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About HERE and SPHERE

HERE - Higher Education Reform Experts in Partner countries
• Initiative of the European Commission – implemented through the EACEA Agency
• Former TEMPUS countries: Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Egypt, Georgia, Israel, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Moldova, Montenegro, Morocco, Palestine, Russia, Serbia, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan and Kosovo.
• Close collaboration with HERE Teams and NEOs at national Erasmus+ Offices

SPHERE – Support and Promotion for HERE
• Annual activities:
  – 1 conference, 1 thematic seminars, 3 study visits to universities,
  – around 50-60 technical assistance missions (TAM)
• SPHERE Consortium: University Barcelona & European University Association (EUA)

https://supporthere.org/
European University Association

- Non-governmental, independent
- 800 member universities in 48 countries
- 24 Ukrainian members
- Represents the interests of the higher education sector at European levels
- Membership services & policy making
- “consultative member of the Bologna Process”
EUA Trends 2018: Data on developments in the EHEA

TRENDS 2018

– Follow-up on TRENDS 2015 – longitudinal data
– Institutional developments in learning and teaching
– 303 responses – 43 European higher education systems
– 6 responses from Ukraine
– Institutional leadership (for the entire institution)
1998/9 – the vision of Bologna

• The Bologna Process vision

- European Higher Education Area
  - building a cultural Europe
  - international competitiveness

- comparable degrees

- credit system

- Mobility for students and staff

- European dimension for QA

- 29 countries
• 48 countries

• 38 million students: 56% in Russia, Turkey, Germany, France and UK
Your say

Has Bologna achieved its goals?

a) The EHEA has been positive
b) The EHEA has mixed results
c) The EHEA made no difference
d) The EHEA is negative.
European University leaders say...

Which statement best describes the situation at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of the realisation of the EHEA</th>
<th>Trends 2010</th>
<th>Trends 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The realisation of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) has generally been very positive</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The realisation of the EHEA has had mixed results</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The realisation of the EHEA has made no difference</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The realisation of the EHEA has been negative</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trends 2010, Q6: N= 760
Trends 2015, Q28: N= 420
European Ministers say ...

PARIS COMMUNIQUÉ
Paris, May 25th 2018

“progress has been made while implementation remains uneven, both between policy areas and between countries”

• Key commitments
  – Recognition – Lisbon Recognition Convention
  – 3 study cycles/ qualification frameworks
  – Quality Assurance – Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area” (ESG)
Supporting individual systems in implementation of longstanding reform commitments

Thematic Peer Learning Group (TPG)

on “key commitments”: recognition, quality assurance, qualification frameworks

3 groups: Recognition, Qualifications Frameworks, M

Bologna Implementation Coordination Group (BICG)

Funding support

High participation in the (between 28-45 countries per group)

3 chairs per group

Erasmus programme countries: E+ restricted call - project applications

EU Neighbourhood: HERE funding, TAM, and capacity building projects
Organisation

- BFUG Working Group 1 (Monitoring)
- co-chaired by Norway and Eurydice
- involving countries and stakeholders (EUA, EQAR, ESU, EI)

Data:

- Statistical data: Eurostat/national statistics agencies / data collections
- Qualitative data: survey to Ministries
- reports and surveys from Eurostudent, EUA, ESU, EQAR
Bologna Scorecard indicators

- Indicator 1: Degree structure implementation
- Indicator 2: National Qualifications Frameworks
- Indicator 3: ECTS
- Indicator 4: Lisbon Recognition Convention
- Indicator 5: Diploma Supplement
- Indicator 6: Quality Assurance
Key indicators

Key commitments: not yet all green
3 cycle degree structure: comparable but different

**Use of cycles**

- 50% of EHEA countries: most first-cycle graduates continue to study in a second-cycle programme
- 25% of EHEA countries: less than 25% that move directly into the second cycle

**ECTS**

- **1st cycle**
  - 180 - 240 ECTS

- **2nd cycle**
  - 60 - 120 ECTS

*Most common total workload of first- and second-cycle programmes, 2016/17*
Recognition

• Lisbon Recognition Convention principles well embedded in national legislation

• But recognition practice is far from "automatic"
  • problems at the level of HEI
Quality Assurance

- Positive development since 2015
- ESG well-respected
- HEI restricted to national QA agencies
- European approach for QA of joint programmes not permitted in many countries

Scorecard indicator n°6:
Stage of development of external quality assurance system,
Should the Bologna Process continue?

55% Yes, and it should take up new goals, such as learning and teaching.

23% Yes, but limited to some core areas (recognition, QA, QF)

12% Rather start a new process restricted to EU countries, and others that are ready to match the requirements.

6% As the goals have been reached, we can end the process.

4% It was not useful – better end it.

Participants at the 2017 European Quality Assurance Forum (EQAF)
Meeting in Paris on 24 and 25 May 2018, twenty years after the Sorbonne Declaration was signed, we, the Ministers responsible for higher education, wish not only to celebrate the progress made in building the European Higher Education Area over the past two decades, but also to make strong and ambitious commitments for its further development.

