



Education and Culture DG

**CURRICULAR REFORM
PART FOUR**

**The extent and impact of higher education
curricular reform across Europe**

**Final report to the Directorate-General for Education and
Culture of the European Commission**

Contract: 2006 – 1394 / 001 – 001 S02-81AWB

Part Four: Curriculum Reform Survey Results



This study was requested by the European Commission, Directorate-General Education and Culture. This report does not reflect the views of the European Commission. The interpretations and opinions contained in it are solely those of the authors

Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS)
University of Twente
P.O. Box 217
7500 AE Enschede
The Netherlands

T +31 – 53 – 489 3263
F +31 – 53 – 434 0392
W www.utwente.nl/cheps
E j.m.file@utwente.nl

Table of Contents

Questionnaire for curriculum survey HE Reforms	5
Contents of Curriculum Results (Frequencies)	23
Contents of Curriculum Results (Cross tabs)	73

Questionnaire for curriculum survey HE Reforms

SECTION 1: GENERAL PERSONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

1. What is your position within the higher education institution?
 - a) dean (or functional equivalent)
 - b) director of study (or functional equivalent)

2. For which area of study are you responsible?
 - a) medicine
 - b) law
 - c) teacher training
 - d) engineering
 - e) history

3. My institution is most similar to a:
 - a) comprehensive research university
 - b) specialised research university (e.g., technical, medical, agricultural)
 - c) comprehensive professional/vocational education institution (e.g. Fachhochschule, college, hogeschool, AMK, grande école)
 - d) specialised professional/vocational education institution (e.g. Fachhochschule, college, hogeschool, AMK, grande école)
 - e) other

4. What is the ownership status of your institution?
 - a) public institution
 - b) private institution

5. Please indicate the number of students (head count) undertaking full- and part-time studies at your institution
 - a) less than 5.000
 - b) between 5.000 – 10.000
 - c) between 10.000 – 20.000
 - d) between 20.000 – 30.000
 - e) more than 30.000

SECTION 2: CURRICULUM REFORMS IN YOUR AREA OF STUDIES AT YOUR INSTITUTION

In the following sub-sections, we ask you to reflect on the state of the art regarding the Bologna process in your area of study at your institution. We address five dimensions of the Bologna process: the introduction of the two-cycle degree structure, competence-based learning, flexible learning paths, recognition of student achievements and degrees, and (international) mobility of students and staff. After each element, we ask you what you see as the main hindrances and drivers in the developments up to now.

SECTION 2.1: Degree structure

In the following Section 2.1 you will find some question dealing with the introduction of the two-cycle degree structure in your area of studies at your institution.

6. The highest possible academic degree currently offered *in my area of studies* at my institution is:
- PhD (or equivalent)
 - masters (or equivalent)
 - bachelor (or equivalent)
 - below bachelor (or equivalent)

Answer 6a

7. Programmes in my area of studies at my institution are structured in two main cycles: Bachelor (or equivalent) and Masters (or equivalent).

- no, none of the programmes
- yes, but only some of the programmes
- yes, a considerable part of the programmes
- yes, all programmes - *you will be automatically directed to question 9*

8. All new entrants will enrol in the two-cycle degree structure in my area of study at my institution by:

Answer 6b&c

7. Programmes in my area of studies at my institution lead to a "Bologna-type" Bachelor degree that qualifies for entry into a Masters-level programme.

- no, none of the programmes
- yes, but only some of the programmes
- yes, a considerable part of the programmes
- yes, all programmes - *you will be automatically directed to question 9*

8. The 'Bologna-type' Bachelor degree will be implemented fully in my area of studies at my institution by:

Answer 6d

7. Programmes in my area of studies at my institution lead to a degree that qualifies for entry into a Bachelor-level programme at other institutions.

- no, none of the programmes
- yes, but only some of the programmes
- yes, a considerable part of the programmes
- yes, all programmes - *you will be automatically directed to question 9*

8. Programmes in my area of studies at my institution will lead to a degree that qualifies for entry into a Bachelor-level programme at another

<i>Answer 6a</i>	<i>Answer 6b&c</i>	<i>Answer 6d</i>
<p>a) 2007 b) 2008 c) 2009 d) 2010 e) after 2010 f) there are no plans to fully implement the two-cycle structure in my area of studies at my institution. - <i>you will be automatically directed to question 16</i></p>	<p>a) 2007 b) 2008 c) 2009 d) 2010 e) after 2010 f) there are no plans to fully implement the two-cycle structure in my area of studies at my institution. - <i>you will be automatically directed to question 16</i></p>	<p>institution by: a) 2007 b) 2008 c) 2009 d) 2010 e) after 2010 f) there are no plans to fully implement such possibilities for transition in my area of studies at my institution - <i>you will be automatically directed to question 11</i></p>
<p>9. Curricula in my area of studies at my institution have been adjusted to account for the two-cycle structure. a) not at all b) to some extent c) to a considerable extent d) fully - <i>you will be automatically directed to question 11</i></p>	<p>9. Curricula in my area of studies at my institution have been adjusted to account for the two-cycle structure. a) not at all b) to some extent c) to a considerable extent d) fully – <i>you will be automatically directed to question 11</i></p>	<p>9. Curricula in my area of study at my institution have been adjusted to smoothen transition to Bachelor-level programmes at other institutions. a) not at all b) to some extent c) to a considerable extent d) fully - <i>you will be automatically directed to question 11</i></p>
<p>10. Curricula in my area of studies at my institution will be (fully) adjusted, namely by: a) 2007 b) 2008 c) 2009 d) 2010 e) after 2010 f) there are no plans to adjust curricula in my area of studies at my institution to the two-cycle structure.</p>	<p>10. Curricula in my area of studies at my institution will be (fully) adjusted, namely by: a) 2007 b) 2008 c) 2009 d) 2010 e) after 2010 f) there are no plans to adjust curricula in my area of studies at my institution to the two-cycle structure.</p>	<p>10. Curricula in my area of studies at my institution will be fully adjusted to smoothen transition to Bachelor-level programmes at other institutions by: a) 2007 b) 2008 c) 2009 d) 2010 e) after 2010 f) there are no plans to fully adjust curricula in my area of study at my institution.</p>
<p>11. The first cycle (Bachelor-level) in my area of studies at my institution takes nominally: a) 3 years</p>	<p>11. The first cycle (Bachelor level) in my area of study at my institution takes nominally: a) 3 years</p>	

Answer 6a

- b) 3,5 years
c) 4 years
d) other
12. The second cycle (Masters-level) in my area of studies at my institution takes nominally:
a) 1 year
b) 1,5 years
c) 2 years
d) other
13. The *main* function of the first degree (Bachelor-level) in my area of studies at my institution is (*tick only one*):
a) only to lead to a formal degree
b) a point for orientation and for further specialisation (after the Bachelor-level degree) within my institution.
c) a point for orientation and for further specialisation (after the Bachelor-level degree) at another national or international institution
d) to lead to employment
e) other
14. The *main* function of the first degree (Bachelor-level) in my area of studies at our institution *should be* (*tick only one*):
a) only to lead to a formal a degree
b) a point for orientation and for further specialisation (after the Bachelor-level degree) within my institution.
c) a point for orientation and for further

Answer 6b&c

- b) 3,5 years
c) 4 year
d) other
12. The *main* function of the Bachelor-level degree in my area of studies at my institution is:
a) 1 year
b) 1,5 years
c) 2 years
d) other
13. The *main* function of the Bachelor-level degree in my area of studies at my institution should be:
a) a point for orientation and for further specialisation at another national or international institution
b) to lead to employment
c) other
14. The Bachelor-level degree in my area of studies at my institution is relevant to the European labour market::
- | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Mildly disagree | Mildly agree | Agree | Strongly agree | Do not know |
|-------------------|----------|-----------------|--------------|-------|----------------|-------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
15. A 'Bologna-type' Bachelor degree is adequate for

Answer 6d

11. The programmes in my area of study at my institution take (generally) nominally:
a) 1 year
b) 1,5 years
c) 2 years
d) 2,5 years
e) other
12. The *main* function of the degree in my area of studies at my institution is:
a) a point for orientation and for further specialisation at another national or international institution
b) to lead to employment
c) other
13. The *main* function of the degree in my area of studies at my institution *should be*:
a) a point for orientation and for further specialisation at another national or international institution
b) to lead to employment
c) other
14. A degree structure based on two main cycles (Bachelor and Master) with additional short-cycle degrees below that is adequate for structuring studies in my area of studies:

Answer 6a

specialisation (after the Bachelor-level degree) at another national or international institution

- d) to lead to employment
- e) other

15. The first degree (Bachelor level) in my area of studies at my institution is relevant to the *European* labour market::

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Mildly disagree	Mildly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Do not know
1	2	3	4	5	6	

16. A *system of two cycles* is adequate for structuring studies in my area of studies at my institution:

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Mildly disagree	Mildly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Do not know
1	2	3	4	5	6	

17. The following factors can be considered as

Answer 6b&c

completing studies in my area of studies at my institution:

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Mildly disagree	Mildly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Do not know
1	2	3	4	5	6	

16. The following factors can be considered as hindrances to or drivers for the implementation of a *Bologna type degree structure* in your area of studies. What do you think of their roles?

- Table as used in question 25, page 7/8 -

(No question 17)

Answer 6d

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Mildly disagree	Mildly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Do not know
1	2	3	4	5	6	

15. The following factors can be considered as hindrances to or drivers for the implementation of based on two main cycles (*Bachelor and Master*) with additional short-cycle degrees below that in your area of studies. What do you think of their roles?

- Table as used in question 25, page 7/8 -

(No question 16 and 17)

Answer 6a

Answer 6b&c

Answer 6d

hindrances to or drivers for the implementation of a *Bologna type degree structure* in your area of studies. What do you think of their roles?

- Table as used in question 25, page 7/8 –

SECTION 2.2 Competence-based learning

In the following section we would like to ask you to answer eight questions concerning aspects which are related to the introduction of competence-based learning: modularization of curricula, definition of competences and learning outcomes, as well as the introduction of ECTS in your area of study at your institution.

18. Curricula in my area of studies at my institution are modularised.

- a) not at all
- b) to some extent
- c) to a considerable extent
- d) fully - *you will be automatically directed to question 20*

19. Please estimate if change (and when) *regarding modularisation* will take place in the future (*tick the most appropriate box*):

- a) I expect (further) modularisation of curricula in my area of studies at my institution *in the coming 18 months*.
- b) I expect (further) modularisation of curricula in my area of studies at my institution *in the period up until 2010*.
- c) I do not expect (further) *modularisation* of curricula in my area of studies at my institution.

20. Curricula in my area of study at my institution are defined in terms of competences or learning outcomes.

- a) not at all
- b) to some extent
- c) to a considerable extent
- d) fully - *you will be automatically directed to question 22*

21. Please estimate if change (and when) will take place *regarding competences or learning outcomes* in the future.
- I expect (further) changes regarding competences or learning outcomes will take place in my area of studies at my institution *in the coming 18 months*.
 - I expect (further) changes regarding competences or learning outcomes will take place in my area of studies at my institution *in the period up until 2010*.
 - I *do not expect changes* regarding competences or learning outcomes in my area of studies at my institution.
22. Curricula in my area of studies at my institution are defined in terms of ECTS (or equivalent).
- no
 - yes, some of the curricula
 - yes, a considerable part of the curricula
 - yes, all of the curricula - *you will be automatically directed to question 24*
23. Please estimate if change (and when) will take place *regarding the definition of curricula in ECTS* in the future in your area of studies at your institution.
- I expect (further) changes regarding the definition of curricula in ECTS in my area of studies at my institution *in the coming 18 months*.
 - I expect (further) changes regarding the definition of curricula in ECTS in my area of studies at my institution *in the period up until 2010*.
 - I do not expect (further) changes regarding the definition of curricula in ECTS in my area of studies at my institution.
24. The principles of competence-based learning are desirable/useful for my area of studies:

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Mildly disagree	Mildly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Do not know
1	2	3	4	5	6	

25. The following factors can be considered as hindrances to or drivers for the implementation of *competence-based learning* in your area of studies. What do you think of their roles?

	Strong hin- drance	Hindrance	Slight hin- rance	Slight driver	Driver	Strong driver	Do not know	Not appli- cable
a) Governmental legislation / regulation								
b) Central management at my institution								
c) Academics at my institution								
d) Academics in my area of study								
e) Professional organisations in my area of study								
f) Employers in my area of study								
g) Increasing competition between higher education								

	Strong hin- drance	Hindrance	Slight hin- rance	Slight driver	Driver	Strong driver	Do not know	Not appli- cable
institutions								
h) Adoption of competence-based learning at other higher education institutions								
i) European policies								

SECTION 2.3 Flexibility of learning paths

Flexibility of degree programmes and the recognition of prior learning experience in your study area at your institution are the main focus of the following section.

26. In my area of studies, the programmes at my institution offer large flexibility for students.
- not at all
 - to some extent
 - to a considerable extent
 - to a large extent - *you will be automatically directed to question 28*
27. Please estimate if change (and when) will take place regarding *flexibility for students* in the future.
- I expect (further) changes regarding flexibility for students in my area of studies at my institution *in the coming 18 months*.
 - I expect (further) changes regarding flexibility of students in my area of studies at my institution *in the period up until 2010*.
 - I do not expect changes* regarding flexibility for students in my area of studies at my institution.
28. In my area of studies, my institution offers a variety of teaching modes for different target groups.
- not at all
 - to some extent
 - to a considerable extent
 - to a large extent - *you will be automatically directed to question 30*
29. Please estimate if change (and when) will take place regarding the *variety of teaching modes* in the future (*tick the most appropriate box*)
- I expect (further) changes regarding the variety of teaching modes in my area of studies at my institution *in the coming 18 months*.
 - I expect (further) changes regarding the variety of teaching modes in my area of studies at my institution *in the period up until 2010*.
 - I do not expect change in my area of studies at my institution.

30. In my area of studies, students can validate *relevant prior professional/vocational experience or training* and get it recognised as part of their degree.
- not at all
 - to some extent
 - to a considerable extent
 - to a large extent - *you will be automatically directed to question 32*
31. Please estimate if change (and when) will take place regarding the *validation and recognition of relevant prior professional/vocational experience or training* in the future.
- I expect (further) changes regarding the validation and recognition of relevant prior professional/vocational experience or training in my area of studies at my institution *in the coming 18 months*.
 - I expect (further) changes regarding the validation and recognition of relevant prior professional/vocational experience or training in my area of studies at my institution *in the period up until 2010*.
 - I do not expect change* regarding the validation and recognition of relevant prior professional/vocational experience or training in my area of studies at my institution in my area of studies at my institution.
32. In my area of studies, programmes at my institution offer various entry and exit points to students.
- not at all
 - to some extent
 - to a considerable extent
 - to a large extent - *you will be automatically directed to question 34*
33. Please estimate if change (and when) will take place *regarding the number of entry and exit points* in the future.
- I expect (further) changes regarding the number of entry and exit points in my area of studies at my institution *in the coming 18 months*.
 - I expect (further) changes regarding the number of entry and exit points *in the period up until 2010*.
 - I do not expect changes* regarding the number of entry and exit points in my area of studies at my institution.
34. The existence of *flexible learning paths* for students is desirable in my area of studies:

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Mildly disagree	Mildly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Do not know
1	2	3	4	5	6	

35. The following factors can be considered as hindrances to or drivers for the implementation of *flexible learning paths* in your area of studies. What do you think of their roles?

	Strong hin- drance	Hindrance	Slight hin- drance	Slight driver	Driver	Strong driver	Do not know	not applicable
a) Governmental legislation/regulation								
b) Central management at my institution								
c) Academics at my institution								
d) Academics in my area of study								
e) Professional organisations in my area of study								
f) Employers in my area of study								
g) Increasing competition between higher education institutions								
h) Adoption of flexible learning paths at other higher education institutions								
i) European policies								

SECTION 2.4: Recognition

With the following eight questions we would like to ask you to which extent student achievements from other international and national higher education institutions are currently recognised in your area of study at your institution.

36. A diploma supplement is handed out to the graduates of my area of study at my institution.

- a) no, this is not the case
- b) yes, to some of them
- c) yes, to most of them
- d) yes, to all of them - *you will be automatically directed to question 38*

37. Please estimate if change (and when) will take place regarding the *diploma supplement* in the future.

- a) I expect (further) changes regarding the diploma supplement in my area of studies at my institution *in the coming 18 months*.
- b) I expect (further) changes regarding the diploma supplement in my area of studies at my institution *in the period up until 2010*.
- c) I *do not expect changes* regarding the diploma supplement in my area of studies at my institution.

38. The recognition of student achievements from other *national* institutions works well in my area of study at my institution.
- no
 - yes, to some extent
 - yes, to a considerable extent
 - yes, fully - *you will be automatically directed to question 40*
39. Please estimate if change (and when) will take place regarding the *recognition of student achievements from other national institutions* in the future (tick the most appropriate box).
- I expect (further) changes regarding recognition of student achievements in my area of studies at my institution *in the coming 18 months*.
 - I expect (further) changes regarding recognition of student achievements in my area of studies at my institution *in the period up until 2010*.
 - I do not expect changes* regarding recognition of student achievements in my area of studies at my institution in my area of studies at my institution.
40. The recognition of student achievements from *foreign* institutions works well in my area of study at my institution.
- no
 - yes, to some extent
 - yes, to a considerable extent
 - yes, fully - *you will be automatically directed to question 42*
41. Please estimate if change (and when) will take place regarding the *recognition of student achievements from foreign institutions* in the future (tick the most appropriate box).
- I expect (further) changes regarding the recognition of student achievements from foreign institutions in my area of studies at my *institution in the coming 18 months*.
 - I expect (further) changes regarding the recognition of student achievements from foreign institutions in my area of studies at my institution *in the period up until 2010*.
 - I do not expect changes* regarding the recognition of student achievements from foreign institutions in my area of studies at my institution in my area of studies at my institution.
42. The improvement of issues of recognition (diploma supplement, student achievements at other institutions) is desirable in my area of studies:

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Mildly disagree	Mildly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Do not know
1	2	3	4	5	6	

43. The following factors can be considered as hindrances to or drivers for the implementation of improvement of *issues of recognition* in your area of studies. What do you think of their roles?

	Strong hindrance	Hindrance	Slight hindrance	Slight driver	Driver	Strong driver	Do not know	Not applicable
a) Governmental legislation/regulation								
b) Central management at my institution								
c) Academics at my institution								
d) Academics in my area of study								
e) Professional organisations in my area of study								
f) Employers in my area of study								
g) Increasing competition between higher education institutions								
h) Adoption of measures regarding recognition at other higher education institutions								
i) European policies								

SECTION 2.5: Mobility

The following section is dedicated to the national and international mobility of students and academic staff.

44. *National student mobility* works well in my area of study at my institution.

- a) no
- b) yes, to some extent
- c) yes, to a considerable extent
- d) yes, fully - *you will be automatically directed to question 46*

45. Please estimate if change (and when) will take place regarding *national student mobility* in the future.

- a) I expect (further) changes regarding national student mobility in my area of studies at my institution *in the coming 18 months*.
- b) I expect (further) changes regarding national student mobility in my area of studies at my institution *in the period up until 2010*.
- c) I *do not expect changes* regarding national student mobility in my area of studies at my institution in my area of studies at my institution.

46. *High national student mobility* is desirable in my area of study:

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Mildly disagree	Mildly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Do not know
1	2	3	4	5	6	

47. *International student mobility* works well in my area of study at my institution.

