FROM KUALA LUMPUR TO RIGA
Stocktaking Report

5th Asia Europe Meeting of Ministers for Education
(ASEMME5)
April 2015 27-28
Riga, Latvia

Compossed by the ASEM Education Secretariat and
the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Latvia
in close cooperation with the ASEM members and stakeholders

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE
REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA

Asia-Europe Meeting

FROM KUALA LUMPUR TO RIGA

Stocktaking Report

5th ASEM Education Minister's Meeting (ASEMME5)
27 – 28 April 2015
Riga, Latvia

Composed by the ASEM Education Secretariat and
the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Latvia
in close cooperation with the ASEM members and stakeholders

Asia-Europe Meeting
ASEM Education Secretariat

Table of Contents

List of Annexes:
1. ASEMME4 Chair's Conclusion, Kuala Lumpur 2013
2. Summaries of conclusion, result, and achievement of ASEMME4
3. Result of Early Consultation with ASEM Member Countries and Stakeholder
4. Summary Report of SOM1, 10-11 November 2014, Riga, Latvia
5. Summary Report of ASEM Education Vision Survey
6. ASEM Expert Seminar on Dual Study Program – A Strategy to Expand Opportunities for ASEM Youth, Nuremberg 2014
7. Intermediate Senior Officials' Meeting (ISOM) of ASEMME5, Hangzhou 2014
8. ASEM Dialogue and Seminar on Quality Assurance and Recognition, Balanced Mobility, and Lifelong Learning, Kuala Lumpur 2014
9. Result of the 2nd ASEAN Plus Three Working Group on Mobility of Higher Education and Ensuring Quality Assurance of Higher Education
10. Result of 2nd Working Group of the ASEM Joint Curriculum Development Programme in Tourism and Hospitality
11. Result of the 1st Expert Meeting of the ASEM Work Placement Pilot Program
12. Result of the 3rd Working Group for Implementing ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration
13. Result of ASEM University-Business Seminar
14. Final Report of ASEM PLA
15. ARC4 Students Forum Policy Recommendations
16. Rectors Conference Policy Recommendations

Introduction

The aim of ASEM is to strengthen Asia-Europe links in three main areas - political dialogue, economic cooperation, and social-cultural and educational cooperation. Cooperation in education not only encourages people-to-people contacts between both regions and promotes equal partnership and mutual understanding, but also offers a wide range of possibilities for students and academics to experience other cultures and different ways of thinking, as well as to gain new knowledge and experience, and to develop new skills and new competencies necessary for employment. Every two years, ASEM Education Ministers meet to set priorities for cooperation. It is continued and complemented by a regular cooperation between the policy makers, experts, researchers, education institutions and other stakeholders.

It has now been eight years since the 1st Asia-Europe Meeting of Ministers for Education (ASEMME1) in 2008 in Berlin. ASEMME5 in Riga will gather Asian and European Education Ministers for the fifth time. During these years, the Education Ministers have repeatedly acknowledged the significant role of cooperation between both regions in the field of education, as well as emphasized the necessity to continue dialogue, exchange best practices and implement joint activities in areas of common interest.

During ASEMME3 in Copenhagen in 2011 the Education Ministers concentrated on four priority areas, being also the main areas for cooperation after the ASEMME4:

(a) Quality assurance and recognition;
(b) Engaging business and industry in education;
(c) Balanced mobility; and
(d) Lifelong learning including technical and vocational education and training.

The Stocktaking Report has been prepared with regard to the ASEMME4 in which The Ministers called the ASEM Education Secretariat (AES)[1] to request members to provide information of progress achieved by implementing the initiatives as proposed in the Conclusions by the Chair adopted at ASEMME4 in Kuala Lumpur on 13-14 May 2013. The preparatory stage for stocktaking was launched in Hangzhou, China on 7-9 May 2014 at the Intermediate Senior Officials' Meeting (ISOM), aiming to discuss the implementation of the ASEM activities from a policy perspective. In September 2014, AES sent a letter to all ASEM members and stakeholders requesting updates for the plan of implemented program and future programmes under the four priorities of the ASEM Education Process. In June 2014, Latvia as the host of the ASEMME5 began an early consultation with the ASEM member states and stakeholders to identify possible priorities for the post-ASEMME5 period, as well as to determine the focus of the Ministerial debate and to prepare the proposal of the ASEMME5 agenda. The Ministry continued the early consultation until the middle of October 2014 giving an opportunity to all ASEM members and stakeholders to express their opinions.

This report is structured as follows. The first part contains information on the structure and essence of the ASEM Education Process. The second part provides information on the progress made with regard to implementing the ASEMME4 Chair's Conclusions. The third part summarises the results of the Early Consultation, containing answers of ASEM members and stakeholders to the four early consultation questions and their opinions on the principles proposed by Latvia when setting up priorities and targets for the post-ASEMME5 period, marking the potential areas and methods of cooperation for strengthening the ASEM Education Process in the coming years. The fourth part consists of the result of the 1st Senior Official Meeting (SOM1) which was conducted on 10-11 November 2015 in Riga, Latvia. It is followed by the Summary of ASEM Education Vision Survey in the fifth part. The last part consists of the initiatives proposed in the draft Conclusions by the Chair of ASEMME5.

---

[1] Conclusions by the Chair of ASEMME4, Kuala Lumpur, 13-14 May 2013

1   The ASEM Education Process

The discussions regarding the procedures of mutual recognition between Asia and Europe in the mid-1990's commenced the ASEM process. As the relationship of both regions needed to be strengthened in light of the challenges and opportunities in the coming century, several meetings were conducted in order to find a way to build a partnership between the two regions. Singapore together with France proposed a meeting between the European Union and countries from Asia. This proposal led to the first EU-ASIA Summit which was attended by 26 ASEM Leaders in Bangkok, Thailand, in March 1996, the inaugural Asia-Europe Meeting.[2]

ASEM will celebrate its 20th anniversary in 2016. Over the past nineteen years, ASEM has continually adjusted to reflect new conditions. Now the challenge is not only ensuring the sustainable continuation of partnerships, but also creating conditions for it to flourish and thrive[3].

As an informal trans-regional platform for dialogue and cooperation, the ASEM process is based on an equal partnership. ASEM addresses political, economic, and socio-cultural issues of common concern. Today ASEM consists 51 ASEM member countries (Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cambodia, China, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Republic of Korea, Laos, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mongolia, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, and Viet Nam) together with the European Commission and the ASEAN Secretariat.

The 10th ASEM Summit was held in Milan, Italy, under the theme "Responsible Partnership for Sustainable Growth and Security" discussing important regional and international issues of common interest and concern. ASEM Heads of State and

---

[2]http://www.aseminfoboard.org/history.html. n.d 23 September 2014

[3]Friends of Europe publication - ASEM: Why Asia Europe relations matter in the 21th century, Summer 2014

Government appreciated the positive outcomes of the previous ASEM ministers' meetings, including ASEMME4, as well as the existing cooperation in ASEM Education Process, and highlighted the importance of education in promoting sustainable and inclusive development, innovation, poverty reduction and encouraging people-to-people contacts between Asia and Europe. Furthermore, they "invited the Education Ministers to reaffirm their commitment to strengthen and further develop ASEM educational cooperation."

Apart from the biennial ASEM Summits and gatherings of ASEM Heads of State and Government, the ASEM process features ministerial, senior official meetings and other events in an increasing number of fields, reflecting the expanding opportunities for dialogue and cooperation between the two regions.

The ASEM Education Process is organized at two levels: the political level includes ministerial commitment with representation at ministers' meetings. At the stakeholders' level, the dialogue is established and continued with policy makers and experts within different cooperation platforms and events.

1.   ASEMME1 to ASEMME5

The first meeting of the **Ministers Responsible for Education of the ASEM countries** was held in Berlin, Germany on 5-6 May 2008. The discussion was focused on strengthening cooperation in higher education by forging strategic partnerships and enhancement of employability and lifelong learning by bringing together education and the labour market[4]. The next ministerial meeting, **ASEM Meeting of Ministers Responsible for Higher Education**, was held one year later on 14-15 May, 2009 in Hanoi, Viet Nam. Under the theme "Sharing Experience and Best Practices on Higher Education", this meeting discussed and determined the objectives for joint collaborations to strengthen cooperation in higher education by forging strategic partnerships for quality assurance, credit recognition and transfer

---

[4] Conclusions by the Chair of the ASEM Conference of Ministers Responsible for Education "Education and Training for Tomorrow: Common Perspectives in Asia and Europe", 5-6 May 2008, Berlin

in ASEM countries. The meeting participants also focused on issues such as sustainable human resource development for ASEM's future needs through the promotion of lifelong learning and vocational education and training, as well as enhancing mobility and employability, strengthening university-industry partnerships, and fostering quality vocational education in member countries[5]. The Ministers agreed to convene a two-year meeting to give time for implementing the projects and initiatives proposed by the member countries. The next two education ministers' meetings took place in Copenhagen in 2011 and in Kuala Lumpur in 2013, concentrating on the four priority areas, which for the first time were approved at **the 3rd Asia-Europe Meeting of Ministers for Education (ASEMME3)** in Copenhagen at the political level by the Education Ministers. To deliver political momentum to the ASEM Education Process in 2013 in the ASEMME4, the Ministers for education invited the Senior Officials to meet yearly in order to discuss the implementation of the ASEM activities from a policy perspective and to agree on priority areas for the next Ministerial meeting. Therefore, on 7-9 May, 2014 in Hangzhou, China, there took place the so-called **Intermediate Senior Officials' Meeting (ISOM)** for the first time. As a result, each **Asia-Europe Meeting of Ministers' for Education (ASEMME)** is preceded by three **Senior Officials' Meetings (SOM)** aimed at examining ways for improving the efficiency of ASEM cooperation in addition to the above-mentioned tasks.

The ASEMME5 is in Riga on 27-28 April 2015 during Latvia's EU Presidency. The Meeting is hosted by Ministry of Education and Science of Republic of Latvia and focuses on the four existing ASEM priorities.

2. The Establishment of AES

One of the results from the ASEMME2 in Hanoi, Viet Nam, was the establishment of a rotating ASEM Education Secretariat (AES) in order to ensure the effective coordination and sustainable progress of the ASEM Education process.[6] Between 2009 and 2013, the AES was first hosted by Germany and then transferred

---

[5]Conclusions by the Chair of the ASEM Meeting of Ministers Responsible for Higher Education "Sharing Experience and Best Practices on Higher education", 14-15 May 2009, Hanoi

[6] AES. Chair Conclusion of ASEMME2 2009

to Indonesia, based on the rotating nature of the AES. Currently AES is headquartered in Jakarta, Indonesia. It took up its work with effect from 1 October 2013 and will host the Secretariat under the auspices of the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia until 2017.

Although the AES has been mainly supported by the hosting country (first, Germany, then Indonesia), other ASEM countries have been invited to contribute to the work of the AES by sending national experts to the secretariat. In the context of this cooperation, Australia, Latvia, and Malaysia already have sent their experts to the AES Jakarta.

In accordance with the direction from ASEMME2 in Viet Nam, the objectives of the AES are to coordinate ASEM educational activities, to help with the preparations for ASEM ministerial meetings, and facilitate the implementation of output-oriented initiatives that contribute to educational policy development and practices[7]. Besides it aims at providing independent support to ASEM member governments on all activities carried out and to generally support the ASEM Education Process.

Agenda, activity reports, and newsletter are available on the AES homepage, http://asem-education-secretariat.kemdikbud.go.id. Open public access to comprehensive information on the ASEM Education Process has also been provided by the ASEM InfoBoard (www.aseminfoboard.org), the official information platform of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) maintained by the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) on behalf of ASEM Members.

At the ASEMME4 2013 in Malaysia, Belgium (Flemish Community) expressed interest in hosting the secretariat from 2017 onwards.

3.   The Four Priorities

During the third Asia Europe Meeting of Ministers for Education (ASEMME3) hosted by Denmark in Copenhagen, 9-10 May 2011, ASEM members were asked to fill a questionnaire disseminated by the Danish Ministry. The questionnaire aimed to collect information on the developments and recommendations for future actions on the following four topics:

---

[7] ASEMME2 Chair's conclusion. 2009.

Quality assurance and recognition

It can be stated that the four ASEM priorities are interdependent. The discussion on quality assurance and recognition, for instance, is also connected to the mobility between two regions. By enhancing the quality of the institutions and the study programs, the trust among higher education will be reinforced and leading to increase mobility. Quality assurance and recognition are seen as crucial elements for the attractiveness, transparency, comparability and permeability of education systems. This also holds true for educational cooperation and mobility between Asia and Europe.

Engaging business and industry in education

The Ministers call for concrete measures for knowledge interchange and innovation exchange between education institutions and the world of work, by intensifying the dialogue and collaboration between education, business, and industry within and between the two regions and thereby improving employability of graduates, economic growth of countries and regions and the development of societies at large.

Balanced mobility

The imbalanced number of students' mobility between Asia and Europe is a major issue for the ASEM. In Asia, the number of outgoing student is higher than the number of incoming students, except for Australia and New Zealand. There are several obstacles encountered by the students both from Asia and Europe which prevent mobility. Two considerable obstacles for students from both regions are the language barrier and the lack of funding possibilities. Furthermore, Asian students often face immigration restrictions and European students have to deal with other obstacles, e.g. the recognition of credits.

Lifelong Learning (LLL) Including Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET)

Lifelong learning can be used as a strategy to cope with the negative side effects of the globalization, demographic transformation, and rapid technological developments which are posing new challenges to societies and knowledge-based economies in all parts of the world. This priority aims at developing policies that create learning opportunities for all citizens throughout their lives in order to participate in continuing professional development and enhance their skills and competences for working life, personal fulfillment, active citizenship, and social inclusion.

2 Preparing for the 5ᵗʰ ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting in Riga 2015

In preparation for ASEMME5, the AES has looked closely at all documents related to ASEM in order to identify the topics, to be used as the basis for discussion for the Ministers during ASEMME5. These documents were prepared for the fourth Asia-Europe Meeting of Ministers for Education in Kuala Lumpur 2013 (ASEMME4). In September 2014, the AES embarked on a stocktaking exercise by sending letters requesting updates of implemented programs and future plans for projects on the four priorities of the ASEM Education Process. The letters were sent to all committed ASEM member countries and relevant stakeholders, such as the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), the ASEM Education and Research Hub for Lifelong Learning (ASEM LLL Hub), etc. The collected updates were further analyzed and compiled into a first draft of a stocktaking report. This draft was recirculated to obtain more inputs and updates to stocktake all activities of all members.

The exercise resulted in a detailed Stocktaking Report incorporating the from the ASEM member countries. The following chapters summarize the stocktaking report and include the findings and conclusions of ISOM, ASEM Education events, Working Group meetings, reports of the Working Group leaders, country reports, etc.

