



# **The 11th ESC**

## **Students' active participation in the Implementation of the Lisbon Strategy**

### **Workshops and Panels.**

at the 11<sup>th</sup> European Students Convention  
2006, March 10-14, Vienna

# Desired outcomes of the convention

ESIB wants to make sure that you will go home with a satisfied feeling. We have set a number of aims to be achieved at the end of the convention. We hope they will give you a clear picture on what we expect and make you reflect on your own wishes for the convention.

The general aim of the convention is that it provides better understanding of the Lisbon Strategy and the European Union as a political actor. We don't only want to inform the participants of the conference, but we will also motivate you to communicate the received information to your colleagues and members. Politically the general outcome of the convention will be a **statement** on the Education and Training 2010 programme, which will be sent to the Education Council taking place two days after the convention. Also, after the convention both ESIB and its members will have a political strategy towards the European Union and responsible ministers to make sure our voice is integrated into the Lisbon programme. We will find out on which points we can cooperate and on which points we need to stand on the barricades. The outcomes of the convention will be described in a *general report*.

The panels will be giving us political information on the strategy and will be used as input for the workshops. The first panel serves to *set the agenda*. The strategy will be presented by the European Commission and the current EU-President, Austria, will outline the priorities during the presidency. Two case studies of France and Slovenia will be given by the ones responsible for implementation of the Strategy.

The second panel will focus on a concrete outcome of the Lisbon Strategy and a very hot political issue at this moment: *tuition fees*. Several expert views will be given as well as a view from the European University Association who is internally discussing how fees can be implemented in the best way.

The third panel will be a panel of *stakeholders*. Cooperation must be the central point of our own political strategy towards the Strategy. We will hear the views from our partners and find out how they plan to cooperate with us.

The workshops will be providing concrete outcomes for both the participants and ESIB. The first one will be a **training** on the European Union structures, history and current affairs with education. The second one will serve as an input for a **compendium** ESIB is preparing on financing of higher education, will help developing a strategy against tuition fees and will update members on new financing models. The third workshop, on mobility should also be interesting for non-EU members as its aims are to update the participants on the new mobility programmes of the Union, such as TEMPUS. It should provide a basis for a **statement** on the new mobility programme. The fourth workshop, on quality assurance, will explain and discuss the uprising market for evaluation agencies under the Bologna and Lisbon processes. A **policy paper update** will be written for the next Board Meeting. The fifth and last one will serve as a tool to make a political strategy towards the European Union and the responsible ministries. It will help you to make **campaigns and lobby-strategies** to make sure student points are integrated into the Lisbon Strategy. More concrete aims of the workshops can be found in the individual workshop outlines. We hope you will have a great convention!

in the name of the ESC programme group,

Koen Geven, General Rapporteur of the ESC

all info on: [www.11european-students-convention.org](http://www.11european-students-convention.org)

# Content

- Desired outcomes of the convention ..... 2
- ESC 11 – Agenda..... 4
- Workshops ..... 7
  - Workshop 1 – The European Union as an institution..... 8
  - Workshop 2 – Financing Higher Education ..... 11
  - Workshop 3 – Mobility programmes – the young ones ..... 12
  - Workshop 4 – Quality Assurance – a Europe-wide market?..... 22
  - Workshop 5 – Cooperation of student unions with other partners and influencing the Lisbon process..... 23
- Panel Speakers ..... 24

# ESC 11 – Agenda

## Friday 10 March

- Arrivals day

## Saturday 11 March

9.30

- Welcome address Austrian Ministry for education - Mr Anton Dobart, to give the welcome address and present the government plans for Lisbon and higher education and presidency plans.
- Welcome address by the Chairperson of OeH
- Welcome address by the Chairperson of ESIB - Justin Fenech
- Conference working methods by the General Rapporteur – Koen Geven

10.30

- Coffee Break

10.45

- Panel – *All roads lead to Rome – which strategies to Lisbon?*
  - Chairperson – Angelika Striedinger (ESIB)
  - EU Commission – Jürgen Rienks
  - Austrian EU Presidency – Dr. Anton Dobart
  - Country perspective Slovenia – Ales Vacic
  - Country perspective France

12.45

- Lunch

13.45

- Working groups Session 1

15.15

- Coffee break

15.30

- Working groups Session 2

17.00

- Free time

18.30

- Dinner

## Sunday 12 March

9.30

- Working Groups Session 3

11.00

- Coffee Break

11.15

- Panel – *Financing Education – Is customer pay the only way?*
  - Chairperson – Maher Tekaya (ESIB)
  - BiH Ministry - Lamija Tamovic
  - ReKo (Austrian Rectors Conference) – Mag. Karin Riegler
  - CHEPS - Carlo Salerno
  - UK - Nicholas Barr
  - ESIB –Christine Scholz

13.00

- Lunch

14.00

- Working groups Session 4

15.30

- Coffee Break

16.00

- Working Groups Session 5

18.30

- Dinner

## Monday 13 March

9.30

- Working Groups Session 6

11.00

- Coffee Break

11.15

- *Stakeholder panel – Who cares? Who dares?*
  - Chairperson – Anita Liice (ESIB)
  - EUA – Leslie Wilson (invited)
  - UNICE - Dr. Christoph Anz
  - EI – Gaston de la Haye
  - OBESSU – Luca Scarapiello
  - ESIB – Marja-Liisa Alop
  - Eurashe – Stephan Delplace

13.00

- Lunch

14.00

- Plenary
  - Working Group reports
  - Final report and recommendations by the General Rapporteur

16.00

- Presentation of the statement to the ministers (closed session)
- Closing Remarks
  - ESIB Chairperson – Justin Fenech

18.30

- Dinner

### Tuesday 14 March

- Departures

# Workshops

Workshop 1 – The European Union as an institution

Anita Liice, Victor Vidilles, Michael Hörig

Workshop 2 – Financing Higher Education

Erik Evans, Maher Tekaya

Workshop 3 – Mobility programmes – the young ones

Christine Scholz, Sime Visic, Elena Gorschkov

Workshop 4 – Quality Assurance – a Europe-wide market?

Janja Komljenovic, Jon Ivar Thompson Eikeland, Colin Tück

Workshop 5 – Cooperation of student unions with other partners and influencing the Lisbon process

Angelika Striedinger, Marja Liisa Alop, Nina Gustaffson Aberg

# Workshop 1 – The European Union as an institution

## Workshop description

The European Union or the EU is an intergovernmental and supranational union of 25 European countries. Officially the EU has hardly any competences in the field of education. Still we feel that they steer a lot of the recent educational developments.

