation of periods spent researching, teaching and training in the European Higher Education Area, without prejudicing their statutory rights. Interest in freeing up mobility focuses attention on the issue of the recognition of qualifications.

An increasing number of citizens seek fair recognition of their qualifications. Generally, a qualification, even if not completely equivalent, is recognised, provided it passes a "fitness for purpose" test - a foreign qualification may be at a comparable level and have a comparable function, even though it may differ in details. Recognition has replaced the earlier approach of evaluating diplomas on a course-by-course basis to establish full equivalence.

Since each country is responsible for its education system, the only EU instruments imposing mutual recognition of diplomas are directives on recognition for professional purposes for certain regulated occupations. Two general directives established generally acceptable minimum requirements for qualifications. If these requirements are fulfilled, the host country must prove that the foreign qualification is not up to standard. For academic recognition, higher education institutions should use more the Council of Europe/UNESCO Lisbon Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region. Credit transfer systems, and especially the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS), are facilitating academic recognition. More and more institutions have taken the basic step of allocating 60 ECTS credits to a study year. One of the problems encountered when people move for either professional or academic purposes is that original credentials produced for employers or host higher education institutions provide insufficient information. The Diploma Supplement, developed by UNESCO/CEPES, the Council of Europe and the European Commission, to improve transparency of qualifications and their recognition, and

of Europass, a system recording work-based study periods abroad and facilitating the translation of learning experiences into credit accumulation, could help higher education institutions, employers and public authorities throughout the world to better understand qualifications. These instruments aim to improve the international transparency of qualifications and their academic and professional recognition. The supplement presents the national higher education system, so the diploma can be understood in its national context, and gives information on examinations passed and the level obtained.

More legislation and instruments are not needed at the moment - the challenge is for institutions to implement those that exist and for governments to ensure that national policy decisions are compatible. Mobility outside the European Area

The Bologna Declaration concentrates on mobility within the European Area, but exchange with other regions of the world, and especially attracting more researchers, teachers and students to Europe, is a way to improve the competitiveness of European higher education. Higher education institutions could cooperate to organise activities abroad, e.g. to arrange mobility, and thereby add a new meaning to international cooperation.

Future scenarios

There may be a change in the type of mobility in Europe, particularly if the objective of the Bologna Declaration to arrive at a common framework for compatible qualifications is achieved. Besides short-term organised mobility (exchange), we can expect to see a trend towards long-term free mobility of students, who will continue their graduate studies abroad, having obtained a first degree in their home country. Such a trend may in time have an impact on the European programmes for cooperation and mobility." Free movers would test the limits of free choice and if they were to receive equality of treatment with home students, this might contribute to balancing presently uneven student mobility patterns in Europe.

"It is likely that, in the long-term, traditional student mobility will be eclipsed by study programme mobility, as more transnational programmes are offered. It is becoming cheaper relatively to move courses rather than students. However the initial cost of developing (hard-copy and software) mobile programmes is very high."

Networks of universities across Europe, and beyond, will play an important role in academic recognition, by developing more mechanisms like benchmarking and cooperation in quality assessment beyond the national level.

Points for reflection

- Which obstacles to mobility are higher education institutions able to overcome on their own (individually or by collaborating among themselves), and which require action from governments or from international organisations?
- What are the most urgent actions needed to achieve more and easier student, staff and researcher mobility?
- How can mobility be made possible for a wider range of students?
- How can non-European students be attracted to the continent?
- How can plans for mobility take into account the growth in transnational education?

Theme 4 : Compatibility: a common, but flexible qualifications framework
Pointers for the discussion

- The diversity of study programmes and of qualifications strengthens Europe's competitive position internationally, but potential learners within the region and in the rest of the world must be able to understand the rich variety of education on offer so as to choose between courses, qualifications and institutions.
- A common framework is needed to show compatibility among different systems of higher education. Within a common but flexible qualifications framework, a basic articulation of studies into an undergraduate and postgraduate phase must accommodate the great variety of first degrees, reflecting their different purposes, and of postgraduate degrees, spanning different research methods.
- European credit accumulation and transfer procedures, respecting the principles of structured learning and institutional autonomy to recognise credit or not, are a powerful tool to arrive at a common, yet flexible European framework.
- Higher education institutions are willing to work more through disciplinary networks, in cooperation with professional bodies, in order to identify core features of curricula, qualifications and professional profiles.
Diversity of qualifications

Increased demand for higher education has led to the greater diversity of study programmes, qualifications and of institutions. The survey of trends in higher education structures "shows the extreme complexity and diversity of curricular and degree structures in European countries." Different types of degrees, diplomas, certificates, etc. take a general, scientific, professional, technical or vocational orientation. They are being offered to new publics: adults, lifelong learners, students at universities who have come from polytechnics or colleges, etc.. "Widened access π means further diversification, personalised learning paths, better information about content of courses and combinations, flexible learning structures and transparent recognition and assessment systems."

Establishing a common framework

The Bologna process is a search for a "common European answer to common European problems". The report prepared for the Bologna conference identified these trends affecting the structure of degrees/qualifications in Europe:

- a governmental push towards shorter studies
- an increasingly blurred divide between the university and non-university sectors
- more academic credit transfer (and, to a lesser extent, accumulation) systems
- greater autonomy of universities, often accompanied by initiatives for quality evaluation
- challenges from abroad, notably via transnational education.

Suggested lines of action are:

- the adoption of a common, but flexible frame of reference for qualifications
- the gradual adoption of an ECTS-compatible credit accumulation system
- an enhanced European dimension in quality assurance, evaluation and accreditation.