1. Implementation of the ASEMME4 Chairs' Conclusions

ASEMME4 was conducted in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, on 13-14 May 2013. It was attended by 152 participants from 34 ASEM members (including 3 new members: Bangladesh, Norway, and Switzerland) and 7 international organizations. Under the theme *Strategizing ASEM Education Collaboration,* the meeting discussed the existing four main topics to set out the future direction of the ASEM Education Process and to put into practice concrete activities to implement the policy around four topics.

In order to set the scene for the debate, the four topics were introduced by speakers of different ASEM members: On the first day of the meeting, the topic **Quality Assurance and Recognition** was presented by representatives from China and Estonia. The representatives from Republic of Korea and Germany presented best practices of the implementation of **Engaging Business and Industry in Education**. On the next day, representatives from Malaysia and Austria presented on the topic **Balanced Mobility**. The last topic, **Lifelong Learning including Vocational Education and Training (TVET)**, was introduced by representatives from Indonesia and Denmark.

The summaries of conclusion, result of activities and achievement of the Chair Conclusion of ASEMME4 are attached in **ANNEX 2**.

2. Additional Activities to support ASEM goals

Additional activities have been conducted in order to support the ASEM Education Process since ASEMME4. Activities carried out during the period of ASEMME4 to ASEMME5 were not attached to Chairs' Conclusion of ASEMME4. The programs are as follows:

Model ASEM is a simulation of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) Summit to promote awareness of the ASEM process among students across Asia and Europe. It is a flagship youth project of the **Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF)** and contributes to balanced mobility between Asia and Europe. *Model ASEM 2014* fully sponsored 120 students from all 49 ASEM countries (as of 12 October 2014) to gather in Milan, Italy

before the 10th ASEM Summit to simulate the meeting among the ASEM leaders. It is a remarkable achievement that an Asia-Europe education project has ensured the full support of ASEM Members. This is thanks to ASEF disseminating the open call for this unique learning mobility opportunity to a large number of universities and student groups in all ASEM countries through various channels, including social media. As a result, more than 1700 applications were received.

The student-participants of Model ASEM 2014 have gained practical insights into Asian and European affairs and Asia-Europe relations, as well as sharpened their negotiation, consensus building and public speaking skills. The participants developed on site a Model ASEM 2014 Chair Statement which was channeled to all ASEM members. Furthermore, selected participants had the chance of personal meetings with the highest representatives of ASEM member countries, including the President of the European Council, H.E. Herman Van Rompuy, and the President of the European Commission, H.E. Jose Manuel Barroso, the Prime Minister of Malta, H.E. Joseph Muscat, and the President of Switzerland, H.E. Didier Burkhalter. [8]

The **ASEM Lifelong Learning Hub (ASEM LLL Hub)** initiative to continues the counseling which takes place at the conferences and meetings. This activity is an extension of the ASEM LLL Hub commitment in organizing a large forum regarding lifelong learnin every two years. Under the title *Renewing the Agenda for Lifelong Learning*, the ASEM Forum on Lifelong Learning was conducted in Bali, Indonesia on 9-12 March 2015.

The endeavors of the **Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF)** to promote balanced mobility are not limited to university students, but extend to secondary education as well. This is realized through the *ASEF Classroom Network (ASEF ClassNet)*, a program launched in 1998 to promote cross-cultural and intellectual exchange among teachers and pupils of secondary and high schools in ASEM countries through the use of ICT. ASEF ClassNet consists of both online and offline activities: 1) ASEF Classroom Network Conference: The Conference was organized in Asia and Europe alternatively and provided mobility opportunities to hundreds of school teachers and

---

[8] ASEF's input on first draft stocktaking report

pupils. The 11th ASEF Classroom Network Conference entitled "Creative Classrooms Go 4G: Teach Green, Learn Green, Act Green, Live Green" was held during 28 October 2013 – 1 November 2013 in Bali, Indonesia. 87 secondary school teachers and students from 31 ASEM countries participated. 2) ASEF ClassNet Projects: these projects are online collaborations which are submitted and implemented by Asian and European secondary and high schools, covering a period of 5-9 months and encourage creative teaching and learning through the use of information and communication technologies. In 2014, 38 ASEF ClassNet projects were submitted for implementation and engaged a total of 3,884 students and 200 teachers in 113 schools from 31 ASEM countries. 3) Quarterly e-newsletter. The information on various activities of ASEF ClassNet is easily accessible to the public on the Program's website: http://aec.asef.org/.

The ASEM-DUO Fellowship Program by the **Flemish Community** had a fairly high number of activities. In 2013-2014, there were 17 programs and in 2014-2015 there are 18 programs. The first call for the DUO-Wallonia/Brussels was launched in March 2014. It focused only on teacher/academic mobility. Unfortunately, the response was very low. [9]

As Germany attaches high importance to the development of joint curricula as an instrument to further internationalize collaboration among universities worldwide, the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research financially supports the development of an **ASEM Studies' Curriculum Module**. In order to identify suitable candidates, DAAD and the German Rectors' Conference (HRK) have launched a call for the implementation of this module. The module will be offered as part of a corresponding Masters level program such as European Studies, Asian Studies, Southeast Asian Studies, etc. The key objective of the ASEM Studies' Module is to acquaint Masters level students studying in the field of Asian or European studies, with the goals and instruments of the ASEM process as well as its political, social and economic framework. The module will promote understanding in the

---

[9] Contribution from Belgium to the Stocktaking Report 2014.

ASEM region and enable the respective university graduates to act as promoters of the ASEM spirit in their future careers. So far, three projects have been selected.

In order to increase the visibility of ASEM Education Process, the **ASEM Education Secretariat** published a biannual gazette highlighting the tangible result-oriented from the projects and initiatives of members. It is one of the ways to communicate with public and in particular the participants of ASEMME5. The major articles composed by AES and contributed by several other members were the activities in ASEM Education Process highlighting the successful initiatives and contribution of member countries, such as the host countries of ASEMME, working groups, and other activities. The aim of choosing the article is to trigger the new initiatives in the future of ASEM Education Process.

3.   Support to the ongoing process of ASEM

As the member countries of ASEM had previously agreed to support the four priorities, they were asked regarding their ability to keep supporting the on-going process of ASEM. The following activities are the initiatives to support the further process of ASEM Education.

The ASEF Summer University (AU) is a two-week summer school organized by the **Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF)** in venues alternating between Asia and Europe. Through lecturer, skills development workshops, study visits as well as practical exercises engaging the local communities, the ASEF Summer University offers opportunities for students and young professionals from all ASEM countries to broaden their horizon and deepen their insights into contemporary issues, thus fostering cross-cultural exchanges and networks among the youth of Asia and Europe. The 19th ASEF Summer University is planned to be held in India in 2015, focusing on the role of cultural heritage in sustainable urbanization and its relevance to modern societies.

A second important youth project is the ASEF Young Leaders Summit. This 4 day project initiated by the **Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF)** emerged from a call by the young citizens of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) member countries and the ASEM Head of States and Governments for closer interaction and exchange of

perspectives between the ASEM policy makers and young people on pressing societal issues. The project will take place in conjunction with the 12th ASEM Foreign Ministers' Meeting (ASEM FFM12) in Luxembourg in 2015. The 1st meeting of the ASEF Young Leaders Summit in November 2015 will tackle the topics of youth employment, leadership, and (social) entrepreneurship.

The renewal of the agenda for lifelong learning will be the responsibility of the **ASEM LLL Hub** who organized a discussion of renewal and adjustment of the Agenda for research and dissemination of Lifelong learning in early 2015. In order to stimulate the production of comparative research for the period 2014-2017, the ASEM LLL Hub will maintain the level of research output equivalent to 1-2 research publications. The ASEM LLL Hub will publish two issues of ASEMagazine for Lifelong Learning every year up to 2017, utilizing the http://www.asemLLLhub.org to reach a wider audience, release four policy briefs, and hold 5 conferences in appropriate fields. These activities are conducted so that the link between research, education, counseling, the private sector, and respective markets can be strengthened.[10]

In 2015, the **ASEM LLL Hub** will produce the first two ASEM Reviews of National Policies for Lifelong Learning consisting of two parts. The background report reviews the relevant history, information, and data of the investigated countries. The terms of reference included in the background report will provide information about the purpose and structure of the review and will form the basis for further analysis by a team of independent examiners. The examiners will then visit each of the participating countries and draft and present a report for the authorities in the respective country.

In relation to the financing of appropriate comparative research and the funding of research-informed advice activities, the **ASEM LLL Hub** has put initiatives in place to improve the basis for the financing of the networks' research, dissemination and counseling activities. The underlying reason for this initiative is the growth of ASEM LLL Hub over the last few years, from 70 members to 100 clustered in 5 networks with high activity in each network.

---

[10] ASEM Education and Research Hub for Lifelong Learning (ASEM LLL Hub)'s report of program

3   Result of the Early Consultation with ASEM Members and Stakeholders

The four priority areas for ASEM cooperation in the field of education were set in the ASEMME3 in 2011. Both globalisation and rapid technological change have a continuous impact on education and training policy. Cooperation among the ASEM members and stakeholders during these years has been strengthened through bilateral and multilateral agreements, regional initiatives and various other projects and programmes. Therefore, from June to October 2014 Latvia, as the host of the ASEMME5, carried out an Early Consultation with the ASEM members and stakeholders to identify their initial views on the areas for cooperation under the ASEM Education Process before the First Senior Officials' Meeting of the ASEMME5 (10-11 November 2014).

All parties involved in the ASEM Education Process were invited to participate in the consultation process: both policy-makers and stakeholders representing universities and students, as well as institutions seeking to encourage an exchange of new ideas, to support balanced mobility, and to promote opportunities for cooperation between both regions in the field of education.

At the ISOM, Latvia as the host of the ASEMME5, invited ASEM members and stakeholders to consider **three principles**, which could be followed by members to assist in achieving the four priorities of the ASEM Education Process.

1. **Continuity of the SEM Education Process** should be based on the progress made in four key policy areas, ministerial vision and consultations with stakeholders;

2. Preconditions for achieving common goals are (1) **Early Consultation** with ASEM member states and stakeholders before each ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting and (2) **collaboration for results** by maximizing the value of expert exchanges, peer learning and prioritising pilot projects; and

3. **Ministerial commitment for cooperation** ensures sustainability of the ASEM Education Process.

As a result of this Early Consultation process, a total of 25 ASEM members and stakeholders responded to the questions posed as listed below:

- Europe: Austria, Belgium (Wallonia-Brussels), Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Cyprus, Estonia, the European Commission, France, Greece, Germany, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Romania, Sweden.

- Asia: Australia, Brunei Darussalam, China, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Russian Federation, Thailand.

- Stakeholders: the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), the ASEM LLL-Hub.

Most of ASEM members believe that the four main priority areas should be maintained during the ASEMME5 to ensure continuity and further development of the ASEM Education Process, with the majority of the countries pointing out the importance of collaboration on Quality Assurance and Recognition. The members stated that it is important to explore the progress of the activities identified under each priority area and that an evaluation process should be initiated on the different outcomes of current priorities.

Regarding the proposed complementary measures, the consultation resulted in the member stating the importance of promoting further integration of quality assurance networks among ASEM member countries. Concerted effort is needed to create a more balanced mobility of students and academics. Furthermore, development of joint programmes and research projects between the European and Asian countries has also been recommended.

Members also pointed out the need for a better and quicker information exchange process to share the activities or programmes regarding the four priority areas between the ASEM members. The involvement of the higher education stakeholders should take place more structurally within the process and also in the follow-up and/or implementation activities.

Several members believed that in facilitating balanced mobility between Asia and Europe, fair recognition of qualifications and study periods might be the crucial factor. Part of the obstacle for mobility is administrative – the variation in academic calendar among the higher education institutions, languages barrier, visa issues, funding and other administrative burdens. The lack of comparability of

qualifications, credit systems and learning outcomes and lack of recognition of qualifications and study periods create additional barriers for mobility. Development of the quality assurance systems and recognition procedures, participation in recognition networks and in recognition conventions are essential for facilitating balanced mobility.

ASEM member countries support efforts to promote the development of basic, transferable and professional skills of individuals to facilitate their integration in labour markets and would welcome further exploration of joint activities that could support this objective. Internship or apprenticeship opportunities/programmes in ASEM member countries for students from TVET and higher education would promote their hands-on or industrial skills resulting in increasing their employability. Furthermore, specialized seminars/forums can be held on this topic as exchange of information and best-practices are welcome. In some common areas of study, joint degree study programmes could be drafted and implemented. The ASEM Curriculum, adopted during ASEMME4, could be developed to support the development of skills. ASEM Education cooperation could be built on the work projects already underway in Asia and Europe.

The results of the Early Consultation highlighted several important questions require for further discussions. One of the questions is related to the inclusion of the new ASEM Education priorities and implementing the present priorities. It was asked should we include priorities only when the current ones have been fully accomplished or should we adjust them to allow for changing needs. A discussion need to take place on the question of what should be changed in the process of implementing the present priorities and, perhaps, there are aspects, which should be strengthened or paid particular attention to.

As there were many constructive recommendations from the members and stakeholders regarding the complementary measures, which should be introduced and implemented to promote closer cooperation among stakeholders, a decision needs to be made on which specific complementary measures should be introduced and implemented. Another important issue is related to developing and establishing the monitoring system or guidelines for implementing the priorities and reflecting

their progress in the countries. The question remains whether there is a real need for it and what aspects the monitoring system or guidelines will include.

The text of the summary from the Early Consultation process is attached in **ANNEX 3**.

4   Result of the 1st Senior Officials' Meeting (SOM1)

With the aim of preparing for the 5th ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting to be held in Riga on 27–28 April 2015, the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Latvia, hosted the 1st Senior Officials' Meeting (SOM1) in Riga on 10–11 November 2014.

At the meeting, 89 participants from 33 countries in Europe and Asia, the ASEM Education Secretariat, the European Commission and the European External Action Service (EEAS) as an overall coordinator of the ASEM Process were present. SOM1 was preceded by the Intermediate Senior Officials' Meeting (Hangzhou, China, 7-9 May 2014).

SOM1 was held in a plenary format with participants expressing their opinions and broader discussions taking place in two parallel sessions to prepare proposals for the ASEM Education Process policy agenda and to provide substance for the ASEMME5 Conclusions by the Chair. The discussions of the parallel sessions were based on the results of the Early Consultation with the ASEM members and stakeholders carried out from June to October 2014 and the participants' experience and expectations.

SOM1 delivered a significant contribution towards the preparation of the ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting. The participants agreed on the draft agenda and format of the ASEMME5 and discussed the potential topics for the Ministerial debate.

During group discussions at the SOM1, broad support was given for the suggestion of a Two-Pillar system where Pillar 1 is dialogue-oriented to provide a platform for mutual learning and Pillar 2 is result-oriented covering pilot projects with commitments. A need for a vision document and more active involvement of stakeholders, especially students, rectors and teachers was also supported.