## Why is that?

ESIB does not only represent members from EU countries. EU policy also affects non-EU members. Understanding how the EU works is relevant for all.

Do you know the difference between the role of the parliament, commission or council? Why is the Union built upon three pillars? Where can students influence the policy making process? What does the court of justice say? How does an open method of cooperation work?

Are you good in geography, but still hardly have a clue why there's such a thing as a Lisbon or Bologna process? What happened in Maastricht 1992?

*It is hard to feel individually responsible with respect to the invisible processes of a huge and distant government.*

*/John W. Gardner/*

*Knowledge will forever govern ignorance; and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives.*

*/James Madison/*

For full realization how to deal with the new trends and decisions, it's important to understand the one, who initiates them. The workshop "EU as an institution" will be training on the EU, it's history, structure and competencies for influencing higher education. This will be done in a mixture of lectures and participatory workshops. Get to know the EU with ESIB, you'll need it back home.

## About the European Commission - <http://europa.eu.int/>

The Commission is the institution that **promotes the general interests of the Union** and **ensures the application of European treaties**. It is the driving force within the EU's institutional system. It **proposes legislation** and **manages action programmes**. It is **responsible for implementing the decisions made by the Parliament and the Council**. Last but not least, the Commission **executes the budget**.

Currently, there are **25 Commissioners**, one **for each member state** of the European Union (EU). Most of them have held political positions in their countries of origin, and many have been government ministers, but as members of the Commission they are **committed to acting in the interests of the Union as a whole and not taking instructions from national governments**.

The day-to-day work of the Commission is done by its **administrative officials**, experts, translators, interpreters and secretarial staff. There are approximately 24,000 of these European civil servants. This may sound a lot, but in fact it is fewer than the number of staff employed by most medium-sized city councils in Europe.

A new Commission is appointed every **five years**, in accordance with the following procedure:

- The member state governments agree together on who to designate as the new Commission President; the proposed candidate is submitted for approval by the European Parliament.

- The member state governments, after discussions with the Commission President-designate, choose the other Commission members and distribute portfolios.
- The Parliament then interviews each of the Commissioners separately and gives its opinion on the entire 'College'. If approved, the new Commission can officially start work.

The present Commission's term started on 22 November 2004. Its President is **José Manuel Barroso**.

The Commission remains **politically answerable to the Parliament**, which has the power to dismiss it by adopting a **motion of censure**.

In order to facilitate the decision in an enlarged Europe, the **draft Constitution** proposes that, **from 2014 onwards**, the College will be composed of:

- The President of the Commission
- The Minister of Foreign Affairs, who will have the title of Vice-President

**A number of Commissioners equivalent to two-thirds of the number of member states**, selected on the basis of a system of equal rotation between the member states. In practice, this means that in a EU made up of 27 member states, there would be 18 Commissioners.

About the European Parliament - <http://www.europarl.eu.int/>

The European Parliament is the institution in which the **people in the member states are represented**. Parliamentary **elections are held every five years**, and every EU citizen who is registered as a voter is entitled to vote. So the Parliament reflects the democratic will of the Union's **450 million citizens**, and it represents their interests in discussions with the other EU institutions.

The members of the European Parliament (MEPs) sit not in national blocks but in **Europe-wide political groups** that bring together all the main political parties operating in the EU member states. In principle, the European Parliament acts on a majority of the votes cast. In some cases however, decisions are taken by a majority of its component members (e.g. accession to the Union), which means that 367 votes are necessary in a Parliament of 732 members, as is the case for the current Parliament.

The Parliament has three main roles:

- It shares the **power to legislate** with the Council. The fact that it is a directly elected body helps guarantee the democratic legitimacy of European law.
- It exercises **democratic supervision** over all EU institutions, and in particular the Commission. It has the right to censure the Commission as a whole, which leads to the resignation of all Commissioners.
- It shares **authority over the EU budget** with the Council and can therefore influence EU spending.
- The draft Constitution strengthens the European Parliament as:

There is an increase in the number of decisions taken using the co-decision procedure, where the Parliament makes joint decisions with the Council on a proposal made by the European Commission.

The Parliament has as much power as the Council to decide the European budget.

It elects the President of the Commission, who will be proposed by the European Council based on the results of the European elections.

About the Council of the European Union - <http://ue.eu.int/>

The Council is the institution in which **the governments of the member states are represented**. It is made up of **one representative** appointed by each member state **at ministerial level**. The Council meets in **different**

**configurations** depending on the subject being examined (e.g. the Ministers for Agriculture participate at the Council which has to take decisions under the Common Agricultural Policy).

At present, the Presidency of the Council is held for six months by each member state, on a rotational basis.

The Council exercises legislative and budgetary functions, jointly with the European Parliament. It often acts by a **qualified majority** on Commission proposals, but in certain areas, e.g. taxation, unanimity remains the rule.

The qualified majority is defined by the treaties. Different countries have a different number of votes and since **1 November 2004**, a proposal can be approved by a qualified majority if the following two conditions are met:

**A majority of member states** approves, in some cases a two-thirds majority;

**A minimum of 232 votes** is cast in favour of the proposal, i.e. 72.3% of the total.

Germany, France, Italy, United Kingdom	29
Spain, Poland	27
Netherlands	13
Belgium, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Portugal	12
Austria, Sweden	10
Denmark, Ireland, Lithuania, Slovakia, Finland	7
Cyprus, Estonia, Latvia, Luxembourg, Slovenia	4
Malta	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>321</b>

The Constitution proposes a new definition of qualified majority, which would be reached if:

It represents at least 55% of member states; it comprises at least 65% of the population of the EU.

Four member states can constitute a blocking minority.

## Workshop 2 – Financing Higher Education

In recent years the number of students in every European country has increased dramatically and the increase seems only to continue and even accelerate. Traditionally, education has been funded publicly. But the soaring number of students has not been matched with an equal increase in funding for HE. Governments are increasingly depending on other sources of finances to pay the cost of education and research in their countries. The Lisbon agenda states that a large increase is needed for funding of HE, but that the vast majority of this should come from private sources. The workshop will go deeper into this matter and analyse some of the country reports.

Tuition fees are only one of several ways of obtaining alternate funds. The workshop will deal with tuition fees from an institutional perspective. What do tuition fees actually mean for the institutions? How are these money spent within HEIs? Do they really give us a better education? Do the HEI run any risks by charging tuition fees? If so, what?

