

TEACHERS' EDUCATION AND THE BOLOGNA PROCESS

A SURVEY ON TRENDS IN LEARNING STRUCTURES AT INSTITUTIONS OF TEACHERS' EDUCATION*

Pavel Zgaga, University of Ljubljana

1. Global changes in European higher education: feeling the pulse of teachers' education institutions

1.1 Background of the survey

Needs of national development in all countries, progressing European co-operation and association as well as globalisation have caused in last few years a particular challenge (also) to higher education systems and institutions. The response to this challenge in Europe is widely known today as the *Bologna process*. Four years after signing the *Bologna Declaration* (1999) with its six main "action lines",¹ and two years after *Prague communiqué* (2001) which added three further "action lines"² to the list, the process of establishment of the *European Higher Education Area* (EHEA) deepened to the institutional level. It is not any more only about principles of international co-operation agreed among ministers and therefore rather abstract; it is

* This project has been funded with support from the Slovenian Ministry of Education, Science and Sport (research project "Educational Policies in the Contemporary European Context"; University of Ljubljana, Centre for Educational Policy Studies). Field work collaborators: Mateja Peršak, Igor Repac.

¹ In short, main lines of the *Bologna Declaration* are as follows:

- (1) a system of easily readable and comparable degrees, including the implementation of the Diploma Supplement;
- (2) a system essentially based on two main cycles: a first cycle relevant to the labour market; a second cycle requiring the completion of the first cycle;
- (3) a system of accumulation and transfer of credits;
- (4) the mobility of students, teachers, researchers, etc;
- (5) co-operation in quality assurance;
- (6) the European dimension of higher education.

² *Prague Communiqué* added the following lines:

- (7) life-long learning strategies;
- (8) involvement of universities and of students as partners in the establishment of a European Higher Education Area;
- (9) promoting the attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area.

more and more about future positions of higher education in general and about concrete areas and institutions in particular.

The EUA's (European Association of Universities) Graz Convention in May 2003 proved this statement clearly. European universities and higher education institutions – as they can be often sceptic about political plans – do not stand apart to the recognised need of reforming European higher education and (re)adapting it to changed reality. They confirmed an active approach to the Bologna process already at the signing: they were massively present in Bologna in 1999. Few months before Prague Summit they agreed on principles of their co-operation in the Process³ and after Prague the EUA entered official Bologna follow-up structures.

The EUA's Graz Convention presented results of an important survey: *Trends III Report*.⁴ Actually, there were similar reports (*Trends I* and *II*) prepared and presented at Bologna and Prague Conferences; these reports were based on questionnaires responded by national authorities and centred to an analysis of trends in learning structures in higher education systems of European countries (not only EU members). *Trends III Report* – prepared in a changed situation importantly marked also with institutional involvement to the *Bologna process* – changed methodology: a new questionnaire intended to all “Bologna action lines” was designed and sent to national ministries as well as to universities and other higher education institutions as well as to student organisations. Thus, an exceptional outline of situation in Europe was obtained. A particularly useful novelty of *Trends III Report* is that its results aloud comparative analyse of responses and statements from three types of respondents: ministries, (heads of) universities and student organisations. Therefore, institutional approaches to particular issues as well as institutional reality could be analysed.

Trends III Report – still at its initial stage in late 2002 – gave the first motive for our survey; the other was given by *Tuning project*. Tuning⁵ is a EC-Socrates sponsored project of over 100 European universities aiming at “tuning educational structures in Europe”. It took a challenge of adapting higher education curricula in terms of structures, contents, learning attributes, learning tools, assessment methods etc. very seriously. For us, it was even more important that among initial seven “Pilot Tuning Groups” there was also a group from the area of Educational Sciences, closely related to teachers' education. – Both motives came at a right time: in the frames of research project “Educational Policies in the Contemporary European Context” a special attention was given also to the development of strategies at (higher education) institutions of teachers' education and training. *The idea was to survey “Bologna trends” at these institutions elsewhere in Europe in order to provide a basis for a discussion on a comparative analysis of trends in their learning structures.* For that purpose, we designed a special questionnaire in early 2003. To certain degree it was comparable to the structure of *Trends III* questionnaire: it helped a lot to make some

³ See *Message from Salamanca Convention of European higher education institutions. Shaping the European Higher education Area*. Salamanca, 29-30 March 2001.

⁴ See Reichert, S. and Tauch, Ch., *Trends in Learning Structures in European Higher Education III. Bologna four years after: Steps towards sustainable reform of higher education in Europe [Trends III Report]*. EUA Graz Convention, 29-31 May 2003.

⁵ See <http://www.relint.deusto.es/TuningProject/index.htm>

comparison between responses from (heads of) universities and from (heads) of teachers' education institutions.

1.2 Who responded?

Questionnaires were sent to about 120 e-mail addresses (from the Tuning list of the “education and teacher education” group as well as with a help of some networks easily reached through Internet) end-March 2003 asking addressees *to answer* them until 15 May 2003 or – if they don't feel suitable – *to forward them* to a responsible institution and/or person. We received many responds from colleagues whom we didn't address initially; therefore, “networking” was an efficient method again. Most of responds were received until the deadline (it was prolonged for three weeks); the process of collecting answers ended mid-June. Responses were received from altogether 57 institutions; one could say, about one half of addressees. In fact, it is not possible to equalize addressees and institutions;⁶ as we just mentioned, addressees were often only – more or less successful – mediators.

The data collected made possible to range *responds by type of institution* and by *position of a person who fulfilled a questionnaire*. Responds were mostly prepared and sent from central offices of the institution (university level) but one third if them were also sent from faculty or departmental levels. Results of this survey prove again that university organisation of teacher education is the prevailing European trend (either inside a specialized faculty or in an intra-university cooperation; majority of responses belong to this category). However, there are still some national higher education systems which put teacher education institutions in a special position; in this survey they are referred as *colleges*. In details, results are as follows:

Type (level) of responding institution		Position of a responding person	
<i>University level</i>	31	<i>Academic leadership</i>	31
<i>Faculty (department) level</i>	16	<i>International office</i>	3
<i>College</i>	5	<i>Teaching faculty</i>	11
<i>Other / n.a.</i>	5	<i>Other / n.a.</i>	12

1.3 Responds from institutions by countries

*Responses were received from altogether 57 institutions from 33 countries.*⁷ Only at a first sight it seems that the list of countries corresponds to the list of *signatories of the Bologna Declaration* (altogether 33 after Prague Summit in 2001). Unfortunately, *no response was received from seven of the „Bologna“ countries* (signatories of 1999 – Iceland, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovak Republic; signatories of 2001 – Cyprus, Liechtenstein) *but another seven non-signatory countries* (not yet: most of them are

⁶ There is no ready-made mailing list of institutions in this field.

⁷ In addition, two answers were also received explaining national systems (Belgium/Flanders and Norway). For obvious reasons, these answers are not part of this analysis but, nevertheless, they made an important help.

expected to join at the Berlin Summit) *are represented in the survey* (Serbia, Montenegro, Kosovo, FYR of Macedonia, Albania, Moldova, Armenia)⁸.

Responses were received from at least one institution of each of the fifteen EU members as well as from Norway and Switzerland. Institutions from only one half of associate countries are represented in the survey (Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Slovenia); responses from other half of those countries haven't been received until the beginning of data processing. However, institutions from South East European countries responded very well; and some answers were also received from countries which will not join the *Bologna process* formally in 2003. In the text, international (two-letters) abbreviations for individual countries are used.⁹ For analytical purposes of this survey countries will be divided into three clusters:

Clusters of countries	No. of countries	No. of institutions (% vs. total)
<i>1. Bologna signatories – EU and EFTA member countries</i>	17	27 (47.4%)
<i>2. Bologna signatories – other countries</i>	9	14 (24.6%)
<i>3. Non-signatory countries</i>	7	16 (28.0%)
Total	33	57 (100%)

On average, responses from almost two institutions (1.7) per country were received. Institutions from the fifteen EU and two EFTA countries as well as institutions from “other” countries responded a bit below this average (both groups 1.6)¹⁰ while non-signatory countries responded over this average (2.7). Institutions from the first group of countries give 47.4% of all institutions involved; institutions from the second group give 24.6% and institutions from the third group give 28.0%. In order to easy interpretation of particular questions, it can be taken that their shares are 2 vs. 1 vs. 1.

A sample acquired in the survey is rather small and does not allow making rapid conclusions and firm statements. Nevertheless, it offers some insight in specific (sometimes ambiguous) position towards “Bologna agenda” as appearing at higher education institutions which provide teacher education. Existing survey and analytical studies haven't provided any evidence about this higher education field yet. As it could be also noticed from various comments made at the end of questionnaires, there is a raising interest in these questions and understanding trends in learning structures across Europe. In this regard, a more comprehensive survey in close future could not only give more reliable conclusions and statements but also encourage other higher education fields to launch similar scanning. Bologna process is entering a phase when

⁸ “Countries” are referred to different higher education systems or to divided responsibilities as in case of Serbia, Montenegro and Kosovo.

⁹ Due to recent constitutional changes and other circumstances there is an exception in the case of Serbia, Montenegro and Kosovo where ad hoc abbreviations YUS, YUM and YUK are used.

¹⁰ In the first group, UK with 4 responding institutions is best represented, following by Italy (3). One institution responded from 8 countries out of 17 in this group. In the second group, there is a significant difference between countries which will join EU in 2004 (Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Slovenia – 1 institution per country) and other countries (Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania, Turkey - 2.25 institutions per country).

field-related issues and institutional responses will be crucial for the further steps towards European Higher Education Area.

2. Answers to the questionnaire

In the continuation, results will be summed up and presented in tables. Each table contains first serial number of a question (e.g. **Q01**) and the total number of institutions responding a particular question (e.g. 57 responses). Answers from institutions are also ranged around three clusters of countries (as explained above; see 1.3). The total number of answers can exceed the total number of responding institutions as some institutions answered in particular cases with more than one option; however, it can be also lower as some institutions in particular cases didn't provide any answer. From that reason, the total number of answers is also always noted in tables. The last row of a table contains respective notes (if any). Each table contains information on options respondents could choose and it is accompanied with short explanation and interpretation.

