

## EDUCATION INTERNATIONAL EUROPE

### Higher Education and Research Standing Committee

Barcelona (Spain), 25 – 27 November 2001

**Present:**

Hugo Deckers, ACOD, Belgium  
Camille Dieu, CGSP, Belgium  
Eric Van Damme, CGSP, Belgium  
Jens Vraa-Jensen, DM, Denmark  
Björn Fant, FUURT, Finland  
Yves Baunay, SNES FSU, France  
Guy Lachenaud, UNSA Education, France  
Laurent Dianoux, SNCS FSU, France  
Michel Deyme, SGEN/CFDT, France  
Gerd Köhler, GEW, Germany  
Romin REICH, GEW, Germany  
Gerard Sipkema, AOOb, Netherlands  
Kari Kjenndalen, NARW, Norway  
Ryszard Mosakowski, NSZZ Solidarnosc Science, Poland  
Manuel Pereira Dos Santos, FENPROF, Portugal  
Joao Cunha Serra, FENPROF, Portugal  
Janez Stergar, ESWUS, Slovenia  
Pedro Gonzalez, FECCOO, Spain  
Teresa Munoz, FETE-UGT, Spain  
Mario Rodriguez, FETE-UGT, Spain  
Göran Blomqvist, SULF, Sweden  
Brian Everett, AUT, UK  
Paul Bennett, NATFHE, UK, President  
Jörgen Lindholm and Georges Vansweevelt, ETUCE  
Monique Fouilhoux, EIE

**Spanish observers:**

Francisco Espadas García, FE.CC.OO., Spain  
Jesús Esquimas Cadenas, FE.CC.OO., Spain  
Sofia Luengo, FE.CC.OO., Spain  
José Palasón, FE.CC.OO., Spain  
Marisol Pardo, FE.CC.OO., Spain  
José Antonio García, FETE-UGT, Spain  
Felisa Hernández, FETE-UGT, Spain  
Pepa Sánchez, FETE-UGT, Spain

**Excused :** Gabor Szabo, FDSZ, Hungary; Daltun O'Ceallaigh, IFUT, Ireland; Nikolay

Kolobashkin, ESEUR, Russia.

**Point. 1 Adoption of the previous meeting report**

The report of the previous meeting was ratified with the annexes adopted by the EIE Regional Committee.

**Point. 2 Approval of the agenda**

**Point. 3 Continuation of the work on « Pay and Working Conditions of Academic Staff in Europe »**

Once again, the participants expressed their wish for EI to take up this initiative and extend it to the whole of Europe and to higher education systems elsewhere in the world. Such a database should then be revised periodically and would be a powerful working device for EI and its members. Contacts were made in Berlin with Jurgen Enders, who co-ordinated the joint study with GEW. He made a working proposal together with a financial proposal. A copy of Jurgen Enders' proposal will be sent to GEW, which will then contact him.

The study has been published and will soon be available in Spanish.

At the next meeting, it would be useful to be briefed on the use made of this study in the different countries. Jens Vraa-Jensen asked whether the study could be put on the Internet. Gerd Köhler indicated that GEW had already considered this possibility to enable an update of the database. Gerard Sipkema (AoB) mentioned his organisation's view on this issue, i.e., all trade unions should maybe fund the study updating according to their number of members. It is important to start soon before the information already collected is too outdated, and Paul Bennett (NATFHE) considered that the estimate reported to the Committee for the study is not excessive and could be divided between the different trade unions. According to Ryszard Mosakowski (Solidarnosc Science), the Kassel study is very useful and has to be extended to Eastern and Central Europe countries which are at the gates of the European Union.

After a long discussion, everybody agreed that the enlarged scope of the study should be defined by circulating a questionnaire to the organisations, but also taking into account the existing one, especially the Internet site [www.eurocadres.org/mobilnet](http://www.eurocadres.org/mobilnet).

***The Committee recommends that the EIE Regional Committee adopt the following decision:***

***The study on « Pay and Working Conditions of Academic Staff in Europe » will be pursued, updated and extended to the Central and East European countries. A proposal to turn it into a database to be put on the Internet will also be considered. The higher education trade unions will contribute to the budget of the study submitted by Jurgen Enders. Contacts will also be taken with Eurydice and the European Commission.***

#### **Point. 4 Follow-up of the "Caucus on Higher Education" of the IIIrd EI Congress**

The caucus organised in Jomtien was very satisfactory as it enabled to prepare the Congress : elections, amendments to the resolutions and interventions. Many representatives from the higher education sector expressed their views, making themselves known and rendering this sector more « visible ». The Congress results have been deemed very positive. The preparation of the next Conference in March 2001 has been considered.

Debate on the Globalisation :

A summary of the situation had been made on the Doha Meeting and the next deadlines concerning the GATS. The participants welcomed the progress made on the interpretation of the TRIPS Agreement.

It was indicated that UNESCO, which was asked to intervene on this issue at the last General Conference, had taken the decision to work on the theme « Globalisation and Trade in Higher Education ». A task force, in which EI will be invited to take part, will soon be implemented.