There is also the rather new concept in financing of HE called vouchers. This usually means that the student is given a set sum of fictional money which she then is free to spend on fictional tuition fees. Is this a sustainable way of ensuring funds for HE or is it simply a smoke screen to help sneak in more tuition fees while confusing and silencing the opposition? What are the implications of such a system and how can and should it be enforced.

A HE system has several aspects that need funding. There are many types of personnel and infrastructure. Students as a group more and more find ourselves fighting to be prioritized. Why are campuses getting better and better with larger buildings and nicer rose bushes while student aid and other social measures are lagging further and further behind? Students are also losing this fight against high prestige research programmes. Why is it so and what can we do about it?

## Workshop 3 – Mobility programmes – the young ones

One of the key elements for Europe to become the “most competitive knowledge based economy with more and better jobs and more social cohesion” in the framework of the Lisbon Process is to mobilize mobility of students and researchers within and to Europe.

The issue of student mobility and overcoming obstacles to mobility has been an issue of continuous relevance to all ESIB members. In this workshop we will look on this issue from a new and dual perspective:

How to promote student mobility in Europe, which is not on the expense of Non-European countries

Reflect on concrete new policy developments in this area - the new EU action programme for lifelong learning 2007 – 2013

For this reason we will look in the workshop on the new EU mobility programmes, on programmes and concepts that might promote balanced mobility (the CEEPUS programme and the ESIB concept of a European mobility fund) and the concept of brain drain or brain mobility.

The workshop will serve as an information source for the participants on the new EU mobility programmes. At the same time it will serve as input for ESIB to generate a student response on them. Furthermore we will follow-up on the debates that have taken place in ESIB seminars on the European mobility fund. We will also try to wrap up former debates on the issue of brain drain. In the latter case we are going to look at concrete measures for student unions or NGOs as well as governments and other authorities in both sending and receiving countries. We will try to identify measures taken at the moment, analyze their effectiveness and try to develop measures ourselves. So this will not be theoretical workshop, but we will focus on impacts in practise!

Finally we will bring the discussions in the different areas outlined above – the new EU mobility programmes, programmes and concepts for the promotion of balanced mobility and measures to tackle brain drain – and look at possibilities to combine them. In consequence this means that we are aiming for a European approach of mobility programmes, that are taking into consideration imbalances in mobility and are actively and effectively addressing those imbalances.

The information provided below is giving you basic information as well as links for further reading on the different issues we are going to deal with in the workshop.

We are looking forward to have you in our workshop!

Christine, Sime and Elena

### 1. Information on student mobility and the new EU mobility programmes

The new EU programmes in the field of mobility – the action programme for lifelong learning 2007-2013 - are a follow-up on the currently existing different sectorial mobility programmes of the EU. Those are the programmes on school education (Comenius), higher education (Erasmus), vocational training (Leonardo da Vinci) and adult education (Grundtvig), and is completed by transversal measures and an additional Jean Monnet programme focusing on European integration. The proposed budget is €13.62 billion for the total period 2007-2013.

The Commission adopted the proposal for the new programme on July 14 2004. Their proposal and an ex ante impact assessment of the proposed measures can be found here:

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/newprog/index\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/newprog/index_en.html)

Information on the current mobility programmes and ESIB opinion on them can be found here:

<http://www.esib.org/issues/programmes.php>

ESIB opinion on the issue of mobility in general is available here:

<http://www.esib.org/issues/mobility.php>

### 1.1. Information on CEEPUS

1. CEEPUS: What's in a name? CEEPUS is an acronym for "Central European Exchange Program for University Studies".

2. Who is a member? Currently there are 12 member countries:

Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Poland, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, the Slovak Republic, and Slovenia.

3. What is the legal basis?

The legal basis for CEEPUS is an international Agreement signed by the member states and is open for accession.

4. What is the organizational structure?

CEEPUS is based on lean management. The highest ranking decision making CEEPUS body is the Joint Committee of Ministers that meets once a year and takes all strategic decisions. Coordination, evaluation, program development and advertizing are the main tasks of the Central CEEPUS Office (consisting of only two persons). Each country has a National CEEPUS Office in charge of national implementation. In order to avoid setting up new administrative bodies, the National CEEPUS Offices are integrated into already existing structures, usually national agencies for EU programs.

5. What about finances?

With CEEPUS, there is no transfer of funds: There is an internal currency of "1 scholarship month" instead. Each country pays its INCOMING students and teachers and has to pledge at least 100 scholarship months per academic year. The CEEPUS agreement also specifies that these grants be comprehensive grants linked to the local cost of living. So far, experience has shown that this system works very well.

6. Which forms of cooperation are supported?

The main activity of CEEPUS are university networks operating joint programs ideally leading to joint degrees. CEEPUS covers mobility grants for students and teachers in this framework.

7. CEEPUS: what are its main objectives?

The main objectives of CEEPUS are to

contribute to building Europe and the European Higher Education Area

use regional academic mobility as a strategic tool to implement Bologna objectives

enable cooperation with SEE and the Ukraine

8. Further Information on CEEPUS:

<http://www.ceepus.info/>

### 1.2. ESIB discussion on a European Mobility Fund

Luxembourg Student Declaration:

„Removing all the remaining obstacles to student mobility

One of the main aims of the Bologna Process is to enhance student mobility. However, even if some structural changes have been made in order to remove obstacles to student mobility, many of them still remain.

We believe that the time is now ripe to tackle also one of the most serious obstacles: lack of financing of mobility.

We want mobility to be accessible to all students, without any discrimination. In the EHEA, student mobility must become a right, not remain a privilege.

This question grows in importance with the further integration of the continent and with the raise in the number and diversity of participating countries in the Bologna Process. Mobility is seen by the students as being reserved to only the best or the most financially well-off.

We therefore call upon the Ministers that will meet in Bergen to take the following actions:

To establish of a European mobility fund. That way, financial obstacles to mobility would be considered and concrete action could be proposed to the next Ministerial Conference.

To ease or abolish the conditions for obtaining visa and residence permits for mobile students since these still limit mobility of students between the various countries of the EHEA.

To establish comparable data on the social and economic situation of students in participating countries.“

Final Report of the 9<sup>th</sup> European Students Convention, Luxembourg, March 17<sup>th</sup> – 21<sup>st</sup> 2005:

“Portability of Grants and Loans

WG5 discussed at length the *Home Country vs. Host Country Principles* and their relevance in the debate on the importance of investment in higher education. This led to agreement on a proposal for a dual system, in which both the home and host countries are included in student mobility.

