



Education International
Internationale de l'Éducation
Internacional de la Educación
Bildungsinternationale

Enhancing Quality

Academics' Perceptions of the Bologna Process



A Study by the Education International
Pan-European Structure

On the Occasion of the
Bologna Process Celebration Conference

March 2010

Enhancing Quality

Academics' Perceptions of the Bologna Process

**A Study by the Education International
Pan-European Structure**

**On the Occasion of the
Bologna Process Celebration Conference
March 2010**



**Education International
Internationale de l'Éducation
Internacional de la Educación**

FOREWORD

This is a study of academics' perceptions of the Bologna Process, as they consider it to have been implemented in their respective countries over the past five years. These perceptions are of key importance as they identify a number of issues which an internal stakeholder within higher education institutions - academics – considers central for the success of the implementation of the Bologna Process at institutional, national and European levels.

Education International's Pan-European Structure became a consultative member of the Bologna Process at the Bergen Meeting of Ministers responsible for education in 2005. This study specifically examines developments which took place across a number of European countries since that very date, in order to see what benefits the Bologna Process has brought about with the newfound involvement of academic staff. In turn this study also examines how academics relate to, and are affected by, the implementation of the Bologna Process in their respective countries.

In the analysis put forward in the following pages, a number of aspects are highlighted with respect developments which took place over the past five years. This helps us to examine the situation as it is now vis-à-vis what it was five years ago, and helps us to compare and contrast the realities of then and now. This is a crucial contribution of this study, as it generates an appreciation of what has been gained, and sometimes also lost, in our quest to fulfill the aim of setting up of the European Higher Education Area.

The year 2005 was an important one not only for the official recognition of academics as consultative members of the Process, but also for its marked expansion of the European Higher Education Area by the additional membership of a number of countries of Central and Eastern Europe. The past five years however have not served to bring the two regions of Europe (East and West) at par in terms of implementation of the Bologna Process.

Regrettably working, teaching and research conditions have also deteriorated across Europe over the past 5 years, with teaching conditions being the hardest hit both in countries where Bologna implementation has been more successful and where it has been less successful. This has had an impact upon academics' everyday work environment and their possibilities for undertaking teaching in the manner that most benefits the student, therefore proving to be of detriment to both students and staff. In turn, academics' involvement in the reform process at the decision-making stage has remained weak, notwithstanding involvement at the European level, leading to lack of ownership by academics of the Bologna reforms.

Concomitant to trends for increasing private funding of higher education and decreasing academic freedom for higher education staff, over the past five years, the Bologna Process has also added to the workload of academics and has dictated a clear 'profile' of what being an academic actually requires. The Bologna Process expects academics to speak multiple European languages, to be mobile as much as possible, to better address a diverse student population in the classroom and to publish research findings beyond their national context, in addition to the traditional tasks required of them. This study shows that, as academics strive to meet these expectations, it is important to lend them an ear and give them due recognition in the Bologna implementation process.

Monique Fouilhoux
Deputy General Secretary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of a study undertaken with 34 unions representing higher education staff across 26 European countries. It is a study of academics' perceptions of the implementation of the impact of the Bologna Process in their respective countries over the reference period 2005-2009, with an examination of how this has affected academics in particular, together with an appreciation of other ongoing reforms which are taking place in parallel to the Bologna Process, and which also impact on the daily lives and working conditions of academics.

In Section III, this study finds that academics are clear in their views that more is left to be done for the proper and full implementation of the Bologna Process in the majority of countries represented in this study, while for a large number of union respondents the impact of the Bologna Process has been largely positive in their respective countries, though a number of union respondents also consider the impact to be more or less neutral.

Section IV examines the impact of the Bologna Process on academics' core tasks, and attests a clear rise in bureaucratic work for academics as a direct impact of the Bologna Process. Section V and VI then find that, over the past five years, the Bologna Process has also been accompanied by a deterioration in remuneration for academic staff, as well as a trend of declining teaching and research conditions in Central and Eastern European countries and a trend of deteriorating teaching conditions in Western Europe. In relation to this, Section VII then makes the case for improved working, teaching and research conditions for academic staff as a prerequisite for a successful outcome to the Bologna Process.

Sections VIII and IX then examine the issue of academic staff participation and involvement in Bologna Process implementation at the national and institutional levels, finding it to be consistently weak and concomitantly detrimental to the implementation of the Process. Section X outlines a number of additional factors which have manifested themselves as trends impacting on the lack of involvement of academics over the reference period 2005-2009, while Section XI addresses the European level for involvement of academics with particular reference to the two action lines of quality assurance and mobility as bad and good practice examples respectively. In this context, Section XII then makes the case for better overall involvement of academic staff in the Bologna reform process.

Academics' perceptions of the future of the Bologna Process are then outlined in the final substantive part of this study, Section XIV. Academics are reported to have a positive outlook on the future of the Process, perceiving it to be a sign of quality as well as an opportunity for the creation of an academic labour market. While they see room for better organisation of the Process in general, they also largely consider it possible for the Process to open up to continents outside Europe for better comparability across continents and the creation of further opportunities for students and academic staff.

The concluding chapter then highlights the key findings and concerns emerging from this study, with a view to delineating the salient perceptions of academic staff in relation to the Bologna Process reforms which took place in their respective countries over the past five years.

CONTENTS

Page

	LIST OF TABLES	V
	LIST OF FIGURES	V
	ABBREVIATIONS	V
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	STUDY AIM AND METHODOLOGY	1
III.	THE GENERAL IMPACT OF THE BOLOGNA PROCESS	2
IV.	THE IMPACT OF BOLOGNA ON ACADEMICS' CORE TASKS	4
V.	THE IMPACT OF BOLOGNA ON ACADEMICS' WORKING CONDITIONS AND CAREER OPPORTUNITIES	5
VI.	THE IMPACT OF BOLOGNA ON TEACHING AND RESEARCH CONDITIONS	7
VII.	IMPROVED CONDITIONS AS A PREREQUISITE FOR A SUCCESSFUL OUTCOME TO THE BOLOGNA PROCESS	9
VIII.	INVOLVEMENT OF ACADEMICS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL OF BOLOGNA IMPLEMENTATION	10
IX.	INVOLVEMENT OF ACADEMICS AT THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL OF BOLOGNA IMPLEMENTATION	12
X.	ADDITIONAL FACTORS WHICH IMPACT ON THE LACK OF INVOLVEMENT OF ACADEMICS	13
XI.	INVOLVEMENT OF ACADEMICS AT MULTIPLE LEVELS IN IMPLEMENTATION OF KEY BOLOGNA ACTION LINES	14
XII.	THE NEED FOR BETTER OVERALL INVOLVEMENT OF ACADEMIC STAFF	15
XIII.	ADDITIONAL FACTORS AND TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION	16
XIV.	THE FUTURE OF THE BOLOGNA PROCESS	17
XV.	CONCLUSION	18
	REFERENCES	20
	APPENDIX: QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO MEMBER ORGANISATIONS	21

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1:	Respondent Unions Representing Higher Education Staff	2
Table 2:	Sample Countries CEE and Western Europe Link between Teaching, Research Conditions and Bologna Requirements	8
Table 3:	Analysis of the Impact of Union Involvement in Western European Countries	12
Table 4:	Analysis of the Impact of Union Involvement in CEE Countries	12