The Bologna Declaration calls for organising higher education studies into the two phases of Bachelors and Masters. Despite discussion of such a move in a context influenced in 1999 by reflection in France on a 3-5-8 year system, the Trends Report showed that Bachelors degrees in Europe usually require 3 to 4 years of study; that there is a high degree of convergence to a 5-year Masters; and that there is no 8-year standard duration for doctoral degrees. What the report suggests instead is qualifications equivalent to credit years of study:

- Sub-degree level (certificate, diploma): 1-2 years of equivalent ECTS credits
- first degree level (bachelor's): no less than 3, no more than 4 years of equivalent ECTS credits
- Master's level: about 5 years of equivalent ECTS credits, of which as least 12 months worth of master-level credit
- Doctoral level: about 7 to 8 years of ECTS equivalent credits. In addition, the firstdegree level should be gauged on the basis of the knowledge and competencies acquired rather than the time spent.

When establishing a common framework for existing qualifications, the possibility shoulbe built in for new qualifications to find their place in that structure.

Moving from comparability to compatibility

A step towards transparency of diverse systems and towards compatibility of different qualifications is to develop credit transfer and accumulation systems. Credit systems complement general legal instruments of academic or professional recognition. For example, since university and extra-university institutions both use modular credit-based courses, student transfer between the two sectors has been greatly facilitated.

The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) was established in the 1980s to facilitate student exchange and it functions on the basis of individual student learning agreements.

It is a framework within which institutions agree to recognise quite automatically study courses and thus facilitate credit transfer. To make curricula more transparent, credit points are assigned to study programmes (one year of full-time study has a maximum of 60 credits). But, students are dependent on their professors and, if they take courses not included in their learning agreement, they do not necessarily get credit for them. Even if the system took a long time to gain acceptance and it is still not always applied completely, the tools have proved effective and ECTS has made a noteworthy contribution to making curricula more transparent and to facilitating recognition of study abroad.

ECTS is compatible with other credit systems in Europe, even if these have been designed to achieve different local, regional, national or international objectives.

An overarching European credit accumulation and transfer framework is now needed.

The Trends Report suggested that ECTS should inter alia:

- Be applicable within all sectors of higher education
- Cover all forms of learning
- Recognise equivalent rather than identical learning abroad
- Distinguish between different levels of credit - general, specialised, master
- Respect institutional autonomy to recognise credit or not.

The European Commission feasibility study on developing ECTS into a credit accumulation system to encompass different types of learning argues for a new credit-based lifelong learning framework that would:

- Include professional, vocational and corporate qualifications
- Be designed for use outside the EU (particularly in view of its scheduled enlargement) and take on board the fact that there is high demand for student exchange with the US
- Permit integration of students into degree programmes on the basis of accreditation of prior experiential learning.

The report concluded that it is feasible to extend ECTS, even if it requires further embedding in institutions and that expanding the system would mean that mutual recognition would be more difficult to achieve. "Therefore, it is recommended that the development of a European credit-based lifelong learning framework should be connected to existing Commission initiatives to link existing national quality assurance mechanisms."

But, there is a difference between a credit transfer system and an accumulation system.

Credit systems make it possible to underline the learning path - whether it includes education at universities, extra-university higher education institutions, or other bodies offering education and training. Concerns have been expressed that a credit accumulation system creates an "_ la carte" framework, within which the student is free to mix credit from different types and levels of education and then demand a qualification; this would not guarantee the intellectual development associated with obtaining qualifications. But, since it is the university that decides to validate study program-

mes and award a qualification - or not, credit-based curricula are not incompatible with a structured, progressive learning experience.

And, some doubt that ECTS has in fact the potential to become a model for credit transfer and accumulation on a larger scale. The main criticism is that in the drive to find a pragmatic solution to the problem of academic recognition that was hindering student mobility, ECTS bypassed the question of quality, which has become central to the present debate on the compatibility of European qualifications.

The possible extension of ECTS to incorporate vocational education and training has raised questions in some countries. Presently, most traditional European universities do not apply credits to vocational or to professional training. "There is a need to develop a credit system that takes into account competencies (widely used in vocational education and training) that is compatible with a credit system based on workload (currently used in higher education)." The fact that education is being delivered in more different ways makes notional time measures of credit increasingly problematic. But, the idea is to keep the student workload approach at the core of any future system.

A pilot project to see how to measure student workload in terms of learning outcomes, knowledge, skills and competencies in five disciplines is being launched with the support of the European Commission. It will also examine in each discipline commonly accepted professional profiles, levels of study and curricula.

Future scenarios

New Masters courses will be offered by individual institutions or by consortia in areas where there are no short, or separate, programme at this level. They will be open to students who have done their undergraduate studies at a different institution or in a different country.

"The development and introduction of an ECTS credit-based lifelong learning framework will be a complex process, best achieved at the strategic policy level through processes enabling a wide dialogue between European higher education institutions, initial education providers, professional bodies and employers". The Bologna Declaration is perceived in this context as "an indication of the political support offered by European governments to such a process".

Points for reflection

- Will qualifications come to be described in terms of credit-compatible years?
- Will higher education institutions accept credit for learning acquired in non-higher education contexts?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of ordinary and advanced degrees?
- Will employers accept new intermediate qualifications, particularly in the professional disciplines that usually require an integrated curriculum?
- Will there be a standard nomenclature for European qualifications? Will there be national and "international" titles (in English)?
- How can quality assurance contribute to improving the recognition of higher education qualifications? Which methods would facilitate comparability and could be linked to recognition mechanisms such as credit transfer and accumulation?
- Can more curricular convergence be achieved within broad disciplines?