- a) no
- b) yes, to some extent
- c) yes, to a considerable extent
- d) yes, fully - *you will be automatically directed to question 49*

48. Please estimate if change (and when) will take place regarding *international student mobility* in the future (*tick the most appropriate box*).

- a) I expect (further) changes regarding *international student mobility* in my area of studies at my institution *in the coming 18 months*.
- b) I expect (further) changes regarding *international student mobility* in my area of studies at my institution *in the period up until 2010*.
- c) I *do not expect changes* in my area of studies at my institution in my area of studies at my institution.

49. *High International student mobility* is desirable in my area of study:

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Mildly disagree	Mildly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Do not know
1	2	3	4	5	6	

50. *International graduate mobility* works well in my area of study at my institution.

- a) no
- b) yes, to some extent
- c) yes, to a considerable extent
- d) yes, fully - *you will be automatically directed to question 52*

51. Please estimate if change (and when) will take place *regarding international graduate mobility* in the future).

- a) I expect (further) changes regarding *international graduate mobility* in my area of studies at my institution *in the coming 18 months*.
- b) I expect (further) changes regarding *international graduate mobility* in my area of studies at my institution *in the period up until 2010*.
- c) I *do not expect changes* regarding *international graduate mobility* in my area of studies at my institution.

52. *High international graduate mobility* is desirable in my area of study:

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Mildly disagree	Mildly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Do not know
1	2	3	4	5	6	

53. *International mobility of teaching staff* works well in my area of study at my institution.

- a) no
- b) yes, to some extent
- c) yes, to a considerable extent
- d) yes, fully - *you will be automatically directed to question 55*

54. Please estimate if change (and when) will take place regarding *international mobility of teaching staff* in the future.

- a) I expect (further) changes regarding international mobility of teaching staff in my area of studies at my institution *in the coming 18 months*.
- b) I expect (further) changes regarding international mobility of teaching staff in my area of studies at my institution *in the period up until 2010*.
- c) I *do not expect changes* regarding international mobility of teaching staff in my area of studies at my institution.

55. *High international mobility of teaching staff* is desirable in my area of study:

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Mildly disagree	Mildly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Do not know
1	2	3	4	5	6	

56. The following factors can be considered as hindrances to or drivers for the implementation of improvement of *mobility (in general)* in your area of studies. What do you think of their roles?

	Strong hindrance	Hindrance	Slight hindrance	Slight driver	Driver	Strong driver	Do not know	Not applicable
a) Governmental legislation/regulation								
b) Central management at my institution								
c) Academics at my institution								
d) Academics in my area of study								
e) Professional organisations in my area of study								
f) Employers in my area of study								
g) Increasing competition between higher education institutions								
h) Adoption of measures regarding recognition at other higher education institutions								
i) European policies								

SECTION 3: OVERALL ASSESSMENT

In this last part of the questionnaires we would like to ask you about your opinion about the current state of the implementation of the Bologna-reforms as well as their effects.

57. Please give an overall assessment of the situation in your area of study at your institution regarding degree structure and curriculum reform:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Mildly disagree	Mildly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Do not know
The current situation in my area of study <i>at my institution</i> is in line with the Bologna expectations.							
I expect considerable (further) change at my institution – in terms of meeting the Bologna objectives – in the coming 18 months.							
I expect considerable (further) change at my institution – in terms of meeting the Bologna objectives – <i>until 2010</i> .							
The current situation in my area of study <i>in my country</i> is in line with the Bologna expectations.							

58. The consequences of the Bologna process – regarding the degree structure and curriculum reform in my area of study at my institution – are desirable:

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Mildly disagree	Mildly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Do not know
1	2	3	4	5	6	

59 *Impact assessment*: The Bologna reform is assumed to have an impact, particularly on access to higher education, graduation rates, employability of graduates, general mobility of students, graduates and academic staff, the quality of education and the cost-effectiveness of education. Please give your opinion on the impact(s) of the reform.

Recent reforms in my area of study in my country will have positive impacts on:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Mildly disagree	Mildly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Do not know
Access to programmes in my area of study							
Graduation rates in my area of study							
Employability of graduates in my area of study							
General mobility in my area of study							
Quality of education in my area of study							
Cost-effectiveness in my area of study							

Thank you for your kind co-operation!

Contents of Curriculum Results (Frequencies)

Table 1 Response rates of institutional representatives by country	27
Table 2 Loop	32
Table 3 Position of respondent	32
Table 4 Institution - type	32
Table 5 Institution - ownership	32
Table 6 Number of students	33
Table 7 Highest degree offered at institution	33
Table 8 Programme structure: Bachelor and Masters.....	33
Table 9 degree by.....	33
Table 10 Curricula have been adjusted	34
Table 11 Curricula will be fully adjusted or changed by	34
Table 12 First cycle takes nominally.....	35
Table 13 Second cycle takes nominally	35
Table 14 The main function of the degree is.....	35
Table 15 The main function of the first degree (Bachelor-level) is	35
Table 16 The main function of the degree should be	36
Table 17 The main function of the first degree (Bachelor-level) should be.....	36
Table 18 The Bachelor-level degree is relevant to the European labour market	36
Table 19 cycle is adequate	37
Table 20 The first degree (Bachelor-level) is relevant to the European labour market	37
Table 21 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation	37
Table 22 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution	38
Table 23 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution	38
Table 24 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study	39
Table 25 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study	39
Table 26 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study	39
Table 27 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions	40
Table 28 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of Bologna-type degrees at other heir-s	40
Table 29 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies	41
Table 30 Curricula are modularised.....	41
Table 31 Change regarding modularisation will take place	41
Table 32 Curricula defined in terms of competences or learning outcomes	42
Table 33 Change regarding competences or learning outcomes will take place	42
Table 34 Curricula are defined in terms of ACTS	42
Table 35 Change regarding the definition of curricula in ACTS will take place	42
Table 36 The principles of competence-based learning are desirable/useful	43
Table 37 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation	43
Table 38 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution	43
Table 39 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution	44
Table 40 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study	44
Table 41 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study	45
Table 42 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study	45
Table 43 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions	45
Table 44 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of competence-based learning at other heir-s.....	46
Table 45 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies	46
Table 46 Programmes offer large flexibility for students	47
Table 47 Change regarding flexibility for students will take place	47
Table 48 A variety of teaching modes for different target groups is offered	47
Table 49 Change regarding the variety of teaching modes will take place	47

Table 50 Students can validate relevant prior professional/vocational experience or training and get it recognised as part of their degree	48
Table 51 Change regarding the validation and recognition of relevant prior professional/vocational experience or training will take place.....	48
Table 52 Various entry and exit points to students are offered.....	48
Table 53 Change regarding the number of entry and exit points will take place	48
Table 54 The existence of flexible learning paths for students is desirable.....	49
Table 55 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation	49
Table 56 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution	49
Table 57 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution	50
Table 58 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study	50
Table 59 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study	51
Table 60 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study	51
Table 61 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions	51
Table 62 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of flexible learning paths at other heir-s	52
Table 63 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies	52
Table 64 A diploma supplement is handed out to graduates.....	53
Table 65 Change regarding the diploma supplement will take place	53
Table 66 Recognition of student achievements from other national institutions works well.....	53
Table 67 Change regarding the recognitions of student achievements from other national institutions will take place	53
Table 68 Recognition of student achievements from foreign institutions works well.....	54
Table 69 Change regarding the recognitions of student achievements from foreign institutions will take place	54
Table 70 The improvement of issues of recognition (diploma supplement, student achievements at other institutions) is desirable.....	54
Table 71 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation	54
Table 72 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution	55
Table 73 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution	55
Table 74 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study	56
Table 75 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study	56
Table 76 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study	56
Table 77 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions	57
Table 78 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of measures regarding recognition at other hei-s	57
Table 79 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies	58
Table 80 National student mobility works well	58
Table 81 Change regarding national student mobility will take place.....	58
Table 82 High national student mobility is desirable	59
Table 83 International student mobility works well	59
Table 84 Change regarding international student mobility will take place	59
Table 85 High international student mobility is desirable.....	59
Table 86 International graduate mobility works well	60
Table 87 Change regarding international graduate mobility will take place	60
Table 88 High international graduate mobility is desirable.....	60
Table 89 International mobility of teaching staff works well	61
Table 90 Change regarding international mobility of teaching staff will take place	61
Table 91 High international mobility of teaching staff is desirable.....	61
Table 92 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation	62
Table 93 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution	62
Table 94 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution	62
Table 95 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study	63
Table 96 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study	63

Table 97 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study	64
Table 98 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions	64
Table 99 Hindrances/Drivers - increase mobility at other hei-s	64
Table 100 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies	65
Table 101 assessment of situation - Current situation in my institution is in line with the Bologna expectations .	65
Table 102 assessment of situation - I expect considerable (further) change in terms of meeting the Bologna objectives in the coming 18 months	66
Table 103 assessment of situation - I expect considerable (further) change in terms of meeting the Bologna objectives until 2010	66
Table 104 assessment of situation - Current situation in my country is in line with the Bologna expectations.....	66
Table 105 The consequences of the Bologna process are desirable.....	67
Table 106 Impact assessment - Access to programmes	67
Table 107 Impact assessment - Graduation rates	68
Table 108 Impact assessment - Employability of graduates.....	68
Table 109 Impact assessment - General mobility.....	68
Table 110 Impact assessment - Quality of education.....	69
Table 111 Impact assessment - Cost effectiveness.....	69
Table 112 country	70
Table 113 Area of study	71

Denmark	universities	12	11%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	49	45%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	49	45%	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>110</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>18%</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>56%</i>
Estonia	universities	12	26%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	10	21%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	25	53%	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>23%</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>45%</i>
Finland	universities	20	39%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	31	61%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>33%</i>	<i>87</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>41%</i>
France	<i>see end of table</i>							
Germany	universities	103	27%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	202	53%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	74	20%	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>379</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>32%</i>
Greece	universities	22	58%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	16	42%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>13%</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>19%</i>
Hungary	universities	25	35%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	47	65%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>13%</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>25%</i>
Iceland	universities	9	100%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>22%</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0%</i>
Ireland	universities	7	35%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	13	65%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>50%</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>44%</i>

Italy	universities	90	100%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>19%</i>	<i>110</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>27%</i>
Latvia	universities	36	64%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	20	36%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>14%</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>40%</i>
Liechten- stein	universities	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	3	100%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>33%</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	
Lithuania	universities	21	55%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	17	45%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>24%</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>40%</i>
Luxem- burg	universities	1	25%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	3	75%	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>25%</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>29%</i>
Malta	universities	1	50%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	1	50%	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>75%</i>
Nether- lands	universities	14	11%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	49	39%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	62	50%	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>125</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>7%</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>47%</i>
Norway	universities	12	25%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	34	71%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	2	4%	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>31%</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>46%</i>

Poland	universities	246	58%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	181	42%	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>427</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>6%</i>	<i>71</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>20%</i>
Portugal	universities	30	19%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	132	81%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>162</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>70</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>40%</i>
Romania	universities	94	100%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>94</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>18%</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>28%</i>
Slovak Rep	universities	23	100%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>13%</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>44%</i>
Slovenia	universities	3	23%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	10	77%	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>38%</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>20%</i>
Spain	universities	70	100%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>70</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>14%</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>22%</i>
Sweden	universities	15	31%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	34	69%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>33%</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>40%</i>
Turkey	universities	93	100%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>93</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>12%</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>47%</i>

UK	universities	170	100%	-	-	-	-	-
	vocational	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>170</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>22%</i>	<i>138</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>38%</i>
TOTAL (exclude France)		2558	-	371	15%	1307	463	35%
	universities	1249	49%	-	-	-	-	-
	prof. HEI	821	32%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	488	19%	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>2558</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>371</i>	<i>15%</i>	<i>1307</i>	<i>463</i>	<i>35%</i>
France	universities	559	14%	-	-	-	-	-
	prof. HEI	1056	26%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI*	2516	61%	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>4131</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>1%</i>	<i>142</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>25%</i>
<i>*)classes secondaire (STS and CPG) and IUT not in surveys</i>								
TOTAL (include France)		6689	-	406	6%	1449	499	34%
	universities	1808	27%	-	-	-	-	-
	prof. HEI	1877	28%	-	-	-	-	-
	other HEI	3004	45%	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>Total</i>	<i>6689</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>406</i>	<i>6%</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>

Table 2 Loop

	Frequency	Valid Percent
A	417	87
B	56	12
C	8	2
Total	481	100

N - valid = 481, N - Missing = 0

Table 3 Position of respondent

	Frequency	Valid Percent
dean	211	46
director of study	247	54
Total	458	100

N - valid = 458, N - Missing = 23

Table 4 Institution - type

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Comprehensive research university	220	47
specialised research university	108	23
Comprehensive professional/vocational higher education inst.	70	15
Specialised professional/vocational education institution	57	12
other	9	2
Total	464	100

N - valid = 464, N - Missing = 17

Table 5 Institution - ownership

	Frequency	Valid Percent
public institution	416	89
private institutions	50	11
Total	466	100

N - valid = 466, N - Missing = 15

Table 6 Number of students

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Less than 5.000	176	38
Between 5.000 and 10.000	99	21
Between 10.000 and 20.000	91	20
Between 20.000 and 30.000	52	11
More than 30.000	47	10
Total	465	100

N - valid = 465, N - Missing = 16

Table 7 Highest degree offered at institution

	Frequency	Valid Percent
PhD	306	67
Masters	86	19
Bachelor	55	12
below Bachelor level	9	2
Total	456	100

N - valid = 456, N - Missing = 25

Table 8 Programme structure: Bachelor and Masters

	Frequency	Valid Percent
no, none of the programmes	51	12
yes, but only some of the programmes	82	19
yes, a considerable part of the programme	72	17
yes, all programmes	231	53
Total	436	100

N - valid = 436, N - Missing = 45

Table 9 degree by

	Frequency	Valid Percent
2007	86	40
2008	26	12
2009	8	4
2010	11	5

	Frequency	Valid Percent
after 2010	7	3
No plans to implement	76	36
Total	214	100

N - valid = 214, N - Missing = 267

Table 10 Curricula have been adjusted

	Frequency	Valid Percent
not at all	25	7
to some extent	49	13
to a considerable extent	66	18
fully	232	62
Total	372	100

N - valid = 372, N - Missing = 109

Table 11 Curricula will be fully adjusted or changed by

	Frequency	Valid Percent
2007	65	47
2008	28	20
2009	13	9
2010	15	11
after 2010	7	5
No plans to adjust	11	8
Total	139	100

N - valid = 139, N - Missing = 342

Table 12 First cycle takes nominally

		Frequency	Valid Percent
3 years		239	68
3,5 years		22	6
4 years		78	22
other		8	2
	5	4	1
Total		351	100

N - valid = 351, N - Missing = 130

Table 13 Second cycle takes nominally

		Frequency	Valid Percent
1 year		42	14
1,5 years		24	8
2 years		229	76
other		8	3
Total		303	100

N - valid = 303, N - Missing = 178

Table 14 The main function of the degree is

		Frequency	Valid Percent
point for orientation and further specialisation		11	22
lead to employment		35	71
other		3	6
Total		49	100

N - valid = 49, N - Missing = 432

Table 15 The main function of the first degree (Bachelor-level) is

		Frequency	Valid Percent
only to lead to a formal degree		45	15
point for orientation and further specialisation in own inst		131	43
point for orientation and further specialisation in other		46	15
lead to employment		76	25
other		9	3

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Total	307	100
N - valid = 307, N - Missing = 174		

Table 16 The main function of the degree should be

	Frequency	Valid Percent
point for orientation and further specialisation	12	24
lead to employment	35	70
other	3	6
Total	50	100
N - valid = 50, N - Missing = 431		

Table 17 The main function of the first degree (Bachelor-level) should be

	Frequency	Valid Percent
only to lead to a formal degree	32	10
point for orientation and further specialisation in own inst	115	38
point for orientation and further specialisation in other	78	25
lead to employment	69	23
other	12	4
Total	306	100
N - valid = 306, N - Missing = 175		

Table 18 The Bachelor-level degree is relevant to the European labour market

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	1	2
disagree	3	7
mildly disagree	1	2
mildly agree	7	16
agree	23	53
strongly agree	7	16
do not know	1	2
Total	43	100
N - valid = 43, N - Missing = 438		

Table 19 cycle is adequate

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	16	4
disagree	39	9
mildly disagree	17	4
mildly agree	51	12
agree	187	43
strongly agree	113	26
do not know	9	2
Total	432	100

N - valid = 432, N - Missing = 49

Table 20 The first degree (Bachelor-level) is relevant to the European labour market

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	16	5
disagree	30	10
mildly disagree	31	10
mildly agree	59	19
agree	105	34
strongly agree	55	18
do not know	10	3
Total	306	100

N - valid = 306, N - Missing = 175

Table 21 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	34	8
hindrance	53	13
slight hindrance	38	9
slight driver	39	9
driver	115	28
strong driver	117	28
do not know	7	2
not applicable	13	3

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Total	416	100
N - valid = 416, N - Missing = 65		

Table 22 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	6	1
hindrance	23	6
slight hindrance	13	3
slight driver	68	16
driver	132	32
strong driver	140	34
do not know	12	3
not applicable	20	5
Total	414	100
N - valid = 414, N - Missing = 67		

Table 23 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	9	2
hindrance	31	7
slight hindrance	84	20
slight driver	100	24
driver	122	29
strong driver	32	8
do not know	13	3
not applicable	24	6
Total	415	100
N - valid = 415, N - Missing = 66		

Table 24 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	17	4
hindrance	36	9
slight hindrance	76	18
slight driver	95	23
driver	104	25
strong driver	53	13
do not know	14	3
not applicable	24	6
Total	419	100

N - valid = 419, N - Missing = 62

Table 25 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	26	6
hindrance	53	13
slight hindrance	74	18
slight driver	89	21
driver	77	18
strong driver	40	10
do not know	24	6
not applicable	36	9
Total	419	100

N - valid = 419, N - Missing = 62

Table 26 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	19	5
hindrance	45	11
slight hindrance	66	16
slight driver	104	25
driver	68	16
strong driver	28	7

	Frequency	Valid Percent
do not know	46	11
not applicable	42	10
Total	418	100

N - valid = 418, N - Missing = 63

Table 27 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	12	3
hindrance	28	7
slight hindrance	26	6
slight driver	88	21
driver	130	31
strong driver	68	16
do not know	23	6
not applicable	43	10
Total	418	100

N - valid = 418, N - Missing = 63

Table 28 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of Bologna-type degrees at other heir-s

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	5	1
hindrance	12	3
slight hindrance	18	4
slight driver	84	20
driver	143	34
strong driver	94	23
do not know	25	6
not applicable	36	9
Total	417	100

N - valid = 417, N - Missing = 64

Table 29 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	5	1
hindrance	2	0
slight hindrance	9	2
slight driver	74	18
driver	167	40
strong driver	121	29
do not know	24	6
not applicable	16	4
Total	418	100

N - valid = 418, N - Missing = 63

Table 30 Curricula are modularised

	Frequency	Valid Percent
not at all	34	8
to some extent	134	32
to a considerable extent	85	20
fully	172	40
Total	425	100

N - valid = 425, N - Missing = 56

Table 31 Change regarding modularisation will take place

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Changes in the coming 18 months	106	43
Changes in the period until 2010	78	31
I do not expect changes	65	26
Total	249	100

N - valid = 249, N - Missing = 232

Table 32 Curricula defined in terms of competences or learning outcomes

	Frequency	Valid Percent
not at all	13	3
to some extent	114	27
to a considerable extent	134	32
fully	157	38
Total	418	100