- University values
- Learning and teaching
Thank you for your attention

Michael Gaebel | Director Higher Education Policy Unit
E-mail: Michael.Gaebel@eua.eu

@euatweets
#EUALearnTeach
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Chapter 1: The EHEA Landscape
Chapter 2: Learning & Teaching
CHAPTER 1: THE EHEA LANDSCAPE
Student Enrolment rates

- first-cycle - 58.8%
- second-cycle - 21.7%
- third-cycle programmes - 3%
- short-cycle tertiary education - 16.8%
- System sizes: 7 million in Russia – 450 in Andora
- Russia, Turkey, Germany, France and the United Kingdom = 56.3 % of the total students
- Spain, Italy, Ukraine and Poland – 1.5 Mill students each
“Academic freedom and integrity, institutional autonomy, participation of students and staff in higher education governance, and public responsibility for and of higher education form the backbone of the EHEA.”

- Difficult to assess (self reporting has limits)
  - Different models of governance are not directly & causally linked to problems
  - Legal protection of academic freedom and institutional autonomy is important, but not sufficient

Bologna Implementation Report
CHAPTER 2: LEARNING & TEACHING
Figure 2.4: Share of higher education institutions using ECTS credits for accumulation and transfer, first- and second-cycle programmes, 2016/17

Source: BFUG data collection.
ECTS and learning outcomes

Figure 2.6: Extent to which ECTS credits are linked with learning outcomes in higher education programmes, 2016/17

[Map showing the extent of ECTS credits linked with learning outcomes across Europe]
Institutions

Learning outcomes for all courses

Trends 2010: 53%
Trends 2015: 64%
Trends 2018: 76%

Trends 2010. Q. 19
Trends 2015. Q. 36
Trends 2018. Q. 22
Figure 2.8: Impact of the learning outcomes approach in higher education institutions (% of institutions), 2017

- Course contents have been revised
- Assessment and examinations have been revised
- Students are more aware of their learning objectives
- Teaching methods have changed
- The overall quality of teaching has improved
- Cooperation among teaching staff has improved
- Course duplication has been reduced
- Recognition of credits/degrees from other institutions easier
- Recognition of prior learning has become easier
- Learning paths have become more flexible
- Student pass rates have improved
- Drop out has decreased
- No real change

Source: EUA.
INSTITUTIONS

STAFF ENHANCEMENT

Training on learning outcomes
- 39% on request only
- 25% for all teaching staff
- 12% for new teaching staff only

Voluntary courses
- 77% in place
- 13% planned

Compulsory courses
- 37% in place
- 17% planned

• Trends 2018. Q38, Q39
**DIGITAL LEARNING**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased acceptance/more strategic approaches to e-learning</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boosted education provision through e-learning</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended learning used in regular teaching</td>
<td>36% fully 51% to some extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEARNING IN DIGITAL ENVIRONMENTS

Figure 2.26: National strategies on the use of new technologies in teaching and learning in higher education, 2016/17

Source: BFUG data collection.
### Changing approaches in L&T

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flipped classrooms</strong></td>
<td><strong>15%</strong></td>
<td>very useful</td>
<td><strong>39%</strong></td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem-based learning</strong></td>
<td><strong>43%</strong></td>
<td>works well</td>
<td><strong>44%</strong></td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td><strong>4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research on L&amp;T</strong></td>
<td><strong>67%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
<td>Central structure</td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Trends 2018. Q9, Q24, Q25, Q42
Increased demand for flexible provision

Growing demand for short-term (non-degree) learning opportunities, with a certificate upon course completion.

Enrolment to flexible courses or programmes has increased in the past 3 years.

Growing demand for degree programmes provided under flexible arrangements.

- Trends 2018. Q29
- Yes / To some extent

Tuesday, December 4, 2018
High levels of convergence: Increased attention to L&T throughout the institution (92%)

- Trends 2018. Q9, Q12, Q18
Strong emphasis on external collaboration

On teaching enhancement
• None (10%)
• National initiatives (55%)
• International initiatives (53%)
• University networks (43%)
• Individual partner institutions (43%)
• Commercial providers (13%)

On L&T in general
• Employers (94%)
• Local community (88%)
• Primary and secondary schools (86%)
• Vocational institutions (73%)
• International staff and student exchanges (96%)

Trends 2018. Q27, Q41
Figure 2.1: Expectations towards higher education institutions specified in national learning and teaching strategies (% of institutions reporting that there is a national strategy in place), 2017

Source: EUA.
Collaboration on L&T within the institution

Encouraging and supporting exchange and collaboration among teachers on pedagogical practices

- Teachers do this on their own initiative: 58%
- Responsibility of programme directors or deans: 38%
- Facilitated by learning centre: 36%
- Platform - committee - group - for teachers to exchange: 20%
Enhancing Learning and Teaching at European Higher Education Institutions

Number one obstacle (out of top 3)

Top obstacles for L&T

- Lack of financial resources: 47%
- Lack of infrastructure: 5%
- Lack of recognition for teaching in staff career progression: 19%
- National (system-level) regulations: 6%
- Not enough teaching staff: 5%
- Resistance among teaching staff: 5%

