EMMA

THE COMPOSTELA GROUP OF UNIVERSITIES' RECOMMENDATIONS

Lifelong Learning Programme
ERASMUS Accompanying Measures

EMbracing the Modernisation Agenda
526421-LLP-1-2012-1-ES-ERASMUS-EAM

European Commission

THE COMPOSTELA GROUP OF UNIVERSITIES' RECOMMENDATIONS

Lifelong Learning Programme
ERASMUS Accompanying Measures

compostela

EMMA

THE COMPOSTELA GROUP OF UNIVERSITIES' RECOMMENDATIONS

Lifelong Learning Programme
ERASMUS Accompanying Measures

EMbracing the Modernisation Agenda
526421-LLP-1-2012-1-ES-ERASMUS-EAM

Lifelong
Learning
Programme

European Commission

Acknowledgements

As editors of this recommendation guide from the project *EMbracing the Modernisation Agenda (EMMA),* first of all, we would like to thank our partners, Brussels Education Services (BES), Flanders' Chamber of Commerce and Industry - Vlaams Economisch Verbond (Voka – VEV), and Erasmus Mundus Student and Alumni Association (EMA), for their valuable collaboration.

We would also like to show our gratitude to the European Commission for their financial support and, of course, for the participation of its representatives in the seminars carried out within the framework of the EMMA Project.

We are particularly grateful to the six rapporteurs who led the five group discussions and whose recommendations are included in this publication: Mar Figueras, Enrique López Veloso, Jackie Moses, Jan Petter Myklebust, Nijolé Saugèniené and Rui Vieira de Castro.

We would also like to thank the keynote speakers for their significant contribution to the workshops: Abebaw Yirga Adamu (Tampere University and Erasmus Mundus Alumni and Students Association), Emanuel Alfranseder (Erasmus Student Network), Anna-Lena Claeys-Kulik (European University Association), Lieven Danneels (Televic and Voka), Eveline Depreter (Patient care AZ Damiaan, Oostende and Voka), Tony Hoare (Bristol University), Sylvie Nail (University of Nantes), Stephanie Raible (Erasmus Mundus Alumni), Sven Vandeputte (OCAS and Voka), and Joachim Wyssling (Campus Europae).

Furthermore, we would like to make special mention of Koen Delaere (Managing Director of Brussels Education Services), Inmaculada Fortanet (Vice-president of the CGU and academic coordinator), Isabel Lirola Delgado (Executive Secretary of the CGU) and Jean Pierre Roose (representative of the CGU in Brussels), for their important contributions to this publication.

Finally, we would like to highlight the technical assistance provided by Lucía Castro and Aroa Sánchez (Compostela Group of Universities).

We sincerely hope that these recommendations will be of great use and inspire higher education institutions across Europe to surmount future challenges.

Compostela Group of Universities

September 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION
THE EMMA PROJECT

1.

In his State of the Union address delivered in Strasbourg (28th September 2011), José Manuel Barroso claimed that Europe can create the right conditions for growth to resume. He added that in a competitive world, Europe needs a well-educated workforce with skills to face the new challenges that lie ahead. In addition, Europe must act in a sustainable way. The high unemployment rates among the younger population in Europe need to be addressed urgently. In an introductory presentation to the Lifelong Learning Programme Info Days[1] (Brussels, October 2011), Mr Pierre Mairesse (DG EAC) referred to the major challenges Education and Training are facing in times of crisis: disappearance of low-skilled jobs, accelerated transformation in the labour markets, meeting future skills needs, preparing for longer working lives and the scarcity of funding for Education and Training in several Member States. On 20th December, the draft joint report (by EC and Council) *Education and Training in a smart, sustainable and inclusive Europe*[2] was adopted. Again, the key findings of this report are very much in line with what was the subject of in-depth discussion in the current project's deliverables: need for smart investment, attainment levels, making lifelong learning a reality, transnational mobility and new skills for new jobs.

The Compostela Group of Universities (CGU) applied in 2012 to call for proposals of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Commission. The project, which was finally approved for the period from 1st October 2012 to 30th September 2013, was entitled *EMbracing the Modernisation Agenda (EMMA)*. The CGU partners in this project were Brussels Education Services (BES), an agency which aims to promote inter-university co-operation and to foster university-society relations through international projects; Voka Flemish Employers Association, which unites most of the businesses from all sectors within the Flemish region; and the Erasmus Mundus Students and Alumni Association. In this way, the project gathers the universities as knowledge providers (CGU network), the labour

1   http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/events/infodays_2012/infoday_llp_2012_en.php
2   http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/progress-reports_en.htm

market through a representation of companies (Voka) and a selection of the best students and alumni through the Erasmus Mundus Students and Alumni Association. All these partners, coordinated by BES, can provide a comprehensive view of the main challenges addressed by the European Commission and how to react to these challenges in the coming years.

The Compostela Group of Universities is one of the leading European University Networks. It is an open and inclusive organisation, which in its mission refers to its overarching goal to facilitate and promote co-operation in the higher education sector. All through its history the network has been responsive and pro-active when it comes to both European and global higher education policies and priorities. This is reflected in the long list of projects, working groups and other initiatives that have been initiated by the network over the past year. Moreover, the CGU 2012 General Assembly (Oulu, mid-September 2012) was dedicated to the Modernisation Agenda. This decision was taken by the Executive Committee on 27th January, 2012. The programme foresaw a keynote and several contributions by experts in the field. As an open network, the organisation is keen to generate debates of this nature with the major stakeholders in the context of the Modernisation Agenda. Among its associate members relevant for the EMMA Project, we can list the European Access Network, WACE (Advancing Co-operation and Work-Integrated Education), etc.

In addition, the network planned to establish links with national and regional policies through the contacts with the national ministries of education of the member universities. The Compostela Group of Universities made sure that sufficient academic input was provided for the planning of the major project events as well as the publication. A consultation among the network's members was held and valuable input for the seminars' content and candidate speakers came from Erasmushogeschool Brussel (BE), University of Roehampton (UK), UNINETTUNO (IT), Universidade de Vigo (ES), Nyenrode Business Universiteit (NL), etc. Some of the ideas brought forward by the members were already integrated in the programmes for the main project events. The partners invited to join in the EMMA Project contributed with great enthusiasm and provided further ideas and references.

The title of the project, *EMbracing the Modernisation Agenda (EMMA)*, responds to two documents. On 20th September 2011, the European Commission launched its Communication: *Supporting growth and jobs – an agenda for the modernisation of Europe's higher education systems* – hereafter referred to as the Communication. The Communication is an update and revision of a previous version launched in 2006 *Delivering on the modernisation agenda for universities* in the context of the Lisbon Process. The revised version is written against the background of EU 2020, the EU's strategic agenda for growth.

The project partnership interpreted the Communication as an invitation to launch an in-depth debate on those policy issues that need to be tackled in response to the challenges listed in the document. The partners equally understood that such a debate can only be fruitful if a representative group of universities (both from within and outside the Compostela Group - coordinator) as well as representatives from the main stakeholders (students, employers) and authorities such as the Bologna Follow-Up Group (BFUG) and the European Commission were involved. The EMMA Project facilitated such a debate through the organisation of two successive interactive seminars that were organised in Brussels in the course of the first semester of 2013 (whose programmes can be found in the Annex of this handbook). The final aim of the discussion was to formulate advice and recommendations geared towards the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). These recommendations are presented in the current volume.

The seminars started with some keynotes and then working groups were organised with all the participants to guarantee open discussion. Each working group had a rapporteur, who collected all the ideas, which were presented to the whole audience at the end of the seminar for general discussion. The rapporteurs have been asked to write a chapter for the present book on the conclusions of the discussion on each of the challenges.

The chapters in this book recall the EMMA Project in its entirety. The first section explains the process of development of the project. In the next section, the partners are briefly presented. Next come an introduction of the five challenges listed in the EC Communication *Supporting growth and jobs – an agenda for the modernisation of Europe's higher education systems*. The main discussion topics and the recommendations on each of the challenges are then explained in the following five sections. Finally, a wrap up chapter makes a general interpretation of the relevance of the project and the recommendations made by the participants.

This short book is mainly addressed to the European Commission policy makers as well as administrators and decision makers in universities all over Europe and researchers who may be interested in the social effects of higher education policies. Our objective has been to offer the view of actual European university members on the five challenges posed by the European Commission and to make some recommendations for future policies stemming from these challenges.

Inmaculada Fortanet-Gómez

Vice-president, Compostela Group of Universities
Universitat Jaume I (Spain)
vcriim@uji.es

PROJECT BACKGROUND

2.

According to what is stated in the Communication and given that European higher education institutions' (HEIs) potential to fulfil their role in society and to contribute to Europe's prosperity remains underexploited, it seems certain that the main responsibility for delivering reforms rests with the Member States and HEIs themselves.

The two lead partners of the EMMA Project, Brussels Education Services and the Compostela Group of Universities, met to coincide with a presentation on the Communication at VLEVA (Liaison Agency Flanders-Europe) in Brussels on 3rd October, 2011. The talk given by Mr Adam Tyson, Head of the Unit for Higher Education and Erasmus (DG Education and Culture), was thought-provoking and inspired both parties to look into opportunities to respond in a pro-active manner to the various challenges raised in the working document and to seek the active involvement of both HEIs and stakeholders.

Several working meetings followed and early in 2012 the EMMA Project proposal was submitted. A consortium was set up with two additional partners: Voka and EMA.

The project rationale was straightforward. The Communication would be interpreted by the partnership as an open invitation to launch an in-depth debate on the policy issues that needed to be tackled in response to the five main challenges listed in the document:

1. Increasing attainment levels to provide the graduates and researchers that Europe needs.
2. Improving the quality and relevance of higher education.
3. Strengthening quality through mobility and cross-border co-operation.
4. Making the knowledge triangle work: Linking higher education, research and business for excellence and regional development.
5. Improving governance and funding.

In practical terms, the project partners agreed to organise two workshops in Brussels in the first semester of 2013. A first workshop was held on 25th-26th February, 2013 and a second was scheduled for 24th May, 2013. While the first workshop focused on the first three priorities listed above, the second workshop tackled the last two priorities. The workshop formats consisted of a balanced mix of plenary sessions and group work. Several stakeholders were actively involved as speakers and moderators. Detailed information about the programmes, the speakers and the presentations can be retrieved from the project website: www.emma-project.eu.

Six rapporteurs were appointed by the Compostela Group of Universities. They were in charge of the group discussions that were held in the framework of the two successive workshops. On 3rd June, 2013 the rapporteurs came together for an additional project meeting in Brussels where the details of this publication were discussed and a distribution of work was agreed upon. Each rapporteur contributed recommendations that were brought forward during the workshop discussions.

This publication is meant to offer practical, hands-on advice for the wider European Higher Education Area on how to tackle the challenges raised in the Communication with the goal of supporting growth and jobs in the face of the current and challenging economic environment while involving stakeholders such as employers, students and policymakers in the process.

Koen Delaere
Managing Director, Brussels Education Services (Belgium)
delaere@eduser.eu

EMMA

PROJECT PARTNERS

3.

Compostela Group of Universities (ES)

The Compostela Group of Universities (CGU) is a non-profit association of universities whose main aim is to facilitate and promote co-operation in all fields related to higher education.

Founded in 1995 by the University of Santiago de Compostela, the CGU is one of the largest and most inclusive networks of higher education institutions all over the world. It brings together 67 full member universities in 27 countries, three European associate member entities and two mutual member American networks.

Apart from its Executive Secretariat, which is permanently based in Santiago de Compostela (Spain), the CGU has a liaison officer in Brussels which has connected the network with the heart of Europe since September 2011.

The CGU develops and implements own right activities such as international mobility programmes, training and professional workshops, and exchange of good practices. It also participates as coordinator or partner in a number of EC projects, such as TEMPUS, ERASMUS LLP, ERASMUS MUNDUS and other EC initiatives of interest for the university members.

With the Lifelong Learning Project ERASMUS Accompanying Measures EMMA - EMbracing of Modernisation Agenda, the CGU and the project partners constituted an effective pool of discussion and good practices among the university representatives and relevant stakeholders on the EU Communication (September 2011).

The outcomes of that pool of discussion are outlined in this handbook as recommendations for the European Commission, the parties involved in the project and other institutions which might be interested in the EU policy issues for Horizon 2020.