N - valid = 418, N - Missing = 63

Table 33 Change regarding competences or learning outcomes will take place

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Changes in the coming 18 months	130	49
Changes in the period until 2010	102	38
I do not expect changes	33	12
Total	265	100

N - valid = 265, N - Missing = 216

Table 34 Curricula are defined in terms of ACTS

	Frequency	Valid Percent
No	35	8
Yes, to some of the curricula	35	8
Yes, to most of the curricula	42	10
Yes, to all of the curricula	307	73
Total	419	100

N - valid = 419, N - Missing = 62

Table 35 Change regarding the definition of curricula in ACTS will take place

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Changes in the coming 18 months	63	55
Changes in the period until 2010	33	29
I do not expect changes	18	16
Total	114	100

N - valid = 114, N - Missing = 367

Table 36 The principles of competence-based learning are desirable/useful

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	4	1
disagree	6	1
mildly disagree	14	3
mildly agree	64	15
agree	157	38
strongly agree	160	38
do not know	11	3
Total	416	100

N - valid = 416, N - Missing = 65

Table 37 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	15	4
hindrance	23	6
slight hindrance	34	8
slight driver	105	26
driver	108	26
strong driver	69	17
do not know	27	7
not applicable	30	7
Total	411	100

N - valid = 411, N - Missing = 70

Table 38 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	4	1
hindrance	11	3
slight hindrance	20	5
slight driver	74	18
driver	149	36
strong driver	108	26
do not know	19	5

	Frequency	Valid Percent
not applicable	26	6
Total	411	100

N - valid = 411, N - Missing = 70

Table 39 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	10	2
hindrance	36	9
slight hindrance	77	19
slight driver	91	22
driver	115	28
strong driver	47	11
do not know	18	4
not applicable	17	4
Total	411	100

N - valid = 411, N - Missing = 70

Table 40 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	9	2
hindrance	39	10
slight hindrance	64	16
slight driver	92	22
driver	110	27
strong driver	69	17
do not know	16	4
not applicable	11	3
Total	410	100

N - valid = 410, N - Missing = 71

Table 41 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	6	1
hindrance	17	4
slight hindrance	27	7
slight driver	114	28
driver	107	26
strong driver	63	15
do not know	45	11
not applicable	32	8
Total	411	100

N - valid = 411, N - Missing = 70

Table 42 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	5	1
hindrance	15	4
slight hindrance	22	5
slight driver	100	24
driver	121	29
strong driver	66	16
do not know	48	12
not applicable	36	9
Total	413	100

N - valid = 413, N - Missing = 68

Table 43 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	2	0
hindrance	6	1
slight hindrance	21	5
slight driver	92	22
driver	126	31
strong driver	76	18

	Frequency	Valid Percent
do not know	40	10
not applicable	49	12
Total	412	100

N - valid = 412, N - Missing = 69

Table 44 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of competence-based learning at other heir-s

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	1	0
hindrance	4	1
slight hindrance	8	2
slight driver	108	26
driver	139	34
strong driver	75	18
do not know	40	10
not applicable	35	9
Total	410	100

N - valid = 410, N - Missing = 71

Table 45 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	1	0
hindrance	6	1
slight hindrance	7	2
slight driver	81	20
driver	139	34
strong driver	86	21
do not know	64	16
not applicable	26	6
Total	410	100

N - valid = 410, N - Missing = 71

Table 46 Programmes offer large flexibility for students

	Frequency	Valid Percent
not at all	18	4
to some extent	193	46
to a considerable extent	123	29
to a large extent	83	20
Total	417	100

N - valid = 417, N - Missing = 64

Table 47 Change regarding flexibility for students will take place

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Changes in the coming 18 months	118	35
Changes in the period until 2010	112	33
I do not expect changes	106	32
Total	336	100

N - valid = 336, N - Missing = 145

Table 48 A variety of teaching modes for different target groups is offered

	Frequency	Valid Percent
not at all	45	11
to some extent	185	45
to a considerable extent	118	29
to a large extent	64	16
Total	412	100

N - valid = 412, N - Missing = 69

Table 49 Change regarding the variety of teaching modes will take place

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Changes in the coming 18 months	109	31
Changes in the period until 2010	156	45
I do not expect changes	82	24
Total	347	100

N - valid = 347, N - Missing = 134

Table 50 Students can validate relevant prior professional/vocational experience or training and get it recognised as part of their degree

	Frequency	Valid Percent
not at all	81	19
to some extent	219	53
to a considerable extent	59	14
to a large extent	57	14
Total	416	100

N - valid = 416, N - Missing = 65

Table 51 Change regarding the validation and recognition of relevant prior professional/vocational experience or training will take place

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Changes in the coming 18 months	74	21
Changes in the period until 2010	131	36
I do not expect changes	155	43
Total	360	100

N - valid = 360, N - Missing = 121

Table 52 Various entry and exit points to students are offered

	Frequency	Valid Percent
not at all	73	18
to some extent	215	52
to a considerable extent	77	19
to a large extent	47	11
Total	412	100

N - valid = 412, N - Missing = 69

Table 53 Change regarding the number of entry and exit points will take place

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Changes in the coming 18 months	77	21
Changes in the period until 2010	128	35
I do not expect changes	160	44
Total	365	100

N - valid = 365, N - Missing = 116

Table 54 The existence of flexible learning paths for students is desirable

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	7	2
disagree	29	7
mildly disagree	21	5
mildly agree	79	19
agree	170	41
strongly agree	97	24
do not know	8	2
Total	411	100

N - valid = 411, N - Missing = 70

Table 55 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	40	10
hindrance	50	12
slight hindrance	50	12
slight driver	69	17
driver	107	26
strong driver	46	11
do not know	28	7
not applicable	16	4
Total	406	100

N - valid = 406, N - Missing = 75

Table 56 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	7	2
hindrance	23	6
slight hindrance	49	12
slight driver	88	22
driver	142	35
strong driver	55	14
do not know	20	5

	Frequency	Valid Percent
not applicable	19	5
Total	403	100

N - valid = 403, N - Missing = 78

Table 57 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	9	2
hindrance	46	11
slight hindrance	91	22
slight driver	95	23
driver	95	23
strong driver	27	7
do not know	23	6
not applicable	20	5
Total	406	100

N - valid = 406, N - Missing = 75

Table 58 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	14	3
hindrance	39	10
slight hindrance	88	22
slight driver	101	25
driver	95	23
strong driver	31	8
do not know	21	5
not applicable	16	4
Total	405	100

N - valid = 405, N - Missing = 76

Table 59 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	18	4
hindrance	34	8
slight hindrance	56	14
slight driver	92	23
driver	90	22
strong driver	22	5
do not know	58	14
not applicable	36	9
Total	406	100

N - valid = 406, N - Missing = 75

Table 60 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	12	3
hindrance	32	8
slight hindrance	37	9
slight driver	103	25
driver	91	22
strong driver	38	9
do not know	53	13
not applicable	40	10
Total	406	100

N - valid = 406, N - Missing = 75

Table 61 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	3	1
hindrance	14	3
slight hindrance	18	4
slight driver	98	24
driver	149	37
strong driver	47	12

do not know	37	9
not applicable	39	10
Total	405	100

N - valid = 405, N - Missing = 76

Table 62 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of flexible learning paths at other heir-s

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	2	0
hindrance	6	1
slight hindrance	13	3
slight driver	103	25
driver	162	40
strong driver	50	12
do not know	30	7
not applicable	40	10
Total	406	100

N - valid = 406, N - Missing = 75

Table 63 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	2	0
hindrance	6	1
slight hindrance	17	4
slight driver	91	22
driver	137	34
strong driver	50	12
do not know	80	20
not applicable	22	5
Total	405	100

N - valid = 405, N - Missing = 76

Table 64 A diploma supplement is handed out to graduates

	Frequency	Valid Percent
No, this is not the case	99	24
Yes, to some of them	47	12
Yes, to most of them' 4 'Yes, to all of them'	32	8
	229	56
Total	407	100

N - valid = 407, N - Missing = 74

Table 65 Change regarding the diploma supplement will take place

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Changes in the coming 18 months	86	48
Changes in the period until 2010	49	27
I do not expect changes	44	25
Total	179	100

N - valid = 179, N - Missing = 302

Table 66 Recognition of student achievements from other national institutions works well

	Frequency	Valid Percent
no	16	4
yes, to some extent	76	18
yes, to a considerable extent	135	33
fully	186	45
Total	413	100

N - valid = 413, N - Missing = 68

Table 67 Change regarding the recognitions of student achievements from other national institutions will take place

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Changes in the coming 18 months	65	28
Changes in the period until 2010	87	38
I do not expect changes	79	34
Total	231	100

N - valid = 231, N - Missing = 250

Table 68 Recognition of student achievements from foreign institutions works well

	Frequency	Valid Percent
no	23	6
yes, to some extent	124	30
yes, to a considerable extent	156	38
fully	104	26
Total	407	100

N - valid = 407, N - Missing = 74

Table 69 Change regarding the recognitions of student achievements from foreign institutions will take place

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Changes in the coming 18 months	79	26
Changes in the period until 2010	126	42
I do not expect changes	98	32
Total	303	100

N - valid = 303, N - Missing = 178

Table 70 The improvement of issues of recognition (diploma supplement, student achievements at other institutions) is desirable

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	4	1
disagree	9	2
mildly disagree	12	3
mildly agree	56	14
agree	163	40
strongly agree	152	37
do not know	11	3
Total	407	100

N - valid = 407, N - Missing = 74

Table 71 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	23	6
hindrance	40	10
slight hindrance	42	10

	Frequency	Valid Percent
slight driver	61	15
driver	113	28
strong driver	83	20
do not know	23	6
not applicable	22	5
Total	407	100

N - valid = 407, N - Missing = 74

Table 72 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	5	1
hindrance	12	3
slight hindrance	33	8
slight driver	79	20
driver	145	36
strong driver	87	21
do not know	22	5
not applicable	22	5
Total	405	100

N - valid = 405, N - Missing = 76

Table 73 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	3	1
hindrance	19	5
slight hindrance	78	19
slight driver	103	25
driver	117	29
strong driver	44	11
do not know	21	5
not applicable	21	5
Total	406	100

N - valid = 406, N - Missing = 75

Table 74 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	2	0
hindrance	21	5
slight hindrance	72	18
slight driver	110	27
driver	110	27
strong driver	49	12
do not know	20	5
not applicable	23	6
Total	407	100

N - valid = 407, N - Missing = 74

Table 75 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	7	2
hindrance	24	6
slight hindrance	53	13
slight driver	106	26
driver	84	21
strong driver	31	8
do not know	58	14
not applicable	43	11
Total	406	100

N - valid = 406, N - Missing = 75

Table 76 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	6	1
hindrance	17	4
slight hindrance	41	10
slight driver	102	25
driver	91	23

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong driver	39	10
do not know	51	13
not applicable	57	14
Total	404	100

N - valid = 404, N - Missing = 77

Table 77 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	5	1
hindrance	6	1
slight hindrance	27	7
slight driver	97	24
driver	136	33
strong driver	69	17
do not know	28	7
not applicable	39	10
Total	407	100

N - valid = 407, N - Missing = 74

Table 78 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of measures regarding recognition at other hei-s

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	2	0
hindrance	6	1
slight hindrance	16	4
slight driver	91	22
driver	146	36
strong driver	83	20
do not know	27	7
not applicable	36	9
Total	407	100

N - valid = 407, N - Missing = 74

Table 79 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	1	0
hindrance	6	1
slight hindrance	17	4
slight driver	56	14
driver	154	38
strong driver	111	27
do not know	44	11
not applicable	17	4
Total	406	100

N - valid = 406, N - Missing = 75

Table 80 National student mobility works well

	Frequency	Valid Percent
no	76	19
yes, to some extent	205	50
yes, to a considerable extent	58	14
fully	71	17
Total	410	100

N - valid = 410, N - Missing = 71

Table 81 Change regarding national student mobility will take place

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Changes in the coming 18 months	67	20
Changes in the period until 2010	140	41
I do not expect changes	135	39
Total	342	100

N - valid = 342, N - Missing = 139

Table 82 High national student mobility is desirable

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	11	3
disagree	22	5
mildly disagree	32	8
mildly agree	93	23
agree	126	31
strongly agree	121	30
do not know	3	1
Total	408	100

N - valid = 408, N - Missing = 73

Table 83 International student mobility works well

	Frequency	Valid Percent
no	46	11
yes, to some extent	179	44
yes, to a considerable extent	106	26
fully	80	19
Total	411	100

N - valid = 411, N - Missing = 70

Table 84 Change regarding international student mobility will take place

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Changes in the coming 18 months	96	29
Changes in the period until 2010	156	48
I do not expect changes	76	23
Total	328	100

N - valid = 328, N - Missing = 153

Table 85 High international student mobility is desirable

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	2	0
disagree	4	1
mildly disagree	10	2

	Frequency	Valid Percent
mildly agree	49	12
agree	147	36
strongly agree	195	48
do not know	1	0
Total	408	100

N - valid = 408, N - Missing = 73

Table 86 International graduate mobility works well

	Frequency	Valid Percent
no	69	17
yes, to some extent	199	49
yes, to a considerable extent	90	22
fully	49	12
Total	407	100

N - valid = 407, N - Missing = 74

Table 87 Change regarding international graduate mobility will take place

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Changes in the coming 18 months	80	22
Changes in the period until 2010	177	50
I do not expect changes	100	28
Total	357	100

N - valid = 357, N - Missing = 124

Table 88 High international graduate mobility is desirable

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	2	0
disagree	2	0
mildly disagree	10	2
mildly agree	40	10
agree	170	42
strongly agree	175	43
do not know	7	2

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Total	406	100
N - valid = 406, N - Missing = 75		

Table 89 International mobility of teaching staff works well

	Frequency	Valid Percent
no	100	24
yes, to some extent	215	53
yes, to a considerable extent	67	16
fully	27	7
Total	409	100
N - valid = 409, N - Missing = 72		

Table 90 Change regarding international mobility of teaching staff will take place

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Changes in the coming 18 months	65	17
Changes in the period until 2010	191	50
I do not expect changes	123	32
Total	379	100
N - valid = 379, N - Missing = 102		

Table 91 High international mobility of teaching staff is desirable

	Frequency	Valid Percent
disagree	1	0
mildly disagree	2	0
mildly agree	48	12
agree	154	38
strongly agree	198	48
do not know	6	1
Total	409	100
N - valid = 409, N - Missing = 72		

Table 92 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	29	7
hindrance	55	14
slight hindrance	52	13
slight driver	81	20
driver	94	23
strong driver	66	16
do not know	13	3
not applicable	16	4
Total	406	100

N - valid = 406, N - Missing = 75

Table 93 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	5	1
hindrance	27	7
slight hindrance	37	9
slight driver	78	19
driver	127	31
strong driver	103	25
do not know	14	3
not applicable	15	4
Total	406	100

N - valid = 406, N - Missing = 75

Table 94 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	4	1
hindrance	27	7
slight hindrance	49	12
slight driver	122	30
driver	125	31
strong driver	47	12

	Frequency	Valid Percent
do not know	17	4
not applicable	14	3
Total	405	100

N - valid = 405, N - Missing = 76

Table 95 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	3	1
hindrance	25	6
slight hindrance	51	13
slight driver	101	25
driver	138	34
strong driver	56	14
do not know	13	3
not applicable	16	4
Total	403	100

N - valid = 403, N - Missing = 78

Table 96 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	5	1
hindrance	19	5
slight hindrance	41	10
slight driver	113	28
driver	87	22
strong driver	26	6
do not know	53	13
not applicable	58	14
Total	402	100

N - valid = 402, N - Missing = 79

Table 97 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	8	2
hindrance	18	4
slight hindrance	50	12
slight driver	104	26
driver	92	23
strong driver	29	7
do not know	46	11
not applicable	56	14
Total	403	100

N - valid = 403, N - Missing = 78

Table 98 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	4	1
hindrance	9	2
slight hindrance	18	4
slight driver	97	24
driver	142	35
strong driver	69	17
do not know	31	8
not applicable	36	9
Total	406	100

N - valid = 406, N - Missing = 75

Table 99 Hindrances/Drivers - increase mobility at other hei-s

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	4	1
hindrance	4	1
slight hindrance	6	1
slight driver	89	22
driver	154	38
strong driver	74	18

	Frequency	Valid Percent
do not know	33	8
not applicable	41	10
Total	405	100

N - valid = 405, N - Missing = 76

Table 100 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strong hindrance	2	0
hindrance	6	1
slight hindrance	5	1
slight driver	61	15
driver	162	40
strong driver	126	31
do not know	27	7
not applicable	14	3
Total	403	100

N - valid = 403, N - Missing = 78

Table 101 assessment of situation - Current situation in my institution is in line with the Bologna expectations

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	12	3
disagree	43	11
mildly disagree	31	8
mildly agree	92	23
agree	154	38
strongly agree	68	17
do not know	6	1
Total	406	100

N - valid = 406, N - Missing = 75

Table 102 assessment of situation - I expect considerable (further) change in terms of meeting the Bologna objectives in the coming 18 months

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	24	6
disagree	53	14
mildly disagree	31	8
mildly agree	100	26
agree	113	30
strongly agree	46	12
do not know	16	4
Total	383	100

N - valid = 383, N - Missing = 98

Table 103 assessment of situation - I expect considerable (further) change in terms of meeting the Bologna objectives until 2010

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	20	5
disagree	37	10
mildly disagree	34	9
mildly agree	67	17
agree	146	38
strongly agree	64	17
do not know	16	4
Total	384	100

N - valid = 384, N - Missing = 97

Table 104 assessment of situation - Current situation in my country is in line with the Bologna expectations

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	16	4
disagree	46	12
mildly disagree	40	10
mildly agree	93	24
agree	132	33

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly agree	47	12
do not know	21	5
Total	395	100

N - valid = 395, N - Missing = 86

Table 105 The consequences of the Bologna process are desirable

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	19	5
disagree	21	5
mildly disagree	24	6
mildly agree	90	22
agree	145	36
strongly agree	102	25
do not know	6	1
Total	407	100

N - valid = 407, N - Missing = 74

Table 106 Impact assessment - Access to programmes

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	16	5
disagree	24	8
mildly disagree	36	12
mildly agree	83	27
agree	100	32
strongly agree	30	10
do not know	23	7
Total	312	100

N - valid = 312, N - Missing = 169

Table 107 Impact assessment - Graduation rates

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	14	4
disagree	38	12
mildly disagree	47	15
mildly agree	88	28
agree	81	26
strongly agree	20	6
do not know	25	8
Total	313	100

N - valid = 313, N - Missing = 168

Table 108 Impact assessment - Employability of graduates

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	13	4
disagree	25	8
mildly disagree	46	15
mildly agree	106	34
agree	71	23
strongly agree	30	10
do not know	22	7
Total	313	100

N - valid = 313, N - Missing = 168

Table 109 Impact assessment - General mobility

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	11	4
disagree	23	7
mildly disagree	22	7
mildly agree	94	30
agree	114	36

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly agree	38	12
do not know	12	4
Total	314	100

N - valid = 314, N - Missing = 167

Table 110 Impact assessment - Quality of education

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	11	4
disagree	41	13
mildly disagree	29	9
mildly agree	90	29
agree	77	25
strongly agree	44	14
do not know	20	6
Total	312	100