This approach is indeed very relevant in light of the recent judgement of the European Court of Justice [*The Queen (on the application of Dany Bidar) v London Borough of Ealing, Secretary of State for Education and Skills*, decided on 15<sup>th</sup> March 2005] ruled that the host country principle is applicable within the EU, so that EU students, providing certain requisites are fulfilled, are eligible for the support offered to home students in the host country.

The participants of WG5 agreed that in order to safeguard mobility there has to be a structure at an international level that ensures the portability of funds for student support. This is particularly because countries have a different capacity and approach to the portability of such funds. The discussion on a European Mobility Fund should take place on three levels:

on the student level: those who want to go abroad need financial assistance/compensation;

on the institutional level: institutions which receive mobile students need compensation for the additional students;

on the level of provision of services for mobile students: should be according to living standards of countries.

WG5 also identified short and long term solutions to the funding problems related to mobility:

→ A *short term solution* would be based on the *home country* principle, taking the following different possibilities into account:

The extension of the Socrates Programme to EHEA & vertical mobility - trying to compensate for the differences in living costs;

The CEEPES system - which compensates higher education institutions for a limited number of mobile students;

The setting up of a central agency or legal framework to compensate for costs, if there are no limits to mobility;

A structural fund for capacity building to prevent brain drain in the future (either funded by EU or as a solidarity fund set up by the richer EHEA countries).

→ A *long term solution* would be based on the *host country principle* with an ideal student support system in all the countries in the EHEA and a mobility fund compensating travel costs of students, and the higher expenses incurred by the receiving higher education institutions due to the unbalance of mobility (for reasons of climate, language, etc.)”

## 2. Information on the issue of Brain mobility

The brain drain is one of the most pressing issues that all European countries are currently facing. All countries whether they are predominantly brain gainers such as the UK or brain senders such as Serbia have an interest in creating policy so that sending countries manage the flows and gaining countries do not act as crass brain predators. With this in mind we look forward to seeing you in the workshop.

**Brain drain, brain gain, how to heal the pain**

**Paper by:** James Cemmell (former ESIB CoCo) and Almira Zejnagic (former International officer of SUS)

### **ESIB and the brain drain**

In recent years ESIB and its constituent members have become more concerned about the flows of students and graduates from, to and within Europe. This issue is related to numerous projects that ESIB is involved in from commodification and mobility to Bologna as well as being an area of interest in its own right.

This workshop will scope the attitudes, preconceptions and views of the participants on the brain drain. Activities will be designed to simulate the interests of the actors involved in the brain drain debate with the aim of the session to inform ESIB and member unions for possibly future policy on this increasingly visible topic.

### **What is the brain drain?**

The brain drain is a phenomena that has been defined as:

a one-way movement of highly skilled people from developing countries to the developed countries that only benefits the industrialised (host) countries (Gaillard and Gaillard,1997).

Other definitions have used to the term to refer to the negative effects of brain circulation that deprive countries of doctors, academics, skilled labour and to flows of students.

### **Why is it important?**

On the economic front: For a knowledge based economy to work, knowledge workers are required to be able to generate, adapt and use technologies from around the world. Also important sources of taxation revenue are lost and further funds are required to entice foreign workers into the country.

On the social front: Without doctors and teachers, a country has obvious problems. A more insidious effect is due to the loss of the educated and the resultant problems that this has for empowered citizens to contribute to national development. This issue is related to the role that higher education and the resultant students and graduates play in providing a considered and empowered vision for the country. One problem that development workers have pointed to in Africa is a lack of social science institutions to develop indigenous strategies to solve developmental problems.

On the cultural front: As much as 90% of utilised knowledge is produced in foreign countries. To make this knowledge useful for domestic purposes (for example developing a national economic plan, making a pesticide appropriate for the local environment) local knowledge workers are required that have an intimate knowledge of the local situation as well as the capacity to utilise university produced knowledge.

What can be done?

A range of solutions have been discussed in what is now an extensive literature relating to the brain drain. The international labour organisation (ILO) have an extensive set of resources on their website with a chronology of relevant links (<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/migrant/publ/imp-list.htm>).

Reader of the 3<sup>rd</sup> European Students Convention, Belgium, 2001

## **3. 3rd Esc Workshop 1: Mobility And Competition - A Level Playing Field**

Another very valuable introduction into the topic of brain drain is the Workshop outline on „Mobility and Competition – A level playing field“ at the 3rd European Students Convention in Belgium, which was written by Lars Magnus Bergh and Birgit Lao (former Bologna Process Committee)

### **1.1. BACKGROUND**

Internationalisation has always been part of the higher education institutions' activities both within research and increasingly also within education. It is argued that internationalisation should be considered as an integral part of higher education planning, implementation and evaluation. Europeanisation of higher education is a new dimension that has been added as a result of EU membership.

There is a growing incentive to have an international dimension included in higher education programmes, partly because of labour market stipulations to this effect and partly because social developments in general are heading towards a multicultural and more globally minded society. Finally, the labour market is becoming more

and more internationally based. For example if Danish education institutions are to retain their competitiveness in relation to foreign institutions, they must uphold and continually develop the quality of programmes available, with regard to both content and academic and international standards. We acknowledge today that the quality can only be upheld and developed if students and researchers in one country seek to use the experiences of other countries.

Higher education institutions are already taking an active part in the internationalisation process, in forms including partnership of the EU education and research programmes, bilateral co-operation agreements and other kinds of collaboration between university networks etc. The international dimension also makes its mark on domestic environments through foreign visiting professors, joint teaching projects, visiting students and so on.

However, internationalisation efforts have reached such proportions that the individual institutions are now being forced to take a stance on goals and priorities. This also calls for clarification of the overriding national goals as well as the methods for achieving these goals, including discussion of the existing distribution of resources and assignments in relation to the various players involved in internationalisation.

We can argue about the positive and negative aspects but regardless of that there is still a growing importance of internationalisation in higher education policy. There are two widely recognised arguments which have so far served as main driving forces for internationalisation.

Academic and professional requirements for graduates increasingly reflect the demands of the globalisation of societies, economy and labour markets and thus higher education must provide an adequate preparation for that. These requirements include not only academic and professional knowledge, but also multi-lingualism, and social and intercultural skills and attitudes.

The level of specialisation in research and the size of the investments that are indispensable to certain fields of research and development require collaborative efforts and intensive international co-operation.