Brussels Education Services (BE)

Brussels Education Services (BES) was founded in January 2006 with the aim of promoting inter-university co-operation and fostering university-society relations through international projects. The EMMA Project (EMbracing the Modernisation Agenda) is thus completely in line with the organisation's mission.

BES offers a hands-on, pro-active approach to the following services for the higher education and research sector: Project Proposal Writing, Project Management, Partner Search, Technical Assistance and Coordination.

Over the years BES has drafted many successful project proposals under the EU-funded programmes such as the Lifelong Learning Programme, Erasmus Mundus, Tempus, etc.

BES is also actively involved in several service contracts with the European Commission (EAC) and the Executive Agency (EACEA).

In the period 2008-2013 BES was co-managing the "Higher Education Reform Information Project" Service Contracts with the UNICA Network of Universities with regards to which regular training seminars for Bologna Experts and Tempus Higher Education Reform Experts were organised.

Since January 2013, in a consortium with CHE Consult (Project Leader), CGU and the Erasmus Student Network, BES is a partner in an EU-funded study (Service Contract): "The impact of Erasmus Mobility and Intensive Programmes on skills development, employability, institutional development and the internationalisation of higher education institutions".

Voka - VEV – Flemish Employers Association (BE)

Voka, Flanders' Chamber of Commerce and Industry, is the most representative employers' organisation in Flanders. It represents over 18,000 companies in Flanders and Brussels. Thus it represents 65% of private employment and 66% of the added value in Flanders.

Voka was founded in January 2004, when the Vlaams Economisch Verbond (VEV) and the eight regional chambers of commerce decided to form an alliance. Since 2008, Voka has collaborated with 29 sector associations, which strengthens the field of employers' organisations even more.

Voka - VEV's basic activities are the definition of viewpoints, lobbying and coordination of projects on the Flemish level. Whilst the Voka - Kamers specialise in lobbying on a regional level, networking and rendering a strong service towards its companies, the Voka - Comité Brussel has been created for Flemish companies in Brussels.

EMA – Erasmus Mundus Students and Alumni Association (DE)

The Erasmus Mundus Association (EMA) unites more than 7,500 students and graduates of the EU-sponsored Erasmus Mundus Master and PhD programmes. Members of the association are not only actively involved in promoting the internationalisation of higher education and the Erasmus Mundus programme, their contributions constitute valuable sources for evaluation and quality assessment purposes and, thus, feed into the general modernisation of international higher education. Members of the association are actively involved in discussions with higher education institutions across the globe, the European Commission and other stakeholders.

THE MODERNISATION AGENDA'S FIVE PRIORITIES

4.

The Communication clearly identifies five priorities in order to maximise the contribution of Europe's higher education systems to a smart, sustainable and inclusive growth:

1. **Increasing attainment levels to provide the graduates and researchers Europe needs**

The first priority of the Modernisation Agenda has its origin in the headline target of Europe 2020 which states that, by 2020, 40% of young people should successfully complete higher education or equivalent studies. Although attainment levels have grown significantly in the last decade, they are still far from meeting the estimated needs of knowledge-intensive jobs which are necessary to benefit from globalisation and for the sustainability of the European social model.

Moreover, the current economic situation and the demographic changes are negatively affecting the number of school leavers who decide to continue with higher education. Therefore, it is essential that European higher education institutions focus on a broader cross-section of society, including those more disadvantaged and vulnerable groups, and policies which prevent and reduce school drop-out from earlier stages. It is extremely important to remember that an improvement in attainment levels shall enhance quality and development in educational systems.

In order to meet the 3% of GDP research investment target, more research jobs will be needed, especially in the private sector, and for this, an improvement in career prospects and in investment conditions, including full participation of women's talent, are mandatory.

2. **Improving the quality and relevance of higher education**

Even having great importance in equipping graduates with knowledge and core transferable competences, higher education curricula are often slow to respond to a changing environment or to anticipating new challenges. In order to

become more flexible, co-operation with employers and labour market institutions becomes crucial in the design of academic programmes and contents. Better monitoring of the career paths of former students at all university levels can provide further information concerning the suitability of the programmes. Also, research training must be better aligned with the needs of the knowledge-intensive labour market and with the requirements of the SMEs.

But the quality and relevance of higher education is not only related to employability, but also to innovative learning approaches, which might be reached by encouraging a greater variety of study modes, exploiting the potential of ICTs or even with the introduction of incentives for higher education institutions to invest in continuous professional development or to reward excellence in teaching.

3.   Strengthening quality through mobility and cross-border co-operation

The ministers of the European Higher Education Area have agreed to raise the proportion of students completing a study or training period abroad to 20% by 2020. Learning mobility has a positive impact on employability and skills as it increases professional, social and intercultural abilities. Bologna Process and the three-cycle structure (bachelor-master-doctorate) have facilitated individual mobility. Also, the development of the European Research Area has increased institutional co-operation.

However, the existence of different barriers concerning academic recognition, increasing costs and bureaucracy for exterior and, even, intra-EU mobility may have a negative impact on Europe as a study destination and should be faced. This also applies to the objective of attracting the best students, academics and researchers from outside the European Union and developing new forms of cross-border co-operation.

4.   Making the knowledge triangle work: Linking higher education, research and business for excellence and regional development

The role of higher education institutions in regional development needs further collaboration with the private sector. Education institutions, research organisations and businesses need to understand the importance of the knowledge transfer among them in order to increase efficiency and results.

Public agents are strategic in the development of policies which encourage partnerships that may end up in the creation of regional hubs of excellence and specialisation with a positive impact on both economy and education.

The stimulation of entrepreneurial, creative and innovation skills will certainly contribute to anchor education in the knowledge triangle and integrate higher education institutions as relevant actors of regional and local growth.

5. Improving governance and funding

Europe 2020 highlights the need to protect, with adequate funding, those areas of education and research which enhance growth. The economic situation and the pressure for fiscal consolidation have had a two-fold result in Member States: some of them have reduced their expenditure on education, while others have decided to increase their budgets in recognition of the key role of these areas in economic growth.

With an increasing need for diversifying the origin of funding resources, private investment appears as an alternative together with the increase or introduction of tuition fees. Monitoring the impact of these measures will be key, especially as regards equity and mobility.

In a quite dynamic environment, higher education institutions are in need of flexible structures which let them respond conveniently to these new challenges. They do not only have to deal with the reduction in their budgets, but also with their own legal and administrative restrictions, which complicate their efficiency at these times when flexibility is vital for facing present and future challenges. Autonomy, accountability and professional management are relevant aspects in governance improvement.

Isabel Lirola Delgado
Executive Secretary, Compostela Group of Universities
University of Santiago de Compostela (Spain)
isabel.lirola@usc.es

THE CGU

RECOMMENDATIONS

5.

These recommendations are directed firstly to the European Commission as a response from the Compostela Group of Universities to the key issues listed in the Communication under each priority. At the same time, the recommendations will constitute a source of inspiration for the Compostela Group of Universities and its counterparts and, certainly, they will be very beneficial for the wider European Higher Education Area.

This document tries to inspire higher education institutions across Europe to adopt strategies and to concentrate resources on a limited number of priorities which will maximise the benefits for all stakeholders involved, mainly students and employers.

Furthermore, the practical nature of these recommendations and their "constructive" nature will facilitate their continued use and the promotion of a series of ideas for possible spin-off projects and follow-up initiatives focusing on the specific policy issues listed in the Communication.

PRIORITY 1: Increasing attainment levels to provide the graduates and researchers europe needs

   1.   Key policy issues for Member States and higher education institutions

The EU Communication establishes, as a key issue, the increasing of attainment levels as a means to providing the graduates and researchers Europe needs. This issue is analysed in the following four dimensions:

   1.   Develop clear progression routes from vocational and other education types into higher education. An effective way to achieve this is through national qualification frameworks linked to the European Qualifications Framework and based on learning outcomes, and through clear procedures for recognising learning and experience gained outside formal education and training.

   2.   Encourage outreach to school students from under-represented groups and to "non-traditional" learners, including adults; provide more transparent information on educational opportunities and outcomes, and tailored guidance to inform study choices and reduce drop-out.

   3.   Ensure that financial support reaches potential students from lower income backgrounds through a better targeting of resources.

   4.   Design and implement national strategies to train and re-train enough researchers in line with the Union's R&D targets.

The EMMA Project was oriented towards the awareness-raising of each of these dimensions through a debate that addressed them in the context of the Compostela Group of Universities, notably through in-depth analysis with stakeholders; this strategy supported the formulation of hands-on advice. We hereby present the main aspects of the debate that took place and we formulate some recommendations.

Both the debate and the recommendations take into consideration the more general framework of the on-going reforms in the EHEA and the underlying objective of contributing to the development of a "knowledge society" as a critical condition to support the welfare of nations and their people. The target of 40% of people aged 30-34 with tertiary level qualifications, by 2020, and the progressive and sustainable strengthening of the research and development system cannot be separated from that objective.

The raising of education and qualification levels of people calls for new developments and the corresponding consolidation of the different paths to HE, for the access to HE of groups that are usually marginalised, and for measures facing the problem of dropping-out.

The education and qualification of people as a means to face current societal changes and to assure one's personal development also demands the enhancement of links between education and science. To achieve this objective, the modes of making European research and development systems more attractive and the ways to consolidate the interactions between teaching and research should be understood as crucial for universities to keep their role in the building of the knowledge society.

2. Main topics raised in the workshop discussions

In the context of the EMMA Project, the discussion on the key issue, "Increasing attainment levels to provide the graduates and researchers Europe needs" was developed after a specification of the framework previously outlined which selected the following topics:

1. Benchmarks for education and training in the contexts of the 2020 Agenda.

2. EU and national qualification frameworks.

3. State, regional and institutional policies to address ET 2020.

4. The prevention of drop-out at secondary and tertiary levels.

5. Current attainment levels: how to move forward.

6. The increasing of attainment levels and its extension to the different social groups.

7. University strategies for reaching school leavers.

8. University strategies for communicating with potential students.

9. Research: investment, strategies for developing partnerships.

10. Strategies for the creation of research jobs.

In the course of the debates, some of these topics became more prominent, and were eventually given more attention.

The examination of the available statistics on attainment and drop-out levels and the inclusion of under-represented groups demonstrated a great variability and diversification across EU-27 countries. The good news is that almost all countries will reach the 40% of a youth cohort taking a post-secondary school degree by 2020, and that several European nations have already reached this target and several countries also hold higher ambitions in their policy goals[3].

---

3   OECD (2013). *Education at a Glance 2013: OECD Indicators*, pp. 25-40.
    EC/EACEA/Eurydice (2012). *Key Data on Education in Europe - 2012 Edition.* Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, pp. 67-75.

Meanwhile it should be stressed that some of the existing differences still exist among EU countries, some of which are deeply rooted in the history of each educational system. The existence of such diversity should not be ignored when establishing the targets as a means to make them more effective. The educational, social, and economic implications of establishing the same goals for all the countries, ignoring their historical differences, should be taken into consideration.

The attainment levels must also be considered in terms of the different fields of education, as attainment in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics, the so-called STEM subjects is a serious problem for several HE systems. Thus, not only the issue of the general attainment levels must be addressed, but also the attainment in STEM subjects needs to be faced by specific policy measures at European, national, regional and institutional levels.

To increase attainment levels while maintaining quality, focusing on student and learning-centred strategies in times when the traditional university student is changing, and to include under-represented groups, older students and students attending universities part-time, is not an easy equation to solve.

There is an urgent need for evidence-based policy monitoring in what concerns widening participation in HE. In this respect, there are some experiences that should be carefully analysed. This is the case of Bristol University's strategy for increasing attainment level through outreach programmes directed towards under-represented groups (Hoare, 2013; Hoare & Johnston, 2011). This is also the case of the ExpandO Project oriented towards the promotion of "transnational co-operation in the implementation of Lifelong Learning Strategies, more particularly in the field of Widening Access"[4].

Our current circumstances additionally imply a revision of the progression routes into universities, and notably revisions and more flexibility of academic recognition. Students are also working more while they study higher education, and they are more likely to move to other institutions for complementary credits either abroad or within the same country, also targeting arrangements outside formal education as apprenticeship-like options in the curricula that pose new challenges for academic credit recognition.