Reference

Adam, S. & Gemlich, V. (2000). ECTS Extension feasibility study, carried out for the European Commission, Directorate-General Education and Culture.

http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/socrates/ectsext.html

Theme 5 : Quality assurance and certification (accreditation)
Pointers for the discussion
- The European Higher Education Area can only be built on high quality education and research, and thus on more cooperation in the crucial areas of quality evaluation and quality assurance.
- The European higher education community wants to organise itself in order to design and implement the mechanisms required for quality assurance/certification with a European dimension. When carried out in cooperation with partners in government and society, this will be the best answer to the pressing need for transparent quality assurance in the European higher education area.
- All forms of transnational education must be subject to the same quality standards as other education, both in the providing and in the receiving country.
- The Europeanisation and internationalisation of higher education demands a European dimension to quality assurance/certification mechanisms. The appropriate answer is not a European agency enforcing a single set of standards, but a system based on the development and recognition of quality assurance/certification at the level
of a country, a region, a network or a discipline.
The need for international quality assurance procedures: the transnational context

Quality assurance systems in Europe have a national perspective, when the globalisation of the economy and the emergence of virtual learning have created an international higher education environment. Academic and professional mobility are on the increase and institutions and curricula are crossing borders. The rise of transnational education constitutes a challenge to quality assurance; the urgent need is to protect students and employers from fraudulent institutions and awards. While national quality assurance is geared towards accountability and improvement, there is a need to contribute to the international visibility and compatibility of European qualifications on the internationalleve.

Despite its obvious growth, there are no reliable data on the current size of the transnational education sector in Europe, partly because of the difficulty to agree on what should come under the term. Transnational education is particularly present in regions where there are high selectivity rates in traditional education and little diversification. The United Kingdom (UK) is by far the biggest exporter of higher education in Europe, while Greece, Spain and Italy are the main importers. The widespread knowledge of English facilitates exportation of education from the United States, the UK, Australia and other Englishspeaking countries, which earn money from their educational services abroad. Disciplines are also affected unequally: the most visible challenge is in business and management (especially MBAs), computer science and information technology, and foreign language learning. Much activity is at postgraduate level or in continuing education. Transnational education brings opportunities and challenges. It can improve access to higher education and contribute to diversification of learning paths. It can promote innovation in curricula and delivery methods; further internationalisation of higher education; promote intercultural co-operation; and help make the sector more competitive

For some institutions, there is the possibility to raise income; for others, there can be a loss of income. Conflict with national education systems surfaces when non-official unregulated providers (often franchised institutions and branch campuses) are not subject to internal or external quality audit. There is, then, a concern to protect consumers from exploitation, as well as to recognise quality transnational education. Global quality is more than academic excellence: it balances academic learning with transversal skills, professional competencies, and ethical and civic values. That is why quality assurance of transnational providers should involve all the actors in the process: creators, importers, exporters, students and stakeholders.

Strategies to deal with transnational education should fit with other national education goals, e.g., to promote lifelong learning, transmit culture or increase competitiveness. This is not a domain that is easily regulated through conventional legal measures. Current national regulation is fragmented, mainly requiring foreign providers to be registered, licensed or in some other way approved by local quality assurance authorities or by the Ministry of Education. Pressure to define higher education as a service that should be covered by international trade agreements is growing - a US proposal has been made in the framework of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS).

The Council of Europe/UNESCO Lisbon Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region does not treat recognition issues arising from all kinds of transnational education. But, their Code of Good Practice tries to give a normative framework for countries sending and receiving transnational. While, "in the short-term, the potential impact of transnational education is likely to stay as it is now, relatively small scale πin the longer termπits impact will intensify and broaden." "Transnational education touches on all dimensions of the current European educational debate engendered by the Bologna Declaration, including matters of recognition, transparency, accreditation, cultural and academic autonomy, convergence and divergence."

Different actors and types of evaluation In nearly all European countries, some form of external quality assurance of research and of teaching is in operation. Quality assurance is a continuous process, which takes place at the level of a course, a faculty or an institution. It can serve to improve the quality of education, research or management, facilitate the recognition of courses and qualifications, and help increase the mobility of students and researchers. But, the scope of national evaluations varies: for instance, some countries evaluate programmes, others institutions. A European Institutional Evaluation is offered by CRE, and an Internationalisation Quality Review by CRE, OECD/IMHE and the Academic Co-operation Association (ACA). In addition, there are accreditation activities in many countries, carried out by a national agency or through mutual agreements between institutions, with institutions sometimes seeking American accreditation. The only European-wide accreditation initiative is the EQUIS model for business education, launched by the European Foundation for Management Development.

The growth and variety of evaluation activities in Europe prompted the creation in 1999 of the European Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), founded on a recommendation of the European Council of Ministers of Education. The network assembles national quality assurance agencies to exchange information and experience and to develop jointly their work, but this has not resulted yet in translating national outcomes of evaluations into international ones. ENQA is expected to play a strong role in the future in monitoring and exchanging information and good practice related to quality assurance for transnational education.

Accreditation The question of external accreditation of courses and institutions is increasingly raised in the context of quality assurance, because evaluation without certification is perceived as unfinished business for those who wish clear information about minimal quality standards of qualifications, including transnational ones. There is pressure from the United States, where accreditation procedures are used widely and give information to potential students

as well as competitive tools to institutions. European institutions are more motivated to seek accreditation as a way to enhance international recognition, as well as to attract students, teachers and researchers and facilitate mobility. Employers are interested in accreditation ensuring a minimal quality of standards. The debate on accreditation is

new in Europe, confused and controversial, and what can appear to be a technical question is in fact a fundamental question for the building of a European Higher Education Area.

The basic idea of accreditation (of which there are different interpretations) is that it is a formal, published statement on the quality of a programme or institution, following an evaluation based on agreed standards. Accreditation is a process and a status: a process in that it gives the opportunity and incentive for improvement and a status in that it provides public certification of acceptable quality. A CRE project has identified five principles that should inform the development of Europeanquality assurance:

- Create a space for European convergence, while preserving national diversity
- Preserve institutional diversity to meet differentiated learners' needs
- Balance institutional autonomy and external accountability
- Build in flexibility and the capacity to adapt to new developments.
- Add value to current quality assurance systems, while preserving their improvement function.