Answers to the questionnaire are presented in subchapters, referring to a particular round up cluster of questions: starting with *basic data on institutions* (2.1) and then following by their *considerations about Bologna process* (2.2), *implantation of the two-tier system at the institutional level* (2.3), *curriculum development* (2.4), *recognition issues* (2.5), *furthering of credit systems and mobility* (2.6), *situation in quality assurance* (2.7), and finally, *life-long learning initiatives* (2.8).

2.1 Basic data about institutions involved in a survey

Q01. How many full time equivalent students are enrolled at your institution?

Q01, 57 responses	under 500	500 - 1000	1000 - 3000	over 3000
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	5	4	4	14
<i>BP - other countries</i>	1	2	2	9
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	1	2	7	6
Total answers (57)	7	8	13	29

According to answers, *higher education institutions which provide teachers' education are rather big institutions* (number of students) *elsewhere in Europe*. However, differences in general organisation structure and, in particularly, in internal institutional organisation of teacher education (sometimes in cooperation of several departments and/or faculties) make some methodological problems and partly mist this picture. No significant changes were observed among three clusters of countries.

Q02. What is the activity (field of study) of your institution?

Q02, 57 responses	exclusively	primarily	minor act.	jointly	other
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	8	7	5	1	6
<i>BP - other countries</i>	3	7	3	-	1
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	3	7	2	1	3
Total answers (57)	14	21	10	2	10

At this question, institutions could choose among the following types of activities (fields of studies): (a) *exclusively* teachers' education and training; (b) *primarily* teachers' education and training (but they could also specify other activity); (c) teachers' education and training could be only their *minor activity* (in this case they were asked to specify the main activity); (d) they provide teachers' education and training *jointly* with another institution; and finally, (e) further cases fall under "*other*" which was also asked to be specified.

As we can see, *almost two thirds of responding institutions range their activity as exclusively or primarily teachers' education and training (63,6%)*. When institutions describe their other activity (besides teacher education in proper sense) they usually refer to *particular "subject" study areas* which are more or less close to respective fields of teachers' education (e.g. arts, languages, communication, geography, chemistry, engineering etc.). On the other hand, they refer often also to *specialized educational "non-subject" study areas* (e.g. education/pedagogy, special education, social pedagogy, pre-school education, library management, counselling, etc.). Respondents often mentioned also *research* as their "other activity". However, provision of teachers' education and training jointly with another institution (*option d*) seem to be very rare praxis. Under the final category "other" (*option e*) respondents usually referred to issues of organisation and to particularities of national systems; in most cases answers from this group strengthen the finding that teachers' education is the primarily activity of responding institutions.

There are some minor differences among three clusters of countries. a share of those institutions which provide *primarily* (but not only) teachers' education seems to be higher at institutions from the second and the third clusters (50.0% of institutions from the second and 43.8% from the third cluster; 25.9% of institutions from the first cluster). Similarly, a share of those institutions which provide *exclusively* teachers' education is higher in the first cluster (29.6% of them) than in the second (21.4%) or in the third (18.8%). It seems that *teachers' education institutions from the first cluster of countries are more specialized*.

Q03. Which is the highest level to which your institution trains students?

Q02, 57 responses	Bachelor	Master	Doctorate
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	4	5	18
<i>BP - other countries</i>	2	-	12
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	5	-	11
Total answers (57)	11	5	41

Until recent decades, teachers' education was in most countries by rule excluded as a particular field of doctoral studies. This situation have changed very much; answers to questionnaire show that *almost three quarters (71.9%) of institutions award doctoral degrees, and additional 8.8% of them Master degrees*. In this respect, teachers' education (as we saw, very often combined with "*subject*" area studies and education studies) became equal to other fields of university studies. However, there are still institutions (national systems) which *award only Bachelor degree in teacher education (19.3%)*. It seems that this is more often the case in the third cluster of countries (31.3%; less than 15% of institutions in the first two clusters).

2.2 Considerations about the Bologna process

Q04. In general, how aware do you consider your institution to be regarding the Bologna process?

Q04, 57 responses	very much	reasonably	not very aware	unaware
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	10	10	5	2
<i>BP - other countries</i>	3	10	2	0
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	3	9	2	1
Total answers (57)	16	29	9	3

More than one half of respondents (50.9%) find their institutions reasonably aware regarding the Bologna process; an additional quarter of respondents (28,1%) find them very much aware. Only about 15% respondents find their institutions not very aware and only about 5% declare them as almost completely unaware. There are no significant changes among three clusters of countries in respect of last two options; however, respondents from the first cluster opted equally for “very much aware” as well as for “reasonably aware” (37% vs. 37%) while respondents from the second and third cluster opted more often for “reasonably aware” (20% vs. 63%). It is particularly interesting that among four respondents from UK two of them chose the option “unaware” and one of them “not very aware”, similarly as both Swedish respondents. If we compare these findings with *Trends III Report* it is not a surprise.¹¹ Taking into account comments made at the end of questionnaire as well as structure of those who prepared responses there is another feature which corresponds with findings of *Trends III Report*: there is more awareness and support to the Bologna process among heads of institutions than among faculty in general.

Q05. Which statement best represents your opinion regarding the creation of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA)?

Q05, 56 responses	essential	not ripe yet	not trust	no opinion
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	15	3	2	6
<i>BP - other countries</i>	10	2	1	1
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	10	3	1	2
Total answers (56)	35	8	4	9
<i>Note: One institution (from IT) didn't answer this question.</i>				

At this question we asked about general attitude towards the idea of *European Higher Education Area* (EHEA) as the major aim of the Bologna process. Respondents could chose among the following options: (a) it is *essential* to make rapid progress towards the EHEA; (b) the EHEA is a good idea, but the time is *not yet ripe*; (c) I do *not trust* the idea of the EHEA; and (d) I do *not have an opinion* on the EHEA.

¹¹ “In Estonia, Sweden, Germany, Ireland and most strongly the UK, deliberations regarding institutional Bologna reforms seem to be considerably less widespread. [...] There is widespread support for the Bologna Process among heads of HEIs, with some resistance to individual aspects and the pace of reforms. Such resistance is more pronounced in Norway, France, the French-speaking community of Belgium, Germany, Hungary, Portugal, Ireland and the UK.” - *Trends III Report*, p. 27.

Almost two thirds of respondents (62.5%) agree that it is essential to make rapid progress towards the EHEA. There are no significant differences among three clusters of countries; responses from the second and the third clusters are perhaps slightly more often represented under this positive assessment. Respondents from these clusters are also slightly more often represented among those who believe that the time is not ripe yet for the EHEA (in total 14.3% of answers; 11.5 % of institutions from the first cluster; 14.3% respectively 18.8% from the second and third cluster). It is interesting that the “weight” of this option (“not ripe yet”) is comparable to that one of “no opinion” (16.1% of total answers).

It is surprising that almost one quarter (23.1%) of respondents from the first cluster chose option d (“I do not have an opinion on the EHEA”) while this option is rather infrequent among respondents from other two clusters of countries (7.1% in the second; 12.5% in the third cluster). Does it mean that in these countries teachers’ education institutions are more sceptic (hesitant? passive?) with regard to the general picture of European higher education provided in the *Trends III Report*?¹²

Q06. Which statement best represents your opinion regarding the position of higher education institutions of teachers’ education and training inside the EHEA?

Q06, 56 responses	essential	for others	no trust	no opinion
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	19	-	1	6
<i>BP - other countries</i>	11	1	1	1
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	13	1	1	1
Total answers (56)	43	2	3	8
Note: One institution (from IT) didn’t answer this question.				

Now, respondents have to answer the same question again but from a particular perspective of teachers’ education institution. They could chose among the following options: (a) it is *essential* that these institutions take part in the EHEA; (b) the EHEA is important for other fields; not for teachers’ education; (c) I do not trust the idea of the EHEA; and (d) I do not have an opinion on the EHEA.

More than three quarters of respondents (76.8%) – that is, much more than before – decided for the first option: it is essential that also teachers’ education institutions take part in the EHEA. There are no significant changes among three clusters of countries; institutions from the second and particularly from the third group chosen this option slightly more often. Statistically, answers to other options are not very much relevant. A relatively high share of countries from the first cluster (23.1% of them; 10.7% of all respondents) which do not have an opinion on EHEA (see Q05) is very distinctive again.

¹² “More than two thirds of the heads of institutions regard it essential to make rapid progress towards the EHEA, and another 20% support the idea of the EHEA but think that the time is not yet ripe for it.” *Trends III Report*, p. 26. – See also p. 27: “Awareness of the Bologna Process has increased considerably during the last two years. It is generally more developed at universities than at other higher education institutions.”

Q07. Do you agree that teacher profession should be a regulated profession?

Q07, 57 responses	national regul.	European regul.	no regulation	no opinion
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	12	13	2	1
<i>BP - other countries</i>	6	8	1	-
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	6	8	2	-
Total answers (59)	24	29	5	1
Note: Two institutions (from LV and NL) gave two answers taking options a and b.				

From various reasons (professional standards; mobility of labour force; recognition of qualifications, continuation of study abroad, etc.) association and integration processes brought about the issue of regulated professions. Inside EU, some professions are already “regulated” (but not teachers’ education), that is, common standards are prescribed for the educational and training systems in all member countries. Now, **Q7** is mentioned hypothetically; at a moment there are no concrete proposals but it would be interesting to see how respondents group themselves around this issue. They could choose among two “yes” answers: (a) on the *national* level, and (b) on the *European* (international) level. They could also decide that there should be *no strict regulation* on teacher profession. Finally, there was a possibility for respondents in the questionnaire not to take a position about this issue at all.

*Respondents are strongly in favour of teaching profession as a regulated profession on the national (42.1%) and even more at the European (50.9%) level. Only 8.8% of respondents argue against strict regulation of teaching profession. No significant changes were observed among three clusters of countries. Such unanimous statement (accompanied also with additional comments at the end of questionnaire) in favour of teaching profession as a regulated profession can be probably an expression of a belief that the position of teachers and teachers’ education should be improved and some common standards should be set. Some respondents find national and European regulation as coinciding (two institutions openly answered with taking both answers; see **note**, above). However, on the other hand, one part of those (in principle, from EU member countries) who argue in favour of national regulation (only) seem to be sceptic about teachers’ education as the EU regulated profession.*

2.3 Two-tier system at the institutional level

Q08. Has your institution recently initiated a reform of the curricula in connection to the Bologna Declaration?

Q08, 56 responses	yes, all	yes, some	in near future	no need
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	8	6	6	6
<i>BP - other countries</i>	9	1	4	-
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	5	4	6	1
Total answers (56)	22	11	16	7
Note: One institution (from IT) didn’t answer this question.				