N - valid = 312, N - Missing = 169

Table 111 Impact assessment - Cost effectiveness

	Frequency	Valid Percent
strongly disagree	21	7
disagree	42	13
mildly disagree	56	18
mildly agree	74	24
agree	60	19
strongly agree	18	6
do not know	41	13
Total	312	100

N - valid = 312, N - Missing = 169

Table 112 country

	Frequency	Valid Percent
—	2	0
AUT	30	6
BEL	27	6
CZE	3	1
DEU	48	10
DNK	19	4
ESP	13	3
EST	10	2
FIN	36	7
FRA	16	3
GBR	53	11
GRC	6	1
HRV	2	0
HUN	4	1
IRL	12	2
ITA	30	6
LTU	10	2
LUX	4	1
LVA	4	1
MLT	3	1
NLD	17	4
NOR	13	3
POL	14	3
PRT	28	6
ROM	17	4
SVK	4	1
SVN	4	1
SWE	26	5
TUR	26	5
Total	481	100

N - valid = 481, N - Missing = 0

Table 113 Area of study

	Frequency	Valid Percent
medicine	48	11
law	47	10
teacher training	106	23
engineering	205	45
history	47	10
Total	453	100

N - valid = 453, N - Missing = 28

Contents of Curriculum Results (Cross tabs)

Table 1 Loop	77
Table 2 Position of respondent	77
Table 3 Institution - type	77
Table 4 Institution - ownership	78
Table 5 Number of students	78
Table 6 Highest degree offered at institution	79
Table 7 Programme structure: Bachelor and Masters.....	79
Table 8 degree by.....	79
Table 9 Curricula have been adjusted	80
Table 10 Curricula will be fully adjusted or changed by	80
Table 11 First cycle takes nominally.....	81
Table 12 Second cycle takes nominally	81
Table 13 The main function of the degree is.....	82
Table 14 The main function of the first degree (Bachelor-level) is	82
Table 15 The main function of the degree should be	83
Table 16 The main function of the first degree (Bachelor-level) should be.....	83
Table 17 The Bachelor-level degree is relevant to the European labour market	84
Table 18 cycle is adequate	84
Table 19 The first degree (Bachelor-level) is relevant to the European labour market	85
Table 20 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation	85
Table 21 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution	86
Table 22 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution	87
Table 23 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study	87
Table 24 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study	88
Table 25 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study	88
Table 26 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions	89
Table 27 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of Bologna-type degrees at other heir-s	90
Table 28 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies	90
Table 29 Curricula are modularised.....	91
Table 30 Change regarding modularisation will take place	91
Table 31 Curricula defined in terms of competences or learning outcomes	92
Table 32 Change regarding competences or learning outcomes will take place	92
Table 33 Curricula are defined in terms of ACTS	92
Table 34 Change regarding the definition of curricula in ACTS will take place	93
Table 35 The principles of competence-based learning are desirable/useful	93
Table 36 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation	94
Table 37 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution	94
Table 38 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution	95
Table 39 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study	96
Table 40 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study	96
Table 41 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study	97
Table 42 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions	97
Table 43 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of competence-based learning at other heir-s.....	98
Table 44 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies	99
Table 45 Programmes offer large flexibility for students	99
Table 46 Change regarding flexibility for students will take place	100
Table 47 A variety of teaching modes for different target groups is offered.....	100
Table 48 Change regarding the variety of teaching modes will take place	100
Table 49 Students can validate relevant prior professional/vocational experience or training and get it recognised as part of their degree	101

Table 50 Change regarding the validation and recognition of relevant prior professional/vocational experience or training will take place	101
Table 51 Various entry and exit points to students are offered.....	102
Table 52 Change regarding the number of entry and exit points will take place.....	102
Table 53 The existence of flexible learning paths for students is desirable.....	102
Table 54 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation	103
Table 55 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution	103
Table 56 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution	104
Table 57 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study	105
Table 58 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study	105
Table 59 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study	106
Table 60 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions	107
Table 61 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of flexible learning paths at other heir-s	107
Table 62 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies	108
Table 63 A diploma supplement is handed out to graduates.....	108
Table 64 Change regarding the diploma supplement will take place	109
Table 65 Recognition of student achievements from other national institutions works well.....	109
Table 66 Change regarding the recognitions of student achievements from other national institutions will take place	110
Table 67 Recognition of student achievements from foreign institutions works well.....	110
Table 68 Change regarding the recognitions of student achievements from foreign institutions will take place.....	110
Table 69 The improvement of issues of recognition (diploma supplement, student achievements at other institutions) is desirable.....	111
Table 70 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation	111
Table 71 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution	112
Table 72 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution	113
Table 73 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study	113
Table 74 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study	114
Table 75 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study	114
Table 76 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions	115
Table 77 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of measures regarding recognition at other hei-s	116
Table 78 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies	116
Table 79 National student mobility works well	117
Table 80 Change regarding national student mobility will take place	117
Table 81 High national student mobility is desirable	118
Table 82 International student mobility works well	118
Table 83 Change regarding international student mobility will take place	119
Table 84 High international student mobility is desirable.....	119
Table 85 International graduate mobility works well	120
Table 86 Change regarding international graduate mobility will take place	120
Table 87 High international graduate mobility is desirable.....	120
Table 88 International mobility of teaching staff works well	121
Table 89 Change regarding international mobility of teaching staff will take place	121
Table 90 High international mobility of teaching staff is desirable.....	122
Table 91 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation	122
Table 92 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution	123
Table 93 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution	123
Table 94 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study	124
Table 95 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study	125
Table 96 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study	125
Table 97 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions	126
Table 98 Hindrances/Drivers - increase mobility at other hei-s	126
Table 99 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies	127
Table 100 assessment of situation - Current situation in my institution is in line with the Bologna expectations.....	128

<i>Table 101 assessment of situation - I expect considerable (further) change in terms of meeting the Bologna objectives in the coming 18 months</i>	128
<i>Table 102 assessment of situation - I expect considerable (further) change in terms of meeting the Bologna objectives until 2010</i>	129
<i>Table 103 assessment of situation - Current situation in my country is in line with the Bologna expectations</i>	129
<i>Table 104 The consequences of the Bologna process are desirable</i>	130
<i>Table 105 Impact assessment - Access to programmes</i>	130
<i>Table 106 Impact assessment - Graduation rates</i>	131
<i>Table 107 Impact assessment - Employability of graduates</i>	132
<i>Table 108 Impact assessment - General mobility</i>	132
<i>Table 109 Impact assessment - Quality of education</i>	133
<i>Table 110 Impact assessment - Cost effectiveness</i>	133
<i>Table 111 Country</i>	134

Table 1 Loop

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
A	Count	38	43	83	184	42	390
	(%)	79 %	91 %	78 %	90 %	89 %	86 %
B	Count	7	4	20	19	5	55
	(%)	15 %	9 %	19 %	9 %	11 %	12 %
C	Count	3	0	3	2	0	8
	(%)	6 %	0 %	3 %	1 %	0 %	2 %
Total	Count	48	47	106	205	47	453

Table 2 Position of respondent

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
dean	Count	23	26	40	90	23	202
	(%)	49 %	58 %	39 %	44 %	51 %	45 %
director of study	Count	24	19	63	114	22	242
	(%)	51 %	42 %	61 %	56 %	49 %	55 %
Total	Count	47	45	103	204	45	444

Table 3 Institution - type

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Comprehensive research university	Count	22	39	49	70	35	215
	(%)	46 %	83 %	46 %	34 %	76 %	48 %
specialised research university	Count	19	4	9	73	0	105
	(%)	40 %	9 %	8 %	36 %	0 %	23 %
Comprehensive professional/vocational higher education inst.	Count	3	0	26	32	6	67
	(%)	6 %	0 %	25 %	16 %	13 %	15 %
Specialised professional/vocational education institution	Count	3	3	20	27	2	55
	(%)	6 %	6 %	19 %	13 %	4 %	12 %

other	Count	medicine	1	law	1	teacher training	2	engineering	1	history	3	Total	8
	(%)		2 %		2 %		2 %		0 %		7 %		2 %
Total	Count		48		47		106		203		46		450

Table 4 Institution - ownership

public institution	Count	medicine	47	law	40	teacher training	94	engineering	178	history	45	Total	404
	(%)		98 %		85 %		89 %		87 %		96 %		89 %
private institutions	Count		1		7		12		26		2		48
	(%)		2 %		15 %		11 %		13 %		4 %		11 %
Total	Count		48		47		106		204		47		452

Table 5 Number of students

Less than 5.000	Count	medicine	21	law	15	teacher training	55	engineering	69	history	11	Total	171
	(%)		45 %		32 %		52 %		34 %		23 %		38 %
Between 5.000 and 10.000	Count		7		4		12		64		7		94
	(%)		15 %		9 %		11 %		32 %		15 %		21 %
Between 10.000 and 20.000	Count		8		15		13		41		11		88
	(%)		17 %		32 %		12 %		20 %		23 %		20 %
Between 20.000 and 30.000	Count		8		9		12		14		7		50
	(%)		17 %		19 %		11 %		7 %		15 %		11 %
More than 30.000	Count		3		4		14		15		11		47
	(%)		6 %		9 %		13 %		7 %		23 %		10 %
Total	Count		47		47		106		203		47		450

Table 6 Highest degree offered at institution

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
PhD	Count	33	32	56	138	35	294
	(%)	70 %	71 %	54 %	69 %	80 %	67 %
Masters	Count	4	9	25	41	3	82
	(%)	9 %	20 %	24 %	20 %	7 %	19 %
Bachelor	Count	7	4	19	19	5	54
	(%)	15 %	9 %	18 %	10 %	11 %	12 %
below Bachelor level	Count	3	0	3	2	1	9
	(%)	6 %	0 %	3 %	1 %	2 %	2 %
Total	Count	47	45	103	200	44	439

Table 7 Programme structure: Bachelor and Masters

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
no, none of the programmes	Count	8	8	19	11	5	51
	(%)	18 %	18 %	20 %	6 %	12 %	12 %
yes, but only some of the programmes	Count	16	8	20	26	9	79
	(%)	36 %	18 %	21 %	13 %	21 %	19 %
yes, a considerable part of the programme	Count	9	9	12	32	8	70
	(%)	20 %	20 %	12 %	17 %	19 %	17 %
yes, all programmes	Count	11	20	45	124	20	220
	(%)	25 %	44 %	47 %	64 %	48 %	52 %
Total	Count	44	45	96	193	42	420

Table 8 degree by

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
2007	Count	14	6	20	32	10	82
	(%)	42 %	25 %	37 %	43 %	45 %	39 %
2008	Count	1	1	10	11	2	25
	(%)	3 %	4 %	19 %	15 %	9 %	12 %
2009	Count	1	1	4	1	1	8

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
2010	(%)	3 %	4 %	7 %	1 %	5 %	4 %
	Count	1	1	2	5	2	11
after 2010	(%)	3 %	4 %	4 %	7 %	9 %	5 %
	Count	1	0	2	2	2	7
No plans to implement	(%)	3 %	0 %	4 %	3 %	9 %	3 %
	Count	15	15	16	24	5	75
	(%)	45 %	62 %	30 %	32 %	23 %	36 %
Total	Count	33	24	54	75	22	208

Table 9 Curricula have been adjusted

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
not at all	Count	2	1	12	2	7	24
	(%)	6 %	3 %	14 %	1 %	19 %	7 %
to some extent	Count	5	6	15	17	5	48
	(%)	16 %	21 %	17 %	10 %	14 %	13 %
to a considerable extent	Count	6	4	14	35	7	66
	(%)	19 %	14 %	16 %	20 %	19 %	19 %
fully	Count	18	18	45	119	18	218
	(%)	58 %	62 %	52 %	69 %	49 %	61 %
Total	Count	31	29	86	173	37	356

Table 10 Curricula will be fully adjusted or changed by

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
2007	Count	7	5	19	25	9	65
	(%)	47 %	45 %	49 %	48 %	45 %	47 %
2008	Count	2	2	9	11	3	27
	(%)	13 %	18 %	23 %	21 %	15 %	20 %
2009	Count	1	1	5	5	1	13
	(%)	7 %	9 %	13 %	10 %	5 %	9 %
2010	Count	3	2	2	5	3	15
	(%)	20 %	18 %	5 %	10 %	15 %	11 %
after 2010	Count	1	1	1	3	1	7
	(%)	7 %	9 %	3 %	6 %	5 %	5 %

No plans to adjust	Count	medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
	(%)	1	0	3	3	3	10
		7 %	0 %	8 %	6 %	15 %	7 %
Total	Count	15	11	39	52	20	137

Table 11 First cycle takes nominally

3 years	Count	medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
	(%)	23	18	49	110	29	229
		79 %	64 %	61 %	67 %	81 %	68 %
3,5 years	Count	1	0	6	14	0	21
	(%)	3 %	0 %	8 %	9 %	0 %	6 %
4 years	Count	1	10	22	37	7	77
	(%)	3 %	36 %	28 %	23 %	19 %	23 %
other	Count	2	0	2	2	0	6
	(%)	7 %	0 %	2 %	1 %	0 %	2 %
5	Count	2	0	1	1	0	4
	(%)	7 %	0 %	1 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
Total	Count	29	28	80	164	36	337

Table 12 Second cycle takes nominally

1 year	Count	medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
	(%)	3	7	7	16	6	39
		14 %	28 %	11 %	11 %	18 %	14 %
1,5 years	Count	1	3	4	16	0	24
	(%)	5 %	12 %	6 %	11 %	0 %	8 %
2 years	Count	12	15	49	114	27	217
	(%)	57 %	60 %	79 %	78 %	82 %	75 %
other	Count	5	0	2	1	0	8
	(%)	24 %	0 %	3 %	1 %	0 %	3 %
Total	Count	21	25	62	147	33	288

Table 13 The main function of the degree is

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
point for orientation and further specialisation	Count	4	2	3	1	1	11
	(%)	57 %	50 %	17 %	6 %	33 %	23 %
lead to employment	Count	3	0	14	15	2	34
	(%)	43 %	0 %	78 %	94 %	67 %	71 %
other	Count	0	2	1	0	0	3
	(%)	0 %	50 %	6 %	0 %	0 %	6 %
Total	Count	7	4	18	16	3	48

Table 14 The main function of the first degree (Bachelor-level) is

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
only to lead to a formal degree	Count	5	5	9	16	7	42
	(%)	23 %	20 %	15 %	10 %	23 %	14 %
point for orientation and further specialisation in own inst	Count	6	11	24	74	10	125
	(%)	27 %	44 %	39 %	48 %	32 %	43 %
point for orientation and further specialisation in other	Count	2	1	7	25	9	44
	(%)	9 %	4 %	11 %	16 %	29 %	15 %
lead to employment	Count	8	8	18	34	5	73
	(%)	36 %	32 %	30 %	22 %	16 %	25 %
other	Count	1	0	3	5	0	9
	(%)	5 %	0 %	5 %	3 %	0 %	3 %
Total	Count	22	25	61	154	31	293

Table 15 The main function of the degree should be

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
point for orientation and further specialisation	Count	4	2	2	2	2	12
	(%)	57 %	50 %	11 %	12 %	67 %	24 %
lead to employment	Count	3	0	15	15	1	34
	(%)	43 %	0 %	83 %	88 %	33 %	69 %
other	Count	0	2	1	0	0	3
	(%)	0 %	50 %	6 %	0 %	0 %	6 %
Total	Count	7	4	18	17	3	49

Table 16 The main function of the first degree (Bachelor-level) should be

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
only to lead to a formal degree	Count	4	2	6	13	5	30
	(%)	17 %	8 %	10 %	9 %	16 %	10 %
point for orientation and further specialisation in own inst	Count	7	11	19	62	9	108
	(%)	30 %	44 %	31 %	41 %	28 %	37 %
point for orientation and further specialisation in other	Count	4	6	16	39	9	74
	(%)	17 %	24 %	26 %	26 %	28 %	25 %
lead to employment	Count	7	3	16	34	8	68
	(%)	30 %	12 %	26 %	23 %	25 %	23 %
other	Count	1	3	4	3	1	12
	(%)	4 %	12 %	7 %	2 %	3 %	4 %
Total	Count	23	25	61	151	32	292

Table 17 The Bachelor-level degree is relevant to the European labour market

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	1	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	25 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	2 %
disagree	Count	0	1	1	0	0	2
	(%)	0 %	25 %	7 %	0 %	0 %	5 %
mildly disagree	Count	0	0	0	0	1	1
	(%)	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	33 %	2 %
mildly agree	Count	0	3	4	0	0	7
	(%)	0 %	75 %	27 %	0 %	0 %	17 %
agree	Count	3	0	8	11	1	23
	(%)	75 %	0 %	53 %	69 %	33 %	55 %
strongly agree	Count	0	0	2	5	0	7
	(%)	0 %	0 %	13 %	31 %	0 %	17 %
do not know	Count	0	0	0	0	1	1
	(%)	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	33 %	2 %
Total	Count	4	4	15	16	3	42

Table 18 cycle is adequate

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	3	4	2	5	2	16
	(%)	7 %	9 %	2 %	3 %	5 %	4 %
disagree	Count	5	7	7	15	2	36
	(%)	12 %	16 %	8 %	8 %	5 %	9 %
mildly disagree	Count	4	2	6	4	1	17
	(%)	9 %	5 %	6 %	2 %	2 %	4 %
mildly agree	Count	4	8	9	24	6	51
	(%)	9 %	19 %	10 %	12 %	14 %	12 %
agree	Count	16	13	40	88	20	177
	(%)	37 %	30 %	43 %	46 %	48 %	43 %
strongly agree	Count	8	9	27	52	11	107
	(%)	19 %	21 %	29 %	27 %	26 %	26 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
do not know	Count	3	0	2	4	0	9
	(%)	7 %	0 %	2 %	2 %	0 %	2 %
Total	Count	43	43	93	192	42	413

Table 19 The first degree (Bachelor-level) is relevant to the European labour market

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	3	0	2	7	2	14
	(%)	13 %	0 %	3 %	5 %	6 %	5 %
disagree	Count	2	5	7	12	3	29
	(%)	9 %	21 %	11 %	8 %	9 %	10 %
mildly disagree	Count	1	0	10	12	7	30
	(%)	4 %	0 %	16 %	8 %	21 %	10 %
mildly agree	Count	3	6	15	25	10	59
	(%)	13 %	25 %	25 %	17 %	29 %	20 %
agree	Count	8	7	18	59	7	99
	(%)	35 %	29 %	30 %	40 %	21 %	34 %
strongly agree	Count	6	5	6	32	3	52
	(%)	26 %	21 %	10 %	21 %	9 %	18 %
do not know	Count	0	1	3	2	2	8
	(%)	0 %	4 %	5 %	1 %	6 %	3 %
Total	Count	23	24	61	149	34	291

Table 20 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	6	6	12	5	3	32
	(%)	14 %	15 %	13 %	3 %	7 %	8 %
hindrance	Count	8	4	15	15	9	51
	(%)	19 %	10 %	17 %	8 %	22 %	13 %
slight hindrance	Count	3	5	11	17	2	38
	(%)	7 %	12 %	12 %	9 %	5 %	10 %
slight driver	Count	4	5	8	17	3	37
	(%)	10 %	12 %	9 %	9 %	7 %	9 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
driver	Count	8	9	19	62	14	112
	(%)	19 %	22 %	21 %	34 %	34 %	28 %
strong driver	Count	11	9	22	57	9	108
	(%)	26 %	22 %	24 %	31 %	22 %	27 %
do not know	Count	2	0	0	5	0	7
	(%)	5 %	0 %	0 %	3 %	0 %	2 %
not applicable	Count	0	3	3	5	1	12
	(%)	0 %	7 %	3 %	3 %	2 %	3 %
Total	Count	42	41	90	183	41	397