In this new context, drop-out should be observed as a multifactor problem, demanding additional evidence from research. New perspectives need to be developed on how HEI should promote structural changes to attend the needs and expectations of socially different groups and in particular the need to support students who risk dropping-out.

---

4   See http://expandingopportunities.eu for more detailed information.

The statistical monitoring and policy-formulation of objectives is taking place at state level, and hence not the remit of individual universities, who, however, have control of impact mechanisms upon student communication and the development of extension programs addressing under-represented groups.

There are many research questions involved in uncovering the relationship between university attainment, tuition fees, student support through grants and loans, the relationships between public and private contribution of these costs and the consequences of different student financing arrangements in terms of access to higher education, particularly concerning students from under-represented groups.

Open system of admission (e.g. Belgium) vs. strict admission clauses (e.g. UK) express various approaches to the attainment levels and drop-out issues by different HE systems. In Flanders, access to tertiary education is open to all those who hold a secondary level degree. This generates a large yearly influx of new students, with a low success rate. On average students acquire 61% of the credits of the courses they register for[5]. Means of heightening the success rate of first year students should be evaluated, searching for the factors influencing the transition between secondary and tertiary education, including restricting access based on secondary degree quality, the use of entrance exams, advice on study choices and strengthening of self-awareness in the choice of tertiary education.

KU Leuven University Rector Professor, Mark Waer, has proposed drawing a distinction between "excellence by inclusion" and "excellence by selection", which deserves a wide discussion. For Waer, the statistical data of around half the Flemish university students failing in the first year is "often cited as an argument against the system of widespread acceptance of first-year students", but it needs to be confronted with another statistic showing that five out of six Flemish students obtain a post-secondary degree at a university or university college (Waer, 2012).

With the present development of free online teaching modules in a variety of academic fields on all levels, through videos (such as those on YouTube via the Khan Academy) and through separate teaching platforms developing an increasing number of MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses), universities should find out how these resources could be utilised as complementary education for those social groups with low university recruitment.

In 2013, researchers at Universitat Rovira i Virgili in Tarragona (Spain) in a survey involving 151 employers in Tarragona, reported that 76% of the respondents said they were satisfied with the graduates employed in their company. When asked if they considered hiring a doctorate degree graduate and if this would add

---

5   See http://www.kuleuven.be/cultuur/english/news/official-opening-focuses-on-international-and-regional-networks

value to their company, 65% of the respondents said they did not believe that hiring a PhD student provides any added value compared with an undergraduate candidate, and only 4% of the polled employers absolutely agreed that an employee with a PhD degree should be paid a higher salary (see Figueras, 2013).

These attitudes towards doctorate training should be taken into consideration and again it demands the gathering of more data on doctorate training and work outside academia, and notably how to train doctorate students better in skills demanded by the workforce as a remit under the Modernisation Agenda and the training and re-training of researchers. This is the kind of project the Compostela Group of Universities seems to be in a very good position to perform.

Lieven Danneels, of Televic, a company that develops, manufactures and installs top end high-tech communication systems for specific niche markets in Europe, India and China, reported at the first EMMA conference that in 1998 there was no PhD-holder employed by Televic. In 2009 there were five and in 2013 the number increased to seven PhD-holders employed, the company having looked for more.

Danneels, also President of the Chamber of Commerce West Flanders (one of the eight Voka - Kamers) and member of the Board of KU Leuven, said that the labour market evaluation is increasingly demanding "additionality and complementarity" based on "talent economy", "people that can deal with change", "creative, explorative minds", "managing complexity" and called for a "trilateral network and hybrid organisation between the State, Academia and Industry". Danneels also called for "a quality index in the alignment of degrees" and that the present "high intake, many failures" admission at Flemish universities should be re-examined in order to obtain a 35% attainment level by 2020".

The Council for Doctoral Education of EUA (European Universities Association); the Doctoral Studies Community of LERU (League of European Research Universities); the Doctoral Studies and Research Task-Force of CG (Coimbra Group); the PhD Officers Group & UNICA PhD Master Class of UNICA (Network of Universities from Capitals of Europe) illustrate how important doctorate training is for university network collaboration and coordination. It is now timely to extend the debate on PhD objectives, models, and actitivities, as well as on the strategies to widening the participation in doctoral studies.

3. Recommendations

3.1 Progression routes/national qualification frameworks

1. The intended greater differentiation of the student admitted to first year university courses in Europe, also with attainment of older student groups with either work experience or some higher education to be recognised

as a part of the degree requirements, and of groups that traditionally have not been recruited to university studies, call for a revision of the national qualification frameworks allowing for this diversification.

2. Focus should be placed on the need for excellence by inclusion not excellence by selection of youth cohorts with regard to higher education, postponing such selection until after the bachelor level, to account for the high variability in maturity and social malleability of 18-year-olds.

3. Improve clear progression routes into higher education: European students often have a hiatus between finishing secondary education and starting tertiary training; other students, for several reasons, do not proceed to tertiary education, even if they want to do so. More research into factors provoking such hiatus or leave of formal education should be undertaken, notably on how and why this could change.

3.2 Outreach to under-represented groups/stemming from drop-out rates

4. Drop-out rates and tertiary degree completion rates vary strongly across European countries. For instance, in Denmark the completion age for a Master degree is 28 years old. Universities are recommended to investigate the relationship between drop-out rates and completion age, in order to produce more evidence based on information on which interventions might reduce drop-out rates or improve the delay-time-to-graduation.

5. The social dimension of the Bologna Process and the ERASMUS Programme are of paramount importance in terms of widening participation in higher education and should be further strengthened.

6. Further assessment studies on admission policies to widen participation should be undertaken to monitor the effect such measures have had.

7. Clarification of "cause and effect" factors in assessment studies of widening participation measures should be further re-worked, in order to establish evidence-based policies.

8. Countries and universities demanding tuition fees for students should develop a grant system, with particular allocation for underprivileged groups.

9. Universities should follow the MOOCs development in particular, with regard to how to use such courses as motivational and complementary training for students from social groups with low university enrolment.

10. Because widening participation will imply new organisational challenges, it should be matched with increasing financing of HEIs. As it is acknowledge in the Communication from the Commission on the Modernisation

Agenda investment in HE in Europe is too low if compared to the US or to Japan.

3.3 Support mechanisms for under-represented groups

11. The Bologna process has worked out a catalogue of good practice in social dimension implementation in HE[6]. The measures occur a) before HE entry, b) at HE entry c) during study progress and aim at improving the equity dimension at the HE system level. The EMMA Project proposes updating and extending this good practice catalogue to more countries' practices.

12. On this basis we suggest measures to widen access for disadvantaged students and those from lower socio-economic backgrounds in order to encourage social mobility. We also suggest measures for delivering fair access, in the areas of attainment, informed subject choice, building aspiration and addressing postgraduate access.

3.4 Train and re-train researchers

13. PhD programmes more directed towards the needs of the industry should be actively enhanced by universities and the private sector.

14. Specific devices to exchange information and opportunities for career paths for doctorate candidates outside academia should be developed.

15. Specific actions should be promoted in order to tackle stereotyping by students reaching post-graduate education *vis à vis* STEM-academic fields.

16. Student centred teaching involving students in research processes at an early stage of their studies should be seen as a means of assuring greater recruitment to research upon graduation.

Rui Vieira de Castro
University of Minho (Portugal)
rvcastro@ie.uminho.pt

Jan Petter Myklebust
University of Bergen (Norway)
jan.myklebust@adm.uib.no

6   See http://www.ehea.info/article-details.aspx?ArticleId=244

PRIORITY 2: Improving the quality and relevance of higher education

1. Key policy issues for Member States and higher education institutions

The EC Communication[7] establishes improving the quality and relevance of higher education (HE) as one of its key issues. This issue is examined in the following aspects:

1. Encourage the use of skills and growth projections and graduate employment data (including tracking graduate employment outcomes) in course design, delivery and evaluation, adapting quality assurance and funding mechanisms to reward success in equipping students for the labour market.

2. Encourage a greater variety of study modes (e.g. part-time, distance and modular learning, continuing education for adult returners and others already in the labour market), by adapting funding mechanisms where necessary.

3. Better exploit the potential of ICTs to enable more effective and personalised learning experiences, teaching and research methods (e.g. e-learning and blended learning) and increase the use of virtual learning platforms.

4. Enhance the capacity of labour market institutions (including public employment services) and regulations to match skills and jobs, and develop active labour market policies to promote graduate employment and enhance career guidance.

5. Introduce incentives for higher education institutions to invest in continuous professional development for their staff, recruit sufficient staff to develop emerging disciplines and reward excellence in teaching.

6. Link funding for doctoral programmes to the *Principles for Innovative Doctoral Training*[8].

The debate related to the quality and relevance of higher education took place during the 1st EMMA Project Workshop in Brussels (February 2013). Its main conclusions are presented below with some additional remarks and recommendations.

---

7   *Supporting growth and jobs – an agenda for the modernisation of Europe's higher education systems*, COM (2011) 567 final, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0567:FIN:EN:PDF.

8   See http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/pdf/research_policies/Principles_for_Innovative_Doctoral_Training.pdf

2. Main topics raised in the workshop discussions

Some topics were proposed by the chair, Jean Pierre Roose, for the workshop discussions agenda before the meeting:

1. Anticipating the careers of tomorrow and adapting curricula.

2. Career centres: how to help students in finding the right job.

3. Flexible and innovative learning approaches and delivery methods.

4. New opportunities for researcher training and collaboration with industry.

5. Competencies and motivation of teachers and researchers.

6. Adapting quality assurance to society needs.

The group discussion was started with an introductory presentation by Nijolé Saugènienè (International School of Law & Business, Lithuania) and a follow-up presentation by Eveline Depreter (Director Patient Care Az Damiaan, Ostende & Voka).

The introductory presentation was more of a general nature and emphasised the relation between quality and relevance in HE according to the statements of the Modernisation Agenda. The introductory presentation also drew attention to the impact of information and communication technologies and the opportunities in contemporary higher education.

The second presentation dealt with a case study of Az Damiaan Ostend regional health care reference centre. This case study also stressed some main ideas for the future: an enterprise can be much more than a place for internships and HE needs to design an advanced partnership (building more than pro-forma partnerships, providing accommodation and up-to-date skills-labs, sharing knowledge on a structural basis, keeping continuous dialogue, creating collaboration as a means to enhance expertise on both sides).

Before formulating recommendations, some additional generalisations and findings reached through the debates are summarised.

2.1 Relevance as a standard of HE quality judgment

Today most discussions and surveys about higher education and surveys highlight the assumption that HE must be relevant to the economic, social, and cultural needs of present society. In this context, the question as to whether relevance should be a standard of the HE quality judgment is often discussed. Nevertheless, this question has no single answer. Assuming that HE should be relevant another question emerges - relevant in which sense? The meaning of relevance depends

on several aspects that could be relatively expressed using even more questions: What? Why? How? (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. The significance of relevance

Tendencies of mass higher education and increasing number of students all over EU are forcing HE to rethink the content of curricula and to find new modes of delivery.

The EU average percentage of people with tertiary level qualifications has increased for all age groups since 2000. The examination of the available statistical data reveals that 79 % of young people in Europe aged 20-24 successfully completed upper secondary education (ISCED3) in 2010, confirming the upward trend shown across Europe since 2000.

But it is important to stress that in spite of the overall increase in the number of tertiary graduates, a growing proportion appear to be overqualified for the type of employment they find. More than one in five tertiary graduates are over-qualified for their job, and this proportion has significantly increased since 2000.[9] So the question of how HE responds to the social, economic and cultural needs of nowadays society could be very timely. In this sense, the statements of the Modernisation Agenda were discussed in more than one issue: Why HE? How can we attune curricula to current and emerging labour market needs and foster employability and entrepreneurship? Does better monitoring of career paths of former students by higher education institutions support programme design and increase relevance?.

2.2 Main aspects of HE relevance from the quality perspective

Quality and relevance of HE are very closely related to content (What?), delivering (How?) and societal needs (Why?) approaches. It is very difficult to talk about quality and relevance of higher education without taking into account these three important constituents of HE quality:

9   *Key Data on Education in Europe 2012,* http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice, seen on 22.06.2013

Quality in content relevance

Quality in content relevance first of all means that curricula respond to the needs of individuals (students) and the labour market (required skills and knowledge for the job positions) and is developed in collaboration between employers and universities. Higher education must enhance individual potential and should equip graduates with the knowledge and core transferable competences they need to succeed in high-skilled occupations. But, as mentioned in the Modernisation Agenda, yet curricula are often slow to respond to changing needs in the wider economy.