Considering the stability of the entire Education Process, the participants suggested continuing the four existing priorities: quality assurance and recognition; engaging business and industry in education; balanced mobility; lifelong learning including technical and vocational education and training. The majority of the

19

participants agreed to keep the existing priorities, at the same time realizing a need for a stronger focus and/or evaluation.

At the same time, some of the attendees agreed on a need for change, by reshaping the existing cooperation fields or broadening the scope of cooperation. However, this remains an open question, which was also discussed during the SOM2. In addition, the involvement of education ministers is crucial to decide on major changes in the ASEM Education Process. During the SOM1, close cooperation and exchanges between the relevant ministries (Foreign Affairs, Education, Culture, Labour, etc.) was also emphasized for better synergies.

After the SOM1, the ASEM members and stakeholders were invited to submit their comments and additional views on the issues discussed during the SOM1. In total 14 members sent their opinions and comments, which were summarized and used in the process of preparation for the ASEMME5.

The summary report "1st Senior Officials' Meeting (SOM1) of the 5th ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting (ASEMME5)" is attached in **ANNEX 4**.

5   Result of ASEM Education Vision Survey

As a result of the ASEM Senior Officials Meeting (SOM1) in Riga in November 2014, AES agreed to develop a vision document covering the ASEM Education process and initiatives under a new model for renewing the agenda and to expand pilot collaborative projects. The information related to these matters was obtained by circulating the vision to all ASEM member countries and stakeholders.

AES highly appreciated the contribution from Australia, Austria, Belgium (Flemish and French Community), Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Indonesia, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Spain, The Russian Federation, and United Kingdom who shared their inputs and ideas toward the future of ASEM Education Process. The following are the responses of the members' expectation for future ASEM Education Process:

a. To enable the prominence of the ASEM Education Process, ASEM members are committed to develop education in the world, particularly in Asia and Europe. Such a focus will be needed to assist with a consolidation of the actual developments and activities in the ASEM education process which will develop network collaboration and enhance global educational linkages.

b. Keep providing a platform to encourage open dialogue between member states, in particular the sharing of best practices between ASEM member countries, is also a recommendation to increase the information within the members. It will be important to keep maintaining the consistency of the activities, projects, and actions, as well as creating new opportunities for all higher education stakeholders and reinforcing the cooperation. The process of selecting pilot projects to prevent the duplication should be examined further. ASEM Education cooperation needs to lead to a number of concrete joint actions in the areas of quality assurance, degree structure and recognition of diplomas. Also tangible results need to be achieved on any future agreements.

c. Within the ongoing process, the visibility of the ASEM Education process for members should be increased. Information on the progress of all activities

should be provided to all members in order to share information and encourage new cooperation between members. Results and evidence of the concrete progress achieved in cooperation in both regions should also be distributed to all members.

d. As for the focus of future cooperation in the ASEM Education process, the members were keen to focusing keep maintaining the existing priorities. It is important that the four priorities under the ASEM Education Process should be reviewed regularly to ensure its relevance.

e. Based on several responses, quality assurance issues need to be further discussed. It is needed to establish the recognition of qualifications and study periods as well as the comparability of qualifications and learning outcomes. It is important to raise the mutual recognition and understanding of quality in qualifications which result in to demonstrable success in facilitating greater institutional partnerships. Also, conducting a European-Asian forum on quality assurance involving all stakeholders should be held to develop a compendium of the different quality assurance systems.

f. The proportion of the flow of students and academics from Asia and Europe should also be noted as one of the purposes of the ASEM Education process. The focus should be on maintaining the mobility numbers and increasing cooperation between the two regions. Academic collaboration, work placements, quality assurance, and qualifications frameworks and recognition need to be included in developing a framework on mobility.

g. The members suggested that it is necessary to raise the standards in Higher Education and Vocational Education and Training (VET) as well as to increase the mobility of VET students, academic staff and researchers and also to develop a Quality Assurance Framework for VET/TVET. The other recommendation is that basic education and VET should be included in the ASEM Education Process for the development of the ASEM Education Process.

h. The obstacles within the process should also be considered. Several constraint faced by the majority of members are the lack political momentum, financing, capacity, poor knowledge of Asian Languages, lack of governance structures and

accountability, little recognition of diplomas and that coordination and commitment to the ASEM process varies between member countries.

The two pillars model for ASEM Education Cooperation was another suggestion discussed during SOM1, 10-11 November 2014 in Riga, Latvia. The first pillar is the platform for dialogue and information exchange on topics of common interest and the second pillar is the result-oriented concrete pilot projects.

Mostly, the members support the two pillars model. It is believed that it will facilitate ASEM Education cooperation and also be a good basis for cooperation in both regions. The first pillar will ensure that the ASEM member countries will continue to engage each other on topics of common interest. The second pillar will allow the ASEM member countries that are interested in particular areas to take action on pilot projects. Several steps need to be taken in order to implement these pillars. Progress needs to be tracked and the impact of concrete projects measured. TVET also needs to be included Pillar 1 as does Quality Assurance in the Pillar 2.

In 2018 the ASEM Education Process will celebrate its 10 years of operation. Some countries have proposed several ideas including establishing a set of indicators to monitor the achievement level of each of the activities planned within the 2-pillars model; preparing a conference devoted to the anniversary in both regions including some testimonials of beneficiaries which will enhance the visibility of the results and impact of the ASEM Education Process; the publication of a short booklet or information on the web site about the status of mutual recognition of qualifications, the quality regimes of the ASEM Education Process, and achievements; the Rector's Conference and Students' Forum desire to mobilize more people from the grass roots level to the ASEM Education Process; and more attention needs to be given to the promotion of the ways of improving training opportunities, integration into the labor market and equity and social integration.

The result of ASEM Education Vision Survey is attached in **ANNEX 5**.

6 Conclusion

This report highlighted several important aspects of member countries reports. The contributions from the ASEM member countries were very constructive in keeping the focuses on the existing four priorities. Most activities focused on the priorities, Quality Assurance and Recognition and balanced mobility, and to a lesser extent on Engaging Business and Industry in Education and Lifelong Learning including Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET).

Most of the ASEM education initiatives (in all four priority areas) stated in the ASEMME4 Conclusions by the Chair have been accomplished or partly accomplished. There are several initiatives still underway and efforts should concentrate on continuing and strengthening them.

Most of the activities accomplished belong to priority area Engaging Business and Industry in Education and Lifelong Learning Including Technical and Vocational Education and Training. Majority of the activities underway are in the priority area Quality Assurance and Recognition. Balanced Mobility is the priority where some activities have been fully accomplished, some are underway and some could be intensified (financial support, need for comparable and reliable mobility data etc.). ASEM stakeholders have brought added value to ASEM Education Process and their involvement should be continued.

With regard to the numerous activities implemented or still running, it can be summarized that the commitment of the ASEM member countries remains fairly high. Thus, it is not unreasonable to expect that education cooperation between Asia and Europe will be further developed and promoted. Therefore, AES encourages the member countries to be more active in preparing new initiatives related to each of the four priorities.

ASEM members and stakeholders have wide array of proposals for further development and improvement of ASEM Education Process (including for the 10th anniversary). The challenging task is to set priorities, maintain the interest and commitment of the countries to implement the proposed initiatives, encourage cooperation among countries when implementing activities and ensure coherence with already existing initiatives.

Although ASEM members agree that tangible cooperation should be strengthened, they believe that ASEM Education Process should remain a platform for dialogue and information exchange on topics of common interest. ASEM members support the 2 Pillar system where Pillar 1 is dialogue-oriented to provide a platform for mutual learning and Pillar 2 is result-oriented covering pilot projects with commitments. The question remains how to ensure setting of the main goal, objectives and tasks and definition of expected outcomes and implementation plan for the activities of the second pillar. It is questionable if the monitoring for the activities of the second pillar is necessary.

The results of several consultations with ASEM members and stakeholders clearly show that most of ASEM members believe that the four main priority areas should be maintained during the ASEMME5 to ensure continuity and further development of the ASEM Education Process, with the majority of the countries pointing out the importance of collaboration on Quality Assurance and Recognition and Balanced Mobility.

Part of ASEM members believes that ASEM Education Process should include various educational levels, not only higher education. The ASEM members suggest not putting out the topics by the level of education, but looking at cross-cutting themes, for example, technological developments, balanced mobility, employability and skills. ASEM members support efforts to promote the development of basic, transferable and professional skills of individuals to facilitate their integration in labour markets and would welcome further exploration of joint activities that could support this objective.

Each ASEM member sees the future ASEM education cooperation in 5 years and beyond differently but most commonly mentioned tasks are an increase in student and staff mobility, making progress on recognition of qualifications and study periods as well as comparability of qualifications and learning outcomes. Some countries mention the importance of VET and opportunities offered by „Erasmus+" programme.

Members endorse the informal structure of ASEM and believe it's important to continue the dialogue between member countries. A shared vision for the ASEM

education process could serve as a framework for future collaboration. Focus should be on quality assurance and recognition of international activities and reducing legal, financial, administrative and educational barriers in study and work mobility and joint and double degrees. Members agreed that its important to increase the number of students at European institutions studying Asian languages.

Technology could be used more to promote virtual mobility and ensuring that limited resourcing is not wasted by duplicating work. Proposed new priority areas for ASEM include research collaboration, teacher quality and standards, measurement of teaching and learning outcomes and education for all. Member countries also suggested that basic education and VET be included in the ASEM Education Process.

Mutual recognition agreements between institutions will be important as well as the development of an inter-regional credit transfer system. It is important to ensure regular monitoring of intiatives and distribute results from projects to members and stakeholders, to alleviate the ASEM Education Process losing focus.

Broad support among members for the two pillar process as a way of increasing the visibilty of the ASEM Education Process and evaluating its effectiveness. Targets and priorities should be created in the policy dialogues and will set the overall direction for cooperation.

Members agreed clear tasks and goals are important for AES and that it was important to keep members updated on all working group activities and project outcomes. Clear communication on the type of projects and members' commitment to such projects was important, especially since funding sources are limited. The website could be improved and specific areas of cooperation should be aligned with the four priorities for the ASEM Education Process.

7 References

Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF). *Annual Report*. 2012

ASEM. *ASEM Info Board.* Accessed via http://www.aseminfoboard.org/history.html. n.d 23 September 2014

AES. *Chair's Conclusions of ASEMME2*. Hanoi. 2009

AES. *Chair's Conclusions of ASEMME4*. Kuala Lumpur. 2013

AES. *Status Report of the ASEM Education Process ASEMME3*. Copenhagen. 2011

AES. *Stocktaking Report of ASEMME4*. Kuala Lumpur. 2013

UNESCO. *Quality Assurance and Rrecognition*, accessed via UNESCO: http://www.unesco.org/en/higher-education/themes/quality-assurance-and-recognition/

ASEM LLL Hub. "Updating Draft stocktaking Report for SOM1 - ASEM LLL Hub". Message to ASEM Education Secretariat. September 15, 2014 9:31 PM. Email.

Bureau of International Affairs. Memo to Secretary General of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia. *Intermediate Senior Officials' Meeting (ISOM) of the 5th Asia-Europe Meeting of Minister of Education (ASEMME5).*

Bureau of International Affairs. Memo to Secretary General of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia. *ASEM Expert Seminar "Dual Study Programme- A strategy to expand opportunities for ASEME Youth.* 08 April 2014.

Zhao, Aaron. "Updating Draft stocktaking Report for SOM1 – China". Message to ASEM Education Secretariat. 16 September 2014. E-mail.

Presentations of ASEM International Seminar of Quality Assurance and Recognition, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 25-26 August 2014.

8   Annexes

1.   ASEMME4 Chair's Conclusion, Kuala Lumpur 2013
2.   Summaries of conclusion, result, and achievement of ASEMME4
3.   Result of Early Consultation with ASEM Member Countries and Stakeholder
4.   Summary Report of SOM1, 10-11 November 2014, Riga, Latvia
5.   Summary Report of ASEM Education Vision Survey
6.   ASEM Expert Seminar on Dual Study Program – A Strategy to Expand Opportunities for ASEM Youth, Nuremberg 2014
7.   Intermediate Senior Officials' Meeting (ISOM) of ASEMME5, Hangzhou 2014
8.   ASEM Dialogue and Seminar on Quality Assurance and Recognition, Balanced Mobility, and Lifelong Learning, Kuala Lumpur 2014
9.   Result of the 2nd ASEAN Plus Three Working Group on Mobility of Higher Education and Ensuring Quality Assurance of Higher Education
10.   Result of 2nd Working Group of the ASEM Joint Curriculum Development Programme in Tourism and Hospitality
11.   Result of the 1st Expert Meeting of the ASEM Work Placement Pilot Program
12.   Result of the 3rd Working Group for Implementing ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration
13.   Result of ASEM University-Business Seminar
14.   Final Report of ASEM PLA
15.   ARC4 Students Forum Policy Recommendations
16.   Rectors Conference Policy Recommendations

ASEMME4 Chairs' Conclusions

ANNEX 1

Fourth Asia-Europe Meeting of Ministers for Education (ASEMME4)
Kuala Lumpur, 13-14 May 2013

Strategizing ASEM Education Collaboration

Conclusions by the Chair

1. The Fourth Meeting of the Ministers for Education of the ASEM countries was held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia on 13 and 14 May 2013 and attended by 152 participants from 34 ASEM members and 7 international organisations. The Meeting was chaired by H.E. the Secretary General, Ministry of Higher Education of Malaysia.

2. The Meeting warmly welcomed the new ASEM members Bangladesh, Norway and Switzerland who joined the ASEM process during the 9th ASEM Summit held in Vientiane, Laos in November 2012.

3. The Meeting expressed its sincere appreciation to the Malaysian host for the warm hospitality and excellent arrangements made for the Fourth Asia-Europe Meeting of Ministers for Education and thus providing the right framework to push forward the ASEM Education Process and deepen the education policy dialogue started in Berlin 2008 and continued in Hanoi 2009 and Copenhagen 2011.

4. Under the overarching theme of "Strategizing ASEM Education Collaboration", the Meeting exchanged views on areas of common interest, took note of the results achieved so far and discussed four main topics to set out future direction of the ASEM Education Process and define concrete activities to put policy into practice. These topics, namely "Quality Assurance and Recognition", "Engaging Business and Industry in Education", "Balanced Mobility" and "Lifelong Learning including Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET)" were already identified by the Ministers in the previous Ministerial Meeting in Copenhagen as key policy areas of the ASEM Education Process which should be given particular attention. In order to set the scene for the debate, the four topics were introduced by speakers of different ASEM members: the topic "Quality Assurance and Recognition" by China and Estonia; the topic "Engaging Business and Industry in Education" by the Republic of Korea and Germany; the topic "Balanced Mobility" by Malaysia and Austria and the topic "Lifelong Learning including TVET" by Indonesia and Denmark.