The following six questions (**Q08-13**) investigate one of the central “Bologna goals”: *the state of implantation of the two-tier system at the institutional level*. Now, **Q08** is intended to find out the extent of (planned) curricular reforms at the institutional level and in connection to the Bologna Declaration. Respondents had four options: two of them to answer the question positively (a – *yes*, in *all* departments; b – *yes*, in *some* departments), one (c) to report on their plans to do so *in near future*; and one (d) to say that they do not see a need for curricular change at their institution.

Institutions of teachers’ education seem to be very active in reforming their curricula in connection to the Bologna Declaration. Even more than a half of them (58.9%) have already started with a curricular reform: two fifths (39.3%) of them report that they recently initiated a reform of the curricula in connection to the *Bologna Declaration* in all departments and an additional fifth (19.6%) of them did the same at some departments. A quarter of them (28.6%) say that they plan curricular reform in near future. Only 12.5% do not see a need for change at their institution; almost all respondents came from the first cluster of countries and concentrate in a “northern triangle” as in some other cases (four from UK, one from IE and SE).

With regard to activities in reforming curricula, institutions from the second cluster of countries¹³ make an obvious exception: almost three quarters of them (71.4%) are active in reforms (*options a+b*) while only a bit more than one half of institutions from the first (53.8%) and the third cluster (56.3%) of countries report so.

Q09. Does your institution have a degree structure based on two main cycles (Bachelor, Master) as envisaged by the Bologna Declaration?

Q09, 57 responses	already had	introduced	it is planned	not planned
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	7	7	10	3
<i>BP - other countries</i>	5	3	6	-
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	4	5	6	1
Total answers (57)	16	15	22	4

Two main cycles should be a distinctive feature of the EHEA study structures. At this question, respondents could report that (a) they *already had* it before the *Bologna Declaration* (1999) or (b) that they *introduced* it as a result of the Bologna Process (1999-2003). They could also report (c) that two cycles are in their plans or (d) that they do not plan to launch two cycles structure at all.

A trend towards a two main cycle degree structure is obvious at European teachers’ education institutions: more than one half of institutions (54.4%) report about a two main cycles degree structure, either as a result of pre-Bologna reforms or as a result of the Bologna initiative. There is also a strong group (38.6%) of institutions that have two-cycle degree structure in their plans. Only a minority (7.0%) does not plan changes; these four responds came from diverse countries and, very probably, represent an exception.

¹³ Many of these countries haven been preparing for joining EU in 2004; educational reforms make part of preparation for accession.

There are no major differences among responds by clusters of countries when an already introduced two-cycle degree structure is observed (51.9% institutions from the first cluster, 57.1% from the second and 56.3% from the third cluster); it is almost the same when their plans are observed (37.0% institutions from the first cluster, 42.9% from the second and 37.5% from the third cluster). However, it remains opened how particular institutions interpret "a degree structure based on two main cycles".

Q10. What model of a two-cycle degree structure you (plan to) follow?

Q10, 56 responses	3+2	4+1	B+cont.	B+exit	no answer
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	12	7	3	-	5
<i>BP - other countries</i>	8	8	-	-	-
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	4	9	2	-	2
Total answers (60)	24	24	5	-	7
Note: One institution (from UK) didn't answer this question. – Four institutions (from AM, HR, SI and UK) chosen two options. In two cases (ES, NL) respondents explained that they couldn't give an appropriate answer since (a) decisions haven't been made or (b) institution does not train BA students; these two answers are included under "no answer".					

As we saw, *two-cycle degree structure is a consensual direction of a huge majority of European teachers' education institutions in principle, but they provide diverse answers when we ask about details of the two-cycle study structure.* (As it could be seen from various sources, this is not a case only at teachers' education institutions.) Therefore, at this point the questionnaire asked about several (sub)options. First, it asked how do institutions perceive "the Bologna formula",¹⁴ that is, do they find 3 years Bachelor followed by 2 years Master (3+2) or (and?) 4 years Bachelor followed by 1 years Master (4+1) more applicable. Than, it turns to those institutions which (will) provide Bachelor degree (or equivalent)¹⁵ only and ask what they expect from their graduates: to continue on Master level at other institutions (*B+cont.*) or not (*B+exit*). Finally, there was an option in the questionnaire for those who couldn't answer this question (*no answer*) whatever the reason was.

Respondents confirmed again - almost with an acclamation (85.6%) – the two-cycle degree system opting in favour of 3+1 or/and 4+1 models; only few institutions (8.9%) foresee their mission in providing only the first level (Bachelor) degrees while some of them (12.5%) couldn't give any answer. Interestingly, no institution foresees Bachelor (or equivalent) degree as a final exit for their graduates without having possibility to continue at the second (Master) level.

However, despite the obvious consensus on the two-cycle degree system responding institutions are completely divided into two blocks when the formula (3+2 vs. 4+1) is in question. According to answers to this question, there are two distinct and totally

¹⁴ In fact, there has been no decision about this issue neither in the *Bologna Declaration* nor in the *Prague Communiqué*. However, there were intensive discussions and some proposals were made at Bologna Follow-up Seminars; see <http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de>

¹⁵ It is at least questionable to generalize Bachelor/Master symbolism to all European higher education systems; in the context of the Bologna Process it is much more appropriate to speak about "first" vs. "second" (level) degrees.

*equal majorities, both close to one half of respondents: 42.8% vs. 42.8%. It is also impossible to find any distinct difference by three clusters of countries. Very often, institutions from the same country gave different answers. It is clear that this issue is not related to national systems only (or there is no national consensus on this issue yet). As already mentioned in the **note** (above), four institutions (from all three clusters of countries) even chose both options at the same time: 3+2 as well as 4+1. It seems that their decision is mostly grounded in specialities among institutions' departments (e.g. education studies vs. subject-area studies vs. teachers' education studies, etc.). Anyhow, it could be concluded already at this place that study structures – observed in a context of this particular issue – should be treated as flexible as possible in the run of forthcoming reforms; in this respect, a complete division of institutions as expressed in responses to this question does not allow any uniformed decision on this matter.*

Only in one respect a significant change could be observed among three clusters of countries: *institutions from the first cluster gives a slight advantage to the 3+2 model; the second cluster weights both models equally and the third cluster seems to be more sceptic towards 3+2 model and in favour of 4+1 model* (detailed relations between model 3+2 vs. model 4+1 by clusters of countries are as follows: 46.2% vs. 26.9% in the first cluster, 57.1% vs. 57.1%¹⁶ in the second and 25.0% vs. 56.3% in the third cluster).

There is *no conceptual basis* for the separation of respondents in this issue; at least there is no evidence of contradictory concepts or philosophies behind statements expressed. On the contrary, particular national traditions and situations (e.g. long study programmes; Master as pre-doctoral level of study, organisation and financing of higher education, etc.) seem to be the only – or the decisive – ground when this issue is at stake in contemporary (national) disputes.

Q11. What are your main aims in Bachelor degree structure?

Q11, 57 responses	traditional QF	basic QF	broad QF	other	no answer
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	8	2	9	4	4
<i>BP - other countries</i>	3	4	7	-	-
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	3	6	6	1	-
Total answers (57)	14	12	22	5	4
<i>Note: Two institutions (from IE and NL) do not train BA students; their responses were included under "other" together with a response from the third institution (from SE) which has a liking for "provision of initial professional teacher education which – if the student wishes so – can be followed by doctoral studies. The fourth institution (from AM) put down that its aim is to provide "training in specific field of study". The fifth institution (from PT) didn't specify why it chosen the option "other".</i>					

This question goes further into *details of the two-cycle structure which are important from a particular point of view of teachers' education and training*. The *Bologna Declaration* put the "adoption of a system essentially based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate" as the main goal on the way toward EHEA and added

¹⁶ As mentioned, two of countries from this group chosen both models at the same time as equally appropriate.

that “access to the second cycle shall require successful completion of first cycle studies, lasting a minimum of three years. The degree awarded after the first cycle shall also be relevant to the European labour market as an appropriate level of qualification. The second cycle should lead to the master and/or doctorate degree as in many European countries”.¹⁷

Therefore, it is very important to know how institutions in their (plans for) curricular reforms react at this point. It was presumed in the questionnaire that institutions could, on one hand, either *persist in their traditional qualifications*, or, on the other hand, *try to redesign their curricula in connection with the “Bologna goals”*. In the later case there are *two variants* in the questionnaire: options of „*basic*“ and „*broad*“ qualification. It could be expected that the first degree (Bachelor or equivalent of 3 to 4 years duration) “shall also be relevant to the European labour market as an appropriate level of qualification“ („*basic*“, that is *initial teaching qualification*). In the same context it could be also expected that first degree will be designed as a *broad* qualification enabling candidates either to start working as a teacher (educator) or to continue his/her study for the second degree, sometimes even outside of the teachers’ education area.

Altogether, respondents had five options at this question: their institutions could aim (a) to provide traditional teacher qualifications (*traditional QF*); (b) to provide new basic teacher qualification as first degree (*basic QF*); (c) to provide a broad qualification which leads to labour and/or further study (*broad QF*); they could also (d) specify *other* aims or (e) tell that they can’t answer this question (*no answer*).

Majority of respondents opted for the provision of a broad qualification which leads to labour and/or further study (38.6%). Shares of those opting for traditional qualifications on one hand, and on the other for basic qualifications, are minor and almost equal (24.6% vs. 21.1%). Four institutions (7,0%), all from countries of the first cluster (UK, BE, FR, IT), didn’t respond to this question; respondents of the option “other” are described in the **note**. *It can be said that the majority (which, in fact, is not absolute here) declared in favour of “Bologna goals” and, probably, also against “academic discrimination” of teachers’ education in past (e.g. closed paths to postgraduate study).* “Traditionalists” could be either a sign of caution (scepticism?) or a reflex of institutions operating in higher education systems which are relatively closer to Bologna goals than other systems.

Some differences are noticed with regard to clusters of countries. In the first cluster, one third (33.3%; less than average) of respondents find broad qualifications most appropriate, followed by almost equal share of “traditionalists” (29.6%), while basic qualification was interesting only for 7.4% of them. In the second cluster, the share of those who opted for broad qualifications is the highest (50.0%), followed by those opting for basic qualification (28.6%); in this group “traditionalists” are weak (21.4%). In the third cluster, the options “basic QF” and “broad QF” are equal (37.5%) while the share of “traditionalists” is weak again (18.8%).