Table 21 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	2	0	0	3	0	5
	(%)	5 %	0 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	2	3	5	11	1	22
	(%)	5 %	7 %	6 %	6 %	2 %	6 %
slight hindrance	Count	3	2	3	4	1	13
	(%)	7 %	5 %	3 %	2 %	2 %	3 %
slight driver	Count	5	8	19	29	6	67
	(%)	12 %	20 %	22 %	16 %	15 %	17 %
driver	Count	10	12	18	68	19	127
	(%)	24 %	29 %	20 %	37 %	46 %	32 %
strong driver	Count	14	10	34	62	10	130
	(%)	34 %	24 %	39 %	34 %	24 %	33 %
do not know	Count	0	3	4	2	2	11
	(%)	0 %	7 %	5 %	1 %	5 %	3 %
not applicable	Count	5	3	5	5	2	20
	(%)	12 %	7 %	6 %	3 %	5 %	5 %
Total	Count	41	41	88	184	41	395

Table 22 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	3	0	2	1	7
	(%)	2 %	8 %	0 %	1 %	2 %	2 %
hindrance	Count	4	4	6	12	5	31
	(%)	10 %	10 %	7 %	7 %	12 %	8 %
slight hindrance	Count	6	10	19	40	7	82
	(%)	14 %	25 %	21 %	22 %	17 %	21 %
slight driver	Count	10	5	24	46	11	96
	(%)	24 %	12 %	27 %	25 %	27 %	24 %
driver	Count	10	12	20	62	11	115
	(%)	24 %	30 %	22 %	34 %	27 %	29 %
strong driver	Count	5	2	12	7	2	28
	(%)	12 %	5 %	13 %	4 %	5 %	7 %
do not know	Count	0	2	3	5	3	13
	(%)	0 %	5 %	3 %	3 %	7 %	3 %
not applicable	Count	6	2	5	10	1	24
	(%)	14 %	5 %	6 %	5 %	2 %	6 %
Total	Count	42	40	89	184	41	396

Table 23 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	2	6	0	5	2	15
	(%)	5 %	14 %	0 %	3 %	5 %	4 %
hindrance	Count	4	7	7	14	4	36
	(%)	10 %	17 %	8 %	8 %	10 %	9 %
slight hindrance	Count	9	9	15	35	5	73
	(%)	21 %	21 %	17 %	19 %	12 %	18 %
slight driver	Count	9	5	23	45	8	90
	(%)	21 %	12 %	26 %	24 %	19 %	22 %
driver	Count	6	7	21	49	16	99
	(%)	14 %	17 %	24 %	26 %	38 %	25 %
strong driver	Count	7	6	14	20	3	50
	(%)	17 %	14 %	16 %	11 %	7 %	12 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
do not know	Count	0	1	3	6	3	13
	(%)	0 %	2 %	3 %	3 %	7 %	3 %
not applicable	Count	5	1	6	11	1	24
	(%)	12 %	2 %	7 %	6 %	2 %	6 %
Total	Count	42	42	89	185	42	400

Table 24 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	6	6	3	8	2	25
	(%)	14 %	15 %	3 %	4 %	5 %	6 %
hindrance	Count	6	7	14	24	1	52
	(%)	14 %	17 %	16 %	13 %	2 %	13 %
slight hindrance	Count	6	9	15	35	5	70
	(%)	14 %	22 %	17 %	19 %	12 %	18 %
slight driver	Count	9	6	15	47	10	87
	(%)	21 %	15 %	17 %	25 %	24 %	22 %
driver	Count	5	8	21	30	9	73
	(%)	12 %	20 %	24 %	16 %	21 %	18 %
strong driver	Count	4	3	11	18	2	38
	(%)	10 %	7 %	12 %	10 %	5 %	10 %
do not know	Count	2	0	3	9	7	21
	(%)	5 %	0 %	3 %	5 %	17 %	5 %
not applicable	Count	4	2	7	15	6	34
	(%)	10 %	5 %	8 %	8 %	14 %	8 %
Total	Count	42	41	89	186	42	400

Table 25 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	4	2	3	9	1	19
	(%)	10 %	5 %	3 %	5 %	2 %	5 %
hindrance	Count	8	7	15	14	0	44
	(%)	19 %	17 %	17 %	8 %	0 %	11 %
slight hindrance	Count	6	8	8	36	6	64

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
slight driver	(%)	14 %	20 %	9 %	19 %	15 %	16 %
	Count	5	12	24	51	7	99
driver	(%)	12 %	29 %	27 %	27 %	17 %	25 %
	Count	6	4	14	31	10	65
strong driver	(%)	14 %	10 %	16 %	17 %	24 %	16 %
	Count	3	1	9	13	0	26
do not know	(%)	7 %	2 %	10 %	7 %	0 %	7 %
	Count	3	6	9	16	8	42
not applicable	(%)	7 %	15 %	10 %	9 %	20 %	11 %
	Count	7	1	7	16	9	40
Total	(%)	17 %	2 %	8 %	9 %	22 %	10 %
	Count	42	41	89	186	41	399

Table 26 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	2	1	2	5	2	12
	(%)	5 %	2 %	2 %	3 %	5 %	3 %
hindrance	Count	4	4	6	12	1	27
	(%)	10 %	10 %	7 %	6 %	2 %	7 %
slight hindrance	Count	3	5	7	8	2	25
	(%)	7 %	12 %	8 %	4 %	5 %	6 %
slight driver	Count	6	6	19	45	10	86
	(%)	14 %	15 %	21 %	24 %	24 %	22 %
driver	Count	9	13	25	63	15	125
	(%)	21 %	32 %	28 %	34 %	37 %	31 %
strong driver	Count	5	6	14	30	6	61
	(%)	12 %	15 %	16 %	16 %	15 %	15 %
do not know	Count	3	1	7	8	2	21
	(%)	7 %	2 %	8 %	4 %	5 %	5 %
not applicable	Count	10	5	9	15	3	42
	(%)	24 %	12 %	10 %	8 %	7 %	11 %
Total	Count	42	41	89	186	41	399

Table 27 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of Bologna-type degrees at other heir-s

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	0	1	3	0	5
	(%)	2 %	0 %	1 %	2 %	0 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	2	2	2	5	1	12
	(%)	5 %	5 %	2 %	3 %	2 %	3 %
slight hindrance	Count	3	0	6	7	1	17
	(%)	7 %	0 %	7 %	4 %	2 %	4 %
slight driver	Count	6	8	18	41	9	82
	(%)	14 %	20 %	20 %	22 %	22 %	21 %
driver	Count	11	16	25	71	15	138
	(%)	26 %	40 %	28 %	38 %	37 %	35 %
strong driver	Count	6	6	23	40	9	84
	(%)	14 %	15 %	26 %	22 %	22 %	21 %
do not know	Count	4	2	6	7	6	25
	(%)	10 %	5 %	7 %	4 %	15 %	6 %
not applicable	Count	9	6	8	12	0	35
	(%)	21 %	15 %	9 %	6 %	0 %	9 %
Total	Count	42	40	89	186	41	398

Table 28 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	3	0	1	1	0	5
	(%)	7 %	0 %	1 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	0	1	0	0	1	2
	(%)	0 %	2 %	0 %	0 %	2 %	1 %
slight hindrance	Count	1	0	3	4	1	9
	(%)	2 %	0 %	3 %	2 %	2 %	2 %
slight driver	Count	6	10	17	34	5	72
	(%)	14 %	24 %	19 %	18 %	12 %	18 %
driver	Count	17	14	33	82	15	161
	(%)	40 %	34 %	37 %	44 %	38 %	40 %
strong driver	Count	9	8	29	53	13	112
	(%)	21 %	20 %	33 %	28 %	32 %	28 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
do not know	Count	3	4	2	10	4	23
	(%)	7 %	10 %	2 %	5 %	10 %	6 %
not applicable	Count	3	4	4	3	1	15
	(%)	7 %	10 %	4 %	2 %	2 %	4 %
Total	Count	42	41	89	187	40	399

Table 29 Curricula are modularised

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
not at all	Count	7	4	10	9	2	32
	(%)	17 %	10 %	11 %	5 %	5 %	8 %
to some extent	Count	14	24	30	42	17	127
	(%)	33 %	59 %	32 %	23 %	40 %	31 %
to a considerable extent	Count	11	3	19	43	5	81
	(%)	26 %	7 %	20 %	23 %	12 %	20 %
fully	Count	10	10	35	92	19	166
	(%)	24 %	24 %	37 %	49 %	44 %	41 %
Total	Count	42	41	94	186	43	406

Table 30 Change regarding modularisation will take place

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Changes in the coming 18 months	Count	15	7	30	38	11	101
	(%)	50 %	23 %	51 %	41 %	46 %	43 %
Changes in the period until 2010	Count	6	10	20	29	10	75
	(%)	20 %	33 %	34 %	31 %	42 %	32 %
I do not expect changes	Count	9	13	9	26	3	60
	(%)	30 %	43 %	15 %	28 %	12 %	25 %
Total	Count	30	30	59	93	24	236

Table 31 Curricula defined in terms of competences or learning outcomes

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
not at all	Count	0	3	5	3	2	13
	(%)	0 %	7 %	5 %	2 %	5 %	3 %
to some extent	Count	6	11	31	46	14	108
	(%)	15 %	27 %	33 %	25 %	33 %	27 %
to a considerable extent	Count	17	13	26	61	12	129
	(%)	41 %	32 %	28 %	33 %	29 %	32 %
fully	Count	18	14	31	73	14	150
	(%)	44 %	34 %	33 %	40 %	33 %	38 %
Total	Count	41	41	93	183	42	400

Table 32 Change regarding competences or learning outcomes will take place

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Changes in the coming 18 months	Count	14	5	33	58	16	126
	(%)	58 %	19 %	53 %	53 %	55 %	50 %
Changes in the period until 2010	Count	7	14	24	39	10	94
	(%)	29 %	52 %	39 %	35 %	34 %	37 %
I do not expect changes	Count	3	8	5	13	3	32
	(%)	12 %	30 %	8 %	12 %	10 %	13 %
Total	Count	24	27	62	110	29	252

Table 33 Curricula are defined in terms of ACTS

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
No	Count	7	5	8	6	7	33
	(%)	17 %	12 %	9 %	3 %	17 %	8 %
Yes, to some of the curricula	Count	3	6	9	8	6	32
	(%)	7 %	15 %	10 %	4 %	14 %	8 %
Yes, to most of the curricula	Count	7	1	11	20	3	42
	(%)	17 %	2 %	12 %	11 %	7 %	10 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Yes, to all of the curricula	Count	24	28	64	151	26	293
	(%)	59 %	70 %	70 %	82 %	62 %	73 %
Total	Count	41	40	92	185	42	400

Table 34 Change regarding the definition of curricula in ACTS will take place

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Changes in the coming 18 months	Count	9	1	16	24	11	61
	(%)	53 %	8 %	57 %	69 %	69 %	56 %
Changes in the period until 2010	Count	3	6	8	10	5	32
	(%)	18 %	46 %	29 %	29 %	31 %	29 %
I do not expect changes	Count	5	6	4	1	0	16
	(%)	29 %	46 %	14 %	3 %	0 %	15 %
Total	Count	17	13	28	35	16	109

Table 35 The principles of competence-based learning are desirable/useful

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	1	1	1	1	0	4
	(%)	2 %	2 %	1 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
disagree	Count	0	2	1	2	0	5
	(%)	0 %	5 %	1 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
mildly disagree	Count	0	3	4	6	1	14
	(%)	0 %	7 %	4 %	3 %	2 %	4 %
mildly agree	Count	2	6	12	31	11	62
	(%)	5 %	15 %	13 %	17 %	26 %	16 %
agree	Count	12	12	35	80	10	149
	(%)	29 %	29 %	39 %	44 %	24 %	38 %
strongly agree	Count	26	14	36	61	16	153
	(%)	63 %	34 %	40 %	33 %	38 %	39 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
do not know	Count	0	3	1	2	4	10
	(%)	0 %	7 %	1 %	1 %	10 %	3 %
Total	Count	41	41	90	183	42	397

Table 36 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	0	1	6	2	4	13
	(%)	0 %	3 %	7 %	1 %	10 %	3 %
hindrance	Count	2	1	5	9	4	21
	(%)	5 %	3 %	5 %	5 %	10 %	5 %
slight hindrance	Count	4	5	8	15	2	34
	(%)	10 %	13 %	9 %	8 %	5 %	9 %
slight driver	Count	7	10	21	57	6	101
	(%)	18 %	26 %	23 %	31 %	15 %	26 %
driver	Count	11	11	21	48	12	103
	(%)	28 %	28 %	23 %	27 %	29 %	26 %
strong driver	Count	12	6	21	22	6	67
	(%)	30 %	15 %	23 %	12 %	15 %	17 %
do not know	Count	3	2	2	12	5	24
	(%)	8 %	5 %	2 %	7 %	12 %	6 %
not applicable	Count	1	3	7	16	2	29
	(%)	2 %	8 %	8 %	9 %	5 %	7 %
Total	Count	40	39	91	181	41	392

Table 37 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	0	0	1	2	0	3
	(%)	0 %	0 %	1 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	3	1	1	3	3	11
	(%)	7 %	3 %	1 %	2 %	7 %	3 %
slight hindrance	Count	1	2	4	9	3	19
	(%)	2 %	5 %	4 %	5 %	7 %	5 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
slight driver	Count	4	7	17	36	7	71
	(%)	10 %	18 %	19 %	20 %	17 %	18 %
driver	Count	11	9	35	72	13	140
	(%)	27 %	23 %	38 %	40 %	32 %	36 %
strong driver	Count	15	11	25	46	8	105
	(%)	37 %	28 %	27 %	26 %	20 %	27 %
do not know	Count	1	4	2	5	6	18
	(%)	2 %	10 %	2 %	3 %	15 %	5 %
not applicable	Count	6	5	6	7	1	25
	(%)	15 %	13 %	7 %	4 %	2 %	6 %
Total	Count	41	39	91	180	41	392

Table 38 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	0	1	2	4	1	8
	(%)	0 %	3 %	2 %	2 %	2 %	2 %
hindrance	Count	2	5	9	14	4	34
	(%)	5 %	13 %	10 %	8 %	10 %	9 %
slight hindrance	Count	6	6	19	36	10	77
	(%)	15 %	15 %	21 %	20 %	24 %	20 %
slight driver	Count	7	9	15	46	10	87
	(%)	17 %	23 %	17 %	25 %	24 %	22 %
driver	Count	14	10	27	49	9	109
	(%)	34 %	26 %	30 %	27 %	22 %	28 %
strong driver	Count	8	3	10	20	3	44
	(%)	20 %	8 %	11 %	11 %	7 %	11 %
do not know	Count	1	2	3	7	4	17
	(%)	2 %	5 %	3 %	4 %	10 %	4 %
not applicable	Count	3	3	5	5	0	16
	(%)	7 %	8 %	6 %	3 %	0 %	4 %
Total	Count	41	39	90	181	41	392

Table 39 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	0	1	2	4	1	8
	(%)	0 %	3 %	2 %	2 %	2 %	2 %
hindrance	Count	3	9	8	13	4	37
	(%)	7 %	23 %	9 %	7 %	10 %	9 %
slight hindrance	Count	4	5	16	29	9	63
	(%)	10 %	13 %	18 %	16 %	22 %	16 %
slight driver	Count	5	7	18	44	13	87
	(%)	12 %	18 %	20 %	24 %	32 %	22 %
driver	Count	12	11	23	55	6	107
	(%)	29 %	28 %	25 %	31 %	15 %	27 %
strong driver	Count	14	2	19	26	4	65
	(%)	34 %	5 %	21 %	14 %	10 %	17 %
do not know	Count	1	2	1	7	4	15
	(%)	2 %	5 %	1 %	4 %	10 %	4 %
not applicable	Count	2	2	4	2	0	10
	(%)	5 %	5 %	4 %	1 %	0 %	3 %
Total	Count	41	39	91	180	41	392

Table 40 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	0	1	3	1	6
	(%)	2 %	0 %	1 %	2 %	2 %	2 %
hindrance	Count	1	2	5	5	2	15
	(%)	2 %	5 %	5 %	3 %	5 %	4 %
slight hindrance	Count	1	3	6	12	4	26
	(%)	2 %	8 %	7 %	7 %	10 %	7 %
slight driver	Count	7	12	27	57	9	112
	(%)	17 %	31 %	30 %	32 %	22 %	29 %
driver	Count	11	12	20	51	8	102
	(%)	27 %	31 %	22 %	28 %	20 %	26 %
strong driver	Count	14	5	15	23	3	60
	(%)	34 %	13 %	16 %	13 %	7 %	15 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
do not know	Count	3	4	10	18	7	42
	(%)	7 %	10 %	11 %	10 %	17 %	11 %
not applicable	Count	3	1	7	11	7	29
	(%)	7 %	3 %	8 %	6 %	17 %	7 %
Total	Count	41	39	91	180	41	392

Table 41 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	0	3	0	1	5
	(%)	2 %	0 %	3 %	0 %	2 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	4	1	6	2	1	14
	(%)	10 %	3 %	7 %	1 %	2 %	4 %
slight hindrance	Count	2	1	6	9	3	21
	(%)	5 %	3 %	7 %	5 %	7 %	5 %
slight driver	Count	4	14	21	53	5	97
	(%)	10 %	36 %	23 %	29 %	12 %	25 %
driver	Count	7	14	23	62	9	115
	(%)	17 %	36 %	25 %	34 %	21 %	29 %
strong driver	Count	14	2	18	25	4	63
	(%)	34 %	5 %	20 %	14 %	10 %	16 %
do not know	Count	3	5	8	19	10	45
	(%)	7 %	13 %	9 %	10 %	24 %	11 %
not applicable	Count	6	2	6	11	9	34
	(%)	15 %	5 %	7 %	6 %	21 %	9 %
Total	Count	41	39	91	181	42	394

Table 42 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	0	1	0	0	2
	(%)	2 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	0 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	1	0	3	1	1	6
	(%)	2 %	0 %	3 %	1 %	2 %	2 %
slight hindrance	Count	3	3	7	6	2	21

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
slight driver	(%)	7 %	8 %	8 %	3 %	5 %	5 %
	Count	6	8	16	51	10	91
driver	(%)	15 %	21 %	18 %	28 %	24 %	23 %
	Count	6	12	25	59	14	116
strong driver	(%)	15 %	31 %	27 %	33 %	34 %	30 %
	Count	11	7	16	36	4	74
do not know	(%)	27 %	18 %	18 %	20 %	10 %	19 %
	Count	4	5	7	14	6	36
not applicable	(%)	10 %	13 %	8 %	8 %	15 %	9 %
	Count	9	4	16	14	4	47
Total	(%)	22 %	10 %	18 %	8 %	10 %	12 %
	Count	41	39	91	181	41	393

Table 43 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of competence-based learning at other heir-s

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	0	0	1	0	0	1
	(%)	0 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
hindrance	Count	0	0	2	1	1	4
	(%)	0 %	0 %	2 %	1 %	2 %	1 %
slight hindrance	Count	1	1	1	4	1	8
	(%)	2 %	3 %	1 %	2 %	2 %	2 %
slight driver	Count	11	14	16	55	10	106
	(%)	27 %	36 %	18 %	31 %	24 %	27 %
driver	Count	11	12	31	62	15	131
	(%)	27 %	31 %	34 %	34 %	37 %	34 %
strong driver	Count	8	5	21	32	5	71
	(%)	20 %	13 %	23 %	18 %	12 %	18 %
do not know	Count	3	3	8	14	8	36
	(%)	7 %	8 %	9 %	8 %	20 %	9 %
not applicable	Count	7	4	10	12	1	34
	(%)	17 %	10 %	11 %	7 %	2 %	9 %
Total	Count	41	39	90	180	41	391