***The Committee asked the EIE Regional Committee to support the following recommendation :***

***The participants ask EI to implement as soon as possible the EI Resolution on the Transnational Provision of Higher Education, particularly point 7, which requests EI to « develop guidelines for best practice in relation to the provision of transnational education and actively pursue their endorsement and implementation by UNESCO, the ILO, the World Trade Organisation and international accreditation bodies, such implementation to be pursued in conjunction with EI. Such guidelines should address, among other issues, governance structures, quality assurance, the importance of culturally relevant content and modes of delivery, accreditation, intellectual property management and academic freedom». This work should be started as soon as possible in liaison with member organisations.***

Brian Everett (AUT) presented the study led by his organisation : « ***The General Agreement on Trade in Services: An Impact Assessment for Higher Education in the UK*** ». This study, circulated to all participants, was made in order to bring key acts to light. On the basis of the results, AUT is currently leading a campaign in the UK to demonstrate to the elected representatives the negative aspects and to suggest to the authorities that they implement a thorough research programme on this issue. Paul Bennett suggested that the participants read carefully these documents as well as the publications of other organisations on this issue.

Jens Vraa-Jensen (DM) mentioned that the AUT document was very useful. DM prepared for the Danish press an article which was rejected. He also mentioned that DM welcomed the WTO reaction regarding the Jomtien Resolution. He came round to Paul Bennett's viewpoint and mentioned that, on the same issue, the Canadian colleagues had started an awareness campaign towards the public opinion. Could we move towards a similar process at

European level within the framework of the implementation of a European higher education space? He also suggested the Committee should use the document presented by Carolyn Allport in Jomtien.

Camille Dieu (CGSP Enseignement) reported on the initiatives taken by her organisation and on the very positive reaction of the Belgian French-speaking Community government. Gerd Köhler invited the participants to move forward and prepare suggestions. He also drew the participants' attention to the OECD Working Document « Trade in educational services : trends and emerging issues ». The Secretariat will get this document and circulate it to all its members.

The participants also mentioned the ESIB Declaration on the « Commodification of Education » as well as the « Joint Declaration on Higher Education and the General Agreement on Trade in Services » signed by the AUCC, ACE, EUA and CHEA. The participants expressed their wish that closer relationships be established with ESIB and EUA on this issue within the framework of the implementation of a European space for higher education.

Georges Vansweevelt provided more information on the ESIB meeting which had just been held in Brussels and resulted on the « Brussels Students Declaration »: [www.esib.org](http://www.esib.org) and [www.unige.ch/eua](http://www.unige.ch/eua).

Further to a thorough debate, it was decided to continue working in the following way :

- Carry on with the analyses made by AUT, GEW and other organisations and make a synthesis aimed at warning our members, the authorities the elected representatives, the media and the public opinion. The ethical dimension should also be added.
- ***EI must as soon as possible, as from the beginning of 2002, implement point 5.12 of the Jomtien programme. "Establish a taskforce under Article 14 of the Constitution to develop and recommend policy on the globalisation of higher education and vocational training ». The participants ask the EIE Regional Committee to support this recommendation.***
- Making Point 7 of the resolution on the Transnational Provision of Higher Education a reality (see above).
- Intensify the co-operation with UNESCO and ILO so that their opinions be more often considered by the WTO authorities.
- Develop our relationships with ESIB and EUA. We have to play a more important role together but also be treated equally at the European level.

## **Point. 5 Follow-up of "Prague 2001 to Berlin 2003"**

Jörgen Lindholm and Monique Fouilhoux reported on several meetings. Further to the Luxembourg decision, there was a meeting with the Swedish State Secretary in which the Swedish teacher union SULF was represented. Sweden will take part to the next meeting of the preparatory group for the Berlin Conference (12 Dec. 2001). This meeting will be the last for Sweden, which will be replaced by Denmark. In all countries there is an ongoing debate

and reforms are being implemented everywhere. Contacts are being made for a meeting with Germany which will organise the 2003 Conference. The ETUCE General Secretary proposed that a meeting be organised around the December meeting. In what refers to the European Commission, it seems that the new person in charge is favourable to the participation of teachers' representatives. We have been invited to take part to several meetings on these issues. The SULF representative insisted on the necessity of having higher education personnel to represent the interests of academic staff.

Paul Bennett drew the attention on the fact that, in 2001, we produced quality material to influence the Prague preparation process. But we were not able to maximise the political impact of these efforts because of the weaknesses of our European structures and influence, and this is very frustrating for a certain number of participants who consider the ETUCE structure not to be the appropriate vehicle for this work, since the Bologna/Prague process goes far beyond the European Union.