Any move to validate accreditation procedures, while based on European values, should nevertheless be placed in the global context of higher education and research and should integrate both domains. A system of multiple accreditation organised at different levels (country, region, subject area, institutional type, network, linguistic/cultural area) would suit Europe. Some areas could move to multilateral agreements for the mutual recognition of qualifications in specific subjects, for example. Mechanisms might be designed to extend locally-gained accreditation to the whole European area and scenarios could be developed for European cross-border accreditation in certain disciplines. This would have the advantage of combining internal quality assurance and external accreditation processes aimed at guaranteeing the highest possible level of quality and relevance of curricula and of higher education institutions.

Future scenarios

In the long term, a European quality assurance framework may emerge to complement the existing common framework for recognition of qualifications. In the meantime, national initiatives, with an increasingly open, international perspective, point the way forward. A step-by-step scenario could be implemented, building on current quality assurance processes.

If European higher education does not evaluate the potential of accreditation to contribute to its quality assurance procedures, evaluation of the quality of transnational education and eventual recognition of some courses and providers (accreditation or some alternative certification) will take place at national levels, in an uncoordinated manner. But, national accreditation is unlikely to be able to make decisions in a short time about the large number of courses now on the market. And, conflicting decisions will add to the confusion.

If nothing changes from the present situation, or if Europe moves very slowly to incorporate a more international dimension to quality assurance (on the basis, for example, of many bilateral and multilateral accreditation agreements), accreditation bodies may emerge from the private sector, or from outside Europe (the Global Alliance for Transnational Education - GATE, for example, could offer an accreditation procedure). US accreditation agencies are interested in Europe (e.g., those for Management (AACSB) or Engineering and Technology (ABET), which has already evaluated engineering courses in a couple of European countries).

The CRE project recommends that a working platform of European higher education institutions and relevant partners be established to clarify concepts of quality assurance and accreditation, analyse needs, test different approaches - such as validation of existing procedures, for instance, through pilot projects. An extra bureaucratic layer is not welcome.

Points for reflection

- How could national quality assurance systems incorporate an international dimension?
- How can national quality assurance systems judge the quality of education offered by new types of providers? What is the optimal way to protect students against fraudulent claims? If national legislation is developed for transnational education, what effect does this have on other countries in the European Area?
- Would it be possible to forge consensus on principles for a European platform to test mechanisms of cooperation and validation in the field of quality assurance and accreditation, based on an agreed set of principles?

References

Campbell, C. & van der Wende, M. (2001). International initiatives and trends in quality assurance for European higher education, an exploratory trend report. For the European Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA).
http://www.enqa.net/
Machado dos Santos, S. (2000). "Introduction to the theme of Transnational Education".
Haug, G. "Response". Aveiro: Conference of the Directors General for Higher Education and the Heads of the Rectors' Conferences of the European Union
www.crue.upm.es/eurec/transed.htm
Confederation of European Union Rectors' Conferences (with the support of the European Commission). (2001, unpublished draft). Transnational Education project report and recommendations.
Project information at www.crue.upm.es/eurec

CRE-the Association of European Universities (with the support of the European Commission). (2001, unpublished draft). Towards Accreditation Schemes for Higher Education in Europe.
Project information at http://www.unige.ch/cre

Theme 6 : Competitiveness at home and in the world
Pointers for the discussion

• Competitiveness is mainly the ability to be attractive to local and international students and teachers/researchers, in the global competition for reputation, talent and resources.
• Competition in global and European higher education is inevitable and growing. The main question raised for institutions and governments by transnational education is why students choose imported education over national higher education in situations where they have a choice, and what effect their choice has on enrolment patterns
and related funding of institutions and disciplines.
• Systems and institutions can use a European Higher Education Area to be more attractive at home and abroad, to students, researchers and staff. They can strengthen their individual positions and need to build collaborative competitive strength.
• European higher education needs and wishes to present an understandable identityto the rest of the world, based on high quality, positive diversity and transparency. European higher education needs to more present in the world, internationalising its quality assurance, developing flexible curricula, offering efficient admission procedures
and providing user-friendly information.
Competition from where?
Competition in higher education is a relatively new development. Many new providers of education and training have emerged, some of which deliver transnational education. In Europe, competition between the established higher education institutions and these providers (traditional universities offering distance education, franchising operations
and/or establishing branch campuses, corporate universities, for profit organisations and consortia uniting public and private organisations) is likely to intensify.
American universities are increasingly attractive for European students, while European universities are less attractive for American students. The top American universities attract students, researchers and professors from all over the world, and even the second rank institutions receive large numbers of foreign students. Part of the explanation is the use of English as the lingua franca of contemporary science and the most commonly mastered first foreign language.
An appeal to foster mobility and links between European and Latin American institutions was signed by CRE and its Latin American equivalent in Turin in November 2000. On both continents, the lack of a transparent qualifications framework and international quality assurance mechanisms inhibits cooperation. There is an opportunity for Europe to increase its potential in Latin America as an alternative to other destinations for mobility.
Progress in Europe in providing better information on qualifications, as well as in improving recognition practices, could help similar steps to be taken in other parts of the world, thus contributing to global mobility and cooperation, the other side of competition.
Competing for what?
More competition across boundaries for students and for staff would be a clear sign of the existence of a truly open European Higher Education Area. With demographic decline, fewer students are emerging from the traditional age cohort and institutions compete for students more at national level and, sometimes, internationally. The majority of a sample of universities responding to a CRE survey named other national universities their main future competitor for students, with foreign universities, non-university higher education, virtual universities and private universities following. Other national universities also topped the list of future competitors for recruiting staff, but competition from foreign higher education providers and private companies was regarded as nearly as big. To help universities attract researchers from abroad, the Confederation of EU Rectors' Conferences, in its comments on the European Research Area, has proposed a "green card model" in Europe, where it is still too complicated for people to obtain permission to do research.
Higher education institutions also compete to keep from having research, particularly cutting-edge basic research, moved to specialised institutes or to for-profit organisations. And, they compete for financial resources, influence, reputation and prestige.
How to compete? The first condition for higher education institutions to compete is that they are not overregulated and free to innovate. In a less-regulated environment, higher education institutions rely increasingly on market or market-like signals to make decisions and a shift occurs in rules about their positioning. There is, then, a shift from regulation by legal standards to regulation by market standards. But, less regulation and the freedom to innovate needs to be accompanied by changes in institutions' internal structures and decision-making processes.
To compete more on the global level, European higher education needs to have grown used to competition within the continent, and even at national level. Being competitive requires a certain culture of behaviour and not just rhetoric. Once institutions have specific proposals to make themselves more attractive to students, researchers, and staff, they could request more support from governments and from international organisations like the European Union.