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 1:	Attainment of Bologna Objectives	3
Figure 2:	Impact of the Bologna Process	3
Figure 3:	Nature of Impact of Bologna Process	3
Figure 4:	Core Tasks on which Academics Spend Most of their Time	4
Figure 5:	Academics' Success in Completing Tasks within Working Hours	5
Figure 6:	Academics' Workload and Job Status	6
Figure 7:	Academics' Remuneration and Job Opportunities	6
Figure 8:	Impact of the Bologna Process on Academics' Working Conditions	7
Figure 9:	Academics' Teaching and Research Conditions	7
Figure 10:	Impact of the Bologna Process on Teaching and Research Conditions	8
Figure 11:	General Involvement of Unions Representing Higher Education Staff at National Level	10
Figure 12:	Involvement of Unions Representing Higher Education Staff at the National Level in Bologna Follow-Up Activities	11
Figure 13:	Own-Initiative Bologna Activity by Unions Representing Higher Education Staff	11
Figure 14:	Governance of and within HEIs	13
Figure 15:	Reforms related to Increase in Private Financing in Higher Education	13
Figure 16:	Mobility Opportunities for Academic Staff	15
Figure 17:	Trends in Teaching and Research	16
Figure 18:	Academics' Perception of the Bologna Process in the Future	17

ABBREVIATIONS

BFUG	Bologna Process Follow-Up Group
CEE	Central and Eastern Europe
EHEA	European Higher Education Area
EI	Education International
EU	European Union
ESG	European Standards and Guidelines on Quality Assurance in the EHEA
ESU	European Students' Union
HEI	Higher education institution
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

I. INTRODUCTION

Education International (EI) is the world's largest global union federation representing teachers worldwide, including c.700,000 higher education staff members from 137 member organisations in 45 countries across the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). EI, through its Pan-European Structure, became a consultative member of the Bologna Process at the Bergen Ministerial meeting in 2005. This official recognition put academics on track with the Bologna Process, and higher education staff unions have been working extensively on Bologna Process issues since then. A clear attestation to this is a number of policies adopted by the EI Pan-European Higher Education and Research Standing Committee, the EI body that deals with policies on higher education in the European region.

Since 2005, EI has worked to contribute constructively to the Bologna Process at the European level both through its work within and outside the Bologna Follow-Up Group (BFUG). EI has made significant contributions in this respect, particularly working towards the fulfillment of the action lines on mobility and the external dimension of the EHEA. This has helped EI to empower its member organisations in Europe to tackle Bologna issues and to become more involved in their respective national context.

Being that 2010 marks the targeted completion date of the Bologna Process, EI has undertaken this study to showcase academics' perceptions of the Bologna Process at its 'would-be' end point.

II. STUDY AIM AND METHODOLOGY

At the outset it is important to emphasise that this is a study of academics' *perceptions* of the Bologna Process. It has been undertaken on the basis of a survey distributed among EI member organisations in European countries which represent higher education staff. The survey (cf. Appendix) was designed around a number of questions in relation to academics' perceptions on the implementation of the Bologna Process for the reference period 2005-2009. These perceptions carry much weight as the survey replies were compiled by national unions representative of higher education staff which work incessantly with and on Bologna-related issues. In turn they are of key importance as they identify a number of issues which a *key stakeholder* – academics – considers central for the success of the implementation of the Bologna Process at institutional, national and European levels.

Survey replies were received from 34 member organisations from 26 European countries. The replies represent a wide spread across the European region, from North to South and East to West. In many cases replies were compiled by union representatives following further research with higher education staff at the local level and within higher education institutions (HEIs). In other cases, less research of this sort was necessary as some of the unions concerned already had very elaborate policies and experience in dealing with a number of related issues. This is particularly the case for the section on working conditions of academic staff, as elaborated in Section V of this report. The respondent unions and countries represented in this study are outlined in Table 1 below.

Albania	FSASH: Trade Union Federation of Education and Science of Albania	FYR Macedonia	SONK : Trade Union for Education, Science and Culture in the Republic of Macedonia
Albania	SPASH ITUEA: Independent Trade Union of Education of Albania	Moldova	ESTU: Education and Science Trade Union
Austria	GÖD-Lehrer: Gewerkschaft Öffentlicher Dienst / Arge-Lehrer-Fraktion Christlicher Gewerkschafter	The Netherlands	AOb: Algemene Onderwijsbond
Croatia	IURHEEC: Independent Union of Research and Higher Education Employees of Croatia	Norway	NAR: Norwegian Association of Research Workers
Denmark	DM: Dansk Magisterforening	Norway	UEN: Utdanningsforbundet / Union of Education Norway
Estonia	UNIVERSITAS: Federation of the Estonian Universities	Poland	NSZZ "Solidarność"
Finland	FUUP: Finnish Union of University Professors	Poland	ZNP: Związek Nauczycielstwa Polskiego
Finland	FUURT: Finnish Union of University Researchers and Teachers	Portugal	FENPROF: Federação Nacional dos Professores
Finland	OAJ: Opetusalan Ammattijärjestö	Romania	ALMA-MATER: Federația Națională Sindicală ALMA MATER -
France	SNCS: Syndicat National des Chercheurs Scientifiques	Russian Federation	ESEUR: Education and Science Employees' Union of Russia
France	SNES-FSU: Syndicat National des Enseignements de Second Degré	Serbia	TUS: Teachers Union of Serbia
France	UNSA-Education	Slovakia	OZPSaV: Trade Union of Workers in Education & Science
Georgia	ESFTUG: Educators and Scientists Free Trade Union of Georgia	Spain	F.E.CC.OO: Federación de Enseñanza CC.OO.
Germany	GEW: Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft	Spain	FETE/UGT: Federación de Trabajadores de la Enseñanza de la UGT
Hungary	FDSZ: Trade Union of Employees in Higher Education	Sweden	Läraryrket: Swedish Teachers' Union
Ireland	IFUT: Irish Federation of University Teachers	Sweden	SULF: Swedish Association of University Teachers
Latvia	LIZDA: Latvian Education and Scientific Workers' Trade Union	The United Kingdom	UCU: University and College Union

Table 1: Respondent Unions Representing Higher Education Staff
by Country and Name

The survey replies received were analysed in-depth and are presented in the various sections of this report. This has been coupled with an inter-relational analysis across the resulting perceptions, juxtaposed against results which emerged from other influential publications assessing the implementation of the Bologna Process over recent years. Various aspects of academics' perceptions of the implementation of the Bologna Process over the past five years are outlined in the sections below, which provide an analysis of a number of aspects of higher education relevant to academic staff, against the backdrop of the Bologna Process. A clear **Red**, **Orange** and **Green** scale is often used to indicate the manner of implementation or the nature of the perception of academic staff on key issues. This is similar to the 'traffic light' system used in Bologna Process Stocktaking Reports (cf. Rauhvargers et al, 2009) with red having a negative implication and green having a positive one.

III. THE GENERAL IMPACT OF THE BOLOGNA PROCESS

When asked to assess the general impact of the Bologna Process in their respective countries, academics gave a series of interesting replies in relation to the completion or otherwise of the action lines of the Process in their countries as well as the impact of the

Bologna Process on higher education in their national context and the nature of this impact. A summary of these results is outlined in Figures 1, 2 and 3 below.