¹⁷ “The European Higher Education Area”. *Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education*. [The Bologna Declaration, 1999], paragraph 11.

In the first and the second cluster of countries, there is no evidence of a “nationally” grouping responses to this question: individual countries can be found either in one or in another group. However, in the third cluster of countries, such grouping is more evident: institutions from Moldova mostly opted for traditional model, institutions from Albania for basic qualification, and institutions from former Yugoslavia (Serbia, Montenegro, Kosovo) for broad qualification.

Q12. What are your main aims in Master degree structure.

Q12, 57 responses	advanced	research	attracting	other	no answer
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	12	4	1	6	5
<i>BP - other countries</i>	8	5	1	1	3
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	3	4	3	1	5
Total answers (62)	23	13	5	8	13
Note: Three institutions (from BG, HR, NL) gave two answers to this question and one institution (SI) gave three answers. - Under the option “other” institutions report mostly on particularities of national systems regarding (advanced) teachers’ qualification or with regard to relation between “subject” and “teaching” qualifications.					

After making an insight into the institutional plans about the first degree (Bachelor) it is necessary to find out what are their plans with the second degree (Master) either. Respondents had five options to answer: they would like (a) to provide an *advanced* qualification for all teachers who wish; (b) to provide a *research* qualification for teachers and to train teachers of teachers; (c) *attracting* students (Bachelor graduates) from other adequate study fields; (d) they could specify *other* aims or say (e) that they *can’t answer* this question.

As it could be expected, *over one third of respondents* (37.1% of them) *foresee Master degree as an advanced qualification for all teachers* (Bachelor graduates) who wish. Only one fifth of respondents (21.0%) find *Master degree as an appropriate research qualification for teachers and as a career path to become a teacher of teachers*. It seems that the idea of attracting students from other adequate study fields doesn’t attract institutions yet (8.1%). This time, interestingly, *institutions without answer make a noticeable group* (22,8%; the biggest share until now). Responses to the option “other” (12.9%) are briefly described in the **note**.

There are some minor differences between responds from clusters of countries. We can find slightly more interest of in the research function of second degree (*option b*) at institutions from the second and third cluster. Institutions from the third cluster express less interest in second degree as an advanced qualification (*option a*) and more interest in attracting other first degree students (*option c*); they can be also more frequently found under the option “no answer”. Institutions from the first cluster more frequently used option “other”.

It seems that there is still quite an uncertainty in this issue among institutions. Two-cycle system and Master degree in particular bring huge challenges to traditional schemes of teacher education and to (national) teacher qualifications. What should be *differentia specifica* between e.g. *Bachelor in teaching* and *Master in teaching*? Is it grounded to demark them using a split between *teaching in primary* and *teaching in secondary education*? What new possibilities can the two-cycle system offer to the

overcoming of the traditional borders between “*subject-area*”, “*education/pedagogy*” and “*teaching*” in many countries? Is a transfer to *Master in teaching* after *Bachelor in a subject X* (or to educational sciences¹⁸) an appropriate option? What challenges it brings to the employability issues?

Q13. With a two-cycle degree structure, do you expect your students to leave after a Bachelor degree, or to continue at Master level at your institution?

Q13, 57 responses	many leave	some leave	many continue	no answer
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	12	6	3	6
<i>BP - other countries</i>	2	6	6	-
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	7	6	2	1
Total answers (57)	21	18	11	7

It seems that institutions consider well that changes in higher education bring about more flexibility in students’ flows, that more transfers between institutions (in particularly after the first degree) could be expected and that employability will be even more important. More than one third of respondents (36.8%) believe that many of their students will leave their institution after a Bachelor degree and get a job (*option a*). Only slightly weaker group (31.6%) of respondents expect that some will leave and some continue at Master level at their institution or at other institutions (*option b*). One fifth of respondents (19.3%) believe that many will continue at Master level at their institution or at other institutions (*option c*).

A sum of options b and c gives a big group of more than one half of institutions (50,9%) who expect, in fact, that (their) students will spend more time in higher education and get higher degrees.

A small group of institutions (12.3%) – almost all of them belong to the first cluster of countries – couldn’t answer this question (*option d*); in some cases there is an objective reason since these institutions provide postgraduate studies only. It is also noticeable with regard to three clusters of countries that *majority of institutions from the second cluster do not expect that their Bachelor graduates will leave and find a job; they much more expect them to continue studying.* Interesting: *respondents from the first and third cluster have more or less equal expectation* (first cluster 44.4%, third cluster 43.8%; second cluster only 14.3%) *that many of their Bachelor (or equivalent) graduates will get a job.*

What could be the reason? Decreasing employment opportunities in education in countries of second cluster? It doesn’t seem that these countries are so much comparable in this aspect. Expecting to improve the academic weight of teaching profession? There should be some other reasons.

¹⁸ “As agreed upon at the Copenhagen Tuning meeting (September 2001), educational sciences will be split up into the closely related areas education studies and teacher education.” – See Gonzales, J., Wagenaar, R. (eds.), *Tuning educational Structures in Europe*. Final Report. Phase One. University of Deusto / University of Groningen. Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto, 2003, p. 126.

2.4 Curriculum

Q14. If the curriculum of your institution is modularised (with modules up from 3 ECTS to 15 ECTS credit) - in which format modules are defined?

Q14, 57 responses	not modularised	planned in future	modularised
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	3	8	16
<i>BP - other countries</i>	5	7	2
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	4	8	4
Total answers (57)	12	23	22

Transferring from study structures to the curriculum itself, the questionnaire asked first of all about *modularisation*. Respondents could answer that their curriculum is *not modularised* (a), that their curriculum is not modularised but they *plan to do so in near future* (b), or that their curriculum is already *modularised*; in the later option they were pleased to describe the format of modularisation.

One fifth of respondents (21.1%) do not occupy with the modularisation. But there are *two almost equal groups of respondents who report that they either plan modularised curricula (40.4%) or that their curricula are already modularised (38.6%)*. Not (yet) modularised curricula (*options a+b*) are frequent in countries of the second and third cluster (85.7% respectively 75.0% of them) while modularised curricula are more frequent in countries of the first cluster (59.3% of them).

What are the formats of these modularised curricula? *It seems that there are not only many diverse formats; modularisation itself seems to be rather an opened – and even vague – concept. Q14 takes the Tuning definition of modules¹⁹ (definitely most “tuned” definition so far) as a starting point but according to responses it is clear that lot of “tuning” will be still needed in this area. Altogether, 22 respondents (38.6%) reported about already modularised curricula but only a half of them (13) described the format while 9 of them missed a demand from the questionnaire and their formats remained unknown.*

Almost a half of these 13 respondents (6) alleged module formats in ECTS: *7,5 – 15 ECTS is most frequent average format, but the lower level can be also 2, 3 or 4 ECTS while the upper level can be also 20 ECTS and up to 31 ECTS (for school practice periods)*. There were also responses which simply link the issue of modularisation to ECTS (or other) credit system in general (e.g. one year = 60 ECTS) without referring to a concrete modular format. There are also two respondents who explained modules as groups of subjects: “general subjects, fundamental subjects, speciality subjects and

¹⁹ See *ibid.*, p. 130: “Modules can be conceived as coherent components of programs of study in particular fields or disciplines. Modules usually comprise some 6–15 ECTS credits. They consist of the following components:

- Description of aims and objectives related to content
- Description of learning outcomes (knowledge, skills, transferable competencies)
- Teaching/learning strategies, learning situations and learning cultures
- Evaluation/assessment procedures
- Description of the workload of students
- Entry requirements”.

optional subjects” or “pedagogical-psychological module, subject modules”.

Q15. Which formats for evaluation have been chosen in relation to defined competencies (several answers possible)?

Q15, 57 responses	traditional	papers	assignments	portfolios	other
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	21	20	16	17	7
<i>BP - other countries</i>	14	10	8	5	3
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	15	13	10	1	-
Total answers (150)	40	43	34	23	10

A question on formats for evaluation brought about a broad palette of answers (here, several answers were possible). *Most often, respondents mention seminar papers and essays* (option b; 28.7% of total answers), *followed by traditional tests and examinations* (option a; 26.7% of total answers). *Practical assignments* (option c) were mentioned in 22.7% and *portfolios* in 15.3% of total answers. No major differences among three clusters of countries can be observed; institutions from the third cluster report less frequently on portfolios. Under the option “other” respondents often mention – in addition to mostly all former options – (final) thesis, projects and in school evaluation of teaching.

Q16. In your institution, how important is the concern with the international "employability" of graduates when designing or restructuring the curricula?

Q16, 57 responses	very imp.	important	not very imp.	nation. only
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	3	8	12	5
<i>BP - other countries</i>	1	10	-	3
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	4	6	2	4
Total answers (58)	8	24	14	12
Note: One institution (from NL) gave two answers to this question.				

Employability should be one of the central “Bologna goals” and it is very interesting to see how teachers’ education institutions find it today. Surprisingly, only 14.0% of respondents find it “*very important*” (option a) but a majority of 42.0% respondents found it “*important*” (option b). A sum of both options goes *barely over one half of respondents* (56.0%). *Teacher profession is still prevalingly perceived as a “public job” and not (directly) linked to the labour market in a proper sense.* Therefore, it shouldn’t be such a surprise when *24.6% of respondents don’t see employability of graduates very important and when 21.1% of respondents believe that they train graduates for national (public) educational system only* (one respondent gave both answers).

There are also some interesting distinctions among clusters of countries. Respondents from third cluster of countries find employability more often “*very important*” and “*important*” (25.0% and 37.5%) while respondents from the first cluster find it much more often “*not very important*” (44.4%). Respondents from the second cluster are in between: they find employability of their graduates most often “*important*” (71.4%); no one of them finds it “*not very important*”.

Q17. If your institution involves employers and/or professional associations in the designing and restructuring of curricula they are usually with the relevant faculties and departments (several answers possible)?