Table 44 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	0	0	1	0	0	1
	(%)	0 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
hindrance	Count	1	0	1	3	1	6
	(%)	2 %	0 %	1 %	2 %	2 %	2 %
slight hindrance	Count	2	0	1	3	1	7
	(%)	5 %	0 %	1 %	2 %	2 %	2 %
slight driver	Count	9	10	16	37	6	78
	(%)	22 %	26 %	18 %	21 %	15 %	20 %
driver	Count	10	14	28	67	12	131
	(%)	24 %	36 %	31 %	37 %	29 %	34 %
strong driver	Count	9	3	32	29	9	82
	(%)	22 %	8 %	36 %	16 %	22 %	21 %
do not know	Count	7	7	6	30	11	61
	(%)	17 %	18 %	7 %	17 %	27 %	16 %
not applicable	Count	3	5	5	11	1	25
	(%)	7 %	13 %	6 %	6 %	2 %	6 %
Total	Count	41	39	90	180	41	391

Table 45 Programmes offer large flexibility for students

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
not at all	Count	5	1	5	5	0	16
	(%)	12 %	2 %	5 %	3 %	0 %	4 %
to some extent	Count	27	23	46	71	24	191
	(%)	66 %	56 %	50 %	39 %	56 %	48 %
to a considerable extent	Count	6	10	24	61	13	114
	(%)	15 %	24 %	26 %	34 %	30 %	29 %
to a large extent	Count	3	7	17	45	6	78
	(%)	7 %	17 %	18 %	25 %	14 %	20 %
Total	Count	41	41	92	182	43	399

Table 46 Change regarding flexibility for students will take place

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Changes in the coming 18 months	Count	15	11	26	49	13	114
	(%)	39 %	32 %	35 %	35 %	36 %	35 %
Changes in the period until 2010	Count	12	9	27	41	17	106
	(%)	32 %	26 %	36 %	29 %	47 %	33 %
I do not expect changes	Count	11	14	22	50	6	103
	(%)	29 %	41 %	29 %	36 %	17 %	32 %
Total	Count	38	34	75	140	36	323

Table 47 A variety of teaching modes for different target groups is offered

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
not at all	Count	8	1	8	22	3	42
	(%)	20 %	2 %	9 %	12 %	7 %	11 %
to some extent	Count	18	22	36	84	18	178
	(%)	44 %	55 %	39 %	46 %	43 %	45 %
to a considerable extent	Count	8	12	34	47	13	114
	(%)	20 %	30 %	37 %	26 %	31 %	29 %
to a large extent	Count	7	5	14	28	8	62
	(%)	17 %	12 %	15 %	15 %	19 %	16 %
Total	Count	41	40	92	181	42	396

Table 48 Change regarding the variety of teaching modes will take place

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Changes in the coming 18 months	Count	12	10	32	36	15	105
	(%)	36 %	29 %	41 %	24 %	43 %	32 %
Changes in the period until 2010	Count	14	17	28	76	15	150
	(%)	42 %	49 %	36 %	50 %	43 %	45 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
I do not expect changes	Count	7	8	18	40	5	78
	(%)	21 %	23 %	23 %	26 %	14 %	23 %
Total	Count	33	35	78	152	35	333

Table 49 Students can validate relevant prior professional/vocational experience or training and get it recognised as part of their degree

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
not at all	Count	10	13	13	28	12	76
	(%)	24 %	32 %	14 %	15 %	28 %	19 %
to some extent	Count	17	22	55	91	24	209
	(%)	40 %	54 %	60 %	50 %	56 %	52 %
to a considerable extent	Count	9	4	9	30	5	57
	(%)	21 %	10 %	10 %	16 %	12 %	14 %
to a large extent	Count	6	2	14	33	2	57
	(%)	14 %	5 %	15 %	18 %	5 %	14 %
Total	Count	42	41	91	182	43	399

Table 50 Change regarding the validation and recognition of relevant prior professional/vocational experience or training will take place

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Changes in the coming 18 months	Count	9	5	21	30	7	72
	(%)	25 %	13 %	27 %	20 %	17 %	21 %
Changes in the period until 2010	Count	8	15	31	56	14	124
	(%)	22 %	39 %	39 %	38 %	34 %	36 %
I do not expect changes	Count	19	18	27	63	20	147
	(%)	53 %	47 %	34 %	42 %	49 %	43 %
Total	Count	36	38	79	149	41	343

Table 51 Various entry and exit points to students are offered

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
not at all	Count	11	7	14	26	7	65
	(%)	26 %	17 %	16 %	14 %	17 %	16 %
to some extent	Count	23	24	49	91	23	210
	(%)	55 %	59 %	56 %	50 %	55 %	53 %
to a considerable extent	Count	5	5	16	40	8	74
	(%)	12 %	12 %	18 %	22 %	19 %	19 %
to a large extent	Count	3	5	9	24	4	45
	(%)	7 %	12 %	10 %	13 %	10 %	11 %
Total	Count	42	41	88	181	42	394

Table 52 Change regarding the number of entry and exit points will take place

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Changes in the coming 18 months	Count	9	5	18	33	8	73
	(%)	23 %	14 %	22 %	21 %	21 %	21 %
Changes in the period until 2010	Count	11	10	34	51	16	122
	(%)	28 %	29 %	42 %	32 %	42 %	35 %
I do not expect changes	Count	19	20	28	73	14	154
	(%)	49 %	57 %	35 %	46 %	37 %	44 %
Total	Count	39	35	80	157	38	349

Table 53 The existence of flexible learning paths for students is desirable

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	3	0	0	2	1	6
	(%)	7 %	0 %	0 %	1 %	2 %	2 %
disagree	Count	5	3	5	15	1	29
	(%)	12 %	8 %	6 %	8 %	2 %	7 %
mildly disagree	Count	3	3	4	9	2	21
	(%)	7 %	8 %	5 %	5 %	5 %	5 %
mildly agree	Count	10	17	13	29	6	75
	(%)	24 %	42 %	15 %	16 %	14 %	19 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
agree	Count	11	13	38	84	19	165
	(%)	27 %	32 %	43 %	46 %	45 %	42 %
strongly agree	Count	7	3	28	40	12	90
	(%)	17 %	8 %	32 %	22 %	29 %	23 %
do not know	Count	2	1	0	3	1	7
	(%)	5 %	2 %	0 %	2 %	2 %	2 %
Total	Count	41	40	88	182	42	393

Table 54 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	5	4	14	10	5	38
	(%)	13 %	10 %	16 %	6 %	12 %	10 %
hindrance	Count	6	7	9	19	6	47
	(%)	15 %	18 %	10 %	11 %	15 %	12 %
slight hindrance	Count	4	3	12	25	3	47
	(%)	10 %	8 %	13 %	14 %	7 %	12 %
slight driver	Count	5	10	16	28	10	69
	(%)	13 %	25 %	18 %	16 %	24 %	18 %
driver	Count	13	8	15	56	11	103
	(%)	33 %	20 %	17 %	31 %	27 %	27 %
strong driver	Count	4	2	19	16	3	44
	(%)	10 %	5 %	21 %	9 %	7 %	11 %
do not know	Count	2	4	3	14	2	25
	(%)	5 %	10 %	3 %	8 %	5 %	6 %
not applicable	Count	0	2	2	10	1	15
	(%)	0 %	5 %	2 %	6 %	2 %	4 %
Total	Count	39	40	90	178	41	388

Table 55 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	0	2	4	0	7
	(%)	3 %	0 %	2 %	2 %	0 %	2 %
hindrance	Count	3	3	3	11	3	23

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
	(%)	8 %	8 %	3 %	6 %	8 %	6 %
slight hindrance	Count	5	1	12	22	5	45
	(%)	13 %	3 %	13 %	12 %	12 %	12 %
slight driver	Count	7	13	23	37	8	88
	(%)	18 %	33 %	26 %	21 %	20 %	23 %
driver	Count	13	8	24	70	19	134
	(%)	33 %	21 %	27 %	40 %	48 %	35 %
strong driver	Count	6	5	19	21	2	53
	(%)	15 %	13 %	21 %	12 %	5 %	14 %
do not know	Count	2	3	2	7	3	17
	(%)	5 %	8 %	2 %	4 %	8 %	4 %
not applicable	Count	2	6	5	5	0	18
	(%)	5 %	15 %	6 %	3 %	0 %	5 %
Total	Count	39	39	90	177	40	385

Table 56 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	0	2	4	1	8
	(%)	3 %	0 %	2 %	2 %	2 %	2 %
hindrance	Count	4	6	9	21	6	46
	(%)	10 %	15 %	10 %	12 %	15 %	12 %
slight hindrance	Count	7	10	18	44	8	87
	(%)	18 %	25 %	20 %	25 %	20 %	22 %
slight driver	Count	5	9	23	39	13	89
	(%)	13 %	22 %	26 %	22 %	32 %	23 %
driver	Count	12	6	18	47	10	93
	(%)	31 %	15 %	20 %	26 %	24 %	24 %
strong driver	Count	4	3	8	9	1	25
	(%)	10 %	8 %	9 %	5 %	2 %	6 %
do not know	Count	3	4	6	6	2	21
	(%)	8 %	10 %	7 %	3 %	5 %	5 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
not applicable	Count	3	2	6	8	0	19
	(%)	8 %	5 %	7 %	4 %	0 %	5 %
Total	Count	39	40	90	178	41	388

Table 57 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	2	0	2	7	2	13
	(%)	5 %	0 %	2 %	4 %	5 %	3 %
hindrance	Count	5	10	6	15	3	39
	(%)	13 %	25 %	7 %	9 %	7 %	10 %
slight hindrance	Count	6	11	17	41	9	84
	(%)	15 %	28 %	19 %	23 %	21 %	22 %
slight driver	Count	7	6	27	43	12	95
	(%)	18 %	15 %	30 %	24 %	29 %	25 %
driver	Count	9	5	20	47	12	93
	(%)	23 %	12 %	22 %	27 %	29 %	24 %
strong driver	Count	4	4	10	10	1	29
	(%)	10 %	10 %	11 %	6 %	2 %	7 %
do not know	Count	3	3	3	7	3	19
	(%)	8 %	8 %	3 %	4 %	7 %	5 %
not applicable	Count	3	1	5	6	0	15
	(%)	8 %	2 %	6 %	3 %	0 %	4 %
Total	Count	39	40	90	176	42	387

Table 58 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	3	4	4	5	2	18
	(%)	8 %	10 %	4 %	3 %	5 %	5 %
hindrance	Count	5	3	8	13	3	32
	(%)	13 %	8 %	9 %	7 %	7 %	8 %
slight hindrance	Count	10	6	13	21	4	54
	(%)	26 %	15 %	15 %	12 %	10 %	14 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
slight driver	Count	7	7	19	47	9	89
	(%)	18 %	18 %	21 %	26 %	21 %	23 %
driver	Count	7	9	21	43	6	86
	(%)	18 %	22 %	24 %	24 %	14 %	22 %
strong driver	Count	0	1	7	11	1	20
	(%)	0 %	2 %	8 %	6 %	2 %	5 %
do not know	Count	5	6	10	25	9	55
	(%)	13 %	15 %	11 %	14 %	21 %	14 %
not applicable	Count	2	4	7	13	8	34
	(%)	5 %	10 %	8 %	7 %	19 %	9 %
Total	Count	39	40	89	178	42	388

Table 59 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	2	2	4	2	2	12
	(%)	5 %	5 %	4 %	1 %	5 %	3 %
hindrance	Count	6	5	13	7	1	32
	(%)	15 %	12 %	14 %	4 %	2 %	8 %
slight hindrance	Count	6	3	6	17	3	35
	(%)	15 %	8 %	7 %	10 %	7 %	9 %
slight driver	Count	5	7	27	51	10	100
	(%)	13 %	18 %	30 %	29 %	24 %	26 %
driver	Count	5	8	17	48	10	88
	(%)	13 %	20 %	19 %	27 %	24 %	23 %
strong driver	Count	4	3	6	20	1	34
	(%)	10 %	8 %	7 %	11 %	2 %	9 %
do not know	Count	5	8	9	20	7	49
	(%)	13 %	20 %	10 %	11 %	17 %	13 %
not applicable	Count	6	4	8	12	8	38
	(%)	15 %	10 %	9 %	7 %	19 %	10 %
Total	Count	39	40	90	177	42	388

Table 60 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	0	0	1	2	0	3
	(%)	0 %	0 %	1 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	3	3	4	2	2	14
	(%)	8 %	8 %	4 %	1 %	5 %	4 %
slight hindrance	Count	4	0	4	4	5	17
	(%)	10 %	0 %	4 %	2 %	12 %	4 %
slight driver	Count	5	8	21	47	14	95
	(%)	13 %	20 %	24 %	26 %	34 %	25 %
driver	Count	13	12	31	74	14	144
	(%)	33 %	30 %	35 %	42 %	34 %	37 %
strong driver	Count	3	7	11	20	2	43
	(%)	8 %	18 %	12 %	11 %	5 %	11 %
do not know	Count	4	4	5	17	3	33
	(%)	10 %	10 %	6 %	10 %	7 %	9 %
not applicable	Count	7	6	12	12	1	38
	(%)	18 %	15 %	13 %	7 %	2 %	10 %
Total	Count	39	40	89	178	41	387

Table 61 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of flexible learning paths at other heir-s

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	0	0	1	1	0	2
	(%)	0 %	0 %	1 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	3	0	2	0	1	6
	(%)	8 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	2 %	2 %
slight hindrance	Count	0	0	4	8	1	13
	(%)	0 %	0 %	4 %	4 %	2 %	3 %
slight driver	Count	7	7	19	46	20	99
	(%)	18 %	18 %	21 %	26 %	49 %	26 %
driver	Count	14	18	32	80	11	155
	(%)	36 %	45 %	36 %	45 %	27 %	40 %
strong driver	Count	3	5	17	17	4	46
	(%)	8 %	12 %	19 %	10 %	10 %	12 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
do not know	Count	4	3	4	13	4	28
	(%)	10 %	8 %	4 %	7 %	10 %	7 %
not applicable	Count	8	7	11	13	0	39
	(%)	21 %	18 %	12 %	7 %	0 %	10 %
Total	Count	39	40	90	178	41	388

Table 62 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	0	0	1	1	0	2
	(%)	0 %	0 %	1 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	1	0	1	4	0	6
	(%)	3 %	0 %	1 %	2 %	0 %	2 %
slight hindrance	Count	2	0	4	11	0	17
	(%)	5 %	0 %	4 %	6 %	0 %	4 %
slight driver	Count	8	11	15	43	10	87
	(%)	21 %	28 %	17 %	24 %	24 %	22 %
driver	Count	14	12	33	58	14	131
	(%)	36 %	30 %	37 %	33 %	34 %	34 %
strong driver	Count	4	4	19	15	5	47
	(%)	10 %	10 %	21 %	8 %	12 %	12 %
do not know	Count	8	10	12	36	11	77
	(%)	21 %	25 %	13 %	20 %	27 %	20 %
not applicable	Count	2	3	5	10	1	21
	(%)	5 %	8 %	6 %	6 %	2 %	5 %
Total	Count	39	40	90	178	41	388

Table 63 A diploma supplement is handed out to graduates

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
No, this is not the case	Count	10	16	25	23	17	91
	(%)	24 %	41 %	27 %	13 %	40 %	23 %
Yes, to some of them	Count	4	5	11	19	8	47
	(%)	10 %	13 %	12 %	11 %	19 %	12 %
Yes, to most of them' 4	Count	3	1	12	10	3	29

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
'Yes, to all of them'	(%)	7 %	3 %	13 %	6 %	7 %	7 %
4	Count	24	17	43	123	15	222
	(%)	59 %	44 %	47 %	70 %	35 %	57 %
Total	Count	41	39	91	175	43	389

Table 64 Change regarding the diploma supplement will take place

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Changes in the coming 18 months	Count	8	5	26	33	8	80
	(%)	47 %	23 %	54 %	62 %	30 %	48 %
Changes in the period until 2010	Count	4	7	14	14	7	46
	(%)	24 %	32 %	29 %	26 %	26 %	28 %
I do not expect changes	Count	5	10	8	6	12	41
	(%)	29 %	45 %	17 %	11 %	44 %	25 %
Total	Count	17	22	48	53	27	167

Table 65 Recognition of student achievements from other national institutions works well

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
no	Count	4	1	5	3	1	14
	(%)	10 %	2 %	5 %	2 %	2 %	4 %
yes, to some extent	Count	7	9	22	26	10	74
	(%)	17 %	22 %	24 %	14 %	23 %	19 %
yes, to a considerable extent	Count	9	14	31	61	14	129
	(%)	22 %	35 %	34 %	34 %	33 %	33 %
fully	Count	21	16	33	90	18	178
	(%)	51 %	40 %	36 %	50 %	42 %	45 %
Total	Count	41	40	91	180	43	395

Table 66 Change regarding the recognitions of student achievements from other national institutions will take place

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Changes in the coming 18 months	Count	6	5	23	21	6	61
	(%)	29 %	21 %	38 %	23 %	24 %	27 %
Changes in the period until 2010	Count	9	8	17	39	14	87
	(%)	43 %	33 %	28 %	43 %	56 %	39 %
I do not expect changes	Count	6	11	21	31	5	74
	(%)	29 %	46 %	34 %	34 %	20 %	33 %
Total	Count	21	24	61	91	25	222

Table 67 Recognition of student achievements from foreign institutions works well

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
no	Count	5	4	4	4	5	22
	(%)	12 %	10 %	5 %	2 %	12 %	6 %
yes, to some extent	Count	12	17	33	44	10	116
	(%)	29 %	42 %	38 %	25 %	24 %	30 %
yes, to a considerable extent	Count	14	16	32	75	14	151
	(%)	34 %	40 %	37 %	42 %	33 %	39 %
fully	Count	10	3	18	56	13	100
	(%)	24 %	8 %	21 %	31 %	31 %	26 %
Total	Count	41	40	87	179	42	389

Table 68 Change regarding the recognitions of student achievements from foreign institutions will take place

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Changes in the coming 18 months	Count	8	8	26	28	6	76
	(%)	26 %	22 %	37 %	23 %	21 %	26 %
Changes in the period until 2010	Count	13	14	24	54	13	118
	(%)	42 %	39 %	34 %	44 %	45 %	41 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
I do not expect changes	Count	10	14	21	41	10	96
	(%)	32 %	39 %	30 %	33 %	34 %	33 %
Total	Count	31	36	71	123	29	290

Table 69 The improvement of issues of recognition (diploma supplement, student achievements at other institutions) is desirable

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	0	1	0	2	0	3
	(%)	0 %	3 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
disagree	Count	2	0	2	5	0	9
	(%)	5 %	0 %	2 %	3 %	0 %	2 %
mildly disagree	Count	1	4	2	5	0	12
	(%)	2 %	10 %	2 %	3 %	0 %	3 %
mildly agree	Count	8	6	10	27	4	55
	(%)	20 %	15 %	11 %	15 %	10 %	14 %
agree	Count	16	16	38	71	17	158
	(%)	40 %	41 %	43 %	40 %	40 %	41 %
strongly agree	Count	10	11	37	65	18	141
	(%)	25 %	28 %	42 %	36 %	43 %	36 %
do not know	Count	3	1	0	4	3	11
	(%)	8 %	3 %	0 %	2 %	7 %	3 %
Total	Count	40	39	89	179	42	389