What are, or should be, the distinctive qualities of European higher education compared with that offered on other continents ? What are its strengths ? In Bologna in 1999, institutions agreed that competing in Europe ought to be by emphasising "high quality rather than by attempting to compete on prices." This highlights the importance of quality assurance.

"In an increasingly competitive international market in higher education, quality will have to become a distinguishing characteristic guiding consumers and institutions in their strategic behaviour." But, comparatively low costs of European higher education could also be turned into a global competitive advantage.

Under which conditions can diversity be a selling-point for European higher education?

Is international success possible for institutions delivering courses in lesser-known languages? The EU LINGUA action finances transnational projects to develop, for example, new language learning methods, Internet proficiency tests, marketing videos to attract students to learn a language in Europe. The market should be interpreted as the global one.

Some of the capacity of European higher education to be competitive will depend on national policy decisions and on whether there is convergence between these.

Future scenarios

Countries will have to decide how they wish to position their national education, against the backdrop of the European Higher Education Area and in the global context

The way forward is for universities to use their autonomy to organise themselves to compete better, but a reasonable compromise must be negotiated between deregulation to allowing for a free market and the preservation of national interests related to higher education. Less regulation would result in even more diversification of qualifications - a common qualifications framework would then be even more necessary than it is now.

In the face of increased competition, higher education systems will try to close the competitive gap at home so as to compete better abroad, e.g., they will weed out poor quality, introduce more quality labels, introduce nomenclature to allow their extra-university sector to compete internationally.

The competitive gap will widen among institutions. More large-scale, transnational university networks will develop, clustering around some prestigious institutions. They will trade in the global educational market place as a collective, but with the constituent members maintaining their respective national identities. Qualifications, however, will be awarded within the legal framework of foreign higher education systems. Such networks will look for the most marketable compromise of image building on the one hand, using the names of the most prestigious partners, and freedom from national regulation in the areas of recognition of diplomas and quality assurance on the other.

Another scenario is the emergence of some transnational higher education institutions, for example in a border region, where two traditional institutions could plan close cooperation in education, eventually leading to a merger. The new university could then integrate its research and educational programmes and degree-awarding capacities.

National legislation is not today prepared to deal properly with such institutions.

Transnational education or study abroad will become more and more of an alternative to studying in the national system, which would redirect resources.

Points for reflection

• Can Europe afford its "structural egalitarianism" (Aaviksoo), according to which all universities are supposed to carry out research and teaching and state funds are spread among them? How does this situation affect the ability of individual institutionsto compete?
• What can European higher education institutions change themselves so that they are in the strongest position to maintain and improve their competitiveness?
• Do higher education institutions have the links with stakeholders, especially employers, to reinforce their competitive position? For example, should they seek greater participation of stakeholders (employers, recent graduates, students) in their processes and in their governance to tackle the new competitive situation?
• What changes in national higher education legislation do institutions want so that they would be freer to compete?

Message from the Salamanca Convention of European higher education institutions

SHAPING THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA

Over 300 European higher education institutions and their main representative organisations, gathered in Salamanca on 29-30 March 2001 to prepare their input to the Prague meeting of the Ministers in charge of higher education in the countries involved in the Bologna process, have agreed on the following goals, principles and priorities.

Shaping the future
European higher education institutions reaffirm their support to the principles of the Bologna Declaration and their commitment to the creation of the European Higher Education Area by the end of the decade. They see the establishing of the European University Association (EUA) in Salamanca as of symbolic and practical value to convey their voice more effectively to governments and society and thus to support them in shaping their own future in the European Higher Education Area.

PRINCIPLES

AUTONOMY WITH ACCOUNTABILITY

Progress requires that European universities be empowered to act in line with the guiding principle of autonomy with accountability. As autonomous and responsible legal, educational and social entities, they confirm their adhesion to the principles of the Magna Charta Universitatum of 1988 and, in particular, academic freedom. Thus, universities have to be able to shape their strategy, choose their priorities in teaching and research, allocate their resources, profile their curricula and set their criteria for the acceptance of professors and students. European higher education institutions accept the challenges of operating in a competitive environment at home, in Europe and in the world, but to do so they need the necessary managerial freedom, less rigid regulatory frameworks and fair financing or they will be placed at a disadvantage in co-operation and competition. The dynamics needed for the completion of the European Higher Education Area will remain unfulfilled or will result in unequal competition, if the current over-regulation and minute administrative and financial control of higher education in many countries is upheld.
Competition serves quality in higher education, is not exclusive of co-operation and cannot be reduced to a commercial concept. Universities in some countries in Europe are not yet in a position to compete on equal terms and are in particular faced with unwanted brain drain within Europe.