The topics selected for the workshop and the actual discussions that took place during the event revealed that more attention has been paid to the problem of involving employers and labour market institutions in the design and delivery of programmes. Some recommendations were prepared on this aspect.

Quality in delivering relevance - pedagogical and technological aspects

The Modernisation Agenda points out that there is a strong need for flexible, innovative learning approaches and delivery methods and that it is necessary to improve quality and relevance while expanding student numbers, to widen participation to diverse groups of learners, and to combat drop-out. The Agenda also stresses that one key way of achieving this, in line with the EU Digital Agenda[10], is to exploit the transformational benefits of ICTs and other new technologies. The digital revolution brings important changes for education and technology offers unprecedented opportunities to improve quality, access, equity and flexibility in education and training. Digital learning is leading to fundamental changes in the education world, expanding educational options beyond their traditional formats and borders[11]. Today, lifelong learning takes place in different environments, both virtually and physically, and new technologies have revealed innovative learning methods derived from a shift from formal education to non-formal and informal learning.

Some aspects on the pedagogical and technological relevance of HE were widely discussed during the workshop. Some examples of good practice were presented such as the blended learning strategy at the International School of Law and Business (Lithuania). Many colleges and universities are now offering online degree programs in addition to the traditional campus-based and blended learning programs. It is a challenge of the digital age. It was pointed out that higher education institutions need to have e-learning or digitalisation strategies and need to create institutional support systems for students, and especially for teachers, to

---

10   Digital Agenda for Europe (A Europe 2020 initiative), Action 68: Member States to mainstream e-learning in national policies, http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/pillar-vi-enhancing-digital-literacy-skills-and-inclusion/action-68-member-states-mainstream seen on 22.06.2013.

11   *Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes,* COM(2012) 669 final, http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/rethinking/com669_en.pdf

shape teachers' positive attitudes towards e-learning and to enable them to work in e-learning mode. Without strategic and targeted actions within the institutions, there is a risk that the gap between the young generation's (students - digital generation) learning nature and the older generation's (teachers - non-digital generation) teaching nature remains or even grows. No area of life can escape from technological change and education is no exception. The phenomenal scale and rate of changes in knowledge nature and information communication technologies also have a serious impact on education.

On the one hand, ICT has penetrated almost every area of our life. On the other hand, ICT has penetrated tertiary education in the technological sense, but not often in the pedagogical fundamentals of the classroom. Thus, the main challenge for HE does not seem to be the ability to use technology, but the positive attitude towards technology-related changes that affect every aspect of our lives- professions, personal and professional communication, etc.

Another challenge is the extremely rapid technological changes, for instance, the personal computers that were prominent a few years ago, were quickly replaced by mobile apps and tablet computing, which have massively promoted online courses, cloud-based learning environments with decentralised management possibilities and other learning modes.

The third challenge is that faculty training does not sufficiently acknowledge the fact that digital media literacy continues its rise in importance and has become a key skill in every discipline and profession. Training in supporting skills and techniques is rare in teacher education and non-existent, or existent only in a very fragmented way, in the preparation of the faculty. As lecturers and professors begin to realise that they are limiting their students by not including the development and use of digital media literacy skills in their curricula, the lack of formal training is being offset through professional development or informal learning, but we are far from seeing digital media literacy as a norm[12].

The gap between digital and non-digital generations still exists in HE, how wide this gap is and how it could negatively influence the study process and the quality of teaching and learning is a matter of concern. This aspect was discussed during the workshop and some recommendations were prepared.

Quality in line with society needs relevance

The fast development in ICT has led to significant changes in economic, social and cultural spheres. In this context, it is the role of HE to satisfy the needs of a modern world and the knowledge-based society.

---

12 Johnson, L., Adams Becker, S., Cummins, M., Estrada, V., Freeman, A., and Ludgate, H. (2013). *NMC Horizon Report: 2013 Higher Education Edition*. Austin, Texas: The New Media Consortium.

However, given the rate and extent of the technological changes during the last 20 years, it is very difficult for HE to respond as rapidly as is necessary. This is especially evident in research and university teacher training. We need deep fundamental changes in HE to handle the doubling of knowledge every seven years. Not only regarding technology, but also in terms of content, we need some input and understanding of changes from all HE stakeholders. In meeting the increased demand for knowledge, workers, researchers and teacher trainers, HE must be better aligned with the needs of the present knowledge-based labour market or even be more focused on the future of the labour market and careers of tomorrow.

Courses, curricula, doctoral training schemes and funding models have not changed, even partly, for a long time. Higher education institutions are under more pressure than ever to offer curricula that appeal to a more diverse student population and equip them to succeed in the labour market. Therefore, keeping the curriculum responsive to a changing environment and to increasing demands is essential to any higher education institution's strategy.

3. Recommendations

3.1 Improving quality in content relevance

Anticipating the careers of tomorrow and adapting curricula

1. Both sides (HE and employers) need to get mutual benefits from co-operation, but it is important for employers to articulate what they expect from HE and for HE to learn how to communicate with employers in an effective and transparent way.

2. Due to rapid changes in world industry and in the labour market, it is necessary to create databases on, not only today, but on future competencies, enhancing co-operation between the business and the university sector. Although higher education institutions often know what the needs of employers are, these may change after 3-4 years.

3. The role and importance of transferable skills in HE is vital to ensure the effective design of curricula.

4. Designing curricula in co-operation with employers should be the rule and not the exception. Curricula should not be designed only by universities, this practice must be avoided.

5. Creating a system of effective consultancy with employers for curricula development is necessary to assure the quality and relevance of HE.

6. Reduction of bureaucratic procedures to gain tax benefits for employers offering internship places would increase the employability chances of students and graduates.

Monitoring the career paths of former students in collaboration with employers

7. Employability has become the responsibility of universities, thus encouraging a change of mentality within higher education institutions that is of the utmost importance.

8. Publishing and accessing evidence-based information about successful students' careers (Alumni achievements) and enhancing the importance of Alumni associations to achieve this aim are a good practice to design workable strategies for employability.

9. HEIs should be encouraged to collaborate with local, national or international public employment services.

3.2 Improving quality in delivering relevance

Developing flexible and innovative learning approaches and delivery methods

10. Encouraging the use of relevant IT tools in HE would support the quality of learning processes and reduce the intergenerational digital gap (e-learning platforms for distance learning and virtual mobility, e-tools for administration, e-libraries for information resources, open educational resources, etc.).

11. Adapt to the learning style of the modern student and making significant changes in teachers' attitudes and abilities to work in e-learning mode. In order to do so, it is necessary to train teachers at higher education institutions in pedagogical and technological development systems.

Enhancing teachers' motivation and skills

12. Increasing institutional support systems for teachers would encourage them to get more involved in the implementation of e-learning and the application of new technologies.

13. Offering training programmes at universities for teachers lacking practical experience would help overcome the digital gap and ensure the effective use of teaching and learning IT tools.

14. Establishing centres for teaching excellence in HE at local, national or international levels. The mission of those centres should be to share good practice in HE teaching innovations, to promote integration of new ideas and effective pedagogy into courses, programmes and curricula.

3.3 Improving quality in response to relevant society needs

Ensuring the transparency of curricula and links with other educational sectors

15. HEIs should enhance the transparency of studies and study programmes in order to support more university-business co-operation, employability and links with society. The clear description assessment methods and learning outcomes are key in this regard.

16. Bridging and linking more vocational training and HE will support the transparency and flexibility of educational systems.

Fostering collaboration between HE and employers

17. Establishing more collaboration with the business sector would create new opportunities for training researchers and funding research projects.

18. Building trust between higher education institutions and companies would create more opportunities to co-operate, gain mutual benefits, and support the needs of knowledge-based society. Presently, the collaborations existing between both sectors are not sufficient. In addition, universities are not always that interested in the applied research proposed by the business sector.

4. **Ideas for follow-up initiatives within the Compostela Group of Universities**

Within CGU on the basis of new projects:

1. To create a model of effective collaboration, consultancy with industry and other HE stakeholders in curricula development. HE and industry collaboration has often been a topic of discussion on both sides. Sometimes other HE stakeholders (representatives of governance of other founding holders) take part in this discussion. And still a widely used model does not exist. The collaboration is quite limited, especially in the field of curricula development. This shows that the problem is profound, serious and by expert collaboration should be developed differently to problem solving models.

2. To prepare recommendations on students' career paths, monitoring and networks of alumni. There are no widely used recommendations with regard to collaboration with industry on monitoring the career paths of former students or on creating alumni networks. Of course, a lot of examples of good practice exist and it could be very useful for HE to have recommendations or good practice sharing platforms (such as a web page or a portal).

3. To enhance initiatives of sharing good practice for the implementation of e-learning, the use of open learning resources, mobile apps and tablet computing, etc. Higher education institutions need to create their own e-learning or digitalisation strategies, in order to create institutional support systems for students, and for teachers, to shape teachers' positive attitudes towards e-learning and to enable them to work in e-learning mode. Sharing of good practice in this field could be realised in multilateral projects.

4. To enhance initiatives of sharing good practice in the field of teachers' training and in the creation of teachers' centres of excellence. Some higher education institutions have their own centres of teacher's professional development; provide opportunities for on-going discussions about teaching, etc. Sharing good practice in this field could be realised in multilateral projects.

5. To enhance initiatives of sharing good practice in the field of HE transparency, fostering and collaboration with vocational training and professional development institutions.

6. To enhance initiatives of sharing good practice in the field of HE and industry collaboration on doctoral training schemes, in applied research. Both parties need to be in contact via collaborations with the aim of developing new data, methods and technology. There are many examples of effective two-way communication on innovative doctoral training schemes and in applied research that could be shared on multilateral projects.

Nijolé Saugèniené
International School of Law Business (Lithuania)
nijole.saugeniene@ttvam.lt or n.saugeniene@gmail.com

PRIORITY 3: Strengthening quality through mobility and cross-border co-operation

1. Key policy issues for Member States and higher education institutions

Priority number 3, "Strengthening quality through mobility and cross-border co-operation", is analysed in the Communication regarding the following aspects:

1. Encourage institutions to build learning mobility more systematically into curricula, and eliminate unnecessary barriers to switching institutions between bachelor and master levels and to cross-border co-operation and exchanges.

2. Ensure the efficient recognition of credits gained abroad through effective quality assurance, comparable and consistent use of ECTS and the Diploma Supplement, and by linking qualifications to the European Qualifications Framework.

3. Improve access, employment conditions and progression opportunities for students, researchers and teachers from other countries, including by fully implementing the Directives on students and researchers and the EU Visa Code to facilitate the issuing of Schengen visas to students and researchers undertaking short stays.

2. Main topics raised in the workshop discussions

There is a need to foster quality because there is a perception of having a low cost, poor-quality mobility programme (ERASMUS) in Europe. All students must be mobile and more academic.

The first issue to be tackled is that the mobility programmes, especially Erasmus, are massive. Quality has nothing to do with it. When you have mass use, the quality of mobility disappears. This is a key issue that must be taken into consideration, especially in view of opening Erasmus to the rest of the world (Erasmus+).

Background is relevant, only less than 20% of the overall registered students participate in mobility programmes (either within or outside the EU). Therefore there are 80% of students that did not participate in mobility (figures from 2012).

We cannot talk about quality without taking into account these relevant percentages. There are strategies for non-mobile students (internationalisation at home) which are not supported by the EU (and are expensive). In fact, quality, as a concept, is expensive, whether for mobile students or for non-mobile students.

Europe attracts students because of cultural diversity, geographic dimension and linguistic differences. It is highly recommended to consider those points as added value to the export of knowledge and transfer of technology especially

through the fostering of joint, multiple and double diplomas with third country institutions. (See also the communication *European higher education in the world*[13]).

3. Recommendations

3.1 Encourage institutions to build learning mobility

1. The recognition of participation in mobility programmes, such as Diploma Supplements must be generalised to all higher education institutions

2. Joint and multiple degrees, transnational/international joint programmes should be encouraged. They are a tool for automatic recognition and closer co-operation amongst higher education institutions within and outside Europe. Procedures for the implementation of joint and multiple degrees need to be clear and harmonised at national and international level.

