

SUMMARY OF THE MINUTES OF THE HISTORY GROUP

Welcome to the new colleague, Eero Medijainen, the representative of Estonia, University of Tartu. No representative from Greece.

1. State of Affairs

- Results of TEEP 2002

The impression is rather positive. The self-evaluation leads to a new way of thinking, and a new approach of teaching and learning because based on competences. TEEPs have created direct links between universities and National Agencies, but it is important to have a mixture of experts from different countries ; one of them must know the university system of the assessed country

- Update Implementation of Bologna process.

It can be observed that something is evolving in Germany ; with regard to the first cycle, Austria, Portugal and Spain are still away from the Bologna recommendations ; with regard to the second cycle, some countries keep a one year system : United Kingdom, Sweden, Spain. Estonia has a strange situation with a two year system but giving only 120 and 80 ECTS.

- Main obstacles to enforce Tuning methodology

The model proposed p. 51 is somewhat difficult to interpret. The learning outcomes are hard to understand. The professional profiles –except for research and teaching – must be defined by the professional bodies, not by the Academics. In the university tradition it is not common to consult the “working field” in order to define academic profiles or learning outcomes ; the identification of social needs is more a political than an academic problem. Enforcing Tuning methodology needs more academic and financial resources. It is not sure that governments will increase educational resources...

2. Fine Tuning of first and second cycle descriptions

The aim is to build a schematic model which can be used by other disciplines, a sort of common or basic format for methodological use. The first step is to read the results of the other subject area groups, and try to reduce the number of competences, for instance by eliminating repetitions, and simplifying the level descriptors.

The group started reflecting upon the Coimbra proposal about competences and learning outcomes from the self-evaluation report for the TEEP, and from p. 72-73 in the final report. The number of 7 generic competences in the Coimbra report seems too low, but no more than 15 should be chosen.

The result should be three pages available to each discipline, with a clear list of recommendations using must, should, and may. The presentation could be as below:

1. Methodology	2. Level descriptors
3. Subject specific competences	4. More general guidelines

3. Applying competences in practice

- The Group has mapped the different ways for implementation of **generic competences**. There are two basic models : the system of problem based learning in small groups , and the system where competences are integrated in the whole cursus through lectures and works in small groups.
- **Time left was too short to make a “tour de table” and map the** subject specific competences. Everyone can refer to the papers delivered by some countries (Sweden,

Italy, Belgium, United-Kingdom, Finland, Portugal, Spain) ; the other countries are kindly requested to send information about this topic by email to the Chair.

4. ECTS as an accumulation system

- Developing level indicators.

There is often some confusion between cycle and level. Level indicators are pertinent for the transfer system, but they have to take place in the diploma supplement as descriptors of contents. **There is a large agreement on the fact that ECTS is only a way of measuring student workload. No label of level must be added.** More complex is the system, more difficult is the applying. So the "BIAS" and "CRM" system (p. 47) could work but independently from the ECTS system. The "specialized level" would be better called "technical level".

- Model for measuring workload

The problem is how to measure workload for stage, placements (for teaching), and all activities outside the "normal" curriculum. The Valencia document can be used as starting point.

5. Consulting of relevant actors (stakeholders)

- Some basic questions : What for (what are we asking the stakeholders for ?) : Disseminate results ? Listen to us ? help us to construct the tuning project 2, for instance asking them for validation on line 2. How to get organic feedback ? What level: European, National, local stakeholders ? We can distinguish academics stakeholders and the external one. Cf. composition of the Councils of faculties and universities : there are academics and external actors.
- List of some stakeholders : Euroclio, Cliohnet directory, National associations of historians, Trade Unions, Alumni Associations, Academia Europea, Editorial boards, Massmedia, History teachers in the secondary schools, Industrial entrepreneurs, institutions which disseminate historical knowledge (museums, archives, publishers).

We need a common framework to contact them ; consultation in meetings, conferences and the like is better than by questionnaire. We have to focus on comments about Tuning through two directions to be explored : people must be informed and we need feedback and comments.

6. Quality Assurance

Three types of evaluation can be distinguished : accreditation, evaluation and Quality assurance. Each country described its own situation. The three types are always present.