Additionally, the following two developments are increasingly influencing the international dimension of higher education:

The recruitment of foreign students has become a significant factor for institutional income and of national economic interest.

The use of new information and communication technologies in the delivery of education and the involvement of private actors in this mean that national borders and the role of national governments in education become blurred.

A final argument why higher education can no longer be viewed in a strictly national context is the eroding relationship between the nation state and education systems.

## **1.2. INTRODUCTION**

The labour market for professional skilled personnel is becoming increasingly global, both in terms of the supply of and the demand for skilled labour. Overseas students, for instance, are forming more and more a greater proportion of university students in most industrialised countries, and international mobility schemes for researchers are available at most universities.

It has shown that different push and pull factors influence the volume, the frequency, the length, and the direction of mobility in the various channels. Today, countries, regions, cities, universities, research centres and firms all around the world are competing to maintain their attraction for highly skilled personnel in the various professional areas.

The ability of some countries, regions and cities to attract highly talented personnel from all over the world seems to be enormous and governments are increasingly under pressure to react to these developments. Every year, actors in a few locations around the world recruit many highly talented managers, scientists and engineers. Whereas these trends can have mixed effects on developing countries, it is believed that they evoke largely negative effects on knowledgebased advanced economies like those of Europe.

The OECD paper (1998) "Science and Technology Labour Markets: Mobility and Flexibility" indicates that there are two main types of mobility: external and internal mobility. The first can be divided into geographic mobility (regional, national and international) and into mobility from labour turnover (i.e. changes in individuals among jobs, regardless of whether the jobs are new or existing). Internal mobility refers to occupational changes (i.e. moving across occupational categories) and/or movement within the firm (e.g. between divisions, establishments). In the case of the labour market for science and technology personnel, the most relevant types of internal and external mobility concern:

movement from the educational system to the labour market;

mobility within the public research sector (e.g. universities, laboratories, public research institutes) and between public research and industry;

mobility of S&T personnel within industry and;

international mobility which sheds light on the temporary and permanent migration of science and technology personnel (i.e. “brain gain” and “brain drain” issues).

### 1.3. THE TERMINOLOGY

#### **Brain drain**

There are many definitions, some of the most used ones:

*Gaillard and Gaillard, 1997*: one-way movement of highly skilled people from developing countries to the developed countries that only benefits the industrialised (host) countries.

Encyclopaedia Britannica: departure of educated or professional people from one country, economic sector, or field for another usually for better pay or living conditions.

UNESCO definition: an abnormal form of scientific exchange between countries, characterised by a one-way flow in favour of the most highly developed countries.

In conclusion brain drain can be defined as any loss of skills needed for economic growth and development in any country.

**Brain exchange** implies a two-way flow of expertise between a sending country and receiving country. It is a temporary phenomenon where brain loss is compensated by corresponding brain gain. Where the net flow is heavily biased in one direction, the terms “brain gain” or “brain drain” is used.

**Brain waste** describes the waste of skills that occurs when highly skilled workers migrate into forms of employment not requiring the application of skills and experience applied in the former job (*OECD*).

**Brain circulation** refers to the cycle of moving abroad to study, then taking a job abroad, and later returning home to take advantage of a good opportunity. That form of mobility is often perceived as a positive mobility that provides a channel for knowledge transfer.

**Reverse brain drain** refers to the phenomenon of those who study toward advanced degrees and work in their professions in the same country for a time, but ultimately return to their home countries permanently, taking an important position in academe or in research institutions.

Main characteristics of brain drain:

There are numerous flows of skilled and trained persons from developing to developed countries;

They are characterised by large flows from a comparatively small number of developed countries and by small flows from a larger number of developing countries;

In these flows engineers, medical personnel and scientists usually tend to predominate;

The above flows have grown with increasing rapidity in recent years;

The higher the level of skill/training, the greater the susceptibility to migration tends to be.

### 1.4. IMPORT OF STUDENTS

Many stakeholders are active in the mobility area: students, professors, companies, authorities and politicians. Each of them have their own interest in relation to mobility. It is obvious that countries need students, because the financial situation is depending on them. Countries also have to fulfill industrial demand for an educated work force and ensure recruitment of PhD students and future researchers.

The utilisation of human resources abroad has been one of the most effective ways to attract top-ranked student and researches from abroad, either with permanent or temporary appointments. Employers also have a strong influence on the number of visas issued.

Students are the main sources of workforce supply to the labour market and to local and global knowledge pools. They are mostly affected by governmental, intergovernmental, and inter-institutional policies. A 1998 survey of European graduates, conducted by the Swedish human resources consultancy Universum, found that 82% of European students state that they are interested in an international career and 88% are interested in working and living abroad for at least one year. Students today show an increasing recognition of the global workplace.

Scandinavian countries are among the countries in the world that are the most dedicated to developing aid. Different kinds of co-operation have been set up in order to export knowledge to developing countries. The activities are for example: exchange of researchers and teachers, postgraduate training of developing country researchers, upgrading of laboratories etc.

Host countries are often the main beneficiaries of these inflows as stay rates are often quite high. There is growing evidence that post-graduate students are most influenced by the quality of the organisations they choose to enrol with, and equally important, by the after training opportunities that exist in the host country.

It is worth noting that there are other forms of human capital flows across borders, which are not considered to be part of the brain drain. Examples of this phenomenon are professors, who delivers a lecture abroad or an engineer who works on a foreign construction site. On the other hand, individuals who study abroad and return to their home countries also transfer human capital across borders, which is not reflected in international balance of payments statistics. Foreign study is often discussed in the context of the brain drain but strictly speaking it is not part of the basic phenomenon, either conceptually or in terms of public policy concerns.

### **1.5. UNIVERSITY STRATEGIES**

International contacts between scientists from different countries are a normal part of scientific life and an old norm among scientists. The movements of scientists are most affected by bottom-up developments in academia and science, as these are instrumental in the diffusion of scientific ideas.

The survival of a university is among other things depending on the university's ability to produce graduates with a good standing in a competitive job market as well as a wide interaction with industry and research centres outside the university.

Scientists today are attracted towards expertise and the institutions that produce and vouch for expertise. Scientists put their trust in organisations that are highly reputed for excellence, quality, and originality. Therefore, "attraction" is dependent on the possession of certain qualities that are not available in all organisations, and which are often difficult to assess from the outside. Thus a lot of judgement from outside depends on the prestige and reputation an institution enjoys.