In their meeting the Ministers:

5. Renewed their commitment to strengthen the Asia-Europe Education Process and shape an ASEM Education Area on the basis of mutual respect and benefit, thus contributing to the overall dialogue and cooperation between Asia and Europe in the political, economic and socio-cultural fields, as reaffirmed by the ASEM Leaders during their Summit in Vientiane on 5 and 6 November 2012.

6. Reiterated the importance of education and training for balanced, sustainable and inclusive growth in Asia and Europe, as well as for democracy, cultural diversity and social cohesion in both regions. Ministers, therefore, acknowledged the necessity to invest in all sectors of education and training in order

to further improve the quality and attractiveness of education and training systems, to provide opportunities for lifelong learning in all its aspects and contribute to the development of highly qualified and active citizens who have a strong sense of social responsibility, are open-minded and respect cultural diversity.

7. Underlined the pivotal role of the ASEM Education Process for dialogue and cooperation in the field of education and training between Asia and Europe. Ministers noted with satisfaction that the manifold activities and the outcomes of the ASEM Education Process have received high political attention and attracted great interest from stakeholders. In this context, special recognition is given to the collaboration with the ASEM Summits of Heads of State and Government, the Bologna Policy Forum and the ASEM Rectors' Conference (ARC), with the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) as its permanent secretariat.

8. Recognised that the ASEM Education Process has achieved considerable progress since the first three Ministerial Meetings in Berlin, Hanoi and Copenhagen and noted with gratitude the numerous initiatives described in the Stocktaking Report and carried out by ASEM members, the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) through its ASEM Education Hub (AEH), the ASEM Education and Research Hub for Lifelong Learning and the ASEM Education Secretariat in order to achieve more transparency, improve understanding of the different education systems within and between both regions, thus making education systems more comparable, and facilitating mobility and enhancing cooperation.

9. Felt that the time has come to put policy into practice and strengthen the efforts to further develop the ASEM Education Area by continued joint initiatives and concrete measures focused on the four key policy areas. The Ministers also wished to give additional political momentum to the ASEM Education Process by asking the Senior Officials to meet yearly in order to discuss the implementation of the ASEM activities from a policy perspective and to agree on priority areas for the next Ministerial Meeting proposed by the host of the next meeting in consultation with the ASEM Education Secretariat (AES). In this regard, Senior Officials are expected to meet in the middle of 2014. This meeting will be hosted by China with support of the ASEM Education Secretariat.

10. Expressed their appreciation to the ASEM Education Secretariat, which has been hosted by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) in Bonn, Germany, and sponsored by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) since 2009, for its excellent work during the last four years, especially for effectively coordinating the various ASEM educational activities and providing a comprehensive stocktaking report on the implementation of these activities and their outcomes. The Ministers welcomed the report as a source for the policy-making process and asked the ASEM Education Secretariat to prepare a descriptive stocktaking report on the results of ASEM and related activities for the next Ministerial Meeting. In this context the Ministers renewed their gratitude to Belgium, China, Indonesia, Luxemburg and the Netherlands for the secondment of staff to the current Secretariat.

11. Welcomed the involvement of stakeholders, through the ASEM Rectors' Conference (ARC) and other initiatives from higher education institutions and students' representatives, in the ASEM Education Process to achieve broad consensus on the aims and measures of the Process and acknowledged the recommendations from the 3rd ASEM Rectors' Conference (ARC3) and the contributions of the 1st Asia-Europe Students' Forum, both initiated by the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) and held back-to-back in Groningen, the Netherlands in September 2012. The Ministers recognised the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF)'s efforts to include students in the ASEM Process. Convinced that involvement of higher educa-

tion institutions and students as constructive and active partners in the ASEM Education Process is needed, the Ministers asked the Senior Officials to explore how increased and active involvement of those stakeholders could be ensured in the future.

With the aim to further develop and strengthen the ASEM educational cooperation in the four key policy areas of their meeting and to achieve better understanding of and greater comparability between the different education systems in the ASEM Education Area, the Ministers agreed on a number of concrete activities and measures to be carried out and implemented in the coming years.

A. Quality Assurance and Recognition

Quality assurance systems and recognition mechanisms are critical for the attractiveness, transparency, comparability and permeability of education systems. This is also true for educational cooperation and mobility between Asia and Europe. From the very beginning, quality assurance and recognition, therefore, have been high on the agenda of ASEM Ministerial Meetings. In the years to come, more efforts are needed to improve transparency and understanding of the different quality assurance and recognition systems and tools, developed in Asia and Europe, and to make the education systems of both regions better comparable.

In this context, the Meeting thanked Germany for having held an interregional quality assurance seminar in the field of external quality assurance in July 2011 and France for having hosted a seminar on quality assurance in November 2012.

The Ministers:

12. Acknowledged that quality assurance, qualifications frameworks and recognition are essential for building trust and facilitating the recognition of degrees and diplomas. The Ministers reaffirmed the need for a regular dialogue in the field of quality assurance and recognition between ASEM experts from quality assurance agencies, recognition organisations, higher education institutions, students and governments and welcomed Malaysia's initiative to facilitate this dialogue. In this context, they welcomed Japan's initiatives to establish a higher education quality assurance centre for Asia and to set up a new working group under the ASEAN+3 Education Ministers Meeting with a view to further promoting mobility of higher education and ensuring quality assurance in Asia. The Ministers also welcomed China's initiative to establish a Cross-border Quality Assurance Network in Higher Education (CBQAN).

13. Invited quality assurance agencies to consider their inclusion in the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR) since the membership in EQAR is open to European and non-European countries.

14. Encouraged quality assurance agencies to invite peers from Asia to Europe and vice-versa to take part in external quality assurance procedures in order to facilitate the dialogue and understanding in the field of quality assurance.

15. Welcomed Belgium's (Flemish Community and French Community) initiative to organise peer learning activities related to new approaches in quality assurance in Higher Education and/or to governance of higher education (autonomy, responsibility and accountability).

16. Noted with appreciation Austria's successful initiative and China's organisational support in drafting an ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration, based on the Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region (Lisbon Recognition Convention) and the Asia-Pacific Regional Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications in Higher Education (Tokyo Recognition Convention) and thus contributing to improve recognition of higher education qualifications between Asian and European regions. The Ministers fully endorsed this Declaration and urged ASEM countries to explore concrete steps to implement the Declaration, in close cooperation with existing structures, active in the recognition field. The Ministers welcomed China's offer to coordinate a working group to this end and the willingness of Australia, Austria, Belgium (Flemish Community and French Community), Brunei Darussalam, Germany, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal and the United Kingdom to participate in this working group. Results from the Bologna Process working group on structural reforms should be considered.

17. Affirmed the need to improve information on education systems and on recognition procedures as this is essential for students going abroad. Noted the differences in establishing National Information Centres (NIC) and networks of NICs between the Asian and European regions. In this context the Ministers proposed to build NICs in the Asian region and welcomed China's offer to set up a website including information on NICs, in order to share information and facilitate joint research and collaboration on qualification recognition in the ASEM region. Moreover, cooperation between Asian and European recognition experts and between Asian NICs and ENIC-NARICs should be encouraged to improve communication between the ASEM regions.

18. Aware of the different regional credit systems for academic recognition, they emphasised the need to make these systems more transparent in order to facilitate recognition of study achievements abroad and to stimulate cross-border mobility. The Ministers welcomed the readiness of Australia, Belgium (French Community), Brunei Darussalam, China, Estonia, Lithuania, Malaysia, Portugal and Thailand to establish an expert group to discuss interregional credit transfer mechanisms among ASEM member countries. In order to give valuable input to the discussions in this expert group, the Ministers asked the ASEM Education Secretariat to constantly update its "Compendium on Credits and Learning Outcomes in ASEM countries", providing current information from ASEM countries. Furthermore, they underlined the need to discuss information on education systems, recognition procedures and interregional transfer mechanisms comprehensively on the stakeholder level, e.g. during the next ASEM Rectors' Conference (ARC).

B. Engaging Business and Industry in Education

Close and effective cooperation and permanent transfer of knowledge and innovation between education institutions and the world of work are influential factors for the employability of graduates, economic growth of countries and regions and the development of societies at large. The ASEM Education Process therefore aims at intensifying the dialogue and collaboration between education, business and industry within and between both regions by proposing concrete measures for discussion and implementation. In this way, the ASEM Education Process also contributes to the general wish of ASEM Leaders to reinforce the Asia-Europe cooperation in fields such as economy and education.

The Ministers:

19. Encouraged all stakeholders involved in education and business to engage in further debate and efforts with a view to enhance the employability of higher education and TVET students and their entrepreneurial skills and competences by developing and monitoring strategies for education-business cooperation and collaboration. In order to realise those goals the business sector should be encouraged to define the competences they need and will need in future.

20. Noted with interest the results and recommendations of the 3rd ASEM Rectors' Conference (ARC3) underlining the role of universities as motors for economic growth and development and emphasising the need to equip students with skills that benefit society and reflect the changing demands of the labour market and enhance the entrepreneurial mind-set by offering specific courses. The Ministers asked the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), through the projects of its ASEM Education Hub (AEH), particularly the ASEM Rectors' Conference (ARC), to continue the stakeholders' dialogue on this issue and report on the progress made in the next Ministerial Meeting.

21. Recognised with satisfaction that Germany and Malaysia held the 2nd and 3rd ASEM University-Business Forum (UBF) and made this Forum a regular platform to exchange information and to share good practices, thus strengthening the dialogue on University-Business cooperation. The Ministers welcomed Belgium's (Flemish Community and French Community) willingness to organise the 4th UBF in 2014 and Viet Nam's readiness to host the 5th UBF and invited the Forums to discuss how to combine study with work-based learning. They also asked the European Commission to give special attention to the ASEM Education Process in its European University-Business Forum.

22. Emphasised that work placements in higher education play a key role in enhancing graduate employability and endorsed the launch of an interregional ASEM Work Placement Pilot Programme that promotes practical experience and cross-cultural skills and competences of Asian students in Europe and European students in Asia. The Ministers asked the ASEM Education Secretariat to give organisational support to launch the programme and welcomed Belgium's (Flemish Community), Brunei Darussalam's, Germany's and Thailand's intention to take part in the pilot phase.

C. Balanced Mobility

Interregional exchange of students and staff leads to an increase in internationally trained and experienced labour force and lays the ground for new partnerships in Asia and Europe. However, student mobility between both regions is notably imbalanced. Many more Asian students study in Europe than Europeans in Asia. It was felt in previous Ministerial Meetings that measures should be taken to better balance mobility flows, especially by motivating more European students to spend at least part of their studies in Asia. To this end, mobility-friendly frameworks concerning information, funding and study conditions must be further developed.

The Ministers thanked Thailand for organising the 'International Asia-Europe Conference on Enhancing Balanced Mobility', which took place in Bangkok, Thailand in March 2012, as well as the countries supporting the ASEM-DUO Fellowship Programme, that specifically addresses the imbalance in exchange and encourages balanced mobility by supporting pair-based and two-way exchanges.

The Ministers:

23. Welcomed the willingness of Malaysia and its Asia-Europe Institute (AEI) to develop – in cooperation with other interested ASEM members – a strategy on better balancing mobility for ASEMME5 in Latvia. The strategy will include proposals for concrete activities to overcome the imbalance in mobility between Asia and Europe.

24. Acknowledged the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF)'s efforts to improve information on study opportunities and scholarship schemes in ASEM countries with its Database on Education Exchange Programmes (DEEP) and welcomed the possibility of integrating the DEEP database as part of REDBOOK, a database that aims to facilitate research collaborations among higher education institutions and businesses. The Ministers expressed their expectation that the DEEP database would be further developed and disseminated.

25. Took note with interest of initiatives promoting educational opportunities, involving students and staff with a mobility experience in Asia or Europe as mobility ambassadors. The Ministers commended this successful approach to spread first-hand information on mobility and asked higher education institutions to appoint ASEM mobility ambassadors to inform and advise on educational opportunities.

26. Welcomed the idea to promote and inform on study and training opportunities in both regions via annual ASEM Education Fairs back-to-back with expert group meetings in order to encourage mobility and institutional cooperation. The Ministers invited the European Commission to explore financial support for such fairs.

27. Recognised that lacking financial support is an important obstacle to mobility but noted with appreciation various national and regional grant schemes to financially support interregional learning experiences. The Ministers suggested to exchange examples of good practice and to take the necessary measures to provide more scholarships for periods of study or work placements abroad.

28. Reaffirmed that equal access to interregional learning experiences should be ensured through sufficient public student support and the development of mobility opportunities.

29. Invited the European Commission to organise a seminar for ASEM members on the international dimension of the new EU education programme (2014-2020) with a focus on funding opportunities for Asia-Europe mobility and cooperation.

30. Noted with satisfaction the positive evaluation report of the ASEM-DUO Fellowship Programme. They expressed their appreciation for the programme's contribution to balanced mobility between the two regions and encouraged more ASEM member countries to join the programme. Belgium (French Community) expressed its willingness to join the ASEM-DUO Fellowship Programme.

31. Shared the view that attractive education offerings would positively influence interregional mobility and therefore supported the proposal to set up an ASEM Joint Curriculum Development Pilot Scheme. They welcomed the intention of Belgium (Flemish Community and French Community), Brunei Darussalam, Germany, Indonesia, Lithuania and Malaysia to facilitate the implementation of the pilot scheme with financial support.

32. Repeated the need for comparable and reliable mobility data to enable evidence-based policy-making and encouraged the collection of data on inbound and outbound mobility in cooperation with experienced data collectors in both regions.

D. Lifelong Learning (LLL) including Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET)

Lifelong learning including TVET has been an important topic in the ASEM Education Process from the very beginning and will be given special attention in the years to come. In a rapidly changing world, the workforce in Asia and Europe, as in other parts of the world, faces the challenge of meeting the needs of a changing labour market and of updating their skills and competences throughout their lives. Open personal growth, continuing professional development and lifelong learning for all are key elements for enhancing the employability and ensuring employment of citizens in both regions, especially in times of economic crisis. National and regional qualifications frameworks supporting the permeability of the different education and training sectors have gained increasing significance in this area. These are equally key aspects of fostering social inclusion in complex societies, whereby lifelong learning is fundamental for creating sustainable communities and active citizens able and willing to participate in shaping the world in which they live.

In this context, the Ministers thanked Denmark, the Republic of Korea and the ASEM LLL Hub, supported by the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), for having organised the ASEM 'Forum on Lifelong Learning', which took place in May 2012. The Ministers also thanked Germany for having hosted a symposium on TVET with special regard to qualifications frameworks in February 2012, and Austria for having carried out a workshop on TVET in the Tourism and Catering Sector in November 2012.

The Ministers:

33. Reaffirmed the importance of a documentation of good practice in TVET and welcomed Germany's offer to organise an expert seminar in order to exchange experiences and lessons learnt in the field of dual education and training and Portugal for participating in this expert seminar. The Ministers welcomed Malaysia's initiative to organise an international ASEM seminar on Lifelong Learning in 2014.