EDUCATION AS A PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

The European Higher Education Area must be built on the European traditions of education as a public responsibility; of broad and open access to undergraduate as well as graduate studies; of education for personal development; and of citizenship as well as of short and long-term social relevance.

RESEARCH-BASED HIGHER EDUCATION

As research is a driving force of higher education, the creation of the European Higher Education Area must go hand in hand with that of the European Research Area.

ORGANISING DIVERSITY

European higher education is characterised by its diversity in terms of languages, national systems, institutional types and profiles and curricular orientation. At the same time its future depends on its ability to organise this valuable diversity to effectively produce positive outcomes rather than difficulties and flexibility rather than opacity. Higher education institutions wish to build on convergence - in particular on common denominators shared across borders in a given

subject area - and to deal with diversity as assets, rather than as reasons for non-recognition or exclusion. They are committed to creating sufficient self-regulation to ensure the minimum level of cohesion needed to avoid that their efforts towards compatibility are undermined by too much variance in the definition and implementation of credits, main degree categories and quality criteria.

3.   KEY ISSUES

QUALITY AS A FUNDAMENTAL BUILDING STONE

The European Higher Education Area needs to build on academic core values while meeting stakeholders' expectations, i.e., demonstrating quality. Indeed, quality assessment must take into consideration the goals and mission of institutions and programmes. It requires a balance between innovation and tradition, academic excellence and social/economic relevance, the coherence of curricula and students' freedom of choice.
It encompasses teaching and research as well as governance and administration, responsiveness to students' needs and the provision of non-educational services. Inherent quality does not suffice, it needs to be demonstrated and guaranteed in order to be acknowledged and trusted by students, partners and society at home, in Europe and in the world. Quality is the basic underlying condition for trust, relevance, mobility, compatibility and attractiveness in the European Higher Education Area.

Trust building
As research evaluation has an international dimension so does quality assurance in higher education. In Europe, quality assurance should not be based on a single agency enforcing a common set of standards. The way into the future will be to design mechanisms at European level for the mutual acceptance of quality assurance outcomes, with "accreditation" as one possible option. Such mechanisms should respect national, linguistic and discipline differences and not overload universities.

Relevance
Relevance to the European labour market needs to be reflected in different ways in curricula, depending on whether the competencies acquired are for employment after the first or the second degree. Employability in a lifelong learning perspective is best served through the inherent value of quality education, the diversity of approaches and development of transversal skills and competencies such as communication and languages, ability to mobilise knowledge, problem solving, team work and social processes.

Mobility
The free mobility of students, staff and graduates is an essential dimension of the European Higher Education Area. European universities want to foster more mobility- both of the "horizontal" and the "vertical" type - and do not see virtual mobility as a substitute to physical mobility. They are willing to use existing instruments for recognition and mobility (ECTS, Lisbon Convention, Diploma Supplement, NARIC/ENIC network) in a positive and flexible way. In view of the importance of teaching staff with European experience, universities wish to eliminate nationality requirements and other obstacles and disincentives for academic careers in Europe. However, a common European approach to virtual mobility and transnational education is also needed.

Compatible qualifications at the undergraduate and graduate levels
Higher education institutions endorse the move towards a compatible qualification framework based on a main articulation in undergraduate and postgraduate studies.
There is broad agreement that first degrees should require 180 to 240 ECTS points but need to be diverse leading to employment or mainly preparing for further, postgraduate studies. Under certain circumstances a university may decide to establish an integrated curriculum leading directly to a Master-level degree. Subject-based networks have an important role to play to inform such decisions. Universities are convinced of the benefits of a credit accumulation and transfer system based on ECTS and on their basic right to decide on the acceptability of credits obtained elsewhere.

Attractiveness
European higher education institutions want to be in a position to attract talent from allover the world. This requires action at the institutional, national and European level. Specific measures include the adaptation of curricula, degrees readable inside and outside Europe, credible quality assurance measures, programmes taught in major world languages, adequate information and marketing, welcoming services for foreign students of prohibitive immigration and labour market regulations. European higher education institutions recognise that their students need and demand qualifications which they can effectively use for the purpose of study and career all over Europe. The institutions and their

networks and organisations acknowledge their role and responsibility in this regard and confirm their willingness to organise themselves accordingly within the framework of autonomy.

Higher education institutions call on governments, in their national and European contexts, to facilitate and encourage change and to provide a framework for coordination and guidance towards convergence, and affirm their capacity and willingness to initiate and support progress within a joint endeavour

- to redefine higher education and research for the whole of Europe;
- to reform and rejuvenate curricula and higher education as a whole;
- to enhance and build on the research dimension in higher education;
- to adopt mutually acceptable mechanisms for the evaluation, assurance and certification of quality;
- to build on common denominators with a European dimension and ensure compatibility between diverse institutions, curricula and degrees;
- to promote the mobility of students and staff and the employability of graduates in Europe; to support the modernisation efforts of universities in countries where the challenges of the European Higher Education Area are greatest
- to meet the challenges of being readable, attractive and competitive at home, in Europe and in the world; and
- to keep considering higher education as an essential public responsibility.

http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de

Göteborg Student Declaration

25 March 2001

Preamble

We, the student representatives in Europe, gathered in Göteborg at the Student Göteborg Convention from the 22nd to the 25th of March 2001.Here we adopted the following declaration on the future of the Bologna Process. ESIB – the National Unions of Students in Europe is and has been actively involved in the construction of the European Higher Education Area.

In June 1999, ESIB and its members, the national unions of students had to invite themselves to the Ministerial meeting on"A European Higher Education Area" in Bologna. Two years later, at the Prague Summit, ESIB is a keynote speaker. The growing recognition of the student input in the process is the result of a strong commitment of European students to promote a high quality, accessible and diverse higher education in Europe.