### **1.6. STUDENT MOBILITY PROBLEMS**

The magnitude of the brain drain has always been difficult to assess, due to the lack of comparable statistics across different countries.

From the start of student mobility activities, it has been possible to ascertain that students largely follow the general trend of seeking destinations where the language of teaching is English.

A crucial proviso for increased student mobility in the form of organised student exchanges as well as greater individual mobility is the creation of transparent and simple credit transfer procedures for study periods and recognition of entire courses of study. Unlike the other Nordic and European countries, Denmark has no joint credit system. Amongst other things, this has placed Danish students wishing to obtain credits abroad at a disadvantage, since in some cases they are hard put to substantiate the extent of individual study periods. For short-duration study periods in particular, transferring credits is difficult if the study programmes involved are not fully modularised, i.e. divided into units each completed with an examination after one term. The SOCRATES programme takes the use of ECTS as a criterion for success, and a large number of institutions have introduced or are in the process of introducing the ECTS system to varying degrees. Since the system requires extensive modularization of study programmes, the system cannot be introduced in all academic fields with equal ease. There appears to be a need for increased cooperation on credit transfer systems and experience in using the ECTS system. Another problem is the increasing demand from foreign quarters for projects within the domains of "joint degrees" and "double degrees". Foreign students greatly appreciate being awarded a degree by the host institution (the Danish institution) in addition to that of the home institution.

The great increase in activities, especially under European mobility programmes, has not been followed up by a commensurate increase in subsidies. In particular, grants for networking, co-ordination, academic contacts and various forms of curricular co-operation have fallen markedly. In the medium term, student scholarship funds are also likely to fall so far behind activities, in terms of their size, that a large proportion of students will have to be referred to alternative sources of funding.

The percentage of students returning after finishing their studies abroad is quickly falling. It is the top problem for the Eastern European countries. These problems are related mainly to factors regarding recognition of credentials and lack of labour market information. Many students feel like that demand for their professional skills in the West is stronger. The reasons are obvious: uncertain professional prospects in East, the lack of domestic capacity in social sciences and education in generally, weak ties between Eastern and Western research

centres, and poor integration of Eastern economic tradition into the international academic community. The shortage is particularly noticeable in public policy, but it also exists in business and in academia, where future leaders are trained.

### **1.7. MIGRATION**

The main crux of the matter is that emigrants as they enter developed countries are often in the most productive phase of his professional life and by the time they returns back, if they do, they are often spent force with wrong ideas not suited even for their native underdeveloped countries.

Motives for migration generally - and of students and highly skilled workers in particular - are complex. However, the following considerations dominate the decision to migrate by persons with high levels of training: prospects for real income, professional opportunities, working conditions, and sociological – cultural aspects of life. The migrant considers each of these four elements by comparing conditions between the native land and foreign countries. Personal tastes and circumstances as well as costs of transaction and travel enter individuals' decisions to migrate.

The migratory trends are stimulated both by the character of national educational systems by lack and inadequate planning for the training of students from developing countries, in developed states as well as the proper utilisation of their-skills in their home country.

How does the migration of highly skilled workers affect the developing world – is it yet another gap in the growing wedge between have and have-not nations? Is there a contradiction between the immigration policies in which the developing world is actively seeking skilled people and foreign aid practices through which they send money and other assistance, such as educators, to deal with the problems they effectively have helped create?

### **1.8. POLITICS**

When the best of professional manpower leave their home country and settle in a more developed one, it is a political phenomenon, but it only rarely occurs that the motives are exclusively political. It involves peculiar contradiction; it simultaneously indicates the lack of production and over production of professional manpower on the drained country. In this sense, brain drain is a symptomatic phenomenon, but at the same time it is expressive of a fundamental difficulty. To some extent it has an objective basis, as the attraction of a more developed country compared with those of the less developed ones has always existed in the course of history. The net effect of this is that the development of science and technology has been accelerated in the developed countries and has been slowed down in the drained countries.

Governmental policies or industrial lobbies' policies might also play a role in influencing the incentives to stay or move abroad, such as by instigating incentives for foreign skills to flow in or remain in the country in certain fields. Governments' policies can make certain locations attractive for individuals by for instance providing tax incentives, superior research infrastructures, and preferred wages.

The nature and structure of National Innovation Systems (NIS) play an important role in shaping the inflows and outflows of highly skilled persons. For instance, countries whose NIS revolves around universities will attract primarily academics from abroad, as universities will be the place where cutting edge national activities in science and technology are happening.

### **1.9. ECONOMIC ASPECT**

The economic aspect of brain drain cannot be divorced from the political aspect. First of all, it should be emphasised that it is in contradiction with the great international economic and political objective, namely the narrowing of the gap between the developed and the under developed countries. It expresses at the same time the complexity and the inter-dependence of different societies, it derives from disproportionate economic, technological and scientific development of the developed and the developing countries, entailing contradiction in the training of professional manpower and ability to satisfy the several demands for this group. It is characteristic of brain drain that the more underdeveloped a country is economically, the more it loses by brain drain while only developed countries profit from the process. It occurs through a complicated interplay of direct an] indirect economic 'push' and 'pull' factors. It is stimulated by the lack of an educational system as well as the absence of a manpower policy in most of the under developed countries, these deficiencies normally hindering the really efficient use of those qualified as well as those having talent. As against this, there are higher living standards and better research and working opportunities of the more developed country, which provides thousands of possibilities for developing human potential. In addition to these objective economic factors brain drain is also stimulated by the actually realised intention of the developed countries to acquire intellectual capital free, and quick as possible.

Low salaries and lack of career advancement opportunities are the primary reasons why young scholars are not entering academic professions in Central- Eastern Europe. Instead, scholars are choosing high-paying corporate careers or opportunities in the West. This leaves the region with few new lecturers and little or no support for students forced to adapt to dramatic changes in their lives and futures.

#### **1.10. CHALLENGES**

There is a high need to provide professional, financial and organizational incentives that will encourage postgraduate students studying abroad to return, despite the country's social and economic instability. Proper compensation and a high-quality research environment are the most important incentives. How to achieve all that?

Policymakers need the capacity to think independently and critically, analyze the consequences of high educational reform programs, and understand the strengths and limitations of foreign advice and the theories underpinning it. The need to build environments that can generate such understanding is even more critical in the later stages of transition.

Can some results be obtained in a relatively short time? Which and how?

What are the institutional gaps we are talking about?

What kind of efforts should be made to stimulate an intellectual environment?