Table 70 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	2	3	8	4	4	21
	(%)	5 %	8 %	9 %	2 %	10 %	5 %
hindrance	Count	4	5	11	14	4	38
	(%)	10 %	12 %	12 %	8 %	10 %	10 %
slight hindrance	Count	6	5	10	18	2	41
	(%)	15 %	12 %	11 %	10 %	5 %	11 %
slight driver	Count	4	5	15	26	8	58
	(%)	10 %	12 %	16 %	15 %	19 %	15 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
driver	Count	10	11	16	63	12	112
	(%)	25 %	28 %	18 %	36 %	29 %	29 %
strong driver	Count	11	4	27	29	6	77
	(%)	28 %	10 %	30 %	16 %	14 %	20 %
do not know	Count	3	3	2	9	4	21
	(%)	8 %	8 %	2 %	5 %	10 %	5 %
not applicable	Count	0	4	2	13	2	21
	(%)	0 %	10 %	2 %	7 %	5 %	5 %
Total	Count	40	40	91	176	42	389

Table 71 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	0	1	1	1	1	4
	(%)	0 %	3 %	1 %	1 %	2 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	3	1	1	4	3	12
	(%)	8 %	3 %	1 %	2 %	7 %	3 %
slight hindrance	Count	2	1	10	17	2	32
	(%)	5 %	3 %	11 %	10 %	5 %	8 %
slight driver	Count	9	10	17	32	8	76
	(%)	22 %	26 %	19 %	18 %	20 %	20 %
driver	Count	12	14	30	67	15	138
	(%)	30 %	36 %	33 %	38 %	37 %	36 %
strong driver	Count	11	4	25	38	6	84
	(%)	28 %	10 %	27 %	22 %	15 %	22 %
do not know	Count	1	3	3	8	5	20
	(%)	2 %	8 %	3 %	5 %	12 %	5 %
not applicable	Count	2	5	4	9	1	21
	(%)	5 %	13 %	4 %	5 %	2 %	5 %
Total	Count	40	39	91	176	41	387

Table 72 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	0	1	0	1	0	2
	(%)	0 %	2 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	2	3	6	6	2	19
	(%)	5 %	8 %	7 %	3 %	5 %	5 %
slight hindrance	Count	5	8	21	34	8	76
	(%)	12 %	20 %	23 %	19 %	20 %	20 %
slight driver	Count	9	9	20	45	15	98
	(%)	22 %	22 %	22 %	26 %	37 %	25 %
driver	Count	10	11	23	59	11	114
	(%)	25 %	28 %	25 %	34 %	27 %	29 %
strong driver	Count	11	2	14	13	1	41
	(%)	28 %	5 %	15 %	7 %	2 %	11 %
do not know	Count	2	5	3	6	3	19
	(%)	5 %	12 %	3 %	3 %	7 %	5 %
not applicable	Count	1	1	4	12	1	19
	(%)	2 %	2 %	4 %	7 %	2 %	5 %
Total	Count	40	40	91	176	41	388

Table 73 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	0	1	0	1	0	2
	(%)	0 %	2 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	3	5	5	6	2	21
	(%)	8 %	12 %	5 %	3 %	5 %	5 %
slight hindrance	Count	7	12	19	28	5	71
	(%)	18 %	30 %	21 %	16 %	12 %	18 %
slight driver	Count	9	8	22	46	18	103
	(%)	22 %	20 %	24 %	26 %	43 %	26 %
driver	Count	9	8	25	55	10	107
	(%)	22 %	20 %	27 %	31 %	24 %	28 %
strong driver	Count	9	2	14	20	1	46
	(%)	22 %	5 %	15 %	11 %	2 %	12 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
do not know	Count	2	4	2	6	4	18
	(%)	5 %	10 %	2 %	3 %	10 %	5 %
not applicable	Count	1	0	4	14	2	21
	(%)	2 %	0 %	4 %	8 %	5 %	5 %
Total	Count	40	40	91	176	42	389

Table 74 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	2	3	1	0	7
	(%)	2 %	5 %	3 %	1 %	0 %	2 %
hindrance	Count	4	4	5	9	2	24
	(%)	10 %	10 %	6 %	5 %	5 %	6 %
slight hindrance	Count	10	6	12	16	6	50
	(%)	25 %	15 %	13 %	9 %	14 %	13 %
slight driver	Count	8	11	21	54	9	103
	(%)	20 %	28 %	23 %	31 %	21 %	27 %
driver	Count	8	8	18	40	8	82
	(%)	20 %	20 %	20 %	23 %	19 %	21 %
strong driver	Count	5	2	7	12	2	28
	(%)	12 %	5 %	8 %	7 %	5 %	7 %
do not know	Count	4	5	14	22	9	54
	(%)	10 %	12 %	16 %	12 %	21 %	14 %
not applicable	Count	0	2	10	22	6	40
	(%)	0 %	5 %	11 %	12 %	14 %	10 %
Total	Count	40	40	90	176	42	388

Table 75 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	1	4	0	0	6
	(%)	2 %	2 %	4 %	0 %	0 %	2 %
hindrance	Count	2	3	8	3	1	17
	(%)	5 %	8 %	9 %	2 %	2 %	4 %
slight hindrance	Count	6	5	12	12	5	40

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
slight driver	(%)	15 %	12 %	13 %	7 %	12 %	10 %
	Count	7	12	18	53	7	97
driver	(%)	18 %	30 %	20 %	30 %	17 %	25 %
	Count	13	7	18	40	12	90
strong driver	(%)	32 %	18 %	20 %	23 %	29 %	23 %
	Count	5	3	8	18	1	35
do not know	(%)	12 %	8 %	9 %	10 %	2 %	9 %
	Count	2	7	9	21	8	47
not applicable	(%)	5 %	18 %	10 %	12 %	20 %	12 %
	Count	4	2	12	29	7	54
Total	(%)	10 %	5 %	13 %	16 %	17 %	14 %
	Count	40	40	89	176	41	386

Table 76 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	0	0	3	1	5
	(%)	2 %	0 %	0 %	2 %	2 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	2	0	1	3	0	6
	(%)	5 %	0 %	1 %	2 %	0 %	2 %
slight hindrance	Count	2	1	9	10	5	27
	(%)	5 %	2 %	10 %	6 %	12 %	7 %
slight driver	Count	7	10	20	48	8	93
	(%)	18 %	25 %	22 %	27 %	19 %	24 %
driver	Count	16	16	26	56	18	132
	(%)	40 %	40 %	29 %	32 %	43 %	34 %
strong driver	Count	4	5	16	31	7	63
	(%)	10 %	12 %	18 %	18 %	17 %	16 %
do not know	Count	3	4	6	9	3	25
	(%)	8 %	10 %	7 %	5 %	7 %	6 %
not applicable	Count	5	4	13	16	0	38
	(%)	12 %	10 %	14 %	9 %	0 %	10 %
Total	Count	40	40	91	176	42	389

Table 77 Hindrances/Drivers - adoption of measures regarding recognition at other hei-s

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	0	1	0	0	2
	(%)	2 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	0 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	2	0	2	1	1	6
	(%)	5 %	0 %	2 %	1 %	2 %	2 %
slight hindrance	Count	2	1	1	8	4	16
	(%)	5 %	2 %	1 %	5 %	10 %	4 %
slight driver	Count	8	11	17	44	8	88
	(%)	20 %	28 %	19 %	25 %	19 %	23 %
driver	Count	13	15	29	66	18	141
	(%)	32 %	38 %	32 %	38 %	43 %	36 %
strong driver	Count	4	5	24	37	6	76
	(%)	10 %	12 %	26 %	21 %	14 %	20 %
do not know	Count	4	3	5	9	4	25
	(%)	10 %	8 %	5 %	5 %	10 %	6 %
not applicable	Count	6	5	12	11	1	35
	(%)	15 %	12 %	13 %	6 %	2 %	9 %
Total	Count	40	40	91	176	42	389

Table 78 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	0	0	1	0	0	1
	(%)	0 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
hindrance	Count	2	0	2	1	1	6
	(%)	5 %	0 %	2 %	1 %	2 %	2 %
slight hindrance	Count	0	0	4	12	1	17
	(%)	0 %	0 %	4 %	7 %	2 %	4 %
slight driver	Count	9	7	11	24	5	56
	(%)	22 %	18 %	12 %	14 %	12 %	14 %
driver	Count	14	15	32	69	15	145
	(%)	35 %	38 %	36 %	39 %	36 %	37 %
strong driver	Count	11	7	34	42	12	106
	(%)	28 %	18 %	38 %	24 %	29 %	27 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
do not know	Count	3	8	3	21	6	41
	(%)	8 %	20 %	3 %	12 %	14 %	11 %
not applicable	Count	1	3	3	7	2	16
	(%)	2 %	8 %	3 %	4 %	5 %	4 %
Total	Count	40	40	90	176	42	388

Table 79 National student mobility works well

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
no	Count	8	8	19	29	8	72
	(%)	20 %	20 %	21 %	16 %	19 %	18 %
yes, to some extent	Count	24	22	41	85	25	197
	(%)	59 %	55 %	45 %	48 %	60 %	50 %
yes, to a considerable extent	Count	3	4	15	29	4	55
	(%)	7 %	10 %	16 %	16 %	10 %	14 %
fully	Count	6	6	16	35	5	68
	(%)	15 %	15 %	18 %	20 %	12 %	17 %
Total	Count	41	40	91	178	42	392

Table 80 Change regarding national student mobility will take place

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Changes in the coming 18 months	Count	5	6	18	25	9	63
	(%)	14 %	18 %	24 %	17 %	24 %	19 %
Changes in the period until 2010	Count	15	11	31	62	18	137
	(%)	42 %	32 %	41 %	43 %	49 %	42 %
I do not expect changes	Count	16	17	26	58	10	127
	(%)	44 %	50 %	35 %	40 %	27 %	39 %
Total	Count	36	34	75	145	37	327

Table 81 High national student mobility is desirable

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	2	4	0	4	0	10
	(%)	5 %	10 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	3 %
disagree	Count	1	0	2	15	2	20
	(%)	2 %	0 %	2 %	8 %	5 %	5 %
mildly disagree	Count	8	6	5	12	0	31
	(%)	19 %	15 %	6 %	7 %	0 %	8 %
mildly agree	Count	11	9	21	42	6	89
	(%)	26 %	22 %	23 %	24 %	15 %	23 %
agree	Count	13	12	32	48	16	121
	(%)	31 %	30 %	36 %	27 %	39 %	31 %
strongly agree	Count	7	8	29	55	17	116
	(%)	17 %	20 %	32 %	31 %	41 %	30 %
do not know	Count	0	1	1	1	0	3
	(%)	0 %	2 %	1 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
Total	Count	42	40	90	177	41	390

Table 82 International student mobility works well

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
no	Count	6	2	19	13	5	45
	(%)	14 %	5 %	21 %	7 %	12 %	11 %
yes, to some extent	Count	20	17	42	71	23	173
	(%)	48 %	42 %	46 %	40 %	55 %	44 %
yes, to a considerable extent	Count	7	13	16	57	8	101
	(%)	17 %	32 %	18 %	32 %	19 %	26 %
fully	Count	9	8	14	38	6	75
	(%)	21 %	20 %	15 %	21 %	14 %	19 %
Total	Count	42	40	91	179	42	394

Table 83 Change regarding international student mobility will take place

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Changes in the coming 18 months	Count	4	8	28	41	9	90
	(%)	12 %	26 %	36 %	29 %	25 %	28 %
Changes in the period until 2010	Count	19	16	31	68	20	154
	(%)	58 %	52 %	40 %	49 %	56 %	49 %
I do not expect changes	Count	10	7	18	31	7	73
	(%)	30 %	23 %	23 %	22 %	19 %	23 %
Total	Count	33	31	77	140	36	317

Table 84 High international student mobility is desirable

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	1	0	0	1	0	2
	(%)	2 %	0 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
disagree	Count	1	0	2	0	0	3
	(%)	2 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	0 %	1 %
mildly disagree	Count	3	2	3	2	0	10
	(%)	7 %	5 %	3 %	1 %	0 %	3 %
mildly agree	Count	2	8	17	16	5	48
	(%)	5 %	21 %	18 %	9 %	12 %	12 %
agree	Count	20	10	31	66	12	139
	(%)	48 %	26 %	34 %	37 %	29 %	36 %
strongly agree	Count	15	19	39	91	24	188
	(%)	36 %	49 %	42 %	51 %	59 %	48 %
do not know	Count	0	0	0	1	0	1
	(%)	0 %	0 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	0 %
Total	Count	42	39	92	177	41	391

Table 85 International graduate mobility works well

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
no	Count	9	6	23	24	6	68
	(%)	22 %	15 %	26 %	13 %	14 %	17 %
yes, to some extent	Count	17	24	44	78	26	189
	(%)	41 %	60 %	50 %	44 %	62 %	48 %
yes, to a considerable extent	Count	9	4	13	52	7	85
	(%)	22 %	10 %	15 %	29 %	17 %	22 %
fully	Count	6	6	8	25	3	48
	(%)	15 %	15 %	9 %	14 %	7 %	12 %
Total	Count	41	40	88	179	42	390

Table 86 Change regarding international graduate mobility will take place

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Changes in the coming 18 months	Count	8	8	19	32	8	75
	(%)	23 %	24 %	23 %	21 %	21 %	22 %
Changes in the period until 2010	Count	17	16	33	84	22	172
	(%)	49 %	47 %	41 %	55 %	56 %	50 %
I do not expect changes	Count	10	10	29	37	9	95
	(%)	29 %	29 %	36 %	24 %	23 %	28 %
Total	Count	35	34	81	153	39	342

Table 87 High international graduate mobility is desirable

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	2	0	0	0	0	2
	(%)	5 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	1 %
disagree	Count	0	0	1	1	0	2
	(%)	0 %	0 %	1 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
mildly disagree	Count	2	4	3	1	0	10
	(%)	5 %	11 %	3 %	1 %	0 %	3 %
mildly agree	Count	2	3	17	10	6	38

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
agree	(%)	5 %	8 %	19 %	6 %	14 %	10 %
	Count	16	16	36	78	16	162
strongly agree	(%)	38 %	42 %	40 %	44 %	38 %	42 %
	Count	18	15	30	85	20	168
do not know	(%)	43 %	39 %	34 %	48 %	48 %	43 %
	Count	2	0	2	3	0	7
Total	(%)	5 %	0 %	2 %	2 %	0 %	2 %
	Count	42	38	89	178	42	389

Table 88 International mobility of teaching staff works well

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
no	Count	7	10	20	51	8	96
	(%)	17 %	25 %	22 %	29 %	19 %	25 %
yes, to some extent	Count	23	22	47	88	25	205
	(%)	56 %	55 %	52 %	50 %	60 %	52 %
yes, to a considerable extent	Count	7	4	19	27	6	63
	(%)	17 %	10 %	21 %	15 %	14 %	16 %
fully	Count	4	4	5	11	3	27
	(%)	10 %	10 %	5 %	6 %	7 %	7 %
Total	Count	41	40	91	177	42	391

Table 89 Change regarding international mobility of teaching staff will take place

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
Changes in the coming 18 months	Count	6	9	20	21	7	63
	(%)	16 %	25 %	23 %	13 %	18 %	17 %
Changes in the period until 2010	Count	21	15	40	89	17	182
	(%)	57 %	42 %	47 %	54 %	45 %	50 %
I do not expect changes	Count	10	12	26	55	14	117
	(%)	27 %	33 %	30 %	33 %	37 %	32 %
Total	Count	37	36	86	165	38	362

Table 90 High international mobility of teaching staff is desirable

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
disagree	Count	1	0	0	0	0	1
	(%)	2 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
mildly disagree	Count	0	0	1	1	0	2
	(%)	0 %	0 %	1 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
mildly agree	Count	3	5	12	22	5	47
	(%)	7 %	12 %	13 %	12 %	12 %	12 %
agree	Count	17	15	35	67	13	147
	(%)	40 %	38 %	38 %	38 %	32 %	38 %
strongly agree	Count	20	20	42	84	22	188
	(%)	48 %	50 %	46 %	47 %	54 %	48 %
do not know	Count	1	0	1	3	1	6
	(%)	2 %	0 %	1 %	2 %	2 %	2 %
Total	Count	42	40	91	177	41	391

Table 91 Hindrances/Drivers - Governmental legislation/regulation

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	5	3	7	5	5	25
	(%)	12 %	8 %	8 %	3 %	12 %	6 %
hindrance	Count	1	4	18	25	5	53
	(%)	2 %	10 %	20 %	14 %	12 %	14 %
slight hindrance	Count	7	8	8	22	6	51
	(%)	18 %	20 %	9 %	13 %	14 %	13 %
slight driver	Count	10	5	17	38	11	81
	(%)	25 %	12 %	19 %	22 %	26 %	21 %
driver	Count	10	13	15	44	8	90
	(%)	25 %	32 %	16 %	25 %	19 %	23 %
strong driver	Count	5	4	21	26	6	62
	(%)	12 %	10 %	23 %	15 %	14 %	16 %
do not know	Count	2	1	4	4	1	12
	(%)	5 %	2 %	4 %	2 %	2 %	3 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
not applicable	Count	0	2	1	10	1	14
	(%)	0 %	5 %	1 %	6 %	2 %	4 %
Total	Count	40	40	91	174	43	388

Table 92 Hindrances/Drivers - Central management in my institution

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	0	0	0	2	2	4
	(%)	0 %	0 %	0 %	1 %	5 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	3	1	7	11	4	26
	(%)	8 %	2 %	8 %	6 %	9 %	7 %
slight hindrance	Count	2	2	8	19	6	37
	(%)	5 %	5 %	9 %	11 %	14 %	10 %
slight driver	Count	8	10	16	34	8	76
	(%)	21 %	25 %	18 %	19 %	19 %	20 %
driver	Count	13	15	26	57	10	121
	(%)	33 %	38 %	29 %	33 %	23 %	31 %
strong driver	Count	12	7	29	41	8	97
	(%)	31 %	18 %	32 %	23 %	19 %	25 %
do not know	Count	0	1	3	4	4	12
	(%)	0 %	2 %	3 %	2 %	9 %	3 %
not applicable	Count	1	4	2	7	1	15
	(%)	3 %	10 %	2 %	4 %	2 %	4 %
Total	Count	39	40	91	175	43	388

Table 93 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics at my institution

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	0	0	1	2	4
	(%)	3 %	0 %	0 %	1 %	5 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	3	0	9	10	4	26
	(%)	8 %	0 %	10 %	6 %	10 %	7 %
slight hindrance	Count	0	2	13	29	4	48
	(%)	0 %	5 %	14 %	17 %	10 %	12 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
slight driver	Count	10	14	25	55	11	115
	(%)	26 %	35 %	27 %	31 %	26 %	30 %
driver	Count	17	15	23	53	12	120
	(%)	44 %	38 %	25 %	30 %	29 %	31 %
strong driver	Count	6	4	11	19	5	45
	(%)	15 %	10 %	12 %	11 %	12 %	12 %
do not know	Count	1	3	6	4	2	16
	(%)	3 %	8 %	7 %	2 %	5 %	4 %
not applicable	Count	1	2	4	4	2	13
	(%)	3 %	5 %	4 %	2 %	5 %	3 %
Total	Count	39	40	91	175	42	387