Figure 1: Attainment of Bologna Objectives
Results by Country, 100%=26 Countries

Most countries represented in this study show a partial attainment of the Bologna objectives, indicating that there remains room for the fulfillment of the Bologna action lines across Europe.

When asked about the impact of the Bologna Process in their respective countries, a large number of union respondents identified this as being moderate or strong, with the union in *Georgia* opining that it was *weak* and unions in *Austria and Croatia* identifying it as being *very strong*. The overall results are shown in Figure 2 below.




Figure 2: Impact of the Bologna Process
Results by Country, 100%=26 Countries




Figure 3: Nature of Impact of Bologna Process
Results by Country, 100%=26 Countries

When asked about their perceptions of the nature of this impact, as shown in Figure 3 above, most unions identified this as being positive or neutral. Union respondents from *Austria* however viewed this as being negative, particularly due to the insufficient discussion on the Bologna reforms generally in Austria, leading to the neglect of wider social and cultural determinants of the Austrian higher education system.

Concerns also arise in cases where academic staff perceive the impact of the Bologna Process to be neutral. In *Italy* for instance, while the Bologna Process has produced better student completion rates, quality of teaching seems to have deteriorated. In *France*, while the Bologna Process brought with it improvements in the pedagogic system, academics' working conditions have deteriorated. In most cases, union respondents who refer to the nature of the impact as neutral identify both positive and negative aspects, so that implementation in these countries remains a cause for concern.

IV. THE IMPACT OF BOLOGNA ON ACADEMICS' CORE TASKS

When asked what core tasks academics spend more time on in relation to their work, the reply received from union representatives was mixed, as evidenced in Figure 4 below. A large number of those who responded to this question report that academics spend most of their time on a combination of **teaching and bureaucratic tasks**.




Figure 4: Core Tasks on which Academics Spend Most of their Time
Results by Country, 100%=26 Countries

In addition, while a number of union respondents were not able to clearly identify the core tasks which take up most of academics' time, findings from supplementary comments made by the same respondents show that **academics' tasks are becoming extremely varied** and include a number of other tasks such as student counselling, dissemination of knowledge, acquisition of third party funding, development of other competences, provision of scientific services to the community, popularising science in schools and referee work.

Indeed, due to such a large amount of tasks it is also not very clear to a number of union respondents whether or not academics succeed to complete their assigned tasks during their working time. However, from those who did respond, an overwhelming majority report that **academics have to work overtime to be able to complete all their work**, as seen in Figure 5 below.




Figure 5: Academics' Success in Completing Tasks within Working Hours
Results by Country, 100%=26 Countries

In addition, **union respondents in 38 percent of the countries represented in this study** clearly indicate that such **overtime work is not paid**, particularly when it is linked to research or bureaucratic work such as administrative work related to quality assurance or research. This has to be considered in the context that the average official working time of academics stands at c. 40 hours per week.

More importantly **respondents from half of the countries represented in this study clearly state that the necessity to work overtime has increased with the implementation of Bologna reforms**. Indeed, some respondents state that academics' workload has increased because of ongoing structural changes which take place from year to year, among them those necessitated by the implementation of the Bologna Process.

A number of respondents indicate that overtime work could be reduced if academics were to be offered more support in implementing Bologna reforms, particularly in relation to administrative work related to transfer of students' credits or in the drafting up of descriptions of course content.

In addition, outside the added pressures put on academics by an increasing number of tasks, as referred to above, it must be appreciated that in countries where remuneration of academics is particularly low, especially in some countries in the Central and Eastern European (CEE) region where administrative support for the implementation of Bologna reforms is characteristically weak, academics often have to take a second job, whether within or outside their own higher education institution (HEI), in order to make ends meet (e.g. *Moldova and Serbia*).

V. THE IMPACT OF BOLOGNA ON ACADEMICS' WORKING CONDITIONS AND CAREER OPPORTUNITIES

As Barrier et al (2009) contend, the reforms led by national governments across Europe and the policies developed at the European level have deeply affected the situation of the academic profession (ibid, p.203). This section of the report aims to establish how much Bologna-related reforms at the national level have done just that.

Issues related to academic careers and working conditions of academics constitute a key area of expertise for unions representing higher education staff. It is traditionally where such unions have worked the most and the hardest and it is the area in which they are most able to identify the direct impact of the Bologna Process in terms of quality and

conditions of teaching and research, also in relation to career paths and other opportunities available to academics.

As Figure 6 illustrates below, findings from this study show that in the majority of cases, while academic **staff workload has dramatically increased** concomitantly with the **large increase in bureaucratic work** to be undertaken by academics, **part-time employment and fixed-term contracts of employment for academics are also on the rise** in a number of countries.




Figure 6: Academics' Workload and Job Status
Results by Country, 100%=26 Countries, Reference Period 2005-9

This study finds that **academic staff workload is on the rise** both in countries in Western Europe (13 countries) as well as in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) (7 countries). Among these countries, there are a number in which, in addition to an increase in their workload, academics are facing a **steady deterioration of job security** as both part-time academic jobs and fixed-term contracts for academic work are increasing (*Austria, Germany, Latvia, Portugal, Russia and the United Kingdom*).

In some countries, the workload increase and the deterioration in job security has at least been met with an increase in remuneration and stability in pension schemes (*Russia*). However, in other countries (*Austria, Latvia and Ireland*), notwithstanding the increase in workload and job precarity, academics have been faced with a decrease in remuneration. Figure 7 below provides the overall picture in the 26 countries which are represented in this study. Overall, findings show that **remuneration is generally decreasing** in *Austria, Hungary, Ireland and Latvia*, once again representing a mix of Western European and CEE countries, while **pension schemes are deteriorating** in *Austria and Hungary*. While most countries show a stability in the level of remuneration and pension schemes, this is still however considered to be insufficient against the backdrop of a general trend of increasing workload and job precarity as described above.




Figure 7: Academics' Remuneration and Job Opportunities
Results by Country, 100%=26 Countries, Reference Period 2005-9

In addition to remuneration in the form of regular salaries and the availability of pension schemes, a complementary consideration is that related to **career opportunities that are available to academics in the form of the creation of new positions**, which seem to be stable or on the rise in a number of the countries represented in this study. Nevertheless, this study finds that there are some countries in which **academics have relatively few new opportunities open to them** (*Georgia, Hungary, Ireland and Romania*).

Furthermore, while most union respondents consider the Bologna Process to have had little or no impact on remuneration, pension schemes, job precarity and new career opportunities, union respondents from 42 and 54 percent of countries represented in this study clearly state that the **Bologna Process has had a direct impact on the increase in academic staff workload and bureaucratic work** respectively in their country, as illustrated in Figure 8 below. The countries where the impact of the Bologna Process is felt on both these areas again include both Western European (*Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Norway and Sweden*) and CEE (*Croatia, Latvia and Romania*) countries.