34. Expressed their conviction that innovative and entrepreneurial skills and competences should be fostered from an early age and endorsed Denmark's proposal to develop a programme for improving innovative and entrepreneurial skills and competences in school education, in cooperation with Brunei Darussalam, the Czech Republic, Latvia, Malaysia, Norway, Republic of Korea, Singapore and Viet Nam.

35. Emphasised that National Qualifications Frameworks (NQFs) play an important role in making lifelong learning a reality, as tools to understand levels and qualifications between systems and subsystems, to enhance transparency and to support comparability and mobility and to recognise prior learning (non-formal and informal learning). The Ministers considered it therefore useful to discuss and explore the possibilities to develop cross-referencing mechanisms between regional qualifications frameworks in Asia and Europe and noted with satisfaction the *Global NQF Inventory*, compiled by the European Training Foundation (ETF), Cedefop and UNESCO, including the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (UIL).

36. Underlined that meaningful descriptions and consistent use of learning outcomes are needed to make regional and national qualifications frameworks a reality. The Ministers invited thus the expert group

on interregional credit transfer mechanisms (see paragraph 18) to discuss and exchange good practices on the development, understanding, implementation and practical use of learning outcomes, in close cooperation with stakeholders mainly higher education institutions and students' representatives.

37. Acknowledged the consistent contributions of the ASEM LLL Hub within the ASEM Education Process and recalled the continued need for objective information and analysis to facilitate evidence-based policy discussions. The Ministers appreciated the joint and comparative studies carried out by researchers from Asia and Europe and encouraged efforts to partnering with the ASEM LLL Hub, including for sponsoring specific studies within its research networks.

The Ministers mandated:

The ASEM Education Secretariat to observe and assist the member countries in implementing the proposed initiatives and to inform the Ministers on the progress achieved with the stocktaking report for ASEMME 5 in 2015.

The Ministers thanked:

- Indonesia for its commitment to host the ASEM Education Secretariat as of October 2013. In this context, Indonesia invited countries to contribute to the operation of the ASEM Education Secretariat by sending staff to work at the Secretariat.

- China for its commitment to host the intermediate SOM in 2014 in preparation of the 5th Asia-Europe Meeting of Ministers for Education (ASEMME5).

- Latvia for its commitment to host the 5th Asia-Europe Meeting of Ministers for Education (ASEMME5) in 2015.

- The Republic of Korea for their commitment to host the 6th Asia-Europe Meeting of Ministers for Education (ASEMME6) in 2017.

- Belgium's (Flemish Community) offer to host the ASEM Education Secretariat as of October 2017.

Summaries of Conclusion Result, and Achievement

ANNEX 2

Conclusions	Status	Activities/Result	
Quality Assurances and Recognitions			
A12. Acknowledged that quality assurance, qualifications frameworks and recognition are essential for building trust and facilitating the recognition of degrees and diplomas. The Ministers reaffirmed the need for a regular dialogue in the field of quality assurance and recognition between ASEM experts from quality assurance agencies, recognition organizations, higher education institutions, students and governments and welcomed Malaysia's initiative to facilitate this dialogue. In this context, they welcomed Japan's initiatives to establish a higher education quality assurance center for Asia and to set up a new working group under the ASEAN+3 Education Ministers Meeting with a view to further promoting mobility of higher education and ensuring quality assurance in Asia. The Ministers also welcomed China's initiative to establish a Cross-border Quality Assurance Network in Higher Education (CBQAN).	√	Facilitating the dialogue in the field of quality assurance and recognition in Malaysia (August 2014)	On 25-26 August 2014 in Kuala Lumpur, **Malaysia**, the dialogue in the field of QA&R was conducted and focused on three sub topics: 1) The issues of Regional Quality Assurance Frameworks and Qualifications Framework – Commonalities and Differences were discussed by highlighting the example of successful implementation of European Standard and Guidelines (ESG), the link between ASEAN Community 2015 and the ASEAN Quality Assurance Framework in Higher Education (AQAFHE), and the implementation of European Qualification Framework (EQF); 2) Several presentations regarding to the subtopic of Cross-Border Higher Education were supported by the presentation about the evolution of Transnational Education (TNE) in ASEAN and European and the Cross Border Quality Assurance Network in Higher Education (CBQAN); 3) The closing topic of this discussion is the *Strengthening Partnership and Cooperation in Implementing Initiatives towards Facilitating Recognition* which highlighted the current situation, challenges, background, and problems encountered by the CBQAN and also the presentation focused on the Interregional credit transfer especially the Asian Academic Credits (AACs). [1]
	Partly	Establishing a higher education quality assurance centre for Asia and Setting up a new working group under the ASEAN+3 Education Ministers Meeting in Japan (Sept 2013)	In the 1st ASEAN Plus Three Education Ministers Meeting in July 2012 in Indonesia, Japan proposed to establish the "Working Group on Mobility of Higher Education and Ensuring Quality Assurance of Higher Education among ASEAN Plus Three Countries" from 2013 to 2017 to promote student exchanges with quality assurance and harmonization of the different system in higher education in ASEAN Plus Three countries. The 1st Working Group which was conducted in Tokyo, on 31 September 2013 approved the "Future Direction" in the working group: (1) draft the guidelines for the

---

[1] Presentations of ASEM International Seminar of Quality Assurance and Recognition, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 25-26 August 2014.

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Conclusions	Status	Activities/Result	
			promotion of student exchange with quality assurance and (2) create opportunities for regular meetings of quality assurance agencies. The 2nd Working Group was conducted in Bali, on 16 October 2014 aiming to share the progress of ASEAN Plus Three Quality Assurance Meeting and discuss the Draft of the ASEAN Plus Three Guidelines on Student Exchange. It is designed to provide the generic guidelines of mobility program in APT countries which will be able to accommodate most of existing mobility programs in the region.[2] The 3rd working group will be hosted by Thailand on 11 June 2015 in Bangkok which will be chaired by Lao DPR and co- chaired by China. This meeting will finalise the Draft of the ASEAN Plus Three Guidelines on Student Exchange.
	Partly	Establishing a Cross-border Quality Assurance Network in Higher Education (CBQAN) in China.	**China** is also the headquarters of the network secretariat. The drafting of Network Charter has been done and it also has been agreed with reference to other international QA Networks, such as INQAAHE and APQN. The Network webpage, as a module of Asia NICs Website, has been designed. Recently, the members from QA and QR agencies have also been added.[3] In November, China had circulated CBQAN Membership Development Letter and Organizational Charter of CBQAN to all ASEM members. This is the further step to develop a network and member of CBQAN among ASEM member countries, institutions, and organizations.
A13. Invited quality assurance agencies to consider their inclusion in the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR) since the membership in EQAR is open to European and non-European countries.	Partly	https://www.eqar.eu/home.html (AES has not received any detail information regarding to this)	
A14. Encouraged quality assurance agencies to invite peers from Asia to Europe and vice-versa to take part in external quality assurance procedures in order to facilitate the dialogue and understanding in the field of quality assurance.			

---

[2] Agenda of the 2nd ASEAN Plus Three Working Group on Student Mobility of Higher Education and Ensuring Quality Assurance of Higher Education, Bali, Indonesia, 16 October 2014.

[3] China's Update of the Implemented Programs, 2014.

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Conclusions	Status	Activities/Result	
A15. Welcomed Belgium's (Flemish Community and French Community) initiative to organize peer learning activities related to new approaches in quality assurance in Higher Education and/or to governance of higher education (autonomy, responsibility and accountability).	√	Peer learning activities related to new approaches in quality assurance in Higher Education and/or to governance of higher education (autonomy, responsibility and accountability) in Brussels, Belgium.	The new approaches in Quality Assurance in Higher Education and the governance of higher education have been implemented as in the Peer Learning Activities (PLA) that were organized by the **Flemish Community and French Community of Belgium** on 19-20 February 2015 in Brussels, Belgium. The objectives of this activity are to discuss common aspects, challenges, as well as current developments and new approaches in both external and internal QA systems and procedures. In this perspective, the PLA aims at further developing a common QA understanding and language between Asia and Europe and at fostering more effectively the cooperation and inter-linkages in QA at international and interregional level.[4]
A16. Noted with appreciation Austria's successful initiative and China's organizational support in drafting an ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration, based on the Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region (Lisbon Recognition Convention) and the Asia-Pacific Regional Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications in Higher Education (Tokyo Recognition Convention) and thus contributing to improve recognition of higher education qualifications between Asian and European regions. The Ministers fully endorsed this Declaration and urged ASEM countries to explore concrete steps to implement the Declaration, in close cooperation with existing structures, active in the recognition field. The Ministers welcomed China's offer to coordinate a working group to this end and the willingness of Australia, Austria, Belgium (Flemish Community and French Community), Brunei Darussalam, Germany, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal and the United Kingdom to participate in this working group. Results from the Bologna Process working group	Partly	Working group on the implementation of the ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration in Kunming, China (Dec 2013)	**China**, in Kunming City on 10-11 December 2013, hosted the first working group which is the implementation of the ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration. It comprised 12 ASEM countries representatives (Austria, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, China, Estonia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Latvia, Lithuania, Republic of Korea, and UK). As the result of the working group, there are 3 action plans agreed as follows: 1) the establishment of Asian NIC-NARICs portal in which the info resources for recognition professionals, researchers, international students, and their parents were provided and also to facilitate the effective communication platform for Asian competent recognition authorities; 2) Furthermore it envisaged to draft the handbook of guidelines, principles, and good practices on Recognition in ASEM regions. This handbook aims to give reference on recognition principles, criteria and procedure, construct a common language and concept, recommend good practices on qualification assessment, and facilitate bilateral, regional, and inter-regional cooperation; 3) The inexistence of the platform targeting the Quality Assurance in cross-border education is a prime reason for the establishment of *Cross Border Quality Assurance Network* (CBQAN). By establishing this network, cross border Quality Assurance can be disseminated, the information sharing and exchange among Quality Assurance bodies and cross-border

---

[4] Contribution from Belgium to the Stocktaking Report, 2014

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Conclusions	Status		Activities/Result
on structural reforms should be considered.			programs will be spread out, and the international recognition of cross-border education can be enhanced. The continuation of the first meeting, the 2nd Working Group on ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration, was conducted in Riga, **Latvia**, on 11-12 November 2014. This working group reviewed the proceeding of action plans.[5] As the continuation of this working group, the 3rd meeting was conducted on 26-27 March 2015 in Hangzhou, **China**, to review the progression of the 3 action plans and finally formulated a report of the working group which was intended to be reported to the ASEMME5.
A17. Affirmed the need to improve information on education systems and on recognition procedures as this is essential for students going abroad. Noted the differences in establishing National Information Centers (NIC) and networks of NICs between the Asian and European regions. In this context the Ministers proposed to build NICs in the Asian region and welcomed China's offer to set up a website including in-formation on NICs, in order to share information and facilitate joint research and collaboration on qualification recognition in the ASEM region. Moreover, cooperation between Asian and European recognition experts and between Asian NICs and ENIC-NARICs should be encouraged to improve communication between the ASEM regions.	Partly	To set up a website for ASIAN NICs in China. To be in close cooperation with ENIC-NARICs in Europe.	The website including information on Asian National Information Centers (Asian NICs) has been set up by **China**. Currently, the technical matters of the website have been completed, and the Information Management Measures for Asian National Information Centers Coordinating Website (ANICCW) is put forward. In September 2014, China asked Asia member countries to provide relevant information in order to complete the website. The Website is scheduled to launch a pilot website by November, 2014. The official launch of the website will be in 2015 around the time of ASEMME5. The Website will be a close link to the website of ENIC/NARIC networks, to establish a common platform (or framework) for close cooperation in information provision on educational systems and recognition practices.
A18. Aware of the different regional credit systems for academic recognition, they emphasized the need to make these systems more transparent in order to facilitate recognition of study achievements abroad and to stimulate cross-border mobility. The Ministers welcomed the readiness of Australia, Belgium (French Community), Brunei Darussalam, China, Estonia, Lithuania, Malaysia, Portugal and Thailand to establish an expert group to discuss interregional	•	Expert group to discuss interregional credit transfer mechanisms among ASEM member countries. Update Compendium on Credits and Learning Outcomes in ASEM countries by ASEM Education Secretariat.	Emphasizing the need to make regional credit systems more transparent, the Ministers welcomed the ASEM member countries **(Australia, Belgium (French Community), Brunei Darussalam, China, Estonia, Lithuania, Malaysia, Portugal and Thailand)** to establish an Expert group to discuss interregional credit transfer mechanisms among ASEM member countries and asked the AES to update the Compendium on Credits and Learning Out-comes in ASEM countries. In February 2014, AES sent e-mail to the participating countries in order to identify the possible

---

[5] China's Report for the Intermediate Senior Official Meeting of ASEMME5, Hangzhou, China, 8 May 2014.