Table 94 Hindrances/Drivers - Academics in my area of study

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	0	0	1	1	3
	(%)	3 %	0 %	0 %	1 %	2 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	3	1	8	9	3	24
	(%)	8 %	2 %	9 %	5 %	7 %	6 %
slight hindrance	Count	1	6	12	26	5	50
	(%)	3 %	15 %	13 %	15 %	12 %	13 %
slight driver	Count	9	15	23	37	11	95
	(%)	23 %	38 %	25 %	21 %	27 %	25 %
driver	Count	18	11	23	68	13	133
	(%)	46 %	28 %	25 %	39 %	32 %	35 %
strong driver	Count	6	4	14	24	5	53
	(%)	15 %	10 %	15 %	14 %	12 %	14 %
do not know	Count	1	2	5	2	2	12
	(%)	3 %	5 %	5 %	1 %	5 %	3 %
not applicable	Count	0	1	6	7	1	15
	(%)	0 %	2 %	7 %	4 %	2 %	4 %
Total	Count	39	40	91	174	41	385

Table 95 Hindrances/Drivers - Professional organisations in my area of study

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	0	3	1	0	5
	(%)	3 %	0 %	3 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	2	2	7	5	3	19
	(%)	5 %	5 %	8 %	3 %	7 %	5 %
slight hindrance	Count	5	9	9	15	2	40
	(%)	13 %	23 %	10 %	9 %	5 %	10 %
slight driver	Count	15	8	24	49	13	109
	(%)	38 %	21 %	26 %	28 %	32 %	28 %
driver	Count	10	7	22	38	8	85
	(%)	26 %	18 %	24 %	22 %	20 %	22 %
strong driver	Count	1	1	4	17	0	23
	(%)	3 %	3 %	4 %	10 %	0 %	6 %
do not know	Count	2	6	16	20	5	49
	(%)	5 %	15 %	18 %	11 %	12 %	13 %
not applicable	Count	3	6	6	30	10	55
	(%)	8 %	15 %	7 %	17 %	24 %	14 %
Total	Count	39	39	91	175	41	385

Table 96 Hindrances/Drivers - Employers in my area of study

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	0	5	1	0	7
	(%)	3 %	0 %	5 %	1 %	0 %	2 %
hindrance	Count	1	1	8	5	3	18
	(%)	3 %	2 %	9 %	3 %	7 %	5 %
slight hindrance	Count	3	7	15	19	4	48
	(%)	8 %	18 %	16 %	11 %	10 %	12 %
slight driver	Count	11	8	19	51	9	98
	(%)	29 %	20 %	21 %	29 %	21 %	25 %
driver	Count	10	8	20	45	8	91
	(%)	26 %	20 %	22 %	26 %	19 %	24 %
strong driver	Count	2	3	6	15	0	26
	(%)	5 %	8 %	7 %	9 %	0 %	7 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
do not know	Count	3	8	10	16	5	42
	(%)	8 %	20 %	11 %	9 %	12 %	11 %
not applicable	Count	7	5	8	22	13	55
	(%)	18 %	12 %	9 %	13 %	31 %	14 %
Total	Count	38	40	91	174	42	385

Table 97 Hindrances/Drivers - Increasing competition between higher education institutions

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	2	0	2	0	0	4
	(%)	5 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	0 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	1	0	4	2	1	8
	(%)	3 %	0 %	4 %	1 %	2 %	2 %
slight hindrance	Count	2	2	5	7	1	17
	(%)	5 %	5 %	5 %	4 %	2 %	4 %
slight driver	Count	7	7	23	46	11	94
	(%)	18 %	18 %	25 %	26 %	26 %	24 %
driver	Count	14	13	22	71	17	137
	(%)	36 %	32 %	24 %	41 %	40 %	35 %
strong driver	Count	7	8	15	27	7	64
	(%)	18 %	20 %	16 %	15 %	16 %	16 %
do not know	Count	1	5	8	9	5	28
	(%)	3 %	12 %	9 %	5 %	12 %	7 %
not applicable	Count	5	5	12	13	1	36
	(%)	13 %	12 %	13 %	7 %	2 %	9 %
Total	Count	39	40	91	175	43	388

Table 98 Hindrances/Drivers - increase mobility at other hei-s

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	1	0	2	0	1	4
	(%)	3 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	2 %	1 %
hindrance	Count	0	0	3	1	0	4
	(%)	0 %	0 %	3 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
slight hindrance	Count	0	2	1	2	1	6

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
slight driver	(%)	0 %	5 %	1 %	1 %	2 %	2 %
	Count	6	5	24	39	11	85
driver	(%)	16 %	12 %	26 %	22 %	26 %	22 %
	Count	15	15	22	83	13	148
strong driver	(%)	39 %	38 %	24 %	47 %	30 %	38 %
	Count	6	7	19	28	8	68
do not know	(%)	16 %	18 %	21 %	16 %	19 %	18 %
	Count	4	5	5	11	6	31
not applicable	(%)	11 %	12 %	5 %	6 %	14 %	8 %
	Count	6	6	15	11	3	41
	(%)	16 %	15 %	16 %	6 %	7 %	11 %
Total	Count	38	40	91	175	43	387

Table 99 Hindrances/Drivers - European policies

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strong hindrance	Count	0	0	1	0	0	1
	(%)	0 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
hindrance	Count	2	0	3	0	1	6
	(%)	5 %	0 %	3 %	0 %	2 %	2 %
slight hindrance	Count	0	1	0	2	2	5
	(%)	0 %	2 %	0 %	1 %	5 %	1 %
slight driver	Count	3	5	12	30	8	58
	(%)	8 %	12 %	13 %	17 %	19 %	15 %
driver	Count	20	15	31	78	13	157
	(%)	51 %	38 %	34 %	45 %	30 %	41 %
strong driver	Count	11	12	34	48	14	119
	(%)	28 %	30 %	38 %	28 %	33 %	31 %
do not know	Count	3	4	5	10	4	26
	(%)	8 %	10 %	6 %	6 %	9 %	7 %
not applicable	Count	0	3	4	6	1	14
	(%)	0 %	8 %	4 %	3 %	2 %	4 %
Total	Count	39	40	90	174	43	386

Table 100 assessment of situation - Current situation in my institution is in line with the Bologna expectations

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	3	3	4	0	2	12
	(%)	8 %	8 %	4 %	0 %	5 %	3 %
disagree	Count	5	8	12	9	6	40
	(%)	12 %	20 %	13 %	5 %	14 %	10 %
mildly disagree	Count	1	5	9	13	2	30
	(%)	2 %	12 %	10 %	7 %	5 %	8 %
mildly agree	Count	11	10	24	33	12	90
	(%)	28 %	25 %	26 %	19 %	29 %	23 %
agree	Count	14	11	25	86	11	147
	(%)	35 %	28 %	27 %	49 %	26 %	38 %
strongly agree	Count	6	2	16	33	6	63
	(%)	15 %	5 %	18 %	19 %	14 %	16 %
do not know	Count	0	1	1	1	3	6
	(%)	0 %	2 %	1 %	1 %	7 %	2 %
Total	Count	40	40	91	175	42	388

Table 101 assessment of situation - I expect considerable (further) change in terms of meeting the Bologna objectives in the coming 18 months

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	3	5	3	8	4	23
	(%)	8 %	14 %	3 %	5 %	10 %	6 %
disagree	Count	5	9	10	25	3	52
	(%)	13 %	24 %	11 %	15 %	7 %	14 %
mildly disagree	Count	3	6	7	13	1	30
	(%)	8 %	16 %	8 %	8 %	2 %	8 %
mildly agree	Count	5	5	27	50	10	97
	(%)	13 %	14 %	31 %	31 %	24 %	26 %
agree	Count	12	6	26	48	15	107
	(%)	31 %	16 %	30 %	29 %	37 %	29 %
strongly agree	Count	10	4	10	13	5	42
	(%)	26 %	11 %	11 %	8 %	12 %	11 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
do not know	Count	1	2	4	6	3	16
	(%)	3 %	5 %	5 %	4 %	7 %	4 %
Total	Count	39	37	87	163	41	367

Table 102 assessment of situation - I expect considerable (further) change in terms of meeting the Bologna objectives until 2010

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	4	3	2	7	3	19
	(%)	10 %	8 %	2 %	4 %	7 %	5 %
disagree	Count	2	6	7	19	2	36
	(%)	5 %	17 %	8 %	11 %	5 %	10 %
mildly disagree	Count	3	5	3	21	2	34
	(%)	8 %	14 %	4 %	13 %	5 %	9 %
mildly agree	Count	2	6	19	32	7	66
	(%)	5 %	17 %	23 %	19 %	17 %	18 %
agree	Count	15	7	33	62	21	138
	(%)	38 %	19 %	39 %	37 %	50 %	38 %
strongly agree	Count	12	6	16	18	6	58
	(%)	31 %	17 %	19 %	11 %	14 %	16 %
do not know	Count	1	3	4	7	1	16
	(%)	3 %	8 %	5 %	4 %	2 %	4 %
Total	Count	39	36	84	166	42	367

Table 103 assessment of situation - Current situation in my country is in line with the Bologna expectations

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	4	3	4	2	3	16
	(%)	10 %	8 %	4 %	1 %	7 %	4 %
disagree	Count	8	9	12	13	2	44
	(%)	20 %	24 %	13 %	8 %	5 %	12 %
mildly disagree	Count	3	4	9	16	6	38
	(%)	8 %	11 %	10 %	9 %	14 %	10 %
mildly agree	Count	7	7	24	43	11	92
	(%)	18 %	19 %	27 %	25 %	26 %	24 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
agree	Count	13	10	26	69	6	124
	(%)	32 %	27 %	29 %	40 %	14 %	33 %
strongly agree	Count	4	1	11	23	7	46
	(%)	10 %	3 %	12 %	13 %	17 %	12 %
do not know	Count	1	3	3	5	7	19
	(%)	2 %	8 %	3 %	3 %	17 %	5 %
Total	Count	40	37	89	171	42	379

Table 104 The consequences of the Bologna process are desirable

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	1	2	3	11	1	18
	(%)	2 %	5 %	3 %	6 %	2 %	5 %
disagree	Count	4	7	4	6	0	21
	(%)	10 %	18 %	4 %	3 %	0 %	5 %
mildly disagree	Count	5	3	5	7	3	23
	(%)	12 %	8 %	5 %	4 %	7 %	6 %
mildly agree	Count	8	11	20	36	12	87
	(%)	20 %	28 %	22 %	21 %	28 %	22 %
agree	Count	12	10	32	69	15	138
	(%)	30 %	25 %	35 %	39 %	35 %	35 %
strongly agree	Count	10	6	26	45	9	96
	(%)	25 %	15 %	29 %	26 %	21 %	25 %
do not know	Count	0	1	1	1	3	6
	(%)	0 %	2 %	1 %	1 %	7 %	2 %
Total	Count	40	40	91	175	43	389

Table 105 Impact assessment - Access to programmes

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	4	3	4	4	0	15
	(%)	14 %	9 %	7 %	3 %	0 %	5 %
disagree	Count	4	8	4	6	2	24
	(%)	14 %	25 %	7 %	4 %	6 %	8 %
mildly disagree	Count	2	3	8	19	3	35

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
	(%)	7 %	9 %	13 %	13 %	9 %	12 %
mildly agree	Count	7	5	17	40	11	80
	(%)	25 %	16 %	28 %	27 %	34 %	27 %
agree	Count	9	7	18	52	9	95
	(%)	32 %	22 %	30 %	35 %	28 %	32 %
strongly agree	Count	2	3	6	14	3	28
	(%)	7 %	9 %	10 %	10 %	9 %	9 %
do not know	Count	0	3	3	12	4	22
	(%)	0 %	9 %	5 %	8 %	12 %	7 %
Total	Count	28	32	60	147	32	299

Table 106 Impact assessment - Graduation rates

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	2	4	1	6	0	13
	(%)	7 %	12 %	2 %	4 %	0 %	4 %
disagree	Count	8	7	6	13	4	38
	(%)	29 %	22 %	10 %	9 %	12 %	13 %
mildly disagree	Count	2	6	10	27	1	46
	(%)	7 %	19 %	17 %	18 %	3 %	15 %
mildly agree	Count	6	4	20	40	13	83
	(%)	21 %	12 %	33 %	27 %	41 %	28 %
agree	Count	7	6	11	44	10	78
	(%)	25 %	19 %	18 %	30 %	31 %	26 %
strongly agree	Count	2	1	6	6	3	18
	(%)	7 %	3 %	10 %	4 %	9 %	6 %
do not know	Count	1	4	6	12	1	24
	(%)	4 %	12 %	10 %	8 %	3 %	8 %
Total	Count	28	32	60	148	32	300

Table 107 Impact assessment - Employability of graduates

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	3	2	1	6	0	12
	(%)	11 %	6 %	2 %	4 %	0 %	4 %
disagree	Count	4	6	3	10	2	25
	(%)	14 %	19 %	5 %	7 %	6 %	8 %
mildly disagree	Count	4	4	14	20	3	45
	(%)	14 %	12 %	23 %	14 %	9 %	15 %
mildly agree	Count	8	11	20	54	11	104
	(%)	29 %	34 %	33 %	36 %	34 %	35 %
agree	Count	5	4	10	39	8	66
	(%)	18 %	12 %	17 %	26 %	25 %	22 %
strongly agree	Count	3	1	6	13	5	28
	(%)	11 %	3 %	10 %	9 %	16 %	9 %
do not know	Count	1	4	6	6	3	20
	(%)	4 %	12 %	10 %	4 %	9 %	7 %
Total	Count	28	32	60	148	32	300

Table 108 Impact assessment - General mobility

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	2	2	3	3	0	10
	(%)	7 %	6 %	5 %	2 %	0 %	3 %
disagree	Count	4	4	3	7	4	22
	(%)	14 %	12 %	5 %	5 %	12 %	7 %
mildly disagree	Count	3	4	6	8	1	22
	(%)	11 %	12 %	10 %	5 %	3 %	7 %
mildly agree	Count	9	8	22	44	9	92
	(%)	32 %	25 %	37 %	30 %	28 %	31 %
agree	Count	4	8	18	65	13	108
	(%)	14 %	25 %	30 %	44 %	41 %	36 %
strongly agree	Count	4	4	7	18	3	36
	(%)	14 %	12 %	12 %	12 %	9 %	12 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
do not know	Count	2	2	1	4	2	11
	(%)	7 %	6 %	2 %	3 %	6 %	4 %
Total	Count	28	32	60	149	32	301

Table 109 Impact assessment - Quality of education

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	3	1	1	6	0	11
	(%)	11 %	3 %	2 %	4 %	0 %	4 %
disagree	Count	5	6	6	19	5	41
	(%)	18 %	19 %	10 %	13 %	16 %	14 %
mildly disagree	Count	1	3	4	16	3	27
	(%)	4 %	9 %	7 %	11 %	9 %	9 %
mildly agree	Count	9	11	16	44	8	88
	(%)	32 %	34 %	27 %	30 %	25 %	29 %
agree	Count	5	6	12	41	8	72
	(%)	18 %	19 %	20 %	28 %	25 %	24 %
strongly agree	Count	5	2	16	14	5	42
	(%)	18 %	6 %	27 %	9 %	16 %	14 %
do not know	Count	0	3	4	8	3	18
	(%)	0 %	9 %	7 %	5 %	9 %	6 %
Total	Count	28	32	59	148	32	299

Table 110 Impact assessment - Cost effectiveness

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
strongly disagree	Count	3	4	2	12	0	21
	(%)	11 %	12 %	3 %	8 %	0 %	7 %
disagree	Count	5	5	12	15	3	40
	(%)	18 %	16 %	20 %	10 %	9 %	13 %
mildly disagree	Count	5	5	9	34	2	55
	(%)	18 %	16 %	15 %	23 %	6 %	18 %
mildly agree	Count	3	8	11	34	13	69
	(%)	11 %	25 %	18 %	23 %	41 %	23 %

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
agree	Count	6	5	11	29	6	57
	(%)	21 %	16 %	18 %	20 %	19 %	19 %
strongly agree	Count	3	1	5	7	2	18
	(%)	11 %	3 %	8 %	5 %	6 %	6 %
do not know	Count	3	4	10	16	6	39
	(%)	11 %	12 %	17 %	11 %	19 %	13 %
Total	Count	28	32	60	147	32	299

Table 111 Country

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
—	Count	0	0	0	2	0	2
	(%)	0 %	0 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	0 %
AUT	Count	1	1	12	10	4	28
	(%)	2 %	2 %	11 %	5 %	9 %	6 %
BEL	Count	7	4	6	6	2	25
	(%)	15 %	9 %	6 %	3 %	4 %	6 %
CZE	Count	0	0	2	0	0	2
	(%)	0 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
DEU	Count	3	3	9	22	7	44
	(%)	6 %	6 %	8 %	11 %	15 %	10 %
DNK	Count	2	2	5	8	2	19
	(%)	4 %	4 %	5 %	4 %	4 %	4 %
ESP	Count	0	4	1	6	1	12
	(%)	0 %	9 %	1 %	3 %	2 %	3 %
EST	Count	1	1	0	8	0	10
	(%)	2 %	2 %	0 %	4 %	0 %	2 %
FIN	Count	1	1	5	26	1	34
	(%)	2 %	2 %	5 %	13 %	2 %	8 %
FRA	Count	0	1	3	8	1	13
	(%)	0 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	2 %	3 %
GBR	Count	5	13	12	12	8	50
	(%)	10 %	28 %	11 %	6 %	17 %	11 %
GRC	Count	0	1	1	3	1	6

		medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
	(%)	0 %	2 %	1 %	1 %	2 %	1 %
HRV	Count	0	0	1	1	0	2
	(%)	0 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
HUN	Count	0	0	2	1	1	4
	(%)	0 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	2 %	1 %
IRL	Count	0	1	2	6	1	10
	(%)	0 %	2 %	2 %	3 %	2 %	2 %
ITA	Count	5	2	5	15	3	30
	(%)	10 %	4 %	5 %	7 %	6 %	7 %
LTU	Count	2	2	5	1	0	10
	(%)	4 %	4 %	5 %	0 %	0 %	2 %
LUX	Count	1	0	2	1	0	4
	(%)	2 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	0 %	1 %
LVA	Count	1	1	1	1	0	4
	(%)	2 %	2 %	1 %	0 %	0 %	1 %
MLT	Count	0	0	1	1	0	2
	(%)	0 %	0 %	1 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
NLD	Count	1	0	3	11	0	15
	(%)	2 %	0 %	3 %	5 %	0 %	3 %
NOR	Count	0	1	4	4	3	12
	(%)	0 %	2 %	4 %	2 %	6 %	3 %
POL	Count	1	1	1	9	2	14
	(%)	2 %	2 %	1 %	4 %	4 %	3 %
PRT	Count	1	1	8	14	2	26
	(%)	2 %	2 %	8 %	7 %	4 %	6 %
ROM	Count	3	5	3	3	1	15
	(%)	6 %	11 %	3 %	1 %	2 %	3 %
SVK	Count	0	0	0	4	0	4
	(%)	0 %	0 %	0 %	2 %	0 %	1 %
SVN	Count	1	0	1	2	0	4
	(%)	2 %	0 %	1 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
SWE	Count	10	1	5	6	4	26
	(%)	21 %	2 %	5 %	3 %	9 %	6 %

TUR	Count	medicine	law	teacher training	engineering	history	Total
	(%)	2	1	6	14	3	26
Total	Count	4 %	2 %	6 %	7 %	6 %	6 %
		48	47	106	205	47	453