Figure 8: Impact of the Bologna Process on Academics' Working Conditions
Results by Country, 100%=26 Countries, Reference Period 2005-9

VI. THE IMPACT OF BOLOGNA ON TEACHING AND RESEARCH CONDITIONS

In view of the above findings therefore, it is not surprising that union respondents indicate that **teaching conditions have deteriorated in the majority of countries (54 percent)** represented in this study over the reference period 2005-2009. In turn, respondents indicate that in **31 percent of the countries** represented in this study **research conditions have also deteriorated** over the same period. This is illustrated in Figure 9 below.




Figure 9: Academics' Teaching and Research Conditions
Results by Country, 100%=26 Countries, Reference Period 2005-9

The seven countries which fare the worst in this respect are those in which respondents consider both teaching and research conditions to be deteriorating simultaneously

(Austria, Denmark, Hungary, Norway, Romania, Serbia and Slovakia). Additionally, in another seven countries, academics have suffered deterioration only in teaching conditions (Georgia, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, and Sweden) and in one country academics have suffered deterioration only in research conditions (Croatia).

Together, these fifteen countries represent an interesting sample from both CEE and Western European countries when considered in light of the findings of the latest stocktaking exercise encompassing ten stocktaking criteria of the Bologna Process, undertaken for the purpose of the Bologna Process Ministerial Meeting in Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve in 2009 (cf. Rauhvargers et al, 2009) referred to in Table 2 below as 'Average Score, Stocktaking 2009'. In this respect it is pertinent to consider the comparisons made in Table 2.

Sample Countries CEE	Deterioration in	Average Score, Stocktaking 2009	Sample Countries Western Europe	Deterioration in	Average Score, Stocktaking 2009
Croatia	Research	4	Austria	Teaching, Research	6
Georgia	Teaching	5			
Hungary	Teaching, Research	4	Denmark	Teaching, Research	9
Poland	Teaching	5	Germany	Teaching	3
Romania	Teaching, Research	7	Ireland	Teaching	8
			The Netherlands	Teaching	8
Serbia	Teaching, Research	7	Norway	Teaching, Research	8
Slovakia	Teaching, Research	4	Portugal	Teaching	6
			Sweden	Teaching	8
Average	Both	5.1	Average	Teaching	7.2

Table 2: Sample Countries from CEE and Western Europe
Link between Teaching, Research Conditions and Fulfillment of Bologna Requirements
 Stocktaking 2009, Reference Period for Teaching, Research Conditions 2005-9

In Table 2 above, the Bologna stocktaking criteria which are listed are those which are indicated as complete (rated as dark green) in the 2009 Stocktaking report (ibid). The sample of countries in which teaching and, or research conditions are reported to have deteriorated, taken in Table 2, shows that in CEE countries it is both research and teaching conditions that have typically deteriorated while the rate of success of Bologna Process implementation remains typically low. In Western Europe teaching conditions have suffered the most while the rate of success of Bologna Process is significantly higher. From the sample taken above, respondents from *Croatia* indicate that the Bologna Process had a direct influence over research conditions over the period 2005-9, while respondents from *Germany, Slovakia and Sweden* indicate that it had a direct influence on teaching conditions for the same period. Figure 10 below illustrates the overall perceptions that all union respondents have of the impact of the Bologna Process on teaching and research conditions.




Figure 10: Impact of the Bologna Process on Teaching and Research Conditions
 Results by Country, 100%=26 Countries, Reference Period 2005-9

While Figure 10 shows that there is little relation between the Bologna Process and a change in teaching and research conditions, Table 2 above illustrates that complete implementation of the Bologna Process can take its toll on teaching conditions, which in turn can prove to be detrimental to both academic staff and students, particularly where it directly impacts on the quality of teaching and learning. Therefore, while the connection between the implementation of the Bologna Process and the deterioration in teaching and research conditions is not widespread over Europe, the above illustrates that this connection does arise in a number of countries. On the other hand, findings from this study show that in countries where teaching conditions are reported to have improved over the period 2005-2009 (*Croatia, FYR Macedonia and Russia*) and where research conditions are reported to have improved (*Albania, Estonia, FYR Macedonia, Moldova, Portugal and Sweden*) it is only in two of these countries that it is reported that the Bologna Process has had a direct influence on teaching or research conditions respectively over the reference period 2005-2009.

VII. IMPROVED CONDITIONS AS A PREREQUISITE FOR A SUCCESSFUL OUTCOME TO THE BOLOGNA PROCESS

Academic staff need to work under conditions which enable them to respond to diverse demands. Apart from the additional demands made upon them by the implementation of the Bologna Process, in many European countries, academic staff have had to respond to the demands of increased participation in higher education which has led to massification, lifelong learning and the pressures of employers and the market place, without additional resources or recognition of the extra burdens which have been placed upon them.

As indicated above, the range of extra demands include pressure to publish, to generate income and to give additional support to students, among other things. Though not all of these demands are directly related to the implementation of the Bologna Process, some of them are a direct consequence of it, and none of these extra demands have replaced the traditional requirements of academics' work, nor have they generally attracted any extra pay (Education International, 2005). The absence of the issue of the working conditions of academic staff from the Bologna Process was clear throughout the first ten years of the Process, the result of which is clearly illustrated above. The 2009 Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Ministerial Communiqué however marked a huge leap forward in this respect by stating the following:

Attractive working conditions and career paths as well as open international recruitment are necessary to attract highly qualified teachers and researchers to higher education institutions. (European Ministers responsible for Higher Education, 2009, §20)

It is now time to turn rhetoric into action and to secure proper teaching and research conditions for academic staff, as well as attractive career paths for academics as an essential component for the success of the Bologna Process. Indeed, any analysis of the issues under discussion, be it quality assurance, the relationship between teaching and research, student and staff mobility, as well as the ongoing restructuring needed to conform to the Bologna requirements, must include a consideration of academic staff's employment and working conditions (Education International, 2005).

VIII. INVOLVEMENT OF ACADEMICS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL OF BOLOGNA IMPLEMENTATION

A study evaluating perceptions of teaching professionals' perceptions of higher education reforms in the EU-27 Member States and Croatia, Iceland, Norway and Turkey found that a clear majority of teaching professionals (59 percent) in higher education institutions (HEIs) have most confidence in their own faculty, followed by the university leadership and the national Rectors' conference or national associations of universities (Gallup, 2007, p. 37). Furthermore, the same study found that teaching professionals in HEIs have the least confidence in the involvement of private enterprises in the higher education reform, and little confidence in the involvement of the European Commission, professional associations and national or regional authorities (ibid). This and subsequent sections of this report aim to assess why this is the case against the backdrop of ongoing Bologna-related reforms across the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), as well as to assess what academic staff involvement means for the success of the Bologna Process.

When asked about their involvement in decision-making at the national level in relation to Bologna-related reforms and to the follow-up on the implementation of the various action lines of the Bologna Process, union respondents presented a very bleak picture in which it is clear that **the role and contribution of academics to the whole Process is more or less discounted**. Figure 11 below provides an initial overall picture of this situation.




Figure 11: General Involvement of Unions Representing Higher Education Staff at National Level
Results by Number of Unions, 100%=34 unions, at Present

Unions in *Italy and Slovakia* report that they are **completely uninvolved** at the national level, while all unions in *Croatia, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Serbia, Romania, Sweden* and one union from *Norway* and one from *Spain* report that they are **quite well involved** at the national level. One union from *Poland* only started to be involved in 2008. The remaining 22 unions represented in this study report that they are **only slightly involved** at the national level.