How to attract people from abroad?

How to retain quality in brain drain consequences?

How to ensure high standard research and policy making?

What is the role of institutions in capacity building?

How can the financial system (including money from the government) be outlined in order to permit every university to plan for a longer term than today?

Is virtual mobility an answer to the brain drain?

What are the instruments to encourage the individual scholars to return?

#### **1.11. CONCLUSION**

The host country is not always the main, or the sole, beneficiary of the movement of students. The concept of "brains circulation", which refers to the cycle of moving abroad to study, then taking a job there, and later returning home to take advantage of a good opportunity, increases knowledge transfer to the home country. It is the sort of mobility that governments often have in mind when supporting their students in going abroad. Yet when the outflows of students are permanent and are not replaced by equal inflows from other countries, then a case of brain drain occurs and the source country is largely perceived to be on the losing side. This remains largely true unless the host country is benefiting from its émigrés by maintaining contacts with them and setting up relations with them, as is the case with students.

Immigration legislation remains the first and utmost important legislation area where human mobility is concerned. Countries that have designated special legislation to allow highly skilled immigrants to take jobs in their local job markets stand better chances of benefiting from a growing international pool of high caliber human resources.

Higher education is the major backdoor for international mobility; however, internationalizing higher education and training should not only mean preparing local students to work overseas, but also foreign students to work in local labour markets.

Mobility programmes should expand to provide mobility opportunities for students and young researchers to go where they think it is best for them to go. This secures a "bottom-up" driven mobility that is driven by inter-institutions collaborations and inter-personal contacts. In other words mobility programmes should be qualitative oriented rather than geographically oriented. Shifting quantities from one direction to another might not be the right thing to do. The important thing is to maintain a two-way flow of talent. For instance, European Commission mobility programmes could be designed to include two stages of mobility, where the first destination could be anywhere in the world, but the second and final destination has to be in an EU member country.

## Recommended Resources

Read for sure

Internationalization of Higher Education in Denmark - A Debate Outline by The Danish Rectors' Conference  
<http://www.rks.dk/int.samarb/int.debate.htm>

Highly Skilled Globetrotters: The International Migration of Human Capital by Sami Mahroum, Institute for Prospective Technological Studies

Joint Research Center of the European Commission, Seville  
<http://www.oecd.org/dsti/sti/sti/inte/prod/Mahroum.pdf>

Europe and the Challenge of the Brain Drain by Sami Mahroum, Institute for Prospective Technological Studies  
<http://www.jrc.es/pages/iptsreport/vol29/english/SAT1E296.htm>

Read to know some more:

Centre for Educational Research [http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/CER/admit\\_synthesis.htm](http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/CER/admit_synthesis.htm)

Scientific Diasporas: A New Approach to the Brain Drain by Jean-Baptiste Meyer and Mercy Brown  
<http://www.unesco.org/most/meyer.htm>

Study of Concepts and Causes of Brain Drain - AUN Report  
<http://shikshanic.nic.in/cd50years/z/8T/H3/8TH30101.htm>

Just for fun

Reversing the Brain Drain in Transition Economies by Erik Berglöf (SITE and RECEP)  
<http://www.worldbank.org/html/prddr/trans/May-Aug2000/pgs29-31.htm>

## Workshop 4 – Quality Assurance – a Europe-wide market?

### Background:

Quality Assurance has become a cornerstone of European debates on higher education. Both in the Lisbon Strategy of the European Union and within the Bologna Process it plays a central role. Besides the official structures also networks on European level emerged which tackle the issue of Quality Assurance, for instance the European Consortium for Accreditation (ECA).

Within the context of the Bologna Process, European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance were adopted by European ministers of education in 2005. These were prepared by EUA, EURASHE, ENQA and ESIB (the E4 group) in the two preceding years. These contain a framework for procedures and scopes of Internal QA, External QA and the work of QA Agencies. Besides that, the guidelines propose an European Register of QA Agencies. The Register is to list all Quality Assurance Agencies which comply with the European Standards and Guidelines. The compliance is to be checked by reviews carried out on national level. A European Register Committee, consisting of representatives from ESIB, EUA, EURASHE and ENQA shall decide upon inclusion of agencies in the register.

The European Union as well made the European Register an objective of its work: The European Parliament approved – after certain negotiations and amendments – an European Commission proposal for a Council and Parliament Recommendation on Quality Assurance. The proposal comprises a proposal for a European Register for Quality Assurance based on national review, analogous to the proposal in the Bologna context.

The main aims of European co-operation and joint actions in the field of Quality Assurance can be described as follows: Enhancing the quality of Higher Education throughout Europe, increasing the transparency and comparability of Quality Assurance procedures, creating mutual recognition of Quality Assurance decisions as well as degrees, and easing mobility of students by improved recognition and transparency. But, besides this academically motivated aims, it is obvious that External Quality Assurance is (potentially) a quite important market. In a deregulated system, with institutions choosing freely an agency for External Quality Assurance, sums of about 20.000€ per reviewed programme are likely, and different agencies would be competing for these money.

### Aims:

Besides providing a brief introduction to the proposals for a European Register and its motivations, the workshop aims to explore the topic of Quality Assurance being seen as a market. It will be discussed if there is the possibility of (external) Quality Assurance being regarded as a service, which is traded on a European- or even world-wide market: Quality Assurance Agencies would be acting as service providers, whereas Higher Education Institutions would act as their customers. It shall be explored if this would be in contradiction to the aim of increasing the quality of Higher Education in Europe. It will be explored which approaches between an entire free market and an entirely state-regulated system exist or are considerable. We will also tackle QA area that can be set up without market based approach. Which one is better and why, what are the consequences for each approach.

Last but not least it will be explored whether the proposals for an European Register could encourage the shift to a market-based Quality Assurance system and how these proposals are to be valued regarding this aspect.

## **Workshop 5 – Cooperation of student unions with other partners and influencing the Lisbon process**

### The issue

The past years made it more and more obvious that the Lisbon Strategy has a direct impact on the role and provision of higher education. While the direction for educational reforms is drawn on the European level and translated into concrete measures and benchmarks, the national education ministries are in charge of implementing the Strategy in their education systems.

In this process, the involvement of students is less than sufficient, both on the European level as well as in the national policy making. Apart from this lack of possibilities to influence the development of higher education, the main focus of critique attacks the core of the Lisbon Strategy: it looks at education through the glasses of economic competitiveness and argues the need for changes from a one-dimensional economic approach, ignoring the multiple roles of education in society.