Q17, 54 responses	MoE etc.	headmasters	associations	not involved
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	10	10	6	8
<i>BP - other countries</i>	6	6	4	6
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	10	5	5	3
Total answers (79)	26	21	15	17
<i>Note: Two institutions (from CH and PT) didn't answer this question. One institution (from ES) didn't decide for one of options and answered with "through consultation" only.</i>				

The involvement of various stakeholders into discussions on designing and restructuring of curricula can be at least partly linked to the issue of employability elsewhere in higher education. In case of teachers' education institutions such consultation can be even more needed; it can be also more complex. School curricula usually come into existence in consultation between the Ministry of Education, headmasters, various associations – and teachers' education institutions. What are results of checking the reality of consultation when teachers' education curricula are in question?

Many respondents took more than one option. As it could be expected, *almost one half of them (48.1%) reported that they involve representatives of the Ministry of Education and related institutions (option a; 32.9% of total answers). Headmasters, leaders of educational establishments, administrators etc. (option b) are the second most frequent group involved (38.9% of respondents; 26.6% of total answers). Associations of teachers/educators and academic associations (option c) are more rarely involved (27.8% of respondents; 19.0% of total answers). Option d – "We don't involve them to designing process, or very rarely" – was taken by surprisingly strong group of almost one third (31.5%; 21.5% of total answers) of respondents.*

Institutions of the third cluster of countries involve Ministry of Education and related institutions more often than institutions from other two groups (62.5% vs. 41.7% in the first and 42.9% in the second cluster); they also notably distinguish from other two groups with low share of responses to the *option d* (18.8% vs. 34.8% in the first and 42.9% in the second cluster).

Q18. If your institution awards doctoral degrees, what structure of doctoral degree studies exists at your institution?

Q18, 55 responses	tutoring	t. + courses	plan for future	not responsible
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	11	11	1	5
<i>BP - other countries</i>	2	10	-	3
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	7	5	3	1
Total answers (59)	20	26	4	9

Note: Two institutions (from NO and CH) didn't answer this question at all. – Four institutions (three from UK and one from RO) answered by taking two options (a and b); therefore, there are 59 answers in total. – In comparison to Q03, some respondents gave contradictory answers: 3 respondents (from AL and NL) of those who stated in Q03 that their institutions do not award doctorates, answered Q18 with “tutoring” or “t.+courses”. One respondent who stated in Q03 that their institution (already) awards doctoral degrees answered Q03 with “plan for future”. – However, another 3 respondents of those who stated in Q03 that their institutions do not award doctorates (from AL and LU) answered with “plan for future”.

In past, doctoral studies were mostly absent from teachers' education institutions but it seems (see also Q03) that they have become a constitutive part of their activity. Here, respondents from institutions which already award doctoral degrees could answer that the structure of doctoral degree studies consists of individual tutoring with supervisor only (“traditional” option a) or that they offer taught courses in addition to tutoring (“modern” option b). With a reference to Q03, two further options were made: that their institutions don't award doctoral degrees (yet) but plan it for future (“progressive” option c) or that doctoral degrees are not a responsibility of teachers' education institutions (“conservative” option d).

What are the results? – “Modernists” got a slight advantage against “traditionalists” (however, four respondents took both options; see note): almost one half (47.3%) of respondents chose “modern” option while a bit more than one third chose the “traditional” option (36.4%). It seems that most “modern” are institutions from the second cluster of countries (even 71.4% of them stated so; only 14.3% claimed as “traditionalists”). Institutions from the first cluster are cleaved between both options (44.0% vs. 44.0%) while institutions from the third cluster seem to be slightly inclined towards “traditionalism” (43.8% vs. 31.3%).

In Q03, one fourth of respondents (16 or 28.1%) reported that their institutions don't award doctoral degrees. Now, only few of them (25.0%; see also note) stated that it is in their planes for future while most of them (50.0%) took the option that doctoral degrees are not a responsibility of teachers' education institutions (2 out of these 16 didn't answer at all; 3 of them answered contradictory to Q03; see note; above). Interestingly, one of respondents who reported in Q03 that their institution awards doctorates joined this group in Q03. *The issue of doctoral degree studies at teachers' education institutions seems to be still opened, at least in some national environments.*

Q19. How much priority does your institutional leadership attach to the development of joint curricula and/or joint degrees with institutions in other countries?

Q19, 57 responses	high	medium	low	no answer
BP - EU/EFTA count.	8	8	10	1
BP - other countries	6	5	2	1
Non-signatory count.	8	3	3	2
Total answers (57)	22	16	15	4

Joint curricula and/or joint degrees are an important indicator of the strength of international cooperation and, in particular, of an arising EHEA. There are still (legal) obstacles to joint degrees but there is also a strong support of the European Commission to extend cooperation in this field. Respondents could chose among four

different options: (a) high, (b) medium or (c) low priority attached to this issue or (d) “We can’t answer this question”.

In general, majority of two thirds of respondents (66.7%; 38.6% high and 28.1% medium) find joint curricula and/or joint degrees as priority areas but also the share of those who find it low priority is quite impressive (26.3%). Interestingly, at this question there is a clear division between countries. Institutions from countries of first cluster are more inclined to the evaluation of low priority (37.0% of them) while institutions from countries of second and third cluster are more inclined to the evaluation of high or medium – rather high than medium – priority (78.6% in the second and 68.8% in the third cluster).

The issue of joint degrees opens another important “Bologna goal” – recognition of degrees and study periods taken abroad. In fact, it is not only a “Bologna goal” but it is important for global cooperation in the contemporary higher education.

2.5 Recognition issues

Q20. Does your institution provide recognition procedures?

Q20, 55 responses	often	some	no responsibility	can't answer
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	8	6	5	6
<i>BP - other countries</i>	5	6	3	1
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	2	7	6	1
Total answers (56)	15	19	14	8
<i>Note: Two institutions (from CH and PT) didn't answer this question (one answer just with a question mark “?”). One institution (BG) put two answers: they have some practice in recognition procedures for periods of study only; institution has no such responsibility for diplomas obtained from abroad.</i>				

First of all, at this question we checked the extent to which responding institutions are entitled to recognition procedures. Respondents could chose one of the following options: (a) “yes, we often practice recognition procedures”; (b) “yes, we have some practice in recognition procedures”; (c) “we have no such responsibility; it is in governmental responsibility”; and (d) “we can’t answer this question”.

According to responses, *more than one half of institutions have often (27.3%) or at least some practice (34.5%) in recognition procedures. One quarter of respondents (25.5%) state (believe?) that they have no such responsibility or that it is in governmental responsibility. Finally, almost one fifth of respondents (17.5%) who couldn't answer or who didn't answer at all give a ground for a hypothesis that recognition issues are not very known at institutions. This hypothesis is even more grounded when we know that respondents from same countries (and from all clusters) often made opposite responses (“we have practice” vs. “it is in governmental responsibility”).*

Q21. To your knowledge, how aware is the academic staff at your institution of the provisions of the Lisbon Convention (1997) and recognition procedures, in general?

Q21, 54 responses	reasonably	not very	completely	no information
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	8	6	5	2
<i>BP - other countries</i>	4	5	2	2
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	4	6	3	2
Total answers (54)	16	18	14	6
Note: Three institutions (from HU, MD and NL) didn't answer this question (one answer just with question marks "??").				

The most important landmark in understanding of recognition and in recognition practice was made in 1997 with the *Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region (The Lisbon Convention)*, developed by the Council of Europe and UNESCO and adopted by national representatives of 44 (not only European) countries so far. The Lisbon Convention offers new philosophy and new concrete tools (in between, Diploma Supplement) to overcome traditional barriers in recognition matters. In many of signatory countries recognition procedures are in responsibility of higher education institutions.

How much is the academic staff at these institutions aware of their (potential) recognition responsibility? Respondents could chose between (a) “*reasonably aware*”, (b) “*not very aware*”, (c) “*almost completely unaware*”, and they could also mention that (d) *no information* is available.

The hypothesis made at the former question (**Q21**) finds additional ground also here. *Majority of over a half of respondents find the academic staff at their institutions “not very aware” (33.3%) or “almost completely unaware” (25.9%) of Lisbon Convention provisions.* Less than one third (29.7%) find them “*reasonably aware*”. No information was available from a tenth (11.1%) of respondents.

There are no major differences among institutions from different clusters of countries. Shares of “*reasonably aware*” as well as “*almost completely unaware*” are almost equal when all three clusters are compared; a share of those who are “*not very aware*” is higher among respondents from the second cluster of countries.

Q22. Do you think that the emerging European Higher Education Area will facilitate the processes of academic recognition at your institution?

Q22, 57 responses	very much	slightly	complicate	not clear
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	11	4	1	11
<i>BP - other countries</i>	7	3	-	4
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	7	2	1	7
Total answers (58)	25	9	2	22
Note: One institution (from AM) gave two answers to this question (“ <i>yes, slightly</i> ” as well as “ <i>difficult to say at this stage</i> ”).				

With regard to recognition matters the EHEA should go even further than *The Lisbon Convention*: it should remove all kind of barriers for recognition and for free

movement of students and graduates. What are expectations at the level of institutions? Respondents could choose among four options: (a) yes, *very much* so; (b) yes, *slightly*; (c) it might *complicate* recognition processes; (d) difficult to say at this stage.

Most of respondents express either strong hopes to the EHEA (option a: 43.9%) or they remain undecided about the question (option d: 38.6%). Other two options received much less interest: 16.7% of respondents expect that EHEA will slightly facilitate recognition processes (therefore, give additional support to EHEA) while only 3.5% expect that it might complicate them. At this question, there are no major differences between three clusters of countries.

Responses to our questionnaire don't differ very much from findings of the *Trends III Report*: "More than half of the academic staff seem to be *not very aware* or *not aware at all* of the provisions of the Lisbon Convention."²⁰

2.6 Credit system, mobility

Q23. Does your institution use a credit system?

Q23, 57 responses	ECTS	not ECTS	not yet	no intention
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	17	7	4	1
<i>BP - other countries</i>	5	6	3	-
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	4	1	10	2
Total answers (60)	26	14	17	3

Note: Two institutions (from BE and DK) gave two answers: they use ECTS in some (e.g. Education studies) but not in all study programmes (e.g. Teacher Education and Training). - Another institution (from YUS) also gave two but contradictory answers ("Not yet but we plan it for near future" vs. "We do not intend to implement one"). One institution (from BG) which answered this question with "not yet" but added, however, that ECTS will start from October 2003.

This chapter deals with development of credit system(s) as well as students and staff mobility at teachers' education institutions. First question should present the spread of credit system(s) at institutional level. Respondents could answer this question with one of the following options: (a) "yes, *ECTS*"; (b) "yes, but *not ECTS*"; (c) "*not yet* but we plan it for near future"; (d) "we do *not intend* to implement one".