The overall picture therefore shows that **74 percent of unions involved in this study are insufficiently involved in the Bologna Process overall decision-making and follow-up procedures at the national level**. It is also important to note that where some unions report that they are quite well-involved in the Process at the national level, this is not always in an official manner (e.g. *Serbia*) while some unions are involved in informal national Bologna follow-up groups which do not make any systematic follow up of the reforms (e.g. *Sweden*).

When examining unions' involvement in the follow-up of specific action lines of the Bologna Process at the national level, findings once again show **poor involvement of unions representing higher education staff in all cases**, as illustrated in Figure 12 below.




Figure 12: Involvement of Unions Representing Higher Education Staff at the National Level in Bologna Follow-Up Activities
Results by Number of Unions, 100%=34 unions, at Present

Results show that while **representation in national Bologna Follow-Up Structures and in the drafting of national stocktaking reports is less than 50 percent, participation in delegations of Ministerial meetings and in Bologna experts groups is truly dismal, at 15 percent and 6 percent respectively, representing 5 and 2 unions respectively.**

On the other hand, findings from this study show that unions representing higher education staff are very active in their approach towards the Bologna Process. Figure 13 below shows the extent of such own-initiative activity, illustrating that in all the cases examined, own-initiative activity by unions representing higher education staff stands at over 50 percent.




Figure 13: Own-Initiative Bologna Activity by Unions Representing Higher Education Staff
Results by Number of Unions, 100%=34 unions, at Present

The above therefore shows that while the level of pro-activity of unions representing higher education staff in relation to the Bologna Process is high, involvement in relevant follow-up bodies at the national level, whether formal or informal, remains low.

In light of the above, Tables 3 and 4 below analyse countries in Western Europe and in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) for the impact of union participation in the national Bologna Follow-Up Group (as reported in Figure 12 above) on the level of completion of the some stocktaking criteria of the Bologna Process as reported in the latest stocktaking exercise of the Bologna Process undertaken for the purpose of the Bologna Process Ministerial Meeting in Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve in 2009 (cf. Rauhvargers et al, 2009) referred to in Tables 3 and 4 below as 'Average Score, Stocktaking 2009'.

The Bologna stocktaking criteria which are listed in these tables are those which are indicated as complete (rated as dark green) in the 2009 Stocktaking report (ibid). These two tables are split according to the two main regions of Europe represented in this study

- Western Europe and CEE - as it cannot be pre-supposed that the conditions for implementation of the Bologna Process are the same across these two European regions, also in light of the later participation of a number of CEE countries in the Bologna Process.

Western European countries with at least one Union in Follow-Up Group	Average Score, Stocktaking 2009	Western European countries with NO Union in Follow-Up Group	Average Score, Stocktaking 2009
Denmark	9	Austria	6
Germany	3	Finland	7
Ireland	8	France	3
The Netherlands	8	Italy	3
Norway	8	Portugal	6
Spain	6		
Sweden	8		
UK	6		
Average	7	Average	5

Table 3: Analysis of the Impact of Union Involvement in Western European Countries

CEE Countries with at least one Union in Follow-Up Group	Average Score, Stocktaking 2009	CEE Countries with NO Union in Follow-Up Group	Average Score, Stocktaking 2009
Croatia	4	Albania	1
Hungary	4	Estonia	4
FYR Macedonia	3	Georgia	5
Moldova	3	Latvia	4
Poland	5	Russia	2
Romania	7	Serbia	4
Slovakia	2		
Average	4	Average	3.33

Table 4: Analysis of the Impact of Union Involvement in CEE Countries

When compared, Tables 3 and 4 above show that **where unions representing higher education staff are involved in national Bologna Follow-Up structures, the probability for a more successful fulfillment of the Bologna action lines is higher.**

IX. INVOLVEMENT OF ACADEMICS AT THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL OF BOLOGNA IMPLEMENTATION

During the course of this study, unions representing higher education staff also indicated how far participation and involvement of academic staff within higher education institutions (HEIs) has been affected over the reference period 2005-2009. Figure 14 below shows the extent to which governance of and within HEIs has changed during the mentioned period. Findings in Figure 14 show that **autonomy of HEIs has increased** in 38 percent of the countries covered in this study, **academic freedom of higher education staff has decreased** in 35 percent of the countries, together with a **decrease in democracy in HEIs** in 31 percent of the countries and a **decrease in participation of academic staff** in 38 percent of the countries. Concomitantly, and perhaps most importantly, **public funding for HEIs has also decreased** in 38 percent of the countries.




Figure 14: Governance of and within HEIs
Results by Country, 100%=26 Countries, Reference Period 2005-9

Union respondents indicate that from all the areas referred to above, **the Bologna Process has mostly had an impact on the autonomy of HEIs**, and has also had some impact on **academic freedom** of higher education staff, as well as on **participation of academic staff within HEIs**. Therefore, where, on the one hand, the Bologna Process impacted upon the autonomy of HEIs this seemed to be largely in the favour of more autonomy for HEIs, where the Bologna Process impacted upon academic freedom and participation of academic staff, this seems to have worked against academics. This could be symptomatic of the manner of implementation of the Bologna Process at the national level where staff involvement is still largely lacking, as examined in Section VIII above.

X. ADDITIONAL FACTORS WHICH IMPACT ON THE LACK OF INVOLVEMENT OF ACADEMICS

In addition to the Bologna Process, this study finds that **national policy** is a key factor which influences governance of and within higher education institutions (HEIs), and results, among other things, in more **private funding of HEIs** in some countries (*Estonia*), the increase in the number of **private HEIs** in others (*Serbia*), the **introduction of student fees** for non-EU students where there previously were none (*Sweden*) and **greater management rather than governance of HEIs** (*Denmark and the United Kingdom*). The greater role of private financing of higher education, in its varying forms, is illustrated in Figure 15 below.




Figure 15: Reforms related to Increase in Private Financing in Higher Education
Results by Country, 100%=26 Countries, Reference Period 2005-9

It is interesting to note however that **88 percent of unions represented in this study do not attribute the rise in private financing to the influence of the Bologna Process in their respective countries.** Nonetheless, by its very nature, more privatisation of higher education reduces the possibility for involvement of academic staff in internal governance and democratic structures of HEIs and can end up having an impact on the success or otherwise of Bologna implementation in a number of countries, as evidenced in Section VIII above, where it is shown that a lower level of involvement of academics at the national level leads to lower attainment of the various criteria of the Bologna Process.

Union respondents also indicate that as autonomy of HEIs is increasing, as attested in Section IX above, much more is being asked of HEIs without a concomitant increase in public funding, which then pushes HEIs to search for alternative private sources of funding. This study finds that higher education staff unions do not welcome the growth of private provision of higher education and of private HEIs, which are the clearest possible manifestation of commodification of higher education. Unions representing higher education staff believe that the best way of ensuring that the public ethos prevails, in the interest of society at large, but particularly to protect students and staff in private institutions, is to require the private sector to meet the same high standards as the public sector. Concomitantly unions recognise the need to defend those standards within the public institutions themselves, against creeping commercialisation and the erosion of quality (Education International, 2005).