3. Concerning students, mobility windows must be considered from the very beginning in the formulation of study plans as a compulsory and integral part.

4. Concerning teaching staff and administrative staff, mobility and international activities must be clearly taken into account in their teaching or administrative career and merits.

5. Setting up a transnational structure for the proper management and co-ordination of international students' placements (internships) so as to enhance international employability of students and young graduates.

6. Excellence or quality label at EU level could be established. Minimum criteria for quality mobility must be set: it should include supporting services (mentoring, housing, counselling).

7. Clear information on the web with institutional and academic transparency (study plans). Minimum length and minimum credits (half semester) must be established.

3.2 Ensure the efficient recognition of credits

8. Harmonisation of grading system. Some countries, even adopting and signing up to the Bologna system still use their own system in parallel.

9. In order to have good ECTS implementation, both home and host institutions must collaborate. The ECTS must be reinforced and its implementation must be timely.

10. There is no sanction system in case of non-recognition of credits for mobility programmes. A clear and realistic set of EU/national sanctions to-

---

13 See http://ec.europa.eu/education/higher-education/doc/com499_en.pdf

wards those institutions not properly implementing ECTS or the Diploma Supplement should be made available.

11. Simplification of the administrative procedures, as well as more flexibility in the recognition of credits earned within the individual institutions participating in the mobility programmes is needed.

3.3 Improve access, employment conditions and progression opportunities for students, researchers and teachers from other countries

12. Harmonisation of visa policies, criteria to obtain a student or researcher visa and regulations is needed, so that bureaucratic problems do not prevent mobility to certain countries.

13. Harmonisation of employment policies for non-Europeans, so that the free movement of persons is possible once you legally enter the EU.

14. Clear and harmonised strategies for funding non-European students by implementing a policy for "attracting talent".

15. Seriously defend and enhance the label, brand and attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area as the means for helping HEIs in their individual international competition for talent.

16. Funding universities is also funding internationalisation. Concerning recommendations about the models of funding HEIs and facing the two extreme models of US and Northern European Countries: the former is all private funding (with tuition fees for international students); the latter is all public with no tuition fees. A mixed model, with fees partly paid by non-European students, partly paid by the state is recommended.

17. The concepts of effectiveness and impact must be included in all programmes and budget lines by establishing clear points and objectives. It should include the necessary funding for the implementation and a strict monitoring that allows the development of a sanctions system in case of guilty failure or non-compliance.

18. Foster the concept of strategic plans and policies among the stakeholders in Europe (higher education institutions) as a transparent and compulsory tool, and an indicator which can be added to multiple ranking lists.

Enrique López Veloso
University of Santiago de Compostela (Spain)
enrique.lopez.veloso@usc.es

PRIORITY 4: Making the knowledge triangle work: Linking higher education, research and business for excellence and regional development

1. Key policy issues for Member States and higher education institutions

The European Commission, through its Communication, identifies as a key policy issue for Member States and higher education institutions (HEI) "Making the knowledge triangle work: Linking higher education, research and business for excellence and regional development", seeking to maximise their contribution to Europe's growth and jobs.

This issue is analysed in the following four dimensions:

1. Stimulate the development of entrepreneurial, creative and innovation skills in all disciplines and in all three cycles, and promote innovation in higher education through more interactive learning environments and strengthened knowledge-transfer infrastructure.

2. Strengthen the knowledge-transfer infrastructure of higher education institutions and enhance their capacity to engage in start-ups and spin-offs.

3. Encourage partnership and co-operation with business as a core activity of higher education institutions, through reward structures, incentives for multidisciplinary and cross-organisational co-operation, and the reduction of regulatory and administrative barriers to partnerships between institutions and other public and private actors.

4. Promote the systematic involvement of higher education institutions in the development of integrated local and regional development plans, and target regional support towards higher education-business co-operation particularly for the creation of regional hubs of excellence and specialisation.

2. Main topics raised in the workshop discussions

The workshop covering the key issue "Making the knowledge triangle work: Linking higher education, research and business for excellence and regional development" was focused on the key role of universities in the knowledge triangle as a main provider of human resources for research and innovation.

The topic was discussed in the working group and, at the heart of the conclusions raised, was the understanding that higher education has to pay special attention to the role it plays in today's society. As providers of knowledge and tech-

nology creation and transfer, it needs to meaningfully contribute to many types of impact through education delivery, which includes focusing on employability and entrepreneurship.

Universities play a crucial role in fostering the knowledge triangle within the region they are embedded in and, more generally, within society as a whole. Companies have to tap into the knowledge developed by universities and public research centres because they can increasingly not afford to run R&D on their own.

As mentioned, universities have a key role in the knowledge triangle: they have to work within European Institute of Technology's (EIT) framework for promoting innovation. That means creating efficient pathways to move people from a specific idea stage to something concrete and profitable, facilitating the transitions from idea to product, from lab to market and from student to entrepreneur.

However, the academia shows some perceived reluctance regarding the commercialisation of knowledge and science. The active encouragement of knowledge exchange requires changes in attitude and, often, in the organisational structure of higher education institutions.

Universities have to rethink their role as higher education institutions and broaden their activities. To provide the right human resources for research and innovation can be considered the main role of universities, but certain differences can be identified between what the university offers and what the business demands, in keeping with the results of Universitat Rovira i Virgili's (URV) survey, as shown in the main topics dealt with in the workshop and highlighted below:

1. Universities increasingly seek to produce more PhDs but the majority of companies state they do not appreciate the added value that hiring a doctor provides to their company. Doctorates are perceived to be closely linked to the academic world, even in the fields that can be expected to have a commercial potential per se.

2. Very few companies allocate a higher salary for a PhD compared to an undergraduate, which highlights the small recognition they attribute to this specialised training. The reasons could be related to two perceptions that should be corroborated through larger and deeper analysis: employers do not want to hire people with a higher degree than they have themselves; PhD's thorough specialisation is seen as too much specialisation on very specific topics.

3. A scarce number of companies hold job positions that require a PhD to be provided, something that puts who is supposed to lead innovation within companies into question.

4. Personal skills are the most decisive factor in the graduate's recruitment process, according to the vast majority of companies surveyed, but academics do not feel they have to play a relevant role in the development of students' attitude and personal values.

5. Objective outputs associated with university education's high performance, such as academic records and publications in scientific journals; get the lowest impact on job recruitment, being overcome by others not directly included in the curricula, such as attitude and personal values, as well as language skills.

6. Universities are producing a generation of graduates who, in some aspects, do not fulfil the demand of companies, in the sense that employers recognise the good academic, technical and IT preparation that students have been given, but those attributes are perceived as a must, and not as a response to the company's specific needs.

7. The results of the URV survey show, in general terms, that companies have the perception that graduate students show a lack of capacity for sacrifice, effort or self-demand, as well as a reluctance to become personally involved or committed, and a lack of experience, or practical applicability of the knowledge they have acquired.

The aforementioned divergences are obviously stressed or smoothed out by cultural or social differences in the various countries, but indisputably lead us to ask whether the universities are performing their role of providing the right human resources for research and innovation, and more precisely, if the Bologna Process has represented a real improvement towards this. To corroborate the existing differences within the EAHE, the Compostela Group could suggest extending URV's survey at European level to the Commission, and check if the conclusions at European level match those achieved at a regional level.

In view of the aforementioned survey results, the working group agreed that there are a number of barriers that need to be overcome and challenges to be faced by new companies and new HEI. Mental barriers are perceived between the academic and the business world, in the sense that a deep mutual ignorance seems to be established. Both parts have difficulties in visualising the benefits of working together. The working group suggests the need to explore innovative ways in which institutional and behavioural change could be encouraged through university-business co-operation, and supports the impact of this co-operation to be measured.

According to that, the group stresses the need to increase the emphasis on collaboration at all three levels (research, education and business). This collaboration will necessarily have a major impact on the change of what universities

deliver (joint skills strategies, lifelong learning, curriculum design and delivery, entrepreneurial initiatives, business driven alliances, etc.). Measuring the impact of this collaboration will bring a new range of activities that will represent a new perspective for all three actors of the knowledge triangle. Even if the impact of co-operation between academia-business is still rarely measured, the demand for HEI accountability, going beyond the area of research, is gradually emerging. Society starts to be (and should be more from the working group perspective) demanding as regards university accountability in terms of new aspects, such as employability and fostering regional development. The difficulty rests in finding fair and objective indicators to measure these universities' accountability. But, at the same time, to be able to respond successfully to this demand of accountability, universities should receive real support and involvement from society, and very specifically from government bodies.

As a conclusion of the workshop, the working group agrees that an economy focused on knowledge and innovation should be based on a close and collaborative relationship between companies, universities, research centres, technology centres, government and society, formally organised into a platform, and based on established formal commitments.

There are many examples of successful co-operation between academia and industry throughout Europe that should be followed by HEI as a source of inspiration for good initiatives. The European Commission notes on its website some examples of good practices, which can be taken as a roadmap to be extended to other higher education institutions in Europe, such as case of the University of Westminster, that is pioneering new MSc courses in Enterprise Systems and Information Quality in collaboration with the company SAS. Years ago, SAS alerted the university of a major shortfall in experts. To address this, Westminster developed its MSc in Information Quality, specifically designed to enable database administrators, data analysts and managers to expand their knowledge and skills, in which SAS provided a range of tools to show the practicalities of dealing with data quality issues, as part of the MSc platform. The Grenoble School of Management shares the same good experience by partnering SAS in the pioneering of an MSc in Business Intelligence (see more on: http://ec.europa.eu/education/higher-education/business-examples_en.htm).

3. Recommendations[14]

The EMMA workshop format has proved a great success in generating new ideas and pinpointing those areas for development in higher education-research-business co-operation at European and regional level. Various policy initiatives have resulted from the group discussion, and a range of recommendations

---

14   All references to companies include both industrial and social companies.

have been identified that could be undertaken, some by universities others by the EU Commission, which respond to the need for higher education to extend its role in the knowledge economy by working with business at all levels (research, education and business). The recommendations which arise in this workshop are detailed below:

1. To encourage the creation of formal working consortia, following the EIT's pattern, on a regional basis. Together (universities, companies and research and technology centres) they should actively promote a competitive strategy, economic and social progress, that creates jobs in the region where they are based, heavily sustained by knowledge and innovation.

2. To promote a stable funding system for higher education and scientific research, as well as a stable system of incentives for encouraging innovation addressed to companies, always committed to rigorous accountability in terms of employment and regional development.

3. To explore new ways of tax benefits and other instruments to promote patronage and to tighten the relationship between companies, universities, research centres and technology centres, ensuring systematic monitoring and evaluation of the results of this co-operation. This new set of instruments must be affordable not only for big companies, but also for SMEs and even for companies with no benefits in their balance (normally tax benefits are conceived in forms of deductions applicable only to companies with profits in the Profit and Loss account).

4. To drive new typologies of working contracts that benefit companies who want to hire candidates that hold a PhD. As a suggestion, they could benefit from the deduction of social security contributions during the first two years of contract, and an additional tax relief if they sign a permanent contract.

5. To provide new forms of industrial doctorate that could be feasible for companies that are constrained to hire (due to union pressures, internal dismissal programs, etc.). As a suggestion, some of the governmental fellowships should be directed at candidates who will write their thesis in a company, with the employment contract being issued by the state as a fellowship.

6. Since much of the business environment in many regions is formed by SMEs, it is essential to promote specific actions to direct the universities to those companies, as drivers of innovation in their business and providers of a highly-skilled workforce. To be more effective, it would be necessary to use the same channels SMEs use to interact (chambers of commerce, business associations, etc...) to foster communication between them and the university.

7. To promote awareness communication campaigns about the tangible benefits companies may get if they collaborate with universities and vice versa. It is equally important that academics are aware of the need to collaborate with the industry and with the social economy. The number of effective and productive collaborations between companies and universities can be taken as a measure to assess the recognition of the scientific productivity of professors.

8. To promote gentle introduction as a quality indicator in university rankings, the degree of employability of graduates or entrepreneurship. Other possibilities would be to link university funding to these two indicators.