Similarly as higher education area in general (see *Trends III*),²¹ *teachers' education institutions use credit systems broadly: two thirds of them (66.7%) use either ECTS (43.3%) or some other system (23.3%). Still, a bit less than one third (29.8%) of them only plan it for near (or nearest; see note) future. In this category, institutions from the third cluster of countries make a majority (62.5% of them) while institutions from the*

²⁰ *Trends III Report*, p. 90. – See also (ibid.): "In a number of countries, institution-wide procedures for recognition seem to be quite under-developed."

²¹ "Two thirds of HEIs today use ECTS for *credit transfer*, while 15% use a different system. [...] In many HEIs, the use of ECTS is still not integrated into institution-wide policies or guidelines, and its principles and tools are often insufficiently understood." - *Trends III Report*, p. 99.

first and second clusters are very rare (14.8% respectively 21.4% of them). Institutions with no intention to implement credit system are very rare (5.0% of total answers).

Q24. If your institution has introduced a credit system, on what basis do you now award degrees / diplomas?

Q24, 55 responses	credits only	combined	traditional	not applicable
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	12	7	4	3
<i>BP - other countries</i>	2	8	2	3
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	2	3	3	7
Total answers (56)	16	18	9	13
<i>Note: Two institutions (from DE and PT) that answered Q23 (“Yes, ECTS” and “Not yet but we plan it for near future”) didn’t answer this question. Probably, in their cases it is not applicable. - One institution (from FR) answered to this question with two answers: in principle it uses combined system, however, it awards diplomas to strangers on the basis of accumulated credits.</i>				

At this question, respondents had four options again: they could award degrees (a) on the basis of accumulated *credits only*; (b – *combined*) on the basis of accumulated credits plus traditional end of year exams; (c) only on the basis of *traditional* exams; certainly, those institutions which haven’t introduced a credit system yet could also state (d) that the question is *not applicable*.

One third of respondents (32.7%) report that their institutions award degrees on a combined basis (option b). Not much less institutions (29.1%) award degrees on credits basis only (option a). A cohort of 15.8% of institutions remains traditional, quite equally distributed among three clusters of countries. There is a group of almost one quarter (23.6%) of respondents who find this question not applicable (see Q23; see also note).

Institutions which award degrees on credits basis only are most frequent in the first cluster of countries (44.4%) while in other two clusters they are very rare (14.3%; 12.5%). Combined system can be most often found at institutions of the second cluster (57.1%). Institutions from the third cluster most often (43.8%) answered that the question is not applicable (see also Q23).

Q25. Do students returning to your institution from study abroad encounter problems with the recognition of their credits?

Q25, 57 responses	often	occasionally	never	no such students
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	-	13	8	6
<i>BP - other countries</i>	2	7	1	4
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	1	7	-	8
Total answers (57)	3	27	9	18
<i>Note: One institution (from IE; only postgraduate) answered this question with “We have no such students yet” and reported that there are lots in other undergraduate departments.</i>				

A successful use of credit system should facilitate student mobility. However, there

could be a gap between principles and praxis²² which we aimed to mark at this question; further, we could get a picture of student mobility at teachers' education institutions. Therefore, respondents chose among four options: students encounter such problems (a) *often*; (b) *occasionally*; (c) *never*; and (d) institution has *no such students yet*.

Very realistically, almost one half of respondents report that students encounter such problems occasionally (47.4%); there are no differences between clusters of countries in this respect. Only a modest share (15.8%) of them report that students never encounter problems (option c) and almost all of them belong to the first cluster of countries (29.6% of them). Often problems with the recognition of student credits seem to be very rare, in case of the first cluster even non-existent. And finally: almost one third of respondents (31.6%) report that there are no such students at their institutions yet. A share of those respondents is higher in the third cluster of countries (50%; 22.2% in the first and 28.6% in the second cluster).

Q26. When comparing incoming and outgoing student mobility (Erasmus, Ceepus, Tempus etc.) at your institution, is there an imbalance?

Q26, 57 responses	more in	balanced	more out	no such students yet
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	8	12	3	4
<i>BP - other countries</i>	1	3	8	2
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	1	1	5	9
Total answers (57)	10	16	16	15

There are often complaints in higher education that student mobility between countries is not balanced. We aimed to know situation at teachers' education institutions and gave respondents to choose among four options: (a) significantly *more incoming* than outgoing students; (b) similar levels (*balanced*); (c) significantly *more outgoing* than incoming; (d) *no such students yet*.

The responds are almost homogenously spread amongst all four options. A balanced ratio is reported from 28.1% of institutions; significantly more outgoing than incoming students can be found at another 28.1% of institutions; a smaller share of 17.5% of institutions reports on significantly more incoming than outgoing students. More than one quarter (26.3%) of institutions have no such students yet.

Geographic distribution can be particularly important at this question. Countries of the first cluster report much more often that the ratio is balanced (44.4) or that there are more incoming than outgoing students (29.6% of them). Institutions from the second cluster most often report on more outgoing than incoming students (57.1%). Institutions from the third cluster most often report that they have no such students yet (56.3%).

²² "While HEIs are rather optimistic with regard to the smoothness of recognition procedures of study abroad periods, students' experience partly contradict this." - *Trends III Report*, p. 99. – Unfortunately, we can't check this statement at teachers' education institutions since our survey couldn't include students.

Q27. Has teaching staff mobility increased at your institution over the last three years?

Q27, 57 responses	significantly	slightly	not at all	decreased	no information
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	6	13	6	-	2
<i>BP - other countries</i>	2	10	2	-	-
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	4	6	2	2	3
Total answers (58)	12	29	10	2	5
<i>Note: One institution (from AM) gave two answers to this question (“significantly” as well as “slightly”).</i>					

Student and staff mobility don't necessary develop in equal terms. We asked respondents to evaluate staff mobility separately. They could choose among five options: teaching staff mobility increased (a) *significantly*; (b) *slightly*; (c) *not at all*; (d) on the contrary, it *decreased*; (e) *no information* available.

Evidently, teaching staff mobility at responding institutions is increasing. More than one half of institutions (50.9%) report that it increased slightly and one fifth of them (21.1%) report that the increase was significant. Less than one fifth of them (17.5%) report that there was no increase. Only a minority of 3.5% of institutions – both from the third cluster of countries – report on decreasing of teaching staff mobility. 8.8% of respondents had no information available.

2.7 Quality Assurance

Q28. Do you have internal mechanisms for monitoring quality in your institution (several answers possible)?

Q28, 57 responses	teaching	research	other activities	not yet
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	24	18	9	2
<i>BP - other countries</i>	9	8	1	3
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	9	6	-	3
Total answers (92)	42	32	10	8

Quality assurance has become an issue of highest priority in recent years; it is also one of exposed action lines of the Bologna Process. In this chapter we investigate the reality of quality assurance mechanisms at teachers' education institutions, and as first, the existence of internal mechanisms. Respondents could answer this question positively choosing one (or more) of the following options: (a) with regard to *teaching*; (b) with regard to *research*; (c) with regard to *other specified activities* at the institution. They could also report (*option d*) that such mechanisms haven't been established yet.

Almost three quarters of institutions report on internal mechanisms for monitoring quality of teaching (73.7% of respondents; 45.7 of total answers). Even internal mechanisms for monitoring quality of research are reported from more than one half of institutions involved in the survey (56.1% of respondents; 34.8 of total answers).

A small group of 17.5% of respondents (10.9% of total answers) also mention “other activities”: monitoring of the institutional management is the most often type. According to this survey, internal mechanisms for monitoring quality haven’t been developed yet at 14.0% of institutions (8.7% of total answers).

Internal mechanisms for monitoring quality of teaching are developed at 88.9% of institutions from the first cluster of countries, at 64.3% of institutions from the second cluster and at 56.3% of institutions from the third cluster. Similar trend – however, shares are lower than in former case – can be found in monitoring quality of research: 66.7% of institutions from the first, 57.1% from the second and 37.5% from the third cluster. “Other activities” are almost exclusively monitored only at one third of institutions (33.3%) from the first cluster.

At this point, responds from our questionnaire are also very close to findings of the *Trends III Report*.²³

Q29. Do external mechanisms for monitoring quality assurance and/or providing accreditation exist in your country (several answers possible)?

Q29, 56 responses	national level	university	institutional	no mechanisms
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	20	8	5	3
<i>BP - other countries</i>	10	5	2	3
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	7	10	-	2
Total answers (75)	37	23	7	8
<i>Note: One institution (from IT) didn't answer this question arguing that mechanisms have been developed but not implemented yet. – Two institutions (from HR and YUS) gave two but contradictory answers (a positive answer in combination with “No such mechanisms have been developed so far”).</i>				

A similar question was prepared to check the existence of external mechanisms for monitoring quality in particular national environments. Respondents could answer the question positively choosing one of the following options: (a) accreditation and quality assurance procedures exist at the *national level*; (b) we provide quality assurance at the *university level*; (c) we provide quality assurance at the *institutional level*. They could also state that *no such mechanisms* have been developed so far.

Two thirds (66.1%) of respondents report on existent accreditation and quality assurance procedures at the national level: approximately three quarters of them from the first (74.1%) and from the second (71,4%) cluster of countries; in the third cluster there is less than one half (43.8%) of such responses. Less than one half of respondents (41.1%) report also on quality assurance mechanisms provided at the university level and a tenth of them (12.5%) on mechanisms provided at the institutional level only.

²³ “Internal quality assurance procedures are just as widespread as external ones. Most often they focus on teaching. 82% of the heads of HEIs reported that they have internal procedures to monitor the quality of teaching, 53% also have internal procedures to monitor the quality of research. Only a quarter of HEIs addressed aspects other than teaching and research.” – Trends III Report, p. 123.

Among responses from the third cluster – and in comparison to the first and second cluster – mechanisms provided at the national level are less frequent (43.8% of them) while mechanisms provided at the university level are more frequent (62.5% of them).

No such mechanisms are reported from 14.3% of respondents from all clusters of countries. A relatively high figure warns that it could be probably a result of weak information on national quality assurance systems, similarly as we found in recognition matters. There is also some ground to mistrust the achieved results when comparing them to *Trends III Report* findings. At this point it offers a different picture (however, based on a responses from ministries, universities and student organisations): “Currently 80% of HEIs in Europe undergo external quality assurance procedures (quality evaluation or accreditation)”.²⁴ *Is the information on national quality assurance systems weaker at faculty level* which is – differently as in *Trends III Report* – observed in this survey? Or do heads of universities (as in case of *Trends III Report*) have more optimistic approach to this issue than heads of faculties?