XI. INVOLVEMENT OF ACADEMICS AT MULTIPLE LEVELS IN IMPLEMENTATION OF KEY BOLOGNA ACTION LINES

When discussing the notion of involvement of academic staff in the Bologna Process, it therefore becomes clear that while much progress was made at the European level in 2005 when the EI Pan-European Structure became a consultative member of the Bologna Process, such good practice is often not replicated at national and institutional levels.

This study however finds that with respect to one of the key action lines of the Bologna Process - namely **Quality Assurance** - academics also remain under-represented at the European level, which is in turn replicated in terms of gross under-representation of academics in decision-making structures on quality assurance both at institutional and national levels. Whereas the adoption of the European Standards and Guidelines on Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) (E4, 2005) at the Bologna Process Ministerial meeting in Bergen in 2005 was a positive catalyst for more student involvement in quality assurance processes and related decision-making structures, it did not provide the same positive results for academics and their representative unions.

This study finds that the majority of union respondents consider that their unions have often been sidelined because of a formalisation of procedures in which unions are, at the first instance, seen as social partners, rather than professional associations of academic staff. This development has also been reflected at European level with EI's Pan-European Structure itself, as it participates in the European Quality Assurance Register general assemblies as a social partner and is excluded from the E4 group which is the driver, at the European level, of reforms and initiatives related to quality assurance.

At European and national levels, the realisation has not yet come about that academic staff unions represent a key internal stakeholder in higher education institutions (HEIs), which makes up the second largest group after students. In addition, at the institutional level, while academics were traditionally the core of the quality assurance process at its very beginnings, they are now largely being excluded from decisions related to the design and implementation of quality assurance processes within their own institutions. In the whole discourse on quality assurance, there is therefore a need for a clearer delineation of the roles of the three internal stakeholders within higher education institutions – students, staff and the leadership/management bodies of HEIs - and an urgent need to give academics the place that they deserve within the relevant quality assurance structures.

With respect to another action line of the Bologna Process - namely **mobility of students and staff** – the opposite situation arises to that evidenced in the case of quality assurance. Unions representing higher education staff and those representing students have worked extremely hard on the issue of mobility of students and staff by means of a joint project entitled *Let's Go!* initiated by the EI Pan-European Structure and the European Students' Union (ESU) in 2006, with the purpose of encouraging member organisations from both sides to work together at the national level to enhance mobility opportunities for students and staff. This is a key area where involvement of academics and their respective unions was very high, which involvement has translated, together with national government and institutional efforts, into improvement of possibilities for mobility of academic staff in a number of countries (namely *Albania, Estonia, Ireland, Latvia, FYR Macedonia, Moldova, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia and the United Kingdom*) as illustrated in Figure 16 below.




Figure 16: Mobility Opportunities for Academic Staff
Results by Country, 100%=26 Countries, Reference Period 2005-9

In particular, the issue of mobility is of key importance in terms of career opportunities that arise for academic staff via mobility as well as the experience of different teaching and research practices which help to enhance pedagogic and research practice in one's home institution. It is to be appreciated however, that although mobility opportunities for academics seem to have improved, this is a complicated issue for a number of reasons, and Ministers need to follow up on their commitments in this area, with continued input from academics and their unions.

XII. THE NEED FOR BETTER OVERALL INVOLVEMENT OF ACADEMIC STAFF

Academic staff and researchers are an essential pillar of the higher education and research community who must be involved in the Bologna Process through their representative unions (Education International, 2005). **Respondent unions in this study attach great importance to the issue of representation on the basis that academics collectively make up one of the largest internal stakeholders within higher education institutions (HEIs), making them key to ensuring the success of Bologna reforms**

both at the institutional and national levels and warranting a greater participation of academics at all levels. In this respect, respondent unions are clear that their role goes beyond the concept of “social dialogue”, to embrace a range of professional issues relating to quality of higher education, access, public accountability, working conditions, and the public sector values which are central to HEIs’ place in modern European societies.

As described above (cf. Section VIII) this is also likely to lead to more successful fulfillment of the various Bologna action lines. Concomitantly, union respondents argue that keeping higher education within the public domain preserves the public character of higher education, which must be sustained. In turn, the public setting of higher education is the place where, first and foremost, the active participation of academic staff must be guaranteed for the greater success of higher education and of the implementation of reforms such as those inspired by the Bologna Process.

XIII. ADDITIONAL FACTORS AND TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

In view of the considerations made above, it therefore becomes very clear from this study that academics, higher education institutions (HEIs) and higher education systems are subject to a number of developments, pressures and political processes that have an impact on higher education and its provision to varying degrees. Even beyond the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) there are factors which influence HEIs and academics in Europe.

This study finds that, additionally to national policy and the Bologna Process, **institutional policy** of HEIs, **international globalisation**, **the European Union’s Lisbon Process** and **Recommendations by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)** also have an impact on ongoing reforms in higher education in the various countries represented in this study. **In particular, union respondents in a number of Western European countries (Denmark, Finland and the Netherlands) refer to an increasingly market-driven policy in higher education with more emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness and on economic factors related to higher education.** Figure 17 below illustrates a number of trends in higher education teaching and research over the reference period for this study 2005-2009 which arose in 50 percent or more of the countries represented in this study.




Figure 17: Trends in Teaching and Research
Results by Country, 100%=26 Countries, Reference Period 2005-9

In particular, union respondents indicate that while curricular reforms, the increase in courses taught in English, the diversification of programmes and the rise in accreditation processes are a direct consequence of the Bologna Process, other trends do not directly arise out of a direct influence of the Bologna Process. It is of utmost importance to take this into consideration when assessing the conditions for the implementation of Bologna-related reforms, as academics finds themselves often submitted to a varied array of developments that may make implementation by them at the institutional level all the more difficult.

XIV. THE FUTURE OF THE BOLOGNA PROCESS

As 2010 marks the year in which Europe should have had a fully-functioning European Higher Education Area, the question as to the future of the Process is a crucial one. In practical terms, the large majority of union respondents opine that, at all levels, the **Bologna Process could be improved by benefiting from a more structured organisation. The majority of unions represented in this study also indicate that they wish to see the Bologna Process open up to continents outside Europe, in order to be able to spread comparability and recognition practices for the benefit of both students and academic staff.**

In the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué (European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education, 2009) Ministers identified the following as priorities for the coming decade: the social dimension of higher education, lifelong learning, employability of degree programmes, student-centered learning and the teaching mission of higher education, the link between higher education, research and innovation, the international openness of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), mobility of students and staff, multi-dimensional transparency tools and funding of higher education.

With respect to the priorities for the Bologna Process in the future, an overwhelming number of union respondents indicate the need to **develop the social dimension as a core aspect of the Bologna Process with better provision of counselling services for students, better access to student housing and better living conditions.** Some unions also indicate the need for **better language training for students and financial support for students in the form of removal of tuition fees where these exist or the distribution of grants and scholarships.** A number of union respondents also point to the **need to secure the social dimension of the Bologna Process for academic staff as well, with particular reference to social security and pensions, as well as to granting more access to the academic profession to under-represented groups in society.** A number of union respondents also emphasise the need to **continue intensive work on making mobility a reality for academic staff.**

In addition, academics also express their view of the Bologna Process in the future, projecting it as **a symbol of quality.** They also view the EHEA as constituting **an academic labour market** in the future.