9. To propose to the competent quality agencies, that they establish a new system by which the number of PhD students employed in the companies should be taken into account as one of the indicators to be considered in the quality systems approval (ISO 9001, etc..).

10. To propose that the number of PhD students employed in the companies could be a weighting factor in the awarding of public subsidies for big companies when applying for public funds (e.g. European projects that are benefiting big business).

11. To push for the establishment of formal or informal organisational meetings where local university teachers could offer free weekly short sessions addressed to local entrepreneurs, for the purposes of the dual objective of providing them with lifelong learning as well as a formal space to meet each other.

12. To arrange a call for local companies, particularly for SMEs, in which they may present a business or social project that could lead to the development of a thesis. The projects selected by the university would benefit from a PhD student scholarship to develop the project in a thesis format within the company.

13. To establish an organised system whereby local companies could request specific research lines, in order that these would be collected in a continuous way by universities, so that it may result as a source of inspiration for future research projects promoted by universities jointly with the group of sector companies targeted by the subject aim. This would be a good way to channel the specific R&D's needs in the region, in which the initiative of the demand would emerge directly from the companies.

14. To empower universities to enable specific graduate programmes designed and taught together between academics and professionals from local companies to actively promote the development of a thorough di-

agnosis in order to identify clusters with the greatest potential for high value-added economy and society.

15. To promote training activities specifically addressed to faculty members, based on the knowledge of business and other economic and social issues, entrepreneurship, as well as the possibility of creating placements in enterprises.

16. To include internships as a mandatory part of the curriculum at all levels of university studies. The aim is to bring the private sector to students during their studies, including at doctoral level, and to have the opportunity to face real working situations.

17. To promote the creation of professional development departments in Graduate Schools, allowing doctoral students to enhance their employability and/or entrepreneurship skills.

18. To work actively and directly (not implicitly included in other curricula subjects) on the development of personal skills for employability within all curricula, with the support of professional or subject specialist teachers. Universities should focus on the students' personal skills as a core activity, and European institutional strategy should be sensitive to rewarding those efforts.

19. To organise Summer Schools on Complementary Skills for PhD Students (presentation skills, communication skills, team work, co-operation with sales departments, etc.) with grants promoted by the EU, for PhD students and PostDoc Students.

20. To establish a European Talent Placement Agency aimed specifically for placement, outplacement and development of PhD students throughout their professional life. This agency would act as a sort of head-hunter agency, but with public ownership, dealing only with very specific positions addressed to PhD students. This organisation should be backed by National Agencies, responsible at territorial level for the management of the candidates and job placements in each country that should be articulated with the Central European Agency, which, in turn, could jointly act with other agencies overseas.

21. To promote a European e-Portal for the listing of job vacancies, mobility opportunities, training opportunities, scholarships, etc. aimed at PhD students as their only target, where universities and companies could act as information and opportunities providers. That portal would have to be officially recognised in Europe.

22. To promote the introduction of the knowledge triangle at all levels of education (undergraduate, graduate, master PhD), and at all levels of university (all academic and non-academic staff). The concept must be integrated and become part of the annual academic planning, training and promotion of staff, and clearly stated in the mission statement of the university.

23. To strengthen the Alumni Network of PhD students, both at a regional and European level, establishing a system that helps to follow up their career development. They could act as future employers of prospective graduate students, as well as lead innovation projects in the companies in the future and produce a network that could foster joint innovative projects between companies.

24. To establish a platform that not only helps to track graduate's employability, but also to gain feedback from them. This is essential in improving the curriculum in universities so that it efficiently addresses the ever demanding working conditions.

25. To promote and spread the introduction of an extra chapter to the PhD thesis, focusing on the "employability" or "entrepreneurship", based on the possible applied results of their research.

26. To give specific training to graduate students on several very specific issues that have a clear impact on scientific productivity: patents, start-ups and spin-offs, in addition to writing and publishing scientific articles.

27. It could also be interesting to ask to a real business group, specially integrated for SMEs, about their views on the proposals contained in this document and collect their feedback and contributions.

2. Ideas for follow-up initiatives within the CGU

1. How to encourage universities to work for greater salary compensation in Europe for candidates who have completed a PhD degree could be an issue for the Compostela Group to work on. Examining how to get compensation would form part of a complex but interesting project that the CGU could lead with the participation of experts in Employment Law and Human Resource Management.

2. As a concrete recommendation, the Compostela Group could suggest that the Commission perform a survey at the European level, following the URV procedure, to assess the perceived value of graduates within companies in different countries with special focus on PhD candidates, which

can be corroborated if the conclusions reached match those observed at Tarragona's regional level.

Mar Figueras Moreno
Universitat Rovira I Virgili – Tarragona (Spain)
mar.figueras@urv.cat

PRIORITY 5: Improving governance and funding

    1.   Key policy issues for Member States and higher education institutions

The key policy issues for Member States and higher education institutions (HEIs) with reference to governance and funding according to the EC Communication[15] are as follows:

1. Encourage a better identification of the real cost of higher education and research as well as careful targeting of spending through funding mechanisms linked to performance which introduce an element of competition.

2. Target funding mechanisms adjusted to the needs of different institutional profiles in order to encourage institutions to focus efforts on their individual strengths, and develop incentives to support diversity of strategic choices and to develop centres of excellence.

3. Facilitate access to alternative sources of funding, including public funds and exceed average private and other public investment (through match funding for example).

4. Support the development of strategic and professional higher education leaders, and ensure that higher education institutions have the autonomy to set strategic direction, manage income streams, reward performance to attract the best teaching and research staff, set admissions policies and introduce new curricula.

5. Encourage institutions to modernise their human resource management and obtain the HR Excellence on research logo and to implement the recommendations of the Helsinki Group of Woman in Science.

According to this communication (*Supporting growth and jobs – an agenda for the modernisation of Europe's higher education systems*, 2011), investment in higher education (HE) in Europe is lagging behind emerging economies. Far more needs to be done to address this lag, particularly if we consider that 35% of all jobs in the EU require a HE qualification and yet only 25% of the workforce has a HE degree. In addition, European universities also lag behind other economies in the number of researchers (EU = 6:100, US = 9:100, Japan = 11:100) and too few EU Universities are recognised as world leaders (200 of 400 EU universities are not in top 500, only three in top 20).

One of the key aims of the European Commission is that by 2020, 40% of young people will have successfully completed university or equivalent studies. In

---

15   *Supporting growth and jobs – an agenda for the modernisation of Europe's higher education systems*, COM(2011) 567 final, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0567:FIN:EN:PDF .

addition, the EU aims to stimulate the number of researchers and research activities by increasing the investment in research up to 3% of GDP (it is estimated that this one million of new research jobs will be created, mainly in the private sector). In order to achieve this aim, the system will require: a) more doctoral students, b) increase in research, c) more financial support, better targeting of resources and accountability for spending.

Financial support will especially be necessary for students from low-income backgrounds. Spending levels in HEIs across Member States vary widely but none has sufficient total investment; across Europe average funding is 1.3% of GDP whereas in the US this increases to 2.7%.

Funding will be needed to:

1. Design new programmes.

2. Develop innovative and flexible approaches to learning & teaching and pedagogy.

3. Improve the quality and relevance of courses and research.

4. Explore the potential of information and communication technology and other technologies.

5. Support personalised learning.

6. Facilitate access to online and distance learning.

7. Streamline the administration.

8. Create new research opportunities.

9. Develop research training to meet the needs of the labour market.

10. Increase supply of appropriately qualified human capital (particularly those at doctoral level and more business oriented).

It is acknowledged that public investment is important for the sustainability of higher education and research, but if quality is to improve and expansion is to happen this investment needs to be increased and mechanisms need to be put in place so higher education institutions are able to:

1. Better identify the real cost of higher education and research.

2. Appropriately target funding to match their profile and focus on its own areas of expertise.

3. Facilitate easier access to alternative funding sources.

4. Develop strategic and professional higher education leaders.

5.   Obtain greater autonomy in order to allow self-governing so that HEIs can set their own strategy, manage their own income, reward performance, attract top scholars, and so on.

6.   Modernise human resources management.

2.   Main topics raised in the workshop discussions

The EMMA Project workshops aimed to raise awareness of these key issues amongst those attending and to facilitate debate amongst representatives in order to tease out some possible solutions and suggestions for a way forward. The main topics from the discussion group focused on:

2.1 How to retain good researchers and prevent them from going overseas

Concern was expressed that many EU universities are losing some of their best brains, in particular to the US, as they are unable to compete with the terms and conditions of employment offered by North American universities. In addition there are not enough scholarship and loans schemes to attract PhD and other postgraduate students, which has a detrimental effect on knowledge exchange and transfer activity.

2.2 How to support and promote PhD students by Industry

Workshop participants felt very strongly that industrial support for research students would be a very positive outcome and would enable PhD students to earn a salary whilst undertaking their studies. This was seen as having a benefit for both the student in terms of employment, and industry in that they would have access to specific industry-related research. Certainly within Spanish industry, but more than likely the case elsewhere, one of the key barriers is that industry wants quick fixes rather than investing in longer-term research.

2.3 How much freedom universities have to set their own tuition fees

A case study was shared with workshop participants highlighting that 80% of Spanish universities receive funding from the public purse and the regional governments set the amount of funding that universities will receive and the price for the courses they offer. The problem raised here is that the tuition fees do not cover all aspects of the cost of the course. Moreover this fact has not been established via a full economic costing model. Aside from obvious issues of sustainability, there was also discussion concerning the quality of the offer that universities could give if they were not fully funded.

2.4 How to clearly identify roles and responsibilities of academic, administrative and managerial staff and ensure that they have the right skill sets to carry out their work effectively

Concern was expressed that academic staff were spending time on administrative and managerial tasks and becoming involved with political aspects of university life which was distracting them from their core duties in terms of teaching and research. (This latter point was specifically felt in Spanish universities but may not be exclusive to them). It appears that there are few, if any, opportunities for fixed-term appointments, that administrative staff are not as professional in their roles as they need to be and that universities managers have not always had sufficient training and development in order to be productive in their roles.

2.5 The setting of tuition fees

There was a strong argument presented from a student perspective that if education is seen as a government priority, then support needs to come from public government or European funds. In some countries, for example in England, it was felt that the policy for tuition fees was unsustainable in the long-term and would have a negative effect on student recruitment. Concern was also expressed with regard to the different practices across Europe in the setting of fees for international students; there was a suggestion that a more equitable approach should be encouraged. The counter-argument to this is that if universities are given the autonomy to set their own fees, then competition comes into play, which in turn should see a raise in quality as students would become more discerning with regard to university choices. Competition, though, should be offset by a clear and transparent system of support for students through grants, scholarships and other funding streams (in particular for students from low-income families; some countries already offer this e.g. Belgium). Finally, there was some discussion about the possibility of offering tax benefits to industry in order for them to financially support, in particular, research students.

2.6 How public investment in universities should be undertaken

Discussion centred on how public funding should be invested in universities. Two ideas were suggested: That an outside committee/body should be appointed to oversee the appropriation of funds, or, that a university body should be appointed to manage this. One thing was clear: a need to review university structures and systems. Particular attention should be paid to where accountability lies and to the possible outcome if institutions fail to adhere to the structure and systems. An example was presented: in Spain, rectors are elected and, in order to be elected, they need the support of the electing body who are themselves academic staff within the university. As a consequence, controversial exchanges often fail to occur between rectors and the electing body due to rectors' fear of not being elected. It is recognised that there is a real need for reform.

2.7 How universities are managed (including decision-making concerning their strategy and direction), appointment of senior personnel, and training and development activity availability, especially at a senior level

In order for universities to have control over their direction and development, they need to be responsible for their finances, staffing, organisation structure and their academic delivery, including research, as stated in University Autonomy in Europe's (UAE)[16] website:

"The capacity to create profit and non- profit entities and to decide on internal academic structures is directly linked to an institution's ability to determine and pursue its academic strategic direction. The ability to set up distinct legal entities may also open up important new funding streams."

By way of example, the UK, where universities are largely autonomous, feature 1st place in Europe for organisational control; 2nd in staffing; and 3rd in finance and academic control, according to the UAE website.