Q30. Does your institution involve students in the process of quality evaluation?

Q30, 57 responses	a questionnaire	an opinion	a chance	not involved
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	24	9	-	-
<i>BP - other countries</i>	9	5	1	2
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	11	3	1	2
Total answers (67)	44	17	2	4
Note: One institution (from FR) didn't answer this question.				

An increasing involvement of students in the governance of higher education institutions has also become a distinctive feature of the Bologna process, also in quality assurance sector. This questions checks a reality of their involvement into QA procedures. Respondents had two clearly positive options: (a) yes, our institution organizes students' *questionnaire* (or similar procedures); and (b) yes, students can formally express *opinion* through student organisation. They could also answer under (c) “They have a concrete chance but they don't use it” or, simply, with (d) “No”.

According to responses, students' quality evaluation questionnaires or similar procedures have become prevailing practice also at teachers' education institutions: more than three quarters (77.2%; 65.7% of total answers) of respondents reported so (88,8% of those from the first cluster; 64.3% from the second and 68.8% from the third).

²⁴ *Trends III Report*, p. 122. – See also p. 105: “Our own data reveal that 80% of HEIs in Europe currently undergo external quality assurance procedures (quality evaluation or accreditation). There is no notable difference between universities and other HEIs in this respect. Institutions specializing in business and economics and those specialized in technology and engineering are affected even more often (85% and 89% respectively). In fact, even in those countries where QA agencies have only recently been or are about to be established, more than 50% of the institutions (45% in SEE) nevertheless mention the existence of external quality assurance procedures. Only in Greece and among the non-university HEIs of Spain, a majority of institutions report that no external QA procedures exist.”

Almost one third (29.8%; 34,6% of those from the first cluster; 35.7% from the second and 18.8% from the third) of them reported that there is (also) a possibility for students to make an opinion through their organisations. Only 3.5% of respondents took *option c* while 7.0% of them reported that students are not involved in the process of quality evaluation. Respondents from the second and third cluster of countries only chose the last two options.

2.8 Life-Long Learning

Q31. Has your institution developed an overall strategy regarding Life-Long Learning (LLL) initiatives?

Q31, 57 responses	yes	initial stage	not yet	no need
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	13	6	7	1
<i>BP - other countries</i>	4	6	4	-
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	2	6	5	3
Total answers (57)	19	18	16	4

Last but not least: Life-Long Learning (LLL) as a part of “Bologna strategies” could and should find a proper place in teachers’ education institutions also. *Have they already prepared LLL strategies or do they plan to do so? At this question responds from institutions distribute into three more or less equal groups. One third of them (33.3%) report that they already developed an overall strategy; a bit less than one third of them report that they are in the initial stages (31.6%) or that such a strategy is planned (28.1%).* Only a minority of institutions (7.0%) do not see the need for an overall strategy regarding LLL. Results are quite comparable to those from *Trends III Report* (however, as we already mentioned methodology was not the same; in *Trends III Report* ministries, universities and student organisations were respondents).²⁵

If responds are observed from a perspective of a particular cluster of countries than already developed strategies could be find much more often at institutions from the first group while institutions from the second and third group more often report about initial stages. It is interesting that among institutions which report that they haven’t developed a LLL strategy yet but it is planned, there is not much differences according to groups of countries (25.9% such responds were received from institutions of the first group, 28.6% from the second and 31.3% from the third); in addition, responds are quite dispersed and not grouped in one or two countries only. Among institutions of the third group of countries there is a remarkable share (18.8%) of those who do not see the need for an overall LLL strategy.

²⁵ See *Trends III Report*, p.128. One third (33.3%) of countries have already developed at least one LLL strategy, a bit less than one half of them (47.2%) are in the initial stages, and one fifth (19.4%) of them have at least a planned one.

Q32. Which is/are the main target group/s in your institution's Life-Long Learning (LLL) initiatives?

Q32, 55 responses	in-service	other graduates	other groups	no need
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	22	9	9	1
<i>BP - other countries</i>	12	5	2	-
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	12	1	2	3
Total answers (78)	46	15	13	4
Note: Two institutions (from BE and CH) didn't answer this question. –				

At this question, we tried to identify main target groups at teachers' education institution's LLL initiatives. By their very nature teachers and educators (*in-service* education as traditionally recognised part of their activity) were the first option (a). Graduates from other disciplines who wish to qualify as teachers or educators made the second option (b); in many countries this is quite often and traditional way how to get a teaching qualification. As the third option (c) respondents could specify various *other groups* and as the fourth option (d) respondents could chose a statement that they do not see the need for this at their institution.

As expected, *teachers and educators in the in-service education are far most frequent target group in LLL initiatives* (80.7% of respondents; 59.0 % of total answers). *Graduates from other disciplines are interesting groups only for a quarter of institutions* (27.3% of respondents; 19.2 of total answers). Institutions searching for other groups are of similar share (23.6% of respondents; 16.7 of total answers); they usually reported about *groups from the education area in general, from social service, nursing, culture, arts media, industry and business, or they mentioned adult learners in general*. Only 7.3% of institutions don't have a need for such target groups.

There are some evident differences among clusters of countries. Institutions from the first cluster find graduates from other disciplines more often interesting target groups (33.3% of them) while institutions from the third cluster are most rare in this category (only 6.3% of them). Institutions from the first cluster also search for "other groups" more often (33.3% of them) than institutions from other two clusters (14.3% respectively 12.5% of them). Institutions from the third cluster can be found more often in the category of those who don't have a need for such target groups (18.8% of them).

Q33. Does the implementation of new degree structures (Bachelor/Master) affect the design of LLL programmes and modules?

Q33, 57 responses	yes	no	not applicable
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	16	6	7
<i>BP - other countries</i>	6	5	3
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	4	5	8
Total answers (58)	24	16	18
Note: Two institutions (from AM and UK) gave two but contradictory answers (using also the option "Not applicable").			

How do institutions understand the relationship between the implementation of new two-cycle degree structures and the design of LLL programmes and modules? The question aims at clarifying the division between those institutions which state that they are connected (*option a*) and those which state that they are designed separately (*option b*). There was also an option (c) for those institutions which found this question not applicable.

It seems that curricular reforms in degree studies haven't influenced very much LLL programmes (yet). Institutions are rather dispersed around all three options. The first (positive) option, however, got a relative majority (42.1%) while the second (negative) got relatively the smallest share (28.1%). Yet, almost one third of respondents (31.6%) found this question not applicable. Positive relationship can be more often found at the institutions of the first cluster (59.3% of them) while more frequent responses that the question is not applicable came from the third cluster of countries (50% of them).

Q34. Does your institution use information and communication technology to support LLL offer and delivery, e.g. Internet, distance-learning based modules (several answers possible)?

Q34, 56 responses	to support courses	to support mobility	other	not yet
<i>BP - EU/EFTA count.</i>	20	12	1	5
<i>BP - other countries</i>	7	1	-	6
<i>Non-signatory count.</i>	2	2	-	11
Total answers (67)	29	15	1	22
<i>Note: One institution (from MD) didn't answer this question. – One institution (from UK) answered this question under the option “other” but – in the given context – it could be understood also as combination of options “to support courses” and “to support mobility”.</i>				

A relationship between information and communication technology and Life-Long Learning is particularly interesting. Respondents could choose between three “yes” options: the institution uses ICT in order (a) to support courses taught on site; (b) to support virtual mobility of staff and students; and (c) in other ways (to be specified). Finally, they could report that they do not use ICT in this regard yet.

In general, ICT as a support to LLL offer and delivery is still far from everyday practice at teacher training institutions: 22 institutions (39.3% of respondents) chosen this option in the questionnaire. The picture is rather dark; it worsens if we observe data from the first to the third group of countries. There are remarkable shares of 18.5% of institutions from the first group of countries, 42.9% from the second and 73.3% (of responding institutions; one institution didn't respond this question) from the third group of countries which do not use ICT in this regard yet. Very probably, the use of ICT in life-long learning depends on the general level of development of ICT in a given country but, very probably, it depends very much also on general level of development of ICT at the given institution. We could also suppose that there are no major differences between the use of ICT in LLL and in other institutional activities. Are teachers' education institutions less developed in this regard? If yes, than it is a signal for an alarm.

However, majority of responds tell that ICT is widely used (also) as a support to LLL offer and delivery in teachers' education. One half of institutions (51.8%) report that they use ICT to support courses taught on site and a quarter of them (26.8%) to support virtual mobility of staff and students. The "geographical distribution" of responds is almost identical as before. The use of ICT to support courses taught on site is an everyday praxis at 74.1% institutions from the first group of countries, at 50% institutions from the second group and at 13.3% institutions from the third group of countries. On the other hand, responds regarding the option "to support virtual mobility of staff and students" are worse: 44.4% (first group); 7.1% (second group); 12.5% (third group).

3.0 Conclusions

We will try to make some brief final theses along the eight subchapters.

1. Institutions of teachers' education in Europe are organized in various ways as their traditions root in different national and regional circumstances. Today, teacher's education is organised at universities in most of countries, mostly at specialized institutions (faculties, departments) but also in interdisciplinary cooperation. However, cleaved between "subject discipline" and "education/pedagogy", they mostly still search for an appropriate balance and for their own academic identity. According to number of students these institutions belong to "mass higher education" almost elsewhere. Very probably, their social function is not only to provide future teachers, educators, counsellors, etc.; their graduates can enter also other areas. They are also important providers of general education.

Teachers' education institutions are very active in international co-operation and tend to develop some common structures in order to facilitate mobility of staff and students, recognition as well as general co-operation between different institutions which are all aware that these differences can be real advantages for students and staff. In this regard, doctoral studies and research work have become progressively an important sector of their activity which could decisively influence their future role. From that point, their taking part in the *Bologna Process* could be in particularly important.

2. In fact, teachers' education institutions share their **approach to the Bologna Process** with (their) universities as we can learn from comparisons of our findings with *Trends III Report*. An absolute majority of them is aware of the process of (planned) changes in European higher education. Heads of institutions are usually more informed than staff; nevertheless, in general, it seems that there is often a lack of information on specific systemic issues (like recognition, quality assessment, etc.).