Figure 18: Academics' Perception of the Bologna Process in the Future
Results by Union, 100%=34 Unions

XV. CONCLUSION

The previous sections of this report illustrate both the sensitivity of academics to a range of Bologna issues, as well as their vulnerability in an ongoing world of change in higher education systems across Europe. The considerations made above highlight a number of key issues, which, in the eyes of academics are necessary conditions for the successful attainment of the Bologna objectives across Europe. These are briefly outlined below.

XV.I Support for Implementation of Reforms is Insufficient

The findings of this study show that, across Europe, both governments and higher education institutions (HEIs) need to provide **more support to academic staff for the implementation of Bologna reforms** and in particular for the large amount of bureaucratic and administrative work that the implementation of the Bologna Process requires in practice.

XV.II Deterioration in Working Conditions of Academic Staff

Increased workload and bureaucratic work in particular are portrayed above as being a direct consequence of Bologna Process reforms, while remuneration of academic staff is decreasing in a number of countries. This is a contradiction in itself and needs to be remedied in order to secure the quality of both teaching and research in Europe.

XV.III Participation and Involvement of Academic Staff

Both **governments and HEIs need to provide for and guarantee the full involvement and participation of academic staff** and their unions in decision-making procedures and processes related to the Bologna Process. This study shows, without any doubt, that this is a necessary precondition for the successful implementation of the Bologna Process, especially if one considers that academics need to feel ownership of any kind of reform that they need to implement.

XV.IV A Two-Track Process for CEE and Western European Countries

A clear **distinction** is also drawn above between **Western European and Central and Eastern European (CEE)** countries in terms of the required fulfillment of Bologna requirements. While it is clear that CEE countries lag behind their Western European counterparts, it is equally clear that the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) cannot have two different sides to the same Process. For this reason capacity building is urgently needed between East and West to aid in the implementation of the necessary reforms particularly in non-EU countries, where resources for higher education and research have become even scarcer since the onset of the global financial and economic crisis.

XV.V The Importance of Public Funding of Higher Education

Although this is globally a difficult time for higher education institutions and governments, unions representing higher education staff are aware that the global financial and economic crisis is now turning into a social crisis, raising the necessity for strong, democratic societies based on sound values and with a strong public higher education sector. While discussions on **public funding of higher education** have been scarce within the past developments of the Bologna Process, this study finds that higher education staff unions stress the importance of predictable and sustainable public funding for higher education provision as a primary area of concern.

XV.VI Key Action Lines of the Bologna Process

As far as the future of the Bologna Process is concerned, it is clear in academics' minds that **more work is needed on the social dimension and on creating more mobility opportunities for both academic staff and students**. These two areas are crucial for the development of higher education in Europe under the framework of the Bologna Process.

XV.VII Overall Implementation of the Bologna Process

Regretfully, a number of union respondents note that some governments submit the implementation of the Process to conflicting national agendas, which is a practice that needs to be reversed with immediate effect. While it is clear that there is currently some unrest across a number of countries with respect to the way in which the Bologna Process has been implemented, manifested in a number of student protests held particularly in a number of Western European countries, academic staff remain committed to **the proper implementation of the Bologna Process** as envisaged in the 1999 Bologna Declaration and subsequent Ministerial Communiqués. This is clearly visible from the way in which academics perceive the Bologna Process as developing in the future ... as a symbol of quality!

REFERENCES

Barrier J. and Musselin C. (2009) 'The Rationalisation of Academic Work and Careers: Ongoing Transformations of the Profession and Policy Challenges'. In: Kehm B.M., Huisman, J. and Stensaker B. (eds.) *The European Higher Education Area: Perspectives on a Moving Target* (Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei, Sense Publishers,) pp.203-222

E4 (2005) European Standards and Guidelines on Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (Helsinki, European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education)

Education International (2005) Policy Statement on the Bologna Process in the 'Bergen Round' (Brussels, EI Pan-European Structure)

European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education (2009) *The Bologna Process 2020 - The European Higher Education Area in the New Decade* (Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Benelux Secretariat of the Bologna Follow-Up Group)

Gallup (2007) *Perceptions of Higher Education Reforms*. Special Target Survey, Flash Eurobarometer (Brussels, European Commission)

Rauhvargers, A., Deane C. and Pauwels P. (2009) *Bologna Process Stocktaking Report 2009* (Benelux Secretariat of the Bologna Follow-Up Group, Brussels)

APPENDIX: QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO MEMBER ORGANISATIONS

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 Name of the organisation: _____

1.2 Country: _____

1.3 Contact person, name and surname: _____

1.4 Contact person, e-mail address: _____

2. GENERAL IMPACT OF THE BOLOGNA PROCESS [Mark answer with an X]

2.1 Do you think that in your country the objectives of the Bologna process are completed?

Yes totally	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes partially	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/>

Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.2 What was the level of impact of the Bologna Process on higher education in your country since 2005?

Very strong	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strong	<input type="checkbox"/>
Moderate	<input type="checkbox"/>
Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>

None	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.3 What was the nature of this effect?

Very negative	<input type="checkbox"/>
Negative	<input type="checkbox"/>
Neutral	<input type="checkbox"/>
Neutral	<input type="checkbox"/>

Positive	<input type="checkbox"/>
Very Positive	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>

Add your comments to part 2 (Please add the number of the question to your comments)

3. THE MAIN CHANGES IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND RESEARCH FROM 2005 (UNTIL TODAY) GERNERALLY RELATED TO ACADEMIC STAFF WERE ... [Mark answer with an X]

3.1 Employment & working conditions

Bureaucratic work	Increasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Stable	<input type="checkbox"/>	Decreasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fixed term contracts	Increasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Stable	<input type="checkbox"/>	Decreasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
International staff mobility	Increasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Stable	<input type="checkbox"/>	Decreasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
National staff mobility	Increasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Stable	<input type="checkbox"/>	Decreasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
Part time jobs	Increasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Stable	<input type="checkbox"/>	Decreasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pension schemes	Increasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Stable	<input type="checkbox"/>	Decreasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
Remuneration	Increasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Stable	<input type="checkbox"/>	Decreasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
Staff workload	Increasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Stable	<input type="checkbox"/>	Decreasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.2 Careers

Competition	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Creation of new positions	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Evaluation system	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Promotion criteria	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Recruitment system	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	

3.3 Teaching

Accreditation	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Courses taught in English	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Curriculum reforms	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Diversification of courses and programs	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Mobility of students	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Number of students	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Teaching conditions	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	

3.4 Research

Programme oriented funding	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Short term programs	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Units mergers	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Research conditions	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	

3.5 Which of these reforms were directly influenced by the Bologna Process?

[Mention one or more of the issues listed above]

- _____
- _____

3.6 Working Time [Mark answer with an X]

3.6a What is the average working time (in hours) for academic staff in your country?

3.6b What is such working time mostly dedicated to?

Research	
Teaching	
Bureaucratic Tasks	
Other Tasks	

3.6c If academic staff carry out tasks other than teaching/research/bureaucratic work, please specify what such tasks are.

3.6d Do academic staff members manage to complete all their tasks within their assigned working hours (as per work contract) or do they have to work overtime?