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Conclusions	Status		Activities/Result
credit transfer mechanisms among ASEM member countries. In order to give valuable input to the discussions in this expert group, the Ministers asked the ASEM Education Secretariat to constantly update its "Compendium on Credits and Learning Out-comes in ASEM countries", providing current information from ASEM countries. Furthermore, they underlined the need to discuss information on education systems, recognition procedures and interregional transfer mechanisms comprehensively on the stakeholder level, e.g. during the next ASEM Rectors' Conference (ARC).			coordinator for the expert group. So far, there are no committed countries confirming their willingness to be a coordinator for this meeting. In order to give valuable input in the expert group, AES is collecting the updated reports on credits and learning outcomes from ASEM member countries. AES collected the updated credit systems and learning outcomes from each ASEM member countries in Asia region and for countries in Europe region, the update comes from the report of EURIDYCE reported by the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). This aims to obtain the newest information and reports of credit system and learning outcomes. AES has received input that Thailand purposes to invite ASEAN University Network (AUN) in this expert group meeting.
Engaging Business and Industry			
B19. Encouraged all stakeholders involved in education and business to engage in further debate and efforts with a view to enhance the employability of higher education and TVET students and their entrepreneurial skills and competences by developing and monitoring strategies for education-business cooperation and collaboration. In order to realize those goals the business sector should be encouraged to define the competences they need and will need in future.	Partly	Organizing the 1st ASEF Young Leaders Summit	The ASEF Young Leaders' Summit initiated by the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASFE) focuses on a specific priority issues as defined by the ASEM Leaders. Bringing together about 150 students, volunteers and young professionals from all ASEM member countries, the project provides a platform for solution-centred dialogue, exchange of best practises and youth policies. It will be held in conjunction with ASEM Foreign Ministers' Meetings (ASEM FMMs), in 2015 with the 12th ASEM Foreign Minister's Meeting (ASEM FMM12) in Luxembourg. The theme for the 1st edition of the ASEF Young Leaders' Summit focuses on youth employment, leadership and (social) entrepreneurship.
B20. Noted with interest the results and recommendations of the 3rd ASEM Rectors' Conference (ARC3) underlining the role of universities as motors for economic growth and development and emphasizing the need to equip students with skills that benefit society and reflect the changing demands of the labor market and enhance the entrepreneurial mind-set by offering specific courses. The Ministers asked the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), through the projects of its ASEM Education Hub (AEH), particularly the	√	Organized 4th ASEM Rectors Conference and Students' Forum.	The 4th ASEM Rectors' Conference and Students' Forum (ARC4) by the **Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF)** under the theme "*University-Business Partnerships: Asia and Europe Seeking 21st Century Solutions*" was held on 23-27 March 2015 in Hangzhou, China. ARC4 aimed to enhance Asia-Europe dialogue and experience sharing on university-business cooperation for sustainable societal development. It brought together more than 100 university leaders, business representatives and officials of governments and international organizations from across 45

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Conclusions	Status		Activities/Result
ASEM Rectors' Conference (ARC), to continue the stakeholders' dialogue on this issue and report on the progress made in the next Ministerial Meeting.			ASEM member countries, as well as 51 students from the whole ASEM constituency to discuss how university-business partnerships could better equip students with employability skills, cultivate entrepreneurship, and to innovate new learning environments through communication and information technologies. While strengthening the multi-stakeholder approach and student participation in the ASEM Education Process, ARC4 produced policy recommendations by each the Rectors and the Students to be delivered to ASEMME5. Both sets of policy recommendations were also personally handed over to Ms. Marite Seile, Latvian Minister for Education and Science, at the Conference in Hangzhou.
B21. Recognized with satisfaction that Germany and Malaysia held the 2nd and 3rd ASEM University-Business Forum (UBF) and made this Forum a regular platform to exchange information and to share good practices, thus strengthening the dialogue on University-Business cooperation. The Ministers welcomed Belgium's (Flemish Community and French Community) willingness to organize the 4th UBF in 2014 and Viet Nam's readiness to host the 5th UBF and invited the Forums to discuss how to combine study with work-based learning. They also asked the European Commission to give special attention to the ASEM Education Process in its European University-Business Forum.	Partly	Organizing the 4th University Business Forum (UBF4) in 2014 by Belgium and organizing University Business Forum (UBF) in 2015 by Viet Nam.	The 4th University Business Forum in **Belgium** (Flemish Community and French Community) and the 5th University Business Forum in **Viet Nam** are going to be conducted in 2015 with the discussion on how to combine study with work-based learning. The 4th ASEM University-Business Forum/Seminar was held in Brussels, 4th March 2015. It has been postponed due to the elections in Belgium and in the EU in 2014.

The ASEM seminar focused on the education side of the University-Business cooperation according to the wish of ASEM ministers for Education. How can higher education contribute better to the social, economic, technological and cultural innovation through education? To what extent could trans-regional and cross-border (Asia-Europe) university-business cooperation enhance the effectiveness and the impact on innovation, taking into account the global nature of business and the fact that many companies have branches in the other region? To what extent trans-regional university-business cooperation could better ensure that the graduates can successfully operate in international/global environments).

There were 6 presenters: 4 from academia (1 from Japan, 1 from China, 1 from Spain and 1 from Finland), 1 from a Consulting company and 1 from business (Samsung). The seminar was attended by some 75 people.

Ms Chen (China) told us that China has entered the Era of |

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Conclusions	Status	Activities/Result
		University-Business cooperation 2.0: from university-run enterprise to university-networked innovation base. Universities have to nurture entrepreneurship through an entrepreneurial ecosystem that includes the following components: government policy, regulatory framework and infrastructure, funding and finance, culture, mentors, advisors and support systems, universities as catalysts, education and training, human capital and workforce, local and global markets. The Peking University builds upon alumni's initiatives to invest on student entrepreneurship (1898 Café of Peking University, meeting place of students and alumni).
		Comparing Finland with Malaysia Mr. Parkkinen from Finland makes clear that the industrial infrastructure plays an important role: in Malaysia the industrial structure is more production based than knowledge based and there is a somewhat more protective environment (restrictions to give internships to foreign students). Also the example of a good practice of the a Erasmus + MSc program was presented (COSI: Colour in Science and Industry). The programme includes 4 European and 5 Asian universities as well as 15 associate industrial partners across the globe.
		Mr. Mora (Spain) told us that some teaching and learning modes are more effective in developing the competencies and skills that are more and more required to be successful on the labour market, in particular problem-based learning, facts and practical knowledge, participation in research projects and internships. He also pointed to some examples of good practices in Europe: UAS Cologna and the Deutsche Bahn, Endowed chairs in some particular fields of study.
		Mr. Thelen (Germany) drew our attention to the differences between academic education and corporate learning. He presented also some examples of good practices in particular the Carl Benz Academy (China, US and Germany): it is a corporate academy with degree and non-degree education and with the possibility of credit transfer to the regular university programmes. It is a joint international education program lead by Mercedes-Benz (China) Ltd and Mercedes-Benz Auto

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Conclusions	Status		Activities/Result
			Finance Ltd, and in cooperation with the renowned universities PKU (Peking University / Guanghua School of Management) (Beijing, China), Woodbury University (Los Angeles, USA), DUW (Deutsche UniversitätfürWeiterbildung / Berlin University for Professional Studies) (Berlin, Germany) and INA (International Academy for Innovative Pedagogic, Psychology and Economics at the FreieUniversität Berlin) (Berlin, Germany). Mr. Yonezawa (Japan) told us that the national campaign in Japan for fostering 'Global Human Resources' certainly changed the perspectives and attitudes of universities and industries and students to be more active in getting international experiences for getting better employability in the globalized labour market. But still the customs and the mindsets of students and even young employees need to change. Universities, business and the government have to make great efforts in order to achieve the objectives of the Global Human Resources Development programme (recruitment of graduates from outside Japan, programs taught in English to Japanese students, financial support for mobility). Mr. Dijkman from Samsung Benelux pointed to the efforts of Samsung in reaching the young people through digital academies (VET and university partnerships) for developing digital skills: app development, service engineering and teacher training. Samsung runs also local programmes focusing on (continuing) education in hospitals, museums and sports. Samsung Smart Classrooms gave some 16.000 young people (6-16 years) and their teacher access to ICT and a chance to develop their digital skills with a special focus on pupils from disadvantaged background.
B22. Emphasized that work placements in higher education play a key role in enhancing graduate employability and endorsed the launch of an interregional ASEM Work Placement Pilot Program that pro-motes practical experience and cross-cultural skills and competences of Asian students in Europe and European students in Asia. The Ministers asked the ASEM Education Secretariat to	Partly	Implementing the ASEM Work Placement Pilot Programme. The initiators are Belgium (Flemish Community), Brunei Darussalam, Germany and Thailand.	As agreed in the ASEMME4, **Belgium (Flemish Community), Brunei Darussalam, Germany and Thailand** showed intention to take part in the ASEM Work Placement Pilot Programme. In the Intermediate Senior Official Meeting (ISOM) in China in 2014, the committed countries together with AES discussed the first step that should be taken in the pilot phase. The Expert Meeting on ASEM Work Placement Pilot Programme as the first step toward the pilot programme was

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Conclusions	Status		Activities/Result
give organizational support to launch the program and welcomed Belgium's (Flemish Community), Brunei Darussalam's, Germany's and Thailand's intention to take part in the pilot phase.			organized by The Officer of Higher Education Commission (OHEC) Thailand on 29-30 January 2015 in Bangkok. The result of first meeting was the draft program. Started in 2015-2016, this will be a 3-years pilot program. This is the first program with the balanced number of students from Asia and Europe. As proposed by the members, the upcoming meeting will be conducted in 2016 inviting the first alumni. The meeting welcomed Indonesia to join in this program. In 26 April 2015, all representatives from 5 member countries gathered in Riga to sign the Letter of Intent
Balanced Mobility			
C23. Welcomed the willingness of Malaysia and its Asia-Europe Institute (AEI) to develop – in cooperation with other interested ASEM members – a strategy on better balancing mobility for ASEMME5 in Latvia. The strategy will include proposals for concrete activities to overcome the imbalance in mobility between Asia and Europe.	√	Developing strategy on better balancing mobility for ASEMME5 in Latvia include Proposal for concrete activities to overcome the imbalance in mobility between Asia and Europe.	In order to develop a strategy on better balancing mobility for ASEMME5, the Ministry of Education, **Malaysia** hosted an ASEM International Seminar on Balanced Mobility in Kuala Lumpur, 25-26 August 2014. A program, as one of the strategy for balanced mobility in Asian and European, *AEI-ASEM Summer Camps* (AEI-ASC) will be carried out under the theme *Biodiversity and Culture Heritage* on 2-16 August 2015. The committee has sent invitation letter and brochure to universities in Asia and Europe. The dialogue continued by presenting several points regarding to the balanced mobility such as the European – Asian relation from the European perspective, ASEMUNDUS, the successful cross-cultural mobility in Korea University, the benefit of joining cross cultural programs, and the relation between industries and universities.
C24. Acknowledged the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF)'s efforts to improve information on study opportunities and scholarship schemes in ASEM countries with its Database on Education Exchange Programmes (DEEP) and welcomed the possibility of integrating the DEEP database as part of REDBOOK, a database that aims to facilitate research collaborations among higher education institutions and businesses. The Ministers expressed their expectation that the DEEP database would be further developed and	√	Transforming the original DEEP (Database on Education Exchange Programmes) database into a new cost-efficient while fully functioning tool	*Database on Education Exchanges Programs (DEEP)* was an online portal developed and managed by **Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF)** as tasked by ASEM Education Ministers. It provided comprehensive information on education mobility opportunities in ASEM countries. However, with the rapid spread of internet technology, such information has become widely available through various online sources, provided by governmental education agencies, universities, and international associations, amongst others. Moreover, the maintenance of this portal demanded high financial costs and human resources. In view of this situation, having carefully

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Conclusions	Status		Activities/Result
disseminated.			evaluated the cost-effectiveness of maintaining DEEP in the long-run, ASEF has formulated a successor plan to DEEP. This plan consists of setting up a webpage on ASEF's corporate website with the links to various education mobility opportunities and scholarships, run or endorsed by ASEM countries' governments, the ASEAN Secretariat and the European Commission. ASEM Members interested in publishing such sources on the webpage are encouraged to supply ASEF with the information. Apart from the transformation of DEEP, ASEF stays strongly committed to promoting balanced mobility between Asia and Europe by initiating and implementing a variety of projects.
C25. Took note with interest of initiatives promoting educational opportunities, involving students and staff with a mobility experience in Asia or Europe as mobility ambassadors. The Ministers commended this successful approach to spread first-hand information on mobility and asked higher education institutions to appoint ASEM mobility ambassadors to inform and advise on educational opportunities.			
C26. Welcomed the idea to promote and inform on study and training opportunities in both regions via annual ASEM Education Fairs back-to-back with expert group meetings in order to encourage mobility and institutional cooperation. The Ministers invited the European Commission to explore financial support for such fairs.	√	Inviting the European Commission to explore financial support for such fairs for ASEM Education Fairs.	With respect to the objectives of the idea of ASEM Education Fairs (encouraging the mobility and institutional cooperation) the **European Commission** secured a budget for education fairs and in particular a contribution for future ASEM Education Fairs such as providing EU stands, promotional materials, and information packages. **European Commission** organized the seminar for ASEM members concerning the new EU education program for 2014-2020. [6]
C27. Recognized that lacking financial support is an important obstacle to mobility but noted with appreciation various national and regional grant schemes to financially support interregional learning experiences. The Minister suggested to			

[6] European Commission: Updating Draft Stocktaking Report for SOM1, 2014

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Conclusions	Status		Activities/Result
exchange examples of good practice and to take the necessary measure to provide more scholarships periods of study or work placement abroad.			
C28. Reaffirmed that equal access to interregional learning experiences should be ensured through sufficient public student support and the development of mobility opportunities.			
C29. Invited the European Commission to organize a seminar for ASEM members on the international dimension of the new EU education programme (2014-2020) with a focus on funding opportunities for Asia-Europe mobility and cooperation.	√	Organizing seminar for ASEM members on the international dimension of the new EU education Program (2014-2020) with a focus on funding opportunities for Asia-Europe mobility and cooperation by the European Commission.	Information Day for ASEM members on the international dimension of the European Union's Erasmus+ programme organized by the **European Commission** in cooperation with the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency was on 29 April 2015 in Riga, Latvia. This meeting was conducted back-to-back with ASEMME5 aiming to present all the international actions of the Erasmus+ program focusing on the funding opportunities for Asia-Europe mobility and cooperation in the field of higher education.
C30. Noted with satisfaction the positive evaluation report of the ASEM-DUO Fellowship Programme. They expressed their appreciation for the program's contribution to balanced mobility between the two regions and encourage more ASEM member countries to join the program. Belgium (French Community) expresses its willingness to join the ASEM-DUO Fellowship Programme.			
C31. Shared the view that attractive education offerings would positively influence interregional mobility and therefore supported the proposal to set up an ASEM Joint Curriculum Development Pilot Scheme. They welcomed the intention of Belgium (Flemish Community and French Community), Brunei Darussalam, Germany, Indonesia, Lithuania and Malaysia to facilitate the implementation of the pilot scheme with financial support.	Partly	Implementing the ASEM Joint Curriculum Development Pilot Scheme. The intiators are Belgium (Flemish Community), Brunei Darussalam, Germany, Indonesia, Lithuania and Malaysia.	In Bali, **Indonesia**, the ASEM on Education Expert Meeting on Joint Curriculum Development Program in Tourism and Education Scheme was held on 31 October – 2 November 2014 and attended by 5 committed member countries, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Germany, Lithuania, and Indonesia. It is the first step to implement the ASEM Joint Curriculum Development Pilot Scheme in the field of tourism and hospitality. This meeting discussed on how to start implementing a joint curriculum, the formulation of joint curriculum according to the learning outcomes, student exchange, and evaluation, and the way to develop it further. As

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Conclusions	Status		Activities/Result
			the continuation of this successful meeting, the second seminar discussing the further step of this program was hosted by **Germany** in Bonn on 12-13 March 2015. The participants agreed that the program will be started in 2016 and also the 3rd meeting will be in **Lithuania** next year.
C32. Repeated the need for comparable and reliable mobility data to enable evidence-based policy-making and encouraged the collection of data on inbound and outbound mobility in cooperation with experienced data collectors in both regions.			
Lifelong Learning (LLL) Including Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET)			
D33. Reaffirmed the importance of a document` of good practice in TVET and welcomed Germany's offer to organize an expert seminar in order to exchange experiences and lessons learnt in the field of dual education and training and Portugal for participating in this expert seminar. The Minister welcomed Malaysia's initiative to organize an international ASEM seminar on Lifelong Learning in 2014.	√	Organizing an expert seminar on dual study program in Nuremberg, Germany (31 Mar - 1 Apr 2014)	In Nuremberg, **Germany**, an expert seminar on dual study program entitled '*A Strategy to Expand Opportunities for ASEM Youth*' was conducted on 31 March – 1 April 2014 and attended by representatives from several ASEM member countries such as Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, China, Denmark, Germany, Indonesia, Latvia, Lithuania, Malaysia, the Philippines, Portugal, Romania, and Spain. This meeting tried to depict the implementation experience of dual study program in Germany. There are several conclusions from the expert seminar: 1) the industry needs skilled workforce; 2) the aim of *Dual Study Program* in every country is different one to another, yet recognized as one of the strategy to increase the number of skilled workers; 3) the participants argued that *Dual Study Program* has the potential to be conducted in every country and cooperated internationally; 4) one of the form of real cooperation is the creation of link between higher and vocational education entities in ASEM member countries to adjust the initiatives related to *dual study*. The future plan is the establishment of network between the Higher Education and TVET to integrate theoretical and practical learning. In order to find out the cooperation possibilities on Dual Study Programs among ASEM member countries, the participants purposed the formation of networks between Higher Education and TVET entities.