Some European countries experience particular problems with university autonomy from a leadership perspective. This is distinctly evident where university vice chancellors, rectors etc. are elected by the staffing body. Where this is the case, change is often slow and controversial issues are not tackled as "the head" fears that he or she will not be re-elected or supported during their term. This creates real tension and conflict between central and local control of university appointments, which, in consequence, has knock-on consequences for change and progress. Autonomy should be linked to quality within the university, be externally assessed and have direct bearing on the quality of leadership. Universities should also consider establishing an external body or council that could act as a "critical friend" for the vice chancellor or rector and as a significant support to them when approval is sought for the introduction of important changes or developments.

If there is agreement that universities need greater autonomy regarding the recruitment and retention of staff at all levels - including senior management - researchers, academic and administrative staff, then clear progression routes need to be identified. First, salaries should be more closely aligned to performance and training and second, development programmes need to be reviewed and modernised to ensure they are fit for their stated purpose. The Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (UK)[17] is one example of an organisation providing highly relevant training and development for current and aspiring university leaders and managers. The Higher Education Academy[18] also supports those in higher education by encouraging on-going development of pedagogical practice using a system of rewards linked to achieving specified levels of expertise in practice (associate fellow, fellow senior and principle fellow).

....

16   See http://www.university-autonomy.eu
17   See http://www.lfhe.ac.uk
18   See http://www.heacademy.ac.uk

3. Recommendations

1. Universities should work toward reducing reliance on public funding (approx. 73% of university funding comes from this source), specifically government block grant awards, by encouraging other funding streams, e.g. private funding, match funding, competitive tendering, etc. There is a disparity across the European regions with reference to public funding; for example, Central Europe has seen an increase in funds from the public sector since 2008 but many parts of Southern Europe, Iceland and the Czech Republic have seen a decrease in funding. This recommendation affects recommendations 2-12.

2. Facilitating universities to successfully access other funding streams to provide growth and development, in particular for PhDs and other post-graduate courses.

3. Inviting successful universities to share their knowledge and expertise, in particular, regarding how they have brokered successful industrial partnerships and managed to secure match funding for other income streams.

4. Providing support to manage these sources and ensuring compliance with the regulatory bodies which will be formed due to diversity in funding streams.

5. Providing case study examples of work with various funding streams, along with the establishing a "help line" where from advice and information could be requested.

6. Conducting a review of public investment in universities to ensure their cost-benefit and providing a mechanism whereby public investment is linked to performance. The review of public investment should be undertaken by a combined body of representatives from both public and University sectors.

7. Universities and the State should consider ways of funding PhD students through industrial partners. This works well in Sweden and Swedish case study examples should be collated and shared across the sector.

8. Government should explore the possibility of introducing tax benefits for supporting research through industry funding as a means of incentivising this approach.

9. All stakeholders should consider how they can encourage and market the value and benefits of long-term investment in research because some European governments seem to want "quick fixes" for research and education.

10. Universities need to identify the real cost of their operations by producing a framework for analysing the full economic cost (FEC) of all university

activity. Therefore universities will be able to make more informed choices about the activities they undertake and the funding streams that they utilise (especially where matched funding is required). Some countries within Europe already operate under a FEC system (e.g. England) and other countries should be encouraged to look at these frameworks as examples of current practices and as an aid to developing their own mechanisms.

11. Universities and the supporting authorities should invest more resources in staff development and training at all levels, but namely in the management and leadership development.

12. Consideration should be given to how European countries can retain their "best brains" and prevent them from emigrating overseas to work by being able to match salaries, rewards, benefits and recognition that is offered elsewhere (particularly in the US).

13. Universities who have elected leadership should consider reforming their governance and introducing appointed leaders either from within the university or from another institution.

14. Linked to the previous recommendation, consideration should be given as to how senior leaders are appointed and by whom.

15. Consideration should be given to the formation of an external body/council to act as a "critical friend", especially for senior leaders in the circumstance of the implementation of significant changes.

16. Production of a framework clearly links autonomy and funding to quality. This dynamic should be externally assessed.

17. Consideration should be given to the terms and conditions of employment to ensure that staff have adequate skill sets, that universities are able to retain bright young researchers and to reward performance and longevity in service.

18. A new framework for professional development should be produced that, in particular, meets the needs of senior managers within the organisation. Case study examples of such a framework can be drawn from other EU countries, for example, the UK.

4. Ideas for follow-up initiatives within the CGU

Work towards producing case study material of good/alternative practice in the following:

1. Attracting PhD research students to stay in-country by partnering with industry or other similar supporting organisations.

2. Working with various alternative funding streams.

3. Management and leadership training, specifically designing a framework for professional development to meet the needs of the workforce.

Draw up recommendations for:

1. Terms and Conditions of employment that are favourable across Europe (and, if possible, further afield).

2. The appointment of senior personnel within the sector that allows for transparency and change.

3. A mechanism for fully assessing university activity costs which includes all overheads, resources and any other expenses.

Establish a working group to explore avenues of partnership with industry and other interested bodies that will be mutually beneficial.

Jackie Moses

School of Education, University of Roehampton (United Kingdom)
j.moses@roehampton.ac.uk

CONCLUDING REMARKS

6.

Overall, the EMMA Project met its aims and objectives. An EMMA website was created and updated on a regular basis. It bundles - *inter alia* - the presentations given at seminars held at Erasmushogeschool Brussel and background documents. The latter, published prior to the seminars, have allowed participants and speakers to prepare and to better understand the different topics discussed during the sessions.

The seminars were successful, and for several participants a real eye-opener. They have led to peer discussions as well as to instructive confrontations among representatives of the European Commission, employers, students and other networks such as Campus Europae.

Additionally, the Modernisation Agenda and the EMMA Project were presented at the General Assembly of the Compostela Group of Universities in 2012 (Oulun Yliopisto). The outcomes of the project and the recommendations were discussed in 2013 (Université de Nantes). It was also decided to create an EMMA Working Group within the CGU network. CGU delegates may constitute this EMMA Working Group. Their task will be to collect and discuss best practices through an electronic platform. The outcomes will be presented at each General Assembly.

Whilst the project could be judged a success because it met its aims, the question of impact remains partly unanswered. There is no doubt, as the evaluation forms indicate, that the seminars (presentations and discussions) had an impact on all participants with regard to the necessity to adapt the universities' management, priorities and governance to Europe's reality and its 2020 target. It is more difficult to define the impact of the project's recommendations on the readers who will receive it: CGU member universities, ministries of education, employers, student associations and university networks. The project partners hope that the ideas developed will continue to circulate after the project life cycle and that they will initiate strategic plans involving all stakeholders with a view to address the goals of the Modernisation Agenda. The role of the EMMA Working Group is essential here.

The project provided an excellent insight into the objectives of the Modernisation Agenda amongst a core group of interested and motivated people and so, setting up actions beyond the life of this project can certainly be considered. Whilst there are many positive aspects to be drawn from the project, EMMA can be characterised by one less-positive feature: a lesser number of students and employers' representatives than originally envisaged. Yet, the consortium partners worked on the visibility of the project and made sure that the chosen periods for organising the seminars did not coincide with periods that were too busy. We certainly hope that this is neither a sign of disinterest amongst the parties involved nor a sign of fatigue. Reflection on both the positive and negative features gives rise to the following comments and recommendations.

By the end of the project it was absolutely clear that the stakeholders concerned with the Modernisation Agenda should engage in dialogue on a regular basis. The Agenda should be discussed at all levels of higher education institutions, on the one hand, and at pan-European level, on the other hand. Because a lot has been going on in education since the signature of the Bologna Declaration and the start of the consolidation process of the European Higher Education Area, people need to see clear links between all actions, policies and ministerial decisions; they do not see the wood for the trees anymore.

Another aspect which was brought to evidence - but is this a real surprise? - is that the situation in the European regions is more than often quite varied. Diverse historical backgrounds, distinct understandings of European policies and directives, and various manners and speeds in implementing them still transform the European educational area in a patchwork. Diversity is enrichment, for sure, but diversity as a result of regionalism might have the opposite effect. The variety of approaches in implementing Europe's 2020 targets highlighted the difficulties some universities have with introducing very necessary changes to their systems. Finally, the variety of perspectives amongst the project participants underlined the different priorities defined by each group of stakeholders.

It is often assumed that bringing together a group of people with a common interest and allowing them to meet regularly are sufficient conditions for a network. It should be emphasised that networks are more likely to achieve their goals if they are developed in a deliberately planned manner rather than left to chance. Speakers from the employers' side -especially- demonstrated that constructive and innovative collaboration between the academic and non-academic worlds is possible, provided that the necessary openness of mind exists for mutual learning, so that trust and confidence can be built over time. Networking requires common understanding and shared, mutually agreed-upon goals, to ensure that both the individual and the group derive maximum benefit.

Finally, the participants have identified a number of recommendations which support the implementation of the Modernisation Agenda. We sketch them in broad outlines, relating them to the five priorities in the EU Communication:

1. Increasing the attainment levels to provide the graduates and researchers that Europe needs.

   - Provide more transparent information on educational opportunities (including mobility opportunities) and outcomes.

   - Excellence by inclusion not by selection (importance of the social dimension of the Bologna Process).

   - Students: develop support mechanisms for under-represented groups.

2. Improving the quality and relevance of higher education.

   - Link national qualification frameworks to the European Qualification Framework.

   - Organise continuous training for teachers, researchers and management teams.

   - Analyse how Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) can be used as a motivational support tool.

   - Anticipate the careers of tomorrow and adapt the curricula in co-operation with all stakeholders, including alumni associations and employers.

3. Strengthening quality through mobility and cross-border co-operation.

   - Develop flexible and innovative learning approaches and delivery methods.

   - Work out structural learning mobility linked to quality criteria and full recognition.

   - Improve opportunities and employment/training conditions for incoming students, researchers and teaching staff.

4. Making the knowledge triangle work: linking higher education, research and business for excellence in regional development.

   - Include internships as a mandatory part of the curriculum at all levels of university studies (focus on employability and entrepreneurship).

   - Promote the introduction of the knowledge triangle at all levels of education (undergraduate, graduate, master, PhD), at all levels and types of higher education.

   - Create formal working consortia at a regional basis (universities, companies, research and technology centres).

5. Improving governance and funding.

- Promote a stable funding system for higher education and scientific research, as well as a stable system of incentives for encouraging innovation addressed to companies, always committed to rigorous accountability in terms of employment and regional development.
- Reduce reliance on public funding (e.g. public-private partnerships).
- Share knowledge and expertise in all areas.
- Introduce tax benefits in order to support research through industry funding.
- Identify the real cost of university operations by producing a framework for identifying the full economic cost (FEC).

These recommendations make clear that one of the main challenges of European higher education institutions is the establishment of innovative institutional strategic decision-making and profiling mechanisms able to adapt to the rapidly changing needs of a knowledge-based society. In the next years, in order to emphasise the multiplier effect of the EMMA Project, the Compostela Group of Universities, through its working group and together with its partners, will analyse the possibilities:

- to create a model for effective collaboration and consultation with the industry and other stakeholders, and
- to share good practice at European level.

The EMMA Working Group will have a leading role in this issue.

Jean Pierre Roose
CGU Delegate for Brussels (Belgium)
compostela.brussels@gmail.com

BIOGRAPHIES

Inmaculada Fortanet

Inmaculada Fortanet Gómez has been Vice-president of the Compostela Group of Universities since September 2011. She has also been Vice-rector for Co-operation, International and Institutional Relations and Multilingualism at Universitat Jaume I in Castelló, Spain since 2010. From 1998 to 2001 she was a member of the Executive Committee of the CGU, where she became the first series editor of the publications of the Group. She is a professor of English language and her research interests are Professional and academic discourse analysis and Content and language-integrated learning in higher education.

Koen Delaere

Koen Delaere is a managing director and co-founder of Brussels Education Services sprl, a consultancy firm specialising in project writing and project management for EU-funded higher education and research co-operation programmes. He is the former Executive Director of the Coimbra Group Office, a European Network of Universities. He holds a master degree in Human Resources Management from the College of Europe in Bruges and was qualified as an interpreter at Vlekho, Brussels. In addition to his Dutch mother tongue, he is fluent in French, English, and Spanish.