For us this raises a central question on how to tackle the process: should we put the focus on trying to increase students' involvement on a micro-level, meaning that we try to influence parts of the process, such as for example policies on lifelong learning or financing models and their implementation – even if we only have the chance to achieve smaller changes? Or should we rather focus on the process as a whole – through campaigns that attack the core idea of Lisbon for education? And is there any chance at all to push the huge Lisbon-ship into a different direction?

### the workshop

The basic question of the workshop is: How do we raise the students' voice in the Lisbon Process – both as ESIB and mainly as NUS-s. What strategy do we use: dialogue or fight? How can NUS-s get into a dialogue on Lisbon issues and how to campaign against policies that students dislike? This also includes looking at approaches and claims of other stakeholders and searching for possible cooperation with school students, universities, teachers and rectors, with trade unions and industry.

This workshop will not only discuss those questions but also include a training for student representatives for developing political strategies, strategic cooperation and networks. Good and bad examples of strategy will be discussed.

The main aim of the WS is to prepare national student representatives to work on Lisbon issues and improve that work where it is already taking place.

# Panel Speakers

*CVs of speakers in alphabetical order*

## **Dr. Christoph Anz**

E-mail: C.Anz@bda-online.de

Christoph Anz is the Deputy Director of Education, society and fundamental issues, Confederation of the German Employers Organisations.

## **Stefan Delplace**

E-mail: Stefan.delplace@eurashe.be

Stefan Delplace is the Secretary General of EURASHE, the umbrella organisation for non-university higher education institutions. Stefan Delplace, a Belgian living and working in Gent, has been involved in International Relations since 1989, as a senior staff member in two Flemish hogescholen. He was trained in Languages and Business Studies, taught Germanic languages, and was in charge of twinning projects for the Gent Junior Chamber of Commerce. In the past few years he was mainly active as a project manager and an academic expert, for projects in Central and East European countries.

## **Gaston de la Haye**

E-mail: gaston.delahaye@cmt-wcl.org

Gaston de la Haye is the general secretary of the World Confederation of Teachers. The WCT is a part of the world confederation of labour and recently joined the much bigger global education union Education International. In 1973, the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) was created, and Trade Union Confederations affiliated to the European Organisation of the WCL became member of the ETUC in 1974. In this way, the WCT dedicated its attention to the education branch of ETUC.

## **Mag. Karin Riegler**

E-mail: karin.riegler@reko.ac.at

Mag. Karin Riegler studied History and English at the University of Vienna. She was also an exchange student at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. and later spent a year as a visiting researcher at Indiana University in Bloomington.

She joined the Austrian Fulbright Commission in 1999. Beside being programme officer responsible for the administration of a number of U.S. - Austrian exchange programmes for students and scholars, she also acted as a contact and resource person for educational issues such as equivalences, accreditation, scholarships and study and research opportunities in both countries.

Since November 2002 she has been working for the Austrian Rectors Conference. In this capacity her focus is the Bologna Process and its implementation in Austria. Major current concerns in this context include the preparations for the EUA Graz Convention of Higher Education Institutions in May 2003 and the establishment of an Austrian quality assurance agency.

## **Jurgen Rienks**

E-mail: jurgen.rienks@cec.eu.int

Jurgen Rienks studied public and constitutional Law at the University of Amsterdam. During his study he spent most of his time advocating student rights, among other things being chair of the local student union ASVA and as vice-chair of the University Council. Since 1993 he works in the Dutch Ministry of Education. First he was occupied with revising policies for student financing. Later on, as secretary to the independent committee on the future of student finances, he coordinated a national debate on this issue. In 2000 he became responsible for international bilateral educational affairs. Since the end of 2005 he is seconded to the European Commission, to support policymaking in the field of higher education with regard to the Lisbon strategy and the Bologna process.

## **Dr. Carlo Salerno**

Senior Research Associate

E-mail: c.s.salerno@bbt.utwente.nl

Professional Background and Research Interests

Carlo Salerno comes from the Pennsylvania State University where he completed his Ph.D. in their higher education program and master's level work in economics. He also holds a bachelor's degree in economics from Eastern Michigan University. As a graduate student, Carlo spent two years working on a U.S. Department of Education funded study at Penn State's Centre for the Study of Higher Education.

His research focuses on the economics of higher education, particularly those issues surrounding the behaviour of institutions as non-profit organisations and university production, costs and efficiency. Since coming to CHEPS in August 2001 he has authored or co-authored a number of monographs and papers on topics ranging from privatisation and system-level funding to per-student cost estimation and efficiency. He has been invited to present his research at a number of European-wide conferences and is currently working, along with other CHEPS researchers, on consultancy-based projects in Africa. He is also an affiliate scholar with the Program for Research on Private Higher Education (PROPHE) at the State University of New York at Albany.

## **Luca Scarpiello**

E-mail: luca@obessu.org

Luca Scarpiello is a board member of OBESSU, the European umbrella organization of pupil organizations. He is originally from Italy, from the pupil organization Unione degli Studenti

## **Dr. Lamija Tanovic**

E-mail: lamija.tanovic@pmf.unsa.ba

Lamija Tanovic is a professor of Atomic and Nuclear Physics and Solid State Physics at the Faculty of Sciences, University of Sarajevo. At the same time she is the head of Department for International Scientific, Technical, Educational and Cultural Cooperation at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

She was the Ambassador of Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1994 – 2001 in the Kingdom of Denmark. During that time, she established 53 primary schools and 12 high schools with Bosnian syllabuses for the children of over 20.000 Bosnian refugees in Denmark where, 826 volunteer teachers from Bosnia and Herzegovina worked. In 1994, Danish authorities recognised the diplomas received in these Bosnian schools. Today, there are several hundred students from these schools studying at Danish universities.

Amongst her other contributions to BiH education and training, is a five year bilateral cooperation between the University of Sarajevo and the University of Copenhagen.

She has published several student textbooks in General Physics and she was the editor of two Proceedings in the Physics of Ionised Gases and in Applied Physics. She has also published a number of works in international journals in the area of Physics of Materials and Physics of Thin Films. Prof. Tanovic is a member of the European Academy of Sciences.

## **Dr. Ales Vahcic**

E-mail: ales.vahcic@siol.net

Ales Vahcic is a professor of economics at the university of Ljubljana. He has been a member of the working group of the Slovene government to prepare a reform package on the Lisbon Agenda and economical growth of Slovenia.