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Conclusions	Status	Activities/Result	
	√	Organising an international ASEM seminar on Lifelong Learning in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia (August 2014).	International ASEM Seminar on Lifelong Learning was conducted on 25-26 August 2014 in Kuala Lumpur, **Malaysia** with the sub-theme '*Strategizing Collaboration, Leveraging Resources: Charting The Way Forward for Lifelong Learning'*. The seminar was expected to build cooperation between AES and ASEM LLL Hub in identifying the relevant experts to increase the support and to promote greater participation from ASEM Education country members in *International ASEM Lifelong Learning Seminar*. Three main topics were raised for discussion, namely National Strategies for Lifelong Learning, Intensification of Online Learning: Formulating Effective Strategies and Policies- Issues and Challenges, and Developing Workplace Learning: Workplace as Learning Space. Several points that are crucial for the further development of lifelong learning in ASEM Education, including: 1) the need to determine key performance indicators to measure the result of lifelong learning, 2) the need to foster the ASEM member countries ability to recognize graduates from other countries, 3) access to lifelong learning, 4) how to deal with the problem of aging communities, 5) how to prepare qualified migrant workers.
D34. Expressed their conviction that innovative and entrepreneurial skills and competences should be fostered from an early age and endorsed Denmark's proposal to develop a program for improving innovative and entrepreneurial skills and competences in school education, in cooperation with Brunei Darussalam, the Czech Republic, Latvia, Malaysia, Norway, Republic of Korea, Singapore and Viet Nam.	√	Developing a program for improving innovative and entrepreneurial skills and competences in school education.	In this context, **Denmark** organized the ASEMME Opening Seminar on the Innovative Competences and Entrepreneurial Skills on 30 September – 2 October 2013 in Copenhagen. The seminar was aimed to create the joint understanding and framework of the program and to involve the member countries committed to further development of this important aspect of education policy and practice in the two region. A Working Group (WG) was appointed at the seminar to take responsibility for the future program of Innovation Competencies and Entrepreneurship Education in ASEM member countries which aims to carry out a best practise study on successful programs in member states, the preparation of an International Conference on Innovative Competences and the preparation of a number of recommendations for further development, as well as a web-based inventory to exchange methods and practice between policy makers and a report for the ASEMME5 in Latvia 2015. The outcomes from this meeting is the establishment of a

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Conclusions	Status	Activities/Result
		broad ASEM-ME Working Group to disseminate case studies and create an overview about existing experience in the field of Innovative Competences.

Along with its commitment the first working group in Copenhagen, **Singapore** organized the 2nd Working Group on the Innovative Competences and Entrepreneurial Skills on 27-29 January 2014. WG meeting in Singapore presented the case study on successful/best practice programs or projects selected from the participating countries. Denmark sent out the guidelines to support the WG in the selection and preparation of the cases. The outcomes of the meeting were: 1) Catalogue of "1st outlined" case studies, 2) Targeted analysis of the best practices within the presented case studies.

The 3rd Working Group on the Innovative Competences and Entrepreneurial Skills was held on 19-21 May 2014 in Oslo, **Norway** as the continuation of the 2nd Working Group (Singapore on 27-29 January 2014). The meeting in Oslo brought forward the selection and further elaboration of the Case studies. The meeting was organized also to present the case studies within three main categories of Teacher development, curriculum design and development, and the improved cooperation between the education sector and business and community life. Joint analysis to elaborate what are the Key Drivers for successful implementation in the participating countries had been focussed in the second part of meeting. The meeting outcomes includes: 1) Outline of the Table of Content for the final ASEMME Report on "Innovative Competences and Entrepreneurship" (submitted in ASEMME in Latvia April 2015), 2) The outline of key drivers for successful implementation of policies and programs, and 3) Design principles of the Case Study (18 individual case studies from the 10 participating countries).

In light of the continuity of the previous working group, the 4th Working Group on Innovative Competences was conducted in Hanoi, **Viet Nam**, in 27-29 October 2014. It focused on the final version of the Case Study report. The meeting completed |

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Conclusions	Status	Activities/Result
		the key drivers for the successful policies and programs. The main outcome of this meeting was expected to be the outlining of the main Policy Recommendations. In the coming 18-21 January 2015, **Latvia** hosted the final meeting of the Working Group on Innovative Competences in Riga. The objective of this 5th meeting was to hand over the case study report to the Latvian ASEMME5 chair. It created the working group an opportunity in order to discuss the potential new initiatives and strategies to move forward the work with the ASEMME5 Chair. The Evaluation report will also be carried out and submitted to the ASEMME5 Chair. The preparatory work of the working group is finished after the submitting report to the ASEMME Chair.
D35. Emphasized that National Qualifications Frameworks (NQFs) play an important role in making lifelong learning a reality, as tools to understand levels and qualifications between systems and subsystems, to enhance transparency and to support comparability and to recognize prior learning (non-formal and informal learning). The Minister considered it therefore useful to discuss and explore the possibilities to develop cross-referencing mechanisms between regional qualifications frameworks in Asia and Europe and noted with satisfaction the *Global NQF Inventory*, compiled by the European Training Foundation (ETF), Cedefop and UNESCO, including the UNESCO Institute FOR Lifelong Learning (UIL).	√	Global NQF Inventory is complete and available in print an electronically. The 2013-2014 Global NQF Inventory is complete with 33 more countries added by **UNESCO** and now available in print and electronically. The 2015 update will be coordinated by UNESCO. As for the 2013 edition, the country chapters will be updated by Cedefop for the EU countries, ETF for the countries of the EU Neighborhood, while UNESCO will cover those countries not falling under the mandates of Cedefop and EU. In addition, ETF, Cedefop, and UNESCO are preparing a companion inventory dealing with thematic chapters to be presented at the ASEMME5. The Global NQF Inventory is a collaborative effort between two European Union (EU) agencies, the European Training Foundation (ETF), and the Center of Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop), and two units of UNESCO, the Section for Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) at UNESCO Headquarters and the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (UIL).
D36. Underline that meaningful descriptions and consistent use of learning outcomes are needed to make regional and national qualifications frameworks a reality. The Minister invited thus the expert group on interregional credit transfer mechanisms to discuss and exchange good practices on the development, understanding,		

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Conclusions	Status	Activities/Result	
implementation and practical use of learning outcomes, in close cooperation with stakeholders mainly higher education institutions and students' representatives.			
D37. Acknowledged the consistent contributions of the ASEM LLL Hub within the ASEM Education Process and recalled the continued need for objective information and analysis to facilitate evidence-based policy discussions. The Ministers appreciated the joint and comparative studies carried out by re-searchers from Asia and Europe and encouraged efforts to partnering with the ASEM LLL Hub, including for sponsoring specific studies within its research networks.			

√: accomplished; partly: partly accomplished; •: to be acknowledge; -: Not yet accomplished

Result of Early Consultation
with ASEM Members and Stakeholder

ANNEX 3

Ministry of
Education and Science
Republic of Latvia

Latvian Presidency
of the Council of the
European Union

EU2015.LV

1st Senior Officials' Meeting (SOM1) of the 5th ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting (ASEMME5)

RESULTS OF THE EARLY CONSULTATION WITH THE
ASEM MEMBERS AND STAKEHOLDERS BEFORE THE FIRST SENIOR
OFFICIALS' MEETING (draft)

Last updated: 31.10.2014

The four priority areas for ASEM cooperation in the field of education were set in the ASEMME4 in 2011. Both globalisation and rapid technological change have a continuous impact on education and training policy. Cooperation among the ASEM members and stakeholders during these years has been strengthened through bilateral and multilateral agreements, regional initiatives and various other projects and programmes. Therefore, from June to October 2014 Latvia, as the host of the ASEMME5, carried out an **early consultation** with the ASEM members and stakeholders to identify their initial views on the future cooperation under the ASEM Education Process before the Senior Officials' Meeting for the ASEMME5 to be held on 10-11 November 2014.

All parties involved in the ASEM Education Process were invited to participate in the consultation process: both policy-makers and stakeholders representing universities and students, as well as institutions seeking to encourage an exchange of new ideas, to support a balanced mobility, and to promote opportunities for cooperation between both regions in the field of education.

In total, 24 ASEM members and stakeholders participated in the consultation and sent their written answers:
- *Europe:* Austria, Belgium (Wallonia-Brussels), Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Cyprus, Estonia, the European Commission, France, Greece, Germany, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Romania, Sweden.
- *Asia:* Australia, Brunei Darussalam, China, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Russian Federation.
- *Stakeholders:* the ASEF, the ASEM LLL-Hub.

1. Currently, the four main priority areas of ASEM education process are the following: quality assurance; engaging business and industry and education; balanced mobility; lifelong learning and technical education and training. Should these priority areas be maintained or reviewed during the ASEMME5 to ensure further development of ASEM Education Process. Why?

Most ASEM members and stakeholders believe that the four main priority areas should be maintained during the ASEMME5 to ensure continuity and further development of ASEM education process, with majority of the countries pointing out the importance of the 1st priority area – *quality assurance and recognition*. As underlined by Greece, all priority areas are crucial to meet the socio-economic challenges of today and to develop internationalization of the

education system.

As Cyprus has noted, the development of quality assurance systems and recognition mechanisms is essential for students going abroad since it will stimulate cross-border mobility. As more Asian students study in Europe than Europeans in Asia, measures should be taken to motivate European students to spend part of their studies in Asia. Malaysia has stressed an ever-increasing role of industry in its education system, pointing out that programmes offered, either through lifelong learning courses or full-time TVET programmes, are industry-driven.

While recognising that the four main priority areas cover the key issues for cooperation between Asia and Europe, Belgium notes that the scope of cooperation should be better defined. From Belgian perspective, ASEMME5 should only focus on higher education, including profession-oriented higher education and the lifelong learning perspective. Belgium also suggests paying closer attention to the topic of qualifications frameworks, linking it to the first priority area "quality assurance and recognition", which will give an impetus on the role played by the Qualification Frameworks (QFs) as a transparency tool. Germany likewise supports the four main priority areas but at the same time suggests focusing on one core aspect per topic. Germany also believes that VET could be maintained as a priority area on its own. In the meantime, Bulgaria and ASEF are of the opinion that a priority area "Education for Sustainable Development" could be included.

Austria has proposed to start an evaluation process on the different outcomes of the four main priorities. Brunei Darussalam representatives have meanwhile pointed out that some projects are just starting or mid-way, before the outcomes can be reviewed for the next action plan.

At the same time, some members believe that ASEMME5 should focus on quality assurance and recognition, since this is the basis for the exchange of students and mobility. Similarly having a particular interest in quality assurance and recognition and balanced mobility, Australia believes it may be timely and useful to review the priority areas at the 2015 ASEMME5. Future areas of Australia's interest could include research mobility and collaboration as well as teacher quality and standards.

2. What complementary measures might be necessary to promote closer cooperation among education policy makers, higher education institutions (HEIs), student organizations, employers and other stakeholders within the ASEM Education Process?

It has been suggested that the ASEM Education Secretariat could take the opportunity to disseminate information on the activities and projects offered by ASEM members. A dedicated website or a regular email update can share the activities/ programmes that may be of interest to the stakeholders, such as summer exchange programmes, workshops and seminars, invitations for joint research, establishment of working groups, and internship opportunities.

Another complementary measure would be engagement in other multilateral fora, which would help avoid duplication and identify possible synergies. Belgium further believes that the involvement of the HE stakeholders should take place through the systematic participation of the representing Asian and European organisations (such as EUA[1], EURASHE[2], ESU[3], EI[4] within Europe). Such an involvement should also take place within the follow-up/implementation activities. Through ASEM Education Secretariat, countries organising those activities should systematically invite HE stakeholders. It has been also suggested to invite the European

---

[1] European University Association
[2] European Association of Institutions in Higher Education
[3] European Students Union
[4] Education International

Commission to include specific seminars/fora in its agenda, which would involve representatives of stakeholders from all regions. Germany has noted that further stakeholder meetings, back-to-back with the ministerial meetings, can be envisaged. Such meetings could include a meet and greet session between students and Ministers, as well as discussion rounds with student and industry sector representatives.

China draws attention to the fact that ASEF and ASEM LLL Hub both have carried out some complementary measures to promote closer cooperation among education policy makers, HEIs, student organizations, employers and other stakeholders within the ASEM Education Process. France stresses that the ASEM Education Process is already very active and rather productive in terms of promoting human exchanges between both regions.

Australia has also proposed to consider the establishment of ASEM education 'Track 2' process. A Track 2 could convene alongside the ASEM Education Process reaching out to non-government organisations, including higher education institutions, student organisations, employers and other stakeholders.

The Russian Federation suggests establishing of research laboratories, consolidating scientific knowledge and experience from all members. Malta believes that peer-review visits focused on a specific area would also result in a closer cooperation.

3. To what extent does the promotion of fair recognition of qualifications and study periods, as well as comparability of qualifications and learning outcomes facilitate balanced mobility between Europe and Asia? What are other obstacles?

Most ASEM members believe that fair recognition of qualifications and learning factors is crucial in facilitating balanced mobility between Europe and Asia. Brunei Darussalam has noted that student exchange, involving spending a semester or two in a partner university undertaking several modules, is becoming less complicated due to clearer conversion of modular credits and identification of expected learning outcomes.

In the meantime, member states have also mentioned a number of obstacles to balanced mobility, such as: lack of relevant language skills, diverse education systems, missing recognition of qualifications and study periods, immigration issues, administrative burden, insufficient knowledge about foreign countries, the cost of studying or living in a country, variation in academic calendar among different countries, competition for available funding, different capacities of mobilizing human and financial resources, different levels of political maturity, varying degrees of experience, fear of potential brain-drain, security, fear of potential terrorist attacks, international acclaim and accreditation of the European HEIs.