Trends 2018. Q17
Concluding points

• Data & research on L&T – institutional developments
  • Convergence trends & gaps: social inclusion/engagement, flexible learning offer, digital learning, teaching enhancement
  • Research on L&T

• Key challenge
  • Funding
  • Career development
  • Institutional & policy attention to the education mission

• Institutional level: capacity for change
  • Collaboration within the institution: role of leadership, organisation
  • New and changing roles of staff
  • Overall implications for the institution and its mission

• Exchange & collaboration crucial for L&T development
  • exchanges/projects among institutions
  • national initiatives
  • Europe: Erasmus+, Bologna Process, university associations
2nd European Learning & Teaching Forum
14–15 February 2019, Warsaw, Poland

Call for Thematic Peer Groups 2019

Regular event
Exchange & networking
Build the community
Starting point for other initiatives
Thank you for your attention

**Michael Gaebel** | Director Higher Education Policy Unit
E-mail: Michael.Gaebel@eua.eu

@euatweets
#EUALearnTeach
**FORMAL REQUIREMENTS FOR TEACHING**

**Fig. 29** Formal or most common requirements needed for holding a position with teaching responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Lecturers, associate professors</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Experts, practitioners</th>
<th>Teaching support staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate or post-doctoral academic degree</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other academic degree</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in teaching enhancement courses</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven teaching experience (e.g. a minimum period of teaching practice)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular evaluation of teaching performance</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other requirements</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Programme curricula development

- There are national guidelines/frameworks: 68%
- There are institutional guidelines for this: 67%
- A team or a committee is tasked or authorised to develop it: 47%
- Each faculty or department has its own procedure: 4%
- Individual staff members can develop programmes: 22%
- There is no particular procedure for this: 3%
- Other: 2%

*Trends 2018. Q. 21*

Tuesday, December 4, 2018
Issues regarding Bachelor and Masters programmes

- The Bachelor programmes do not provide students a real academic experience. 56%
- Bachelor programmes are too short, resulting in a heavy workload for students. 51%
- Bachelor degrees are not valued by employers. 40%
- Many or most of the Bachelor programmes do not include research experience. 32%
- Many or most of the Master programmes do not include research experience. 67%
- There are far too many Master programmes offered. 54%
- The Master programmes overlap in contents with respective Bachelor programmes. 44%

This has never been the case
This has been the case, but has been changed / is changing
Continues to be the case
Continues to be the case in some disciplines or parts of the institution
Information unavailable / Not applicable

• Trends 2018. Q. 19
### Social inclusion & engagement

#### Impact of inclusiveness and social engagement on learning and teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage student initiatives on civic/social engagement</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusion is considered in the learning and teaching practice</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social engagement integrated into study programmes (internships with NGOs,…)</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special courses in social engagement</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits for participation in civic/social engagement initiatives</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Trends 2018. Q28**

- Yes / To some extent, or in parts of the institution

Tuesday, December 4, 2018
Measures offered for lifelong learners

- Recognition of prior learning: 59%
- Flexible study programmes/learning paths: 58%
- Courses provided in collaboration with…: 53%
- Guidance and counselling services for…: 44%
- Continuing professional development…: 39%
- Open online learning courses / MOOCs: 38%
- Courses provided in collaboration with…: 32%
- Online degree programmes: 27%
- Courses provided in collaboration with…: 21%
- Other: 6%

Tuesday, December 4, 2018
**Students can...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes it is commonly done across the institution</th>
<th>Yes, but very limited across the institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Switch between full-time and part-time provision</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have some flexibility with respect to the time it…</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have some flexibility when studying some…</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose optional courses in their study…</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change optional courses during their studies</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change study programme during their studies</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide whether or not to physically attend a…</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest the topics s/he wants to study in a…</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have choice between different types of…</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Trends 2018. Q. 16**

**Tuesday, December 4, 2018**
Response from institutions

• Learning outcomes developed

- Yes, for all courses (across the institution)
- Yes, for some courses
- No, but we intend to develop them
- No
- Information unavailable

• Trends 2018. Q. 22
• **SYSTEMATIC EFFORT TO ESTABLISH...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, but we are planning this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optional courses to enhance teaching skills</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory courses to enhance teaching skills</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer feedback system (teachers provide feedback on each other’s teaching)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team teaching (teachers jointly prepare and deliver a course or a class)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios in which teachers document their teaching practices</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on learning and teaching</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of good teaching</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• **Trends 2018.**

Q. 38
Figure 2.37: Means of assessment/enhancement of teaching in place throughout the institution (% of institutions), 2017

- Student feedback surveys
- Engagement with students (face time, mentoring, thesis supervision)
- Processes in place to intervene in case teaching performance is constantly poor
- Heads of departments/deans of faculties regularly discuss teaching performance with individual academic staff
- Self-evaluations
- Completion of teaching enhancement courses
- Students’ progression
- Peer assessments
- Engagement with industry/business sector, community engagement
- Other

Source: EUA.