Introduction

ESIB sees the Bologna process as the crucial step towards a Europe without boundaries for its citizens. A European higher education area should include all European students on an equal basis. The creation of this area is a common responsibility of all European countries and should take into account the political and socio-economic differences in Europe. The reason for creating a European higher education area is the improvement of all national higher education systems, by spreading good practices and promoting cooperation and solidarity between the European states.

The social implications

Although the Bologna Declaration pointed out the basic aspects of the European dimension in higher education, it failed to address the social implications the process has on students. Higher education enables students to acquire the skills and the knowledge they need further in life, both personally and professionally. The social and civic contributions must be present as the primary functions of the higher education institutions.

Higher education institutions are important actors in civic society; therefore all members of the higher education community should be involved. Students therefore are not consumers of a tradable education service, and as a consequence it is the governments' responsibility to guarantee that all citizens have equal access to higher education,

regardless of their social background. This means providing students with adequate funding in the form of study grants and the higher education institutions with enough funding to exercise their public tasks.

The Higher Education Area

As stated earlier, accessible higher education of a high quality is of utmost importance for a democratic European society. Accessibility and diversity have traditionally been the cornerstones of European education and should remain so in the future. Next to this and to ensure that all programmes of higher education institutions are compatible and exchangeable, a system of credits based on workload should be implemented in the whole of Europe. A common European framework of criteria for accreditation and a compatible system of degrees is needed, in order to make sure that credits accumulated in different countries or at different institutions are transferable and lead to a recognisable degree. A two-tier degree system should guarantee free and equal access for all students and should not lead to the exclusion of students on other than academic grounds. To guarantee and improve the quality of higher education, a strong European cooperation of the national quality assurance systems is needed. Accreditation, being a certification

of a programme, takes into account, among other criteria, the quality assurance process and should be used as a tool to promote quality.

A European higher education area promoting improvement and cooperation requires physical mobility of students, teaching staff and researchers. Mobility is also a way to promote cultural understanding and tolerance. Obstacles to mobility exist not only in the academic world. Social, economical and political obstacles must also be removed. Governments should guarantee foreign students the same legal rights as the students in the hosting country and higher education institutions should take the responsibility to provide students with mobility programmes.

The creation of a genuine European higher education area as outlined above will lead to expanded mobility, higher quality and the increased attractiveness of European education and research. The measures taken in the Bologna pro-

cess are only a first step towards transparency. The provision of general information must be encouraged. To improve the level of information Europe needs a fully implemented use of a Diploma Supplement and the creation of a readily accessible database with all relevant higher education information.

The role of students
Finally, it must be stressed that students, as competent, active and constructive partners, must be seen as one of the driving forces for changes in the field of education. Student participation in the Bologna process is one of the key steps towards permanent andmore formalised student involvement in all decision making bodies and discussion foradealing with higher education on the European level.
ESIB – the National Unions of Students in Europe, being the representative of students on the European level, must be included in the future follow-up of the Bologna declaration.
ESIB – the National Unions of Students in Europe will commit itself to continue representing and promoting the students' views on the European level.

http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de

Towards a European Higher Education Area

Communiqué of the meeting of European Ministers in charge of Higher Education in Prague

19 May 2001

Two years after signing the Bologna Declaration and three years after the Sorbonne Declaration, European Ministers in charge of higher education, representing 32 signatories, met in Prague in order to review the progress achieved and to set directions and priorities for the coming years of the process. Ministers reaffirmed their commitment to the objective

of establishing the European Higher Education Area by 2010. The choice of Prague to hold this meeting is a symbol of their will to involve the whole of Europe in the process in the light of enlargement of the European Union.

Ministers welcomed and reviewed the report "Furthering the Bologna Process" commissioned by the follow-up group and found that the goals laid down in the Bologna Declaration have been widely accepted and used as a base for the development of higher education by most signatories as well as by universities and other higher education institutions. Ministers reaffirmed that efforts to promote mobility must be continued to enable students, teachers, researchers and administrative staff to benefit from the richness of the European Higher Education Area including its democratic values, diversity of cultures and languages and the diversity of the higher education systems. Ministers took note of the Convention of European higher education institutions held in Salamanca on 29-30 March and the recommendations of the Convention of European Students, held in GÊteborg on 24-25 March, and appreciated the active involvement of the European University Association (EUA) and the National Unions of Students in Europe (ESIB) in the Bologna process. They further noted and appreciated the many other initiatives to take the process further. Ministers also took note of the constructive assistance of the European Commission.

Ministers observed that the activities recommended in the Declaration concerning degree structure have been intensely and widely dealt with in most countries. They especially appreciated how the work on quality assurance is moving forward. Ministers recognized the need to cooperate to address the challenges brought about by transnational education. They also recognized the need for a lifelong learning perspective on education.

Further actions following the six objectives of the Bologna process

As the Bologna Declaration sets out, Ministers asserted that building the European Higher Education Area is a condition for enhancing the attractiveness and competitiveness of higher education institutions in Europe. They supported the idea that higher education should be considered a public good and is and will remain a public responsibility (regulations etc.), and that students are full members of the higher education community.

From this point of view Ministers commented on the further process as follows:

Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees

Ministers strongly encouraged universities and other higher education institutions to take full advantage of existing national legislation and European tools aimed at facilitating academic and professional recognition of course units, degrees and other awards, so that citizens can effectively use their qualifications, competencies and skills throughout the European Higher Education Area.

Ministers called upon existing organisations and networks such as NARIC and ENIC to promote, at institutional, national and European level, simple, efficient and fair recognition reflecting the underlying diversity of qualifications.