Isabel Lirola Delgado

Isabel Lirola is Executive Secretary of the Compostela Group of Universities since January 2011, leading and coordinating the Executive Secretariat team in Santiago de Compostela. She has a PhD in Law (1992) from the University of Santiago de Compostela and a Master in European Law from the Free University in Brussels. Since 1996, she is Professor for International and European Law in Law Faculty of the USC, where she held the position of Vice-dean for Academic Affairs (2007-2012), charged of the coordination of all cooperation Programmes (Erasmus, Erasmus Mundus, Bilateral Programmes with Latin America and Eng-

lish Speaking countries). She has wide experience in the participation of such Programmes also as Teaching Staff (Tempus, Intercampus, Tempus-MEDA, AECI nets, AECI actions, Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus). She has more than 50 academic publications.

Jan Petter Myklebust

Jan Petter Myklebust is the Deputy Director in Research Management in the University of Bergen and has more than 20 years of experience in international higher education. He previously worked in the Norwegian Government Organisation for Organisational Development and in UNDP in Jakarta. Co-editor of *Who were the Fascists? Social Roots of European Fascism* and Scandinavian correspondent for University World News; he is also a participant in EUA Quality Culture Project and EUA Doctorate Project.

Rui Vieira de Castro

Rui Vieira de Castro is currently Vice-rector for Research and Teaching at the University of Minho (Portugal), where he is Full Professor of Education. His research and teaching activity is focused on Language Education, Literacy, and Adult Education. He was formerly the editor of the Portuguese Journal on Education.

Nijolé Saugèniené

Nijolé Saugèniené has a Master's Degree in Philology and Education Science and a PhD in Social Sciences (Education Science). She has worked in Lithuanian universities since 1995: Kaunas University of Technology, and Mykolas Romeris University, International School of Law and Business. She is interested in E-learning, open and distance learning, theory of curriculum development, education in multicultural environment, and education of national minorities. Her main field of activity during the last seven years has been the development and implementation of e-learning strategies at higher schools in Lithuania in the position of the Head of Distance Learning Centres.

Enrique López Veloso

Enrique López Veloso has been, since 1998, the Director of the International Office in the University of Santiago de Compostela. During the last decade, he has been working as coordinator in different international co-operations and mobility programmes and he has represented the USC in activities worldwide. He graduated in Law in 1991 at University of Santiago de Compostela and earned a Diploma in International Relations in 1994 at the Diplomatic School of the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Mar Figueras

Mar Figueras is the Head of the Doctoral School at the Universitat Rovira i Virgili (URV), Tarragona, Spain. Over the past two decades she has worked in a wide variety of professional capacities in both the private and public sectors. She is well-versed in all aspects of Human Resources management, including performance development and staff recruitment. She graduated with a degree in Industrial Psychology in 1989 at Universitat de Barcelona. She earned her MBA in 1991 at ESADE Business School and her MSC in Behaviour Evaluation and Measurement in 2009 at URV. At the moment, she is finishing her PhD in Psychology, entitled *Personal Skills for International Employability: Special focus on doctoral students* in which she presents research compiled during her professional experience.

Jackie Moses

Jackie Moses is currently Head of The Centre for Professional Practice at the University of Roehampton, having just moved from her previous role as Head of Professional Learning and Development. Jackie is a teacher-educator and has almost 20 years of experience in the initial and on-going training of teachers. Her first experiences within education were as a Physical Educator teacher and lecturer where she also represented the UK on the European Physical Education Association. More recently, she has developed expertise in Education Management and Leadership and this is the subject of her doctoral studies.

Jean Pierre Roose

Jean Pierre Roose is the representative of the Compostela Group of Universities in Brussels. He has broad experience in projects and co-operation in the international education field. Former Head of the International Office at Erasmushogeschool Brussel, he was a member of the Flemish team of Bologna Experts and a reviewer for good practices in international curricula for the Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatie Organisatie. He is proficient in Dutch, French and English, and has a good knowledge of Spanish and Italian.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

8.

EC (2011). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Supporting growth and jobs – an agenda for the modernisation of Europe's higher education systems*. COM(2011) 567 final. Brussels, 29/09/2011.

http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0567:FIN:EN:PDF

EC (2011). *Principles for Innovative Doctoral Training*. DG for Research and Innovation - European Research Area. Brussels, 27/06/2011.

http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/pdf/research_policies/Principles_for_Innovative_Doctoral_Training.pdf

EC (2012). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes*. COM(2012) 669 final. Strasbourg, 20/12/2012.

http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/rethinking/com669_en.pdf

EC (2012). *Europe 2020 Target: Tertiary Education Attainment*. Europe 2020 thematic summary on tertiary education.

http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/themes/28_tertiary_education.pdf

EC (2013). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: European higher education in the world*. COM(2013) 499 final. Brussels, 11/07/2013.

http://ec.europa.eu/education/higher-education/doc/com499_en.pdf

EC. "Action 68: Member States to mainstream eLearning in national policies". *Digital Agenda for Europe (A Europe 2020 initiative)* [viewed on 22th June 2013].

http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/pillar-vi-enhancing-digital-literacy-skills-and-inclusion/action-68-member-states-mainstream

EC, EACEA and Eurydice (2012). *Key Data on Education in Europe - 2012 Edition*. Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/Eurydice/key_data_en.php

Council of Europe and EC (2012). "Joint report of the Council and the commission on the implementation of the Strategic Framework for European co-operation in education and training (ET 2020) – Education and Training in a smart, sustainable and inclusive Europe". *Official Journal of the European Union*, 08/03/2012.

http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=O:C:2012:070:0009:0018:EN:PDF

Figueras, M. (2013). "Making the knowledge triangle (education – research – business) work in view of excellence and regional development". Presentation at *EMbracing the Modernisation Agenda: Workshop 2*, Brussels, 24th May 2013.

http://www.emma-project.eu/index.php?page=results

Hoare, AG (2013). "Attainment Levels and Student Diversity". Presentation at *Embracing the Modernisation Agenda: Workshop 1*, Brussels, 25-26 February 2013.

http://www.emma-project.eu/index.php?page=results

Hoare, AG and Johnston, R (2011). "Widening participation through admissions policy - a British case study of school and university performance". *Higher Education Quarterly*, vol. 36, pp. 21 - 41.

Johnson, L., Adams Becker, S., Cummins, M., Estrada, V., Freeman, A., and Ludgate, H. (2013). *NMC Horizon Report: 2013 Higher Education Edition*. Austin, Texas: The New Media Consortium.

Mairesse, P. (2011). "Policy context and priorities". *Lifelong Learning Programme Info Days,* Brussels, October 2011.

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/events/infodays_2012/infoday_llp_2012_en.php

OECD (2013), *Education at a Glance 2013: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2013-en

Waer, M. (2012). *Regional and international networks as a quality prerequisite for European research universities*. Opening address by Rector Mark Waer, presented on the occasion of the Official Opening of the 2012-2013 academic year.

http://www.kuleuven.be/english/news/opening-address-by-rector-mark-waer-on-the-occassion-of-the-official-opening-of-the-2012-2013-academic-year

Internet sources:

EMMA Project website:
http://www.emma-project.eu

Digital agenda for Europe:
http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/

Directorate General for Education and Culture:
http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/index_en.htm

Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency:

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/index_en.php

European framework for Key competences:

http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/key_en.htm

European University Association website on governance, autonomy and funding:

http://www.eua.be/eua-work-and-policy-area/governance-autonomy-and-funding/University-Funding-Articles-Series.aspx

Eurydice Network - information on and analyses of European education systems and policies:

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/

Expanding Opportunities:

http://expandingopportunities.eu

Higher Education Academy:

http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/

Leadership Foundation for Higher Education:

http://www.lfhe.ac.uk/

Strategic Framework for Education and Training:

http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/framework_en.htm

The Bologna Process:

http://ec.europa.eu/education/higher-education/bologna_en.htm

ANNEX

I

EMMA Workshop 1

Brussels, 25 – 26 February 2013
Erasmus Hogeschool Campus Dansaert

PROGRAMME

MONDAY 25 FEBRUARY 2013	
10.30 – 11.00	Registration & Coffee
11.00 – 11.15	Welcome by Jean Pierre Roose, Compostela Group of Universities Representative in Brussels
11.15 – 12.00	Keynote by Margaret Waters, European Commission, DG Education & Culture (Deputy Head of Unit Higher Education – Erasmus) Q & A
12.00 – 12.30	Keynote by Lieven Daneels, Televic (Belgium) & Voka Flanders
12.30 – 13.00	Keynote by Stephanie Raible, Erasmus Mundus Alumnus (tbc)
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch

14.00 – 15.30	Discussion groups (round 1) - Group 1: Attainment Levels, chaired by Adriana Lago (Universidade do Minho). Introductory Presentation by Jan Petter Myklebust (Bergen University & Group 1 rapporteur) - Group 2: Quality & Relevance, chaired by Jean Pierre Roose. Introductory Presentation by Nijolé Saugènienè (International School of Law & Business Lithuania and Group 2 rapporteur) - Group 3: Quality through Mobility and Cross Border Cooperation, chaired by Joachim Wyssling (Campus Europae). Introductory Presentation by Enrique Lopez Veloso (University of Santiago de Compostela & Group 3 rapporteur)
15.30 – 16.00	Coffee Break
16.00 – 17.30	Discussion groups (round 2) - Group 1: Attainment Levels, Follow-Up presentation by Tony Hoare (Bristol University) - Group 2: Quality & Relevance, Follow-Up presentation by Eveline Depreter (Director Patient Care AZ Damiaan, Oostende & Voka Flanders) - Group 3: Quality through Mobility and Cross Border Cooperation, Follow-up Presentation by Emanuel Alfranseder (Erasmus Student Network)
TUESDAY 26 FEBRUARY 2013	
09.30 – 11.00	Discussion groups round 3 – Wrap up and Preliminary Discussion on the Compostela Group Recommendations: - Group 1: Attainment Levels - Group 2: Quality & Relevance - Group 3: Quality through Mobility and Cross Border Cooperation
11.00 – 11.30	Coffee Break
11.30 – 12.00	Panel discussion focusing on the workshop outcomes, with the participation of the discussion groups rapporteurs.

12.00 – 12.30	Keynote by Vanessa Debiais –Sainton, European Commission, DG Education & Culture, Head Erasmus Team: 'The Erasmus for All Programme' Q&A
12.30 – 12.45	Closure

ANNEX

II

EMMA Workshop 2

Brussels, 24 May 2013
Erasmus Hogeschool Campus Dansaert
Zes Penningenstraat 70 – 1000 Brussels (Rooms 2.20 and 2.23)

http://www.campusdansaert.be/locatie/zespenningenstraat-70

PROGRAMME

FRIDAY 24 MAY 2013	
8.30 – 9.00	Registration & Coffee
9.00 – 9.15	Welcome by Jean Pierre Roose, Compostela Group of Universities Representative in Brussels
9.15 – 10.00	Keynote by Sven Vandeputte (Managing Director OCAS & Voka member): 'Walk Your Talk,' Q & A
10.00 – 10.45	Keynote by Anna-Lena Claeys-Kulik (European University Association): 'Trends and Challenges in University Funding and Governance in Europe', Q & A
10.45 – 11.15	Coffee Break

11.15 – 12.30	Discussion groups (round 1) - Group 1: Making the Knowledge Triangle Work, chaired by Abebaw Yirga Adamu (Tampere University and Erasmus Mundus Alumni and Students Association), Introductory Presentation by Mar Figueras (Rovira i Virgili University & Group 1 rapporteur) - Group 2: Improving Governance and Funding, chaired by Jean Pierre Roose (Compostela Group of Universities) Introductory Presentation by Jacky Moses (University of Roehampton and Group 2 rapporteur)
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch Break
13.30 – 14.45	Discussion groups (round 2) - Group 1: Knowledge Triangle, Follow-Up presentation by Sylvie Nail (Université de Nantes) - Group 2: Governance and Funding, Follow-Up presentation by Isabel Lirola Delgado (Universidad de Santiago de Compostela and Compostela Group Executive Secretary)
14.45 – 15.15	Presentation of the Workshop Conclusions and Plans for the Future: - Next Project Deliverables - Initiatives beyond the EMMA Project Contract Period
15.15 – 15.45	Closing Keynote by Simon Roy (European Commission, EAC)
15.45 – 16.00	Goodbye Words by Jean Pierre Roose, Compostela Group of Universities Respresentative in Brussels

EMMA

Brussels Education Services

VOKa Vlaams Economisch Verbond

Erasmus Mundus Association

compostela