Manage to Complete	
Work Overtime	

3.6e If your answer to 3.6d is 'work overtime', are academics paid extra for such overtime?

Yes	
No	

3.6f If your answer to 3.6d is 'work overtime', do you think the necessity to work overtime has increased since the implementation of the Bologna reforms?

Yes	
No	

3.6g If your answer to 3.6f is 'Yes' do you think that such overtime could be reduced by offering academics more support in implementing the Bologna reforms?

Yes	
No	

3.6h If your answer to 3.6g is 'Yes' what kind of support to you think is needed?

Add your comments to part 3 (Please add the number of the question to your comments)

4. SINCE 2005, THE MAIN REFORMS IN HIGHER EDUCATION ALSO CONCERNED...
[Mark answer with an X]

4.1 Private Financing

of buildings, equipment, etc.	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
of research	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
of teaching	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Students fees (if any)	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	

4.2 Governance

Academic freedom	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Autonomy of universities	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Democracy	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Level of funding	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Participation of academic staff	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Participation of students	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
Proportion of elected members	Increasing		Stable		Decreasing		Don't Know		Not Applicable	

4.3 Which of these reforms were directly influenced by the Bologna Process?

[Mention one or more of the issues listed above]

- _____ - _____
 - _____ - _____

4.4 Can you evaluate the influence of the different political processes on the whole change?

Political Process	Percentage [0-100%]
A worldwide globalization process	
The Bologna process	
The Lisbon process	
The national government policy	
A regional government policy	
Institutional policy	
Other: specify	

Specify (Other): _____

Add your comments to part 4 (Please add the number of the question to your comments)

5. NATIONAL/REGIONAL ACTIVITIES OF YOUR TRADE UNION REGARDING THE BOLOGNA PROCESS [Mark answer with an X]

5.1 How far is your Union involved in the Bologna Process at the national level?

Quite a lot	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/>
A little	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/>

5.2 Does your Union participate at a national follow-up (working) group or council?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

5.3 Is your Union consulted for the elaboration of the national report drawn up for each Ministerial conference?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

5.4 Has your Union been part of the national delegations to the ministerial meetings?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

5.5 Is your Union asked to nominate persons as Bologna experts?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

5.6 Is your Union involved in follow-up activities? (i.e. participates in one or many task force or committees)

Employability	Yes	No	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
Framework for lifelong learning	Yes	No	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
Masters degree	Yes	No	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mobility	Yes	No	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
Qualifications framework	Yes	No	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality assurance system	Yes	No	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
Social dimension	Yes	No	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
Stocktaking	Yes	No	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other: Specify below	Yes	No	Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>

Specify (Other): _____

5.7 Since 2005, did your union take up some initiatives

Yes	
No	

5.8 If yes, the initiatives of your union were:

Collaboration between unions	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Collaboration with students' organizations	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Discussions with an organisation of EUA	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Formal discussions with the institutions	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Information in the media	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Lobbying	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Protest actions, strikes	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Organisation of public seminars or conferences	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Other: Specify below	Yes	No	Not Applicable

Specify (Other): _____

Add your comments to part 5 (Please add the number of the question to your comments)

6. EI ENTERED THE BOLOGNA FOLLOW-UP GROUP IN 2005 [Mark answer with an X]

6.1 What impact do you think EI's participation has had on the whole Process?

Very strong	
Strong	
Moderate	

Weak	
None	
Don't Know	

6.2 Is EI's participation in the Bologna Follow-Up Group (BFUG) considered as useful for implementation at the national level?

Quite a lot	
A little	

Not at all	
Don't Know	

Add your comments to part 6 (Please add the number of the question to your comments)

7. THE BOLOGNA PROCESS AFTER 2010 [Mark answer with an X]

NOTE: The last part of the questionnaire has been organised to help the reflection of your union on the future of the Bologna Process.

7.1 Should the process continue after 2010?

Yes	
No	

Add your comments to 7.1

7.2a If yes, for how long? _____

7.2b Should it be permanent?

Yes	
No	

Add your comments to 7.2

7.3a Do you think the process should be enlarged to other continents or do you think that it should be limited to Europe?

Open to Other Continents	
Limited to Europe	

7.3b If you think it should be open to other continents name which:

Add your comments to 7.3

7.3c If you answered 'limited to Europe' in 8.3a, do you think it should remain "European" but develop stronger links with other regions?

Yes		No	
-----	--	----	--

7.3d If yes, should the process be proactive or responsive?

Proactive		Responsive	
-----------	--	------------	--

7.4 Do you think the process should influence the role of higher education in the following areas?

Increase the economic role of higher education	Yes		No	
Increase the civic role of higher education	Yes		No	
Increase the role of higher education in sustainable development	Yes		No	

Add your comments to 7.4

7.5 Do you think, the process should involve a harmonisation of the following type of content?

Scientific Content	Yes		No	
Cultural Content	Yes		No	
Increase the number of European curricula and diploma	Yes		No	
Other: Specify Below	Yes		No	

Specify (Other): _____

Add your comments

7.6 Do you think that the process should develop its social dimension in the following areas?

More counselling	Yes		No	
Better access to student housing	Yes		No	
Better living conditions	Yes		No	
Other: Specify Below	Yes		No	

Specify (Other): _____

Add your comments

7.7 Can the organisation of the Bologna Process be improved in the following way?

More structured	Yes		No	
With a permanent BFUG secretariat at European level	Yes		No	

Add your comments

7.7 Do you think of the Bologna Process in the future as ...

A label of quality?	Yes		No	
A brand?	Yes		No	
An academic labour market?	Yes		No	
Other: Specify Below	Yes		No	

Specify (Other): _____

Add your comments

7.8 Should EI continue to participate in the Bologna Process?

Yes	
No	

Add your comments

8. PLEASE INSERT ONE OR TWO TESTIMONIALS

Include Good and Bad Practice Examples in Relation to Bologna Implementation

TESTIMONIALS

With the Bologna Process there has been a movement from teacher-centred to student-centred learning influenced by curriculum reform.

Prof. Mr Jakob Kübarsepp, Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs
Tallinn University of Technology

Some of the teaching hours of academics' teaching at the bachelor-doctoral level are not being taken into account in a number of universities in Spain.

Prof. Titular María Luisa Sánchez Simón
Universidade da Coruña, Spain

In my department the Bologna Process has brought benefits as it gave us the opportunity to restructure the curricula into credits, making it easier for students to manage their expectations.

Razvan C. Bobulescu, Associate Professor
Department of Physics, University of Bucharest, Romania

With the Bologna Process, teacher training has become worse.

Prof. Priit Reiska, Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs
Tallinn University, Estonia

Participation in the Bologna process promotes and demands higher qualifications from professors and teachers.

Prof. Yuri Touryghin, Head of Masters' Department, Izhevsk Technical University, Russia
Visiting Professor at Trenčín University, Slovenia



Education International

5, boulevard du Roi Albert II
B-1210 Brussels, Belgium
www.ei-ie.org
headoffice@ei-ie.org

March 2010
Education International

© 2010 Education International
Printed in Belgium

ISBN 978-92-95089-37-2 (paperback)
ISBN 978-92-95089-38-9 (PDF)