Adoption of a system essentially based on two main cycles

Ministers noted with satisfaction that the objective of a degree structure based on two main cycles, articulating higher education in undergraduate and graduate studies, has been tackled and discussed. Some countries have already adopted this structure and several others are considering it with great interest. It is important to note that in many countries bachelor's and master's degrees, or comparable two cycle degrees, can be obtained at universities as well as at other higher education institutions. Programmes leading to a degree may, and indeed should, have different orientations and

various profiles in order to accommodate a diversity of individual, academic and labour market needs as concluded at the Helsinki seminar on bachelor level degrees (February 2001).

Establishment of a system of credits
Ministers emphasized that for greater flexibility in learning and qualification processesthe adoption of common corner-stones of qualifications, supported by a credit system such as the ECTS or one that is ECTS-compatible, providing both transferability and accumulation functions, is necessary. Together with mutually recognized quality assurance systems such arrangements will facilitate students' access to the European labour market and enhance the compatibility, attractiveness and competitiveness of European higher education. The generalized use of such a credit system and of the Diploma Supplement will foster progress in this direction.

Promotion of mobility
Ministers reaffirmed that the objective of improving the mobility of students, teachers,researchers and administrative staff as set out in the Bologna Declaration is of the utmostimportance. Therefore, they confirmed their commitment to pursue the removal of all obstacles to the free movement of students, teachers, researchers and administrative staff and emphasized the social dimension of mobility. They took note of the possibilities for mobility offered by the European Community programmes and the progress achieved in this field, e.g. in launching the Mobility Action Plan endorsed by the European Council in Nice in 2000.

Promotion of European cooperation in quality assurance
Ministers recognized the vital role that quality assurance systems play in ensuring high quality standards and in facilitating the comparability of qualifications throughout Europe.
They also encouraged closer cooperation between recognition and quality assurance networks. They emphasized the necessity of close European cooperation and mutual trust in and acceptance of national quality assurance systems. Further they encouraged universities and other higher education institutions to disseminate examples of best practice and to design scenarios for mutual acceptance of evaluation and accreditation/certification mechanisms. Ministers called upon the universities and other higher educations institutions, national agencies and the European Network of Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), in cooperation with corresponding bodies from countries which are not members of ENQA, to collaborate in establishing a common framework of reference and to disseminate best practice.

Promotion of the European dimensions in higher education
In order to further strengthen the important European dimensions of higher education and graduate employability Ministers called upon the higher education sector to increase the development of modules, courses and curricula at all levels with "European" content, orientation or organisation. This concerns particularly modules, courses and degree curricula offered in partnership by institutions from different countries and leading to a recognized joint degree.

Furthermore Ministers emphasized the following points: Lifelong learning
Lifelong learning is an essential element of the European Higher Education Area. In the future Europe, built upon a knowledge-based society and economy, lifelong learning strategies are necessary to face the challenges of competitiveness and the use of new technologies and to improve social cohesion, equal opportunities and the quality of life.

Higher education institutions and students
Ministers stressed that the involvement of universities and other higher education institutions and of students as competent, active and constructive partners in the establishment and shaping of a European Higher Education Area is needed and welcomed. The institutions have demonstrated the importance they attach to the creation of a compatible and efficient, yet diversified and adaptable European Higher Education Area. Ministers also pointed out that quality is the basic underlying condition for trust, relevance, mobility, compatibility and attractiveness in the European Higher Education Area. Ministers expressed their appreciation of the contributions toward developing study programmes combining academic quality with relevance to lasting employability and called for a continued proactive role of higher education institutions. Ministers affirmed that students should participate in and influence the organisation and content of education at universities and other higher education institutions. Ministersalso reaffirmed the need, recalled by students, to take account of the social dimension in the Bologna process.

Promoting the attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area
Ministers agreed on the importance of enhancing attractiveness of European higher education to students from Europe and other parts of the world. The readability and comparability of European higher education degrees world-wide should be enhanced by the development of a common framework of qualifications, as well as by coherent quality assurance and accreditation/certification mechanisms and by increased information efforts.
Ministers particularly stressed that the quality of higher education and research is and should be an important determinant of Europe's international attractiveness and competitiveness. Ministers agreed that more attention should be paid to the benefit of a European Higher Education Area with institutions and programmes with different profiles.

They called for increased collaboration between the European countries concerning the possible implications and perspectives of transnational education.

Continued follow-up
Ministers committed themselves to continue their cooperation based on the objectives set out in the Bologna Declaration, building on the similarities and benefiting from the differences between cultures, languages and national systems, and drawing on all possibilities of intergovernmental cooperation and the ongoing dialogue with European
universities and other higher education institutions and student organisations as well as the Community programmes.
Ministers welcomed new members to join the Bologna process after applications from Ministers representing countries for which the European Community programmes Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci or Tempus-Cards are open. They a cepted applications from Croatia, Cyprus and Turkey.
Ministers decided that a new follow-up meeting will take place in the second half of 2003 in Berlin to review progress and set directions and priorities for the next stages of the process towards the European Higher Education Area. They confirmed the need for a structure for the follow-up work, consisting of a follow-up group and a preparatory group.
The follow-up group should be composed of representatives of all signatories, new participants and the European Commission, and should be chaired by the EU Presidency at the time. The preparatory group should be composed of representatives of the countries hosting the previous ministerial meetings and the next ministerial meeting, two EU member states and two non-EU member states; these latter four representatives will be elected by the follow-up group. The EU Presidency at the time and the European Commission will also be part of the preparatory group. The preparatory group will be chaired by the representative of the country hosting the next ministerial meeting.
The European University Association, the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE), the National Unions of Students in Europe and the Council of Europe
should be consulted in the follow-up work. In order to take the process further, Ministers encouraged the follow-up group to arrange seminars to explore the following areas: cooperation concerning accreditation andquality assurance, recognition issues and the use of credits in the Bologna process, the development of joint degrees, the social dimension, with specific attention to obstacles to mobility, and the enlargement of the Bologna process, lifelong learning and student involvement.

http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de