Global reforms in higher education seem to be a particular challenge for teachers' education institutions: they can either continue with progressive developments and reach some new goals (e.g. a firm support to teaching as regulated profession) or can loose their momentum. Therefore, their approach contains as firm support as some scepticism towards the EHEA: both depend very much on national and regional circumstances. Institutions from those countries which have either applied to join the *Bologna Process* or have been preparing themselves to join European Union (or both)

usually find “Bologna action lines” as an important prop for their national endeavours and expectations. On the other side, institutions from some member countries of European Union are more inclined to express scepticism but support is not excluded either.

3. On this premise it is not surprising that majority of responding institutions have already started – or they plan to do so in nearest future - with **implantation of the two-cycle system** at the institutional level. For most of them, this is a huge new challenge; for some this is also a possibility to develop Master degree courses, and – if we rather speak about three-cycle system – Doctoral degree courses.

Our survey noticed an obvious consensus on the two-cycle degree system (as proposed up to now) but it also noticed that responding institutions are completely divided with regard to the “*formula 3+2 vs. 4+1*”. This is a peak of an iceberg which should be studied and discussed to details in next period (up to the 2005?) if we mind the EHEA in teachers’ education seriously. True, it is not only a matter of teachers’ education; same ambivalences can be heard also from some other study areas (e.g. engineering, medical studies, etc.). A first step to these discussions could be a consideration on what could be institutional aims regarding new Bachelor (first level degree) and Master degree (second level degree) studies. In this point, teachers’ education as a typical interdisciplinary area finds new options for resolving the traditional dilemma between “subject discipline” and “education/pedagogy”; at the same time it can offer an excellent “transfer point” to students of various disciplines.

4. The launched and/or planned reforms at institutions towards the new two-cycle system reflect in their **curricula**. More we go into details more complicated they are. As it became clear in our findings, the modularisation of curricula encounters many diverse formats (or they don’t exist at all) and the modularisation itself is still an opened and even vague concept. On the other hand, evaluation methods are quite spread – as it could be expected from those institutions (however, it is not always true) – traditional tests and examinations, seminar papers, practical assignments and portfolios.

It is interesting that responding institutions don’t find international employability of their graduates very much important (at least not so much as in management or engineering); this could be a sign that teachers’ education is still predominantly perceived as “the national occupation”. What could be the ground for such a comprehension? Isn’t it in opposition with their broadly expressed wish for international co-operation? It is even more in opposition if we remind their high interest in developing joined curricula and joined degrees at institutions in other countries.

5. If a teaching qualification were designed on basis of comprehension of teaching profession as “the national occupation” than **recognition of degrees** obtained abroad would be nonsensical. It is true – and there are reasonable grounds for that which we couldn’t analyse at this place – that responsibilities for (national) educational systems are with national governments (even in EU members) or even at the level of country regions. On the other hand, national educational systems would find isolated if there were no (legal) connection between them. From this aspect, international conventions

as legislative tools are very important: in recognition matters *The Lisbon Convention* (1997).

It seems (not only on basis of our survey) that institutions (not only of teachers' education) are not very aware of the role of such legislative tools. In past, and in some countries also today, teachers' education institutions had no responsibility to provide recognition procedures since they prepared students for "the national occupation". At this point, the EHEA – objectively – brings about totally new challenges: with common learning structures, joined curricula, etc. How should (teachers' education) institutions respond them?

6. It seems that responding teachers' education institutions are well involved in **mobility of students and staff**; however, they encountered several problems in this field. Most often in our survey institutions reported that students returning from study abroad "occasionally" encounter problems with the recognition of their credits. There are still institutions in various countries which reported that they have no student mobility. Some problems in mobility are linked with financial issues and/or social background of students; this is for sure more hard issue for countries of Eastern and South Eastern Europe but there are also institutions from EU countries which reported that they have no mobility students. What are the reasons? Apart of financial issues there is another obstacle to (balanced) mobility, as we know also from other higher education areas: there are countries with more incoming that outgoing students, and vice versa. Mobility – if it is not balanced – couldn't provide what students and staff expect.

A considerable share of institutions are still in the initial phase of development of credit system(s) and a distinction between credit transfer and credit accumulation is still weak (or merely declarative if we lean on *Trends III Report* findings). On the other hand, ECTS seems to reach majority of responding institutions and that many of them already award degrees, at least partly, on basis of credits. Growing shares of teaching staff in mobility give hope that also student mobility at teachers' education institutions will improve.

7. Teachers' education institutions are participating in **quality assurance** measures at national and/or university level. Students seem to be involved at almost all institutions into the process of quality evaluation. According to our survey, their awareness on *internal* mechanisms for monitoring quality is almost the same as presented in *Trends III Report* but it seems that sound information on *external* mechanisms is missing sometimes at this level.

Issues on quality assurance and, in particularly, on external quality assurance systems have made part of most heated recent discussions. In Europe, there are countries in favour of institutional accreditation as well as those who find problems in spreading such a system to all. There is a consensus that there should be national responsibility and some national regulation on quality in higher education but there are also divergent answers on "common European quality standards". As it is important for the development of institutional "quality culture" to promote and improve appropriate internal procedures, it is also important that teachers' education institutions understand the importance of external procedures and form their particular statements.

8. Life-Long Learning initiatives seem to be an inexhaustible field in most of teachers' education institutions. Traditionally, these institutions from all countries have provided in-service training for teachers and educators, and they still find this area most important with regard to contemporary LLL concept. In fact, they provide in-service training to graduates of teachers' education but can also provide teaching qualification courses to graduates from other disciplines.

On the other hand, it does not seem that institutional reforms of the "regular" degree programmes affect very much the area of LLL offer. Yet, the LLL concept in the context of the *Bologna Process* opens this window even more broadly. The necessity of interdisciplinary study offer at universities will be increased, and at this point at least some of responding institutions shown interest to overcome their traditional limitation to "educational" sphere only. What is a realistic reach of these initiatives? And what could be expected outcomes?

4.0 Bibliography

Bergan, S. (ed.), *Recognition Issues in the Bologna Process*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2003.

Bologna Follow up Group, *Further Accessions to the Bologna Process - Considerations and Suggestions for Further Action*. Report by an ad hoc working party. Revised following the meeting of the Preparatory Group, Bruxelles, September 19, 2002 [with annexes].

Bologna Follow up Group, *Further Development of the Bologna Process: Milestones, Stocktaking and Further Accessions – Considerations and Suggestions for Further Action*. Report by an ad hoc working party. Revised following the meetings of the Preparatory Group, Bruxelles, September 19, the Follow up Group, København, November 4, 2002 and the *ad hoc* Working Party, Bonn, January 15, 2003 [with annexes].

Campbell, C. and Rosznay, C., *Quality Assurance and Development of Course Programmes*. – Bucharest: UNESCO-CEPES, 2003.

Capucci, S., Finocchietti, C., Sticchi Damiani, M., Testuzza, V. (ed.), *Joint Degrees. The Italian Experience in the European Context*. Rome: Cimea, Fondazione RUI, April 2003.

Commission of the European Communities, *Communication from the Commission – European benchmarks in education and training: follow-up to the Lisbon European Council*. Brussels: Commission of European Communities, 20 November 2002.

Commission of the European Communities, *Communication from the Commission – Investing efficiently in education and training: an imperative for Europe*. Brussels: Commission of European Communities, 10 January 2003.

Commission of the European Communities, *Communication from the Commission - The role of the universities in the Europe of knowledge*. Brussels: Commission of European Communities, 05 February 2003.

The Danish Evaluation Institute. *Quality procedures in European Higher Education. An ENQA survey*. ENQA Occasional Papers 5. European Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education. Helsinki, 2003.

Ennafaa, R., *Les grandes tendances dans l'enseignement supérieure (1998-2001). Rapport sur les résultats de l'exploitation des réponses des Etats membres au questionnaire sur l'enseignement supérieure*. Paris: Unesco, 2003.

[EUA], *Graz Reader*. EUA Convention of European Higher Education Institutions. Strengthening the Role of Institutions. Graz, 29-31 May 2003.

The European Higher Education Area. Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education. [Bologna Declaration.] Convened in Bologna on the 19th of June 1999.

Gonzales, J., Wagenaar, R. (eds.), *Tuning educational Structures in Europe*. Final Report. Phase One. University of Deusto / University of Groningen. Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto, 2003.

Harmonisation of the architecture of the European higher education system. Joint declaration of four ministers in charge of higher education in Germany, France, Italy and United Kingdom on the occasion of the 800th anniversary of the University of Paris [*Sorbonne Declaration*]. Paris, Sorbonne, 25 May 1998.

Haug, G., Kirstein, J., Knudsen, I., *Trends in Learning Structures in Higher Education. Project report for the Bologna Conference on 18-19 June 1999. [Trends II Report]*. Kobenhaven: The Danish Rectors Conference, 1999.

Haug, G., Tauch, Ch., *Trends in Learning Structures in Higher Education (II) [Trends II Report]. Follow-up report prepared for the Salamanca and Prague Conferences of March / May 2001*. Finish National Board of Education; European Commission; Association of European Universities (CRE); European Training Foundation, 2001.

Message from Salamanca Convention of European higher education institutions. Shaping the European Higher education Area. Salamanca, 29-30 March 2001.

Persson, A., *Student Participation in the Governance of Higher Education in Europe*. A Council of Europe Survey. – In: Report 2003. Bologna Follow-up Seminar on Student Participation in Governance in Higher Education, Oslo, June 12-14, 2003. - Oslo: Ministry of Education and Research, 2003, pp. 1-50.

Reichert, S. and Tauch, Ch., *Trends in Learning Structures in European Higher Education III. Bologna four years after: Steps towards sustainable reform of higher education in Europe [Trends III Report]*. EUA Graz Convention, 29-31 May 2003. <http://eua.uni-graz.at/documents.html>

Tauch, Ch. and Rauhvargers, A., *Survey on Master Degrees and Joint Degrees in Europe*. Genève: EUA, September 2002.

Towards the European Higher Education Area. Communiqué of the meeting of European Ministers in charge of Higher Education [Prague Communiqué]. Prague, May 19th 2001.

Zgaga, P., *Bologna Process between Prague and Berlin. Report to the Ministers of Education of the signatory countries*. – “Realising the European Higher Education Area”. Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education. Berlin, 18.19 September 2003. <http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de>