Gerd Köhler gave further information on the Berlin preparatory process to be prepared by two groups : the EUA and the Council of Europe. The 12 December meeting will be chaired by a German representative. This group will meet every two months. Seminars will be organised in Spain at the beginning of January and in the Netherlands in March. There will also be possibilities of accreditation. A Conference will be organised by EUA in 2003 and another one by ESIB on the follow-up process. We have to overcome an obstacle CSEE/CES. Indeed, one of the reasons for our absence is that, as ETUCE is part of ETUC, we are considered as social partners and not as representatives of academic staff. We need a concept. If we want to play a role in Berlin, we also have to organise a conference, such as the students and the universities. But we also have to be strongly supported at national level. It was suggested that the unions at national level organise tripartite seminars in the autumn of 2002 which could prepare our Conference in 2003. The GEW is ready to organise this 2003 conference in Germany.

An extremely rich and constructive debate took place. All participants took the floor insisting on the need to make our proposals public and have a real influence at national and European level. We have to be better prepared at the political level as well as having good policies and arguments.

**Further to the discussion, Paul Bennett presented a series of proposals which were adopted by the Committee:**

- 1. National dialogue in the autumn 2002**
- 2. EIE Conference in 2003 in Germany**
- 3. A small group will be established to help Gerd Köhler and GEW preparing Berlin**
- 4. to reinforce the dialogue with ESIB and EUA**
- 5. The next Committee meeting should co-ordinate this preparation especially presenting national reports.**

#### **Themes**

- 1. Democratic deficit and trade union commitment in this process**

2. Diplomas / Relations with the professional sectors
3. Quality evaluation
4. Mobility
5. Academic freedom
6. Articulation with globalisation and GATS process

*The Committee recommends that EIE Regional Committee adopt the principle of organising an EIE Conference on the implementation of the European space in 2003 in Berlin. The funding aspect has still to be defined.*

The organisations will have to communicate with Monique and Jörgen on anything organised by the different actors in the different countries in the coming months. If we want to have a Conference in 2003 with GEW, we will have to announce it rapidly in order to be able to have access to certain national and European funding.

#### **Point. 6 ETUCE Activities and Research (Framework Programme)**

Jörgen Lindholm made a summary on the current European issues, ensuing particularly from the Stockholm Summit. A document on Education was adopted and during the next Barcelona Summit in March 2002, a programme of action will be discussed and, should be, adopted. On the question of lifelong learning, Jörgen reminded the Committee that higher education is included because the definition includes all education sectors as well as adult education. The objective is to prepare a document for the Barcelona Summit between the different social partners. This is an adhoc group which meets every 3 weeks. The main issue is the establishment of an « **individual learning account** » to which the employers and the governments would take part and which would lead to a credit for a 3, 6 or 12-month training period. These training programmes should be linked to an occupation or aimed at an application for a new occupation. All firms, whether small or big, are concerned.

The question of mobility was also mentioned. Indeed, it has become a key word since the Resolution on Mobility. Researchers may not be affected by these arrangements. However it seems that Commissioner Busquin in charge of research has promised to include this issue in the 6<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme. ETUCE worked with rapporteurs from the different committees of the European Parliament and several meetings took place to present amendments. The participants asked how the amendments were prepared, to whom were they directed, and where to consult them?

As usual, ETUCE requested interviews with the future Spanish presidency. Once again the participants expressed the wish that higher education and research organisations expertise be better used especially during the different meetings or appointments to which ETUCE is invited.

Jens Vraa-Jensen mentioned the Ethics declaration adopted in Jomtien and indicated it did not apply to the sector of higher education and research. However this issue has become very important. He proposed to prepare a draft text, together with Daltún O'Ceallaigh (IFUT) for the next meeting.

**Point. 7          Implementation of the EIE Action Programme**

Monique Fouilhoux reminded the Action Programme adopted in Luxembourg. The participants indicated that, apart from their Committee meetings, certain general points concern higher education (points 5, 9, 11, 13 and others).

**Point. 8          UNESCO/ILO**

Monique Fouilhoux summed up the situation especially on the project of a recommendation on "the promotion and use of multilingualism and universal access to cyberspace" presented at the last General Conference and postponed by member states and the editors lobby. A meeting of experts is planned during the first semester of 2002. This issue will have to be followed with careful attention.

**Point. 9          Next EI Conference in Montreal**

A restricted committee was set up for the organisation of the Conference to be held from 14 to 16 March 2002 in Montreal.

**Point. 10        Next meeting**

**10 - 11 June 2002 in Brussels.**

The agenda of this meeting should mainly focus on the Berlin preparation:

In this prospect;

- Each organisation will prepare a written report on the national situation within the framework of the implementation of the European space.
- A small group will work by e-mail on suggestions regarding the EIE Conference programme. This group will have to be informed about the seminars or national preparatory meetings.
- ESIB, EUA as well as the person responsible for the Prague follow up, from the German side, will be invited.
- The results of the EI Conference in Montreal on the basis of the resolution on transnational education guidelines adopted in the Jomtien Congress will also be taken into account. Paul Bennett will prepare a text. Jens Vraa-Jensen and Daltun will work on the ethics.
- Globalisation and the GATS