For instance, Malta points out that it is necessary to have a valid and thorough, commonly accepted harmonization with other international frameworks for adoption of the European Qualifications Framework beyond Europe.

Member states have also come up with a number of suggestions aiming to facilitate the process. It has been pointed out that benchmarking of qualifications, including Technical and Vocational Education & Training (TVET)-related qualifications, would be useful for accreditation and employment purposes among ASEM members. There is also a greater possibility of creating joint programmes at postgraduate level among the ASEM HEIs. Germany has stressed the importance of the implementation of the ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration, as well as establishment of National Information Centres in ASEM member countries as part of the Declaration. This would create more transparency in recognition of qualifications and study periods, as well as

comparability of qualifications. Sweden puts an emphasis of the importance of recognition by using the principles of the Lisbon Convention; thus enabling recognition of all students from all countries.

Cyprus has noted that, as more Asian students study in Europe than Europeans in Asia, measures should be taken to motivate European students to spend part of their studies in Asia. According to the Czech Republic, preference for Europe-directed mobility is tied to the demographic structure of societies. In this regard, Lithuania has pointed out that countries lack trust in each other and are guided by different principles in recognition of qualifications. It is therefore suggested to apply the criterion of acceptability rather than equivalency, which means that qualifications should be recognised unless a substantial difference from the host country's education standards is demonstrated. Australia has also suggested that ASEM members could become party to either the Lisbon Convention or the Tokyo Convention, as both conventions have mechanisms in place for fair recognition of qualifications.

At the same time, Belgium has expressed an opinion that fair recognition of qualifications will not automatically foster a more balanced mobility between Asia and Europe. The (im)balanced mobility should be tackled by specific actions from both regions, through promotion strategies fostering two-ways mobility, development of two-ways mobility schemes, etc. Furthermore, the ethical dimension should also be kept in mind, in order to avoid that recognition would only cause more brain drain and imbalances between regions.

Meanwhile, China points out that there is no effective communication platform in Asia similar to ENIC-NARICs in Europe and, therefore, is striving to build a website for the Asian NIC-NARICs, which would enable connection to ENIC-NARICs in the future.

In addition, Lithuania has stressed the need for various support schemes, bilateral or multilateral.

4. Do you agree that more attention after the ASEMME5 should be paid to encourage cooperation among ASEM countries to promote development of basic, transferable and professional skills of individuals, in particular young people, to facilitate THEIR integration in the labour market, improve their further education opportunities and social integration? What joint activities could be undertaken?

Most member countries support efforts to promote the development of basic, transferable and professional skills of individuals, in particular young people, to facilitate their integration in the labor market. China would like to cooperate with other ASEM countries in this area, for instance holding specialized seminars/forums on this topic and welcomes all the ASEM countries to take part in the National Vocational Students' Skills Competition. Furthermore, a number of joint activities have been mentioned to promote more balanced mobility among students and academic staff between Asia and Europe. The potential initiatives include exchange of experiences and best practices with regard to education systems, joint/double degree programmes, thematic meetings that address issues of common interest, academic and research exchange. In addition to that, members also mention public debates, portability of grants and bank loans for studies, social insurances regarding calculation of retirement rights of teaching and research staff, participated in international mobility, establishment of international cross-cultural student centers in the ASEM countries helping foreign students and young professionals to socialize, facilitating of dialogue on common qualification framework, aiming initiatives for strengthening quality and mobility in HE through exchange of experiences and knowledge rather than through regulations.

Furthermore, Brunei Darussalam recommends fostering of internship or apprenticeship opportunities/programmes in ASEM member countries for students from TVET and HEIs. Germany suggests that an ASEM mobility programme could be envisaged which should promote

mobility of staff in particular. Germany is also working on a call for participation for elaborating an ASEM module which should be included in European and Asian study programs. Bulgaria would like to see the subject being paid more attention after ASEMME5. In the meantime, Lithuania points out that in some study fields related to regulated professions (e.g. medicine, law, engineering, and pedagogics) special professional skills are crucial in quality training. Malaysia believes that joint degree program should be implemented in some common areas of studies (for instance, tourism and hospitality, security, green technology). Malta suggests an organization of blended forms of professional development programmes. Meanwhile, New Zealand stresses that any activities for ASEM education cooperation should be built on the work projects already underway in Asia and Europe.

While recognising that a focus on the employability of young graduates is needed, Belgium also refers to the broader missions of HE. Belgium warns that a too excessive focus on employability issue might result in a utilitarian vision of HE and ASEM Education Process in general. Furthermore, it is also necessary to recognise that ASEM member states face very diverse challenges that do not require the same answers in terms of employability. Therefore, Belgium would suggest tackling the issue of employability via the first two priority areas ("quality assurance and recognition (and QFs?)" and "(mutual?) engagement of business and (higher) education").

Some member states have also expressly supported the use of the three principles for determining priorities and activities for further ASEM education cooperation (continuity of ASEM Education Process, consultation and collaboration for results, and commitment for cooperation). With regard to the third principle, Germany has suggested to consider whether a key note speaker engaged in scientific work could highlight the added value of cooperation within ASEM at the very beginning of ASEMME5. Referring to the idea of introducing pilot projects, Austria has noted that they should first address countries that are already in an advanced state in the respective area.

Apart from that, Germany has suggested to introduce a new format of meeting which would help facilitate Ministers' engagement in the ASEM Education Process: one session could also be held as a closed workshop where only Ministers are allowed to participate. In order to underline the joint character of ASEM, future ministerial meetings could be organised in cooperation of two countries (one Asian country, one European country).

Annex I
Results of the early consultation
with the ASEM members and stakeholders
before the first Senior Officials' Meeting for ASEMME5

	1.	**2.**	**3.**	**4.**
Member/ stakeholder/ partner	**Should the four main priority areas (quality assurance and recognition; engaging business and industry in education; balanced mobility; lifelong learning and technical and vocational education and training) be maintained or reviewed during the ASEM ME5?**	**What complementary measures might be necessary to promote closer cooperation among education policy makers, higher education institutions, student organizations, employers and other stakeholders within the ASEM Education Process?**	**To what extend does the promotion of fair recognition of qualifications and study periods, as well as comparability of qualifications and learning outcomes facilitate balanced mobility between Europe and Asia? What are other obstacles?**	**Do you agree that more attention after the ASEM ME5 should be paid to encourage cooperation among ASEM countries to promote development of basic, transferable and professional skills of individuals, in particular young people, to facilitate their integration in the labor market, improve their further education opportunities and social integration?**
Australia	Australia suggests to review current priority areas as they were identified back in 2011. Out of the four areas, Australia has a particular interest in quality assurance and recognition and balanced mobility.

It is not only watching other multilateral fora, like UNESCO work on Global Guidelines, but also developing regional qualifications framework in Asia-Pacific and aligning Australian | • Cooperation of policy makers with other multilateral fora
• Establishment of ASEM education 'Track 2' process, reaching out to non-governmental and student organizations and employers. | ASEM members could become party to either Lisbon Convention or the Tokyo Convention (both have mechanisms for the fair recognition of qualifications). | Australia supports efforts to promote the development of basic, transferable and professional skills of individuals to facilitate integration into labour markets and would welcome further exploration of joint activities that would support this objective. |

	1.	2.	3.	4.
	and European Qualifications Frameworks. Australia's examples could provide a strong basis for further ASEM development. In future, Australia is interested in research collaboration and teacher quality and standards: it is currently working to identify world's best practice in teacher education programmes and would welcome any further work undertaken in this area.			
Austria	Current priority areas should be maintained. Suggests to start an evaluation process on the different outcomes of current priorities.		In respect of fair recognition it should be considered that spare use or even reduction of regulatory measures would ease the work and the exchange between ASEM countries.	
Belgium	Proposes a better defining of the scope of cooperation. Suggestions: - Focus on higher education exclusively - Shift the focus of the 4th priority area from TVET to LLL as for many countries TVET is a strictly separate sector from the higher education - Revise the wording of 2nd priority area to ensure equal	Involvement of the HE stakeholders should take place more structurally within the process and also within the follow-up/implementation activities.	A fair recognition will not automatically foster a more balanced mobility between Asia and Europe. Mobility problem should be tackled through promotion strategies fostering two-ways mobility. Ethical dimension of recognition and mobility in order to avoid that recognition will only cause more brain-drain and imbalances between regions, which has been	Broader missions of HE should not be forgotten. Focusing too much on the employability issue might foster a utilitarian vision of HE and this cooperation process. Both regions are facing very diverse challenges, not requiring the same answers in terms of employability, therefore, tackling this via the first two priority areas would work.

	1.	2.	3.	4.
	engagement of business and higher education sectors • Systematic discussions on qualification frameworks in the Asia and Europe cooperation and linking QFs with the 1st priority area.		discussed on a UNESCO global convention on recognition.	
Brunei Darussalam	Current priority areas should be maintained. It is crucial for ASEMME5 to identify the progress of the projects and programs identified under each priority area.	• Website or regular email update sharing the activities/ programmes of the four priority areas • Summer exchange programmes • Invitation for joint research • Internship opportunities • Ministerial commitment to ensure the sustainability and success of the ASEM Education Process.	Obstacles: • Variation in academic calendar among the HEIs • Language barrier • Visa issues, especially for student internship. Better mobility is facilitated by comparability of qualifications and learning outcomes. Student exchange, involving spending a semester or two in a partner university, is becoming less complicated due to clearer conversion of modular credits and identification of expected learning outcomes.	More attention should be given to encouraging this cooperation. Internship or apprenticeship opportunities/programmes in ASEM member countries for students from TVET and HEIs would enhance their hands-on or industrial skills hence increasing their employability.
Bulgaria	The current priority areas should be maintained. With regards to the importance of one of the main problems – the high levels of youth unemployment, it is essential to:		The comparability of qualification frameworks and qualifications is the basis for increasing the trans-national mobility. Obstacles:	The importance of the subject requires more attention after the ASEMME5.

	1.	2.	3.	4.
	• Engage the business and industry in education and training • Increase the role of the Life Long Learning • Provide quality assurance and recognition. Priority area which could be included is "Education for Sustainable Development".		• Lack of comparability of qualifications and results from learning • Lack of recognition of qualifications and study periods • Funding • Language barriers; • Administrative burden.	
China	Priority areas should be maintained and reviewed. During ASEMME4, these four priority areas were well accepted by all the countries, and there are a lot of follow-ups to be carried out. For implementation of all the initiatives, it is necessary to adhere to the current priorities to see the amount of progress achieved. However, China is open to any other priorities that may arouse all members' interest.	Besides the ASEMME, ASEF and ASEM LLL Hub both have carried out some complementary measures to promote closer cooperation among education policy makers, HEIs, student organizations, employers and other stakeholders within the ASEM Education Process. China would like to encourage more countries/organizations to propose initiatives and welcomes all the members to attend the 4th ARC, which is coordinated by ASEF, in Hangzhou, China in February 2015.	Obstacles: • Unbalanced mobility (it can be balanced by developments of the quality assurance systems and recognition mechanisms) • Variation in academic calendar among different countries • Comparability of credit systems; • Language barriers. China is currently committing to implement the ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration and to establish Cross-border Quality Assurance Network in Higher Education (CBQAN).	China agrees since employability is a very topical issue both in China and in all ASEM countries. It is trying to reform talent cultivation mode and to vigorously develop vocational education for employability of the students. China would like to cooperate with other ASEM countries in this area, for instance holding specialized seminars/forums on this topic. It also holds National Vocational Students' Skills Competition every year for promoting development of professional skills and facilitating young people's integration in the labour

	1.	2.	3.	4.
			In the meantime, Europe has established ENIC-NARICs, which provides information resources and serves as an effective communication platform for European competent recognition authorities. However, Asia lacks such a platform. Therefore, China is leading to build a website for the Asian NIC-NARICs which will help connect with ENIC-NARICs in the future.	market and would like to welcome all the ASEM countries to take part in the Competition and to exchange views and opinions.
Cyprus	Current priority areas should be maintained. Cyprus enhances that engaging business and industry in education and LLL and TVET is crucial for the employability of graduates.	Invite the European Commission to include in its agenda specific seminars/fora with representatives of all stakeholders from all regions.	Balanced mobility will be enabled by developments of the quality assurance systems and recognition mechanisms. Obstacles: • Visa problems • Recognition of the period spent studying in other countries • Incompatible credit system.	Facing an economic crisis and trying to deal with youth unemployment, promoting professional development and education and skills is essential, therefore, more attention should be paid to this issue after the ASEMME5.
Czech Republic	The current priority areas should be maintained. They are important priorities of higher education policies of EU member states.	• Periodical meetings between policy makers and HEI in particular (represented both by the students and academic staff) • Establishment of working groups composed of all	Obstacles: • Substantial differences between education systems existing in Europe and Asia (evaluation methods, documents)	Programmes devoted do the development of basic and other transferable skills should be promoted in individual countries. The professional skills of individuals and employability should not be their only focus.

	1.	2.	3.	4.
		parties representing various interests of different stakeholders • Organization of interactive workshops and seminars • Bilateral and multilateral contacts at the level of individual HEIs may be the most effective tool to achieve this aim within the ASEM process.	• Lack of communication • Insufficient availability of information that would facilitate assessment of qualifications obtained in Asian countries by the European HEIs • Demographic structure of societies favour Europe-directed mobility • High quality of education offered by European HEIs across the entire range of study fields • International acclaim and accreditation of the European HEIs.	The Czech Republic has a well-developed system of VET throughout the relevant levels of education system and can share its experience with other countries.
European Commission	Current priority areas should be maintained. Particular interest in mobility between Europe and Asia.		Credit recognition for students between ASEM members is the single biggest obstacle to mobility. Europe has a large vested interest in advancing this work, given that under Erasmus+ almost 150 million EUR will be dedicated to credit mobility between Europe and the Asian members of ASEM.	
Estonia	Current priority areas should be maintained. Estonia is mainly interested in an active participation and information about activities	Focus should be on already chosen activities trying to implement them in the best way possible.	Harmonization of frameworks is important so that trans-national education becomes a norm and not an exception for students. Obstacles:	There should be paid more attention. Since ASEM ME is informal network without direct financial means, this task is more country-

	1.	2.	3.	4.
	regarding quality assurance and recognition.		• Funding • Language skills • Immigration issues.	specific although change of information and best-practice could be welcome.
France	The four main priority areas are very pertinent, essential and central for reinforcing cooperation between Asia and Europe.	• Workshops and seminars with representatives of all stakeholders for strengthening the contacts and identifying mutual questions of interest • Development of ASEF activities in the field of education by facilitating the exchanges between experts. France would like to emphasize that the ASEM Education Process is already very active and already quite productive in terms of promoting human exchanges between Europe and Asia, and notes that it is the only process, which has created a permanent Secretariat to follow up after the Ministerial Meetings.	Mutual recognition of degrees, qualifications generally speaking and study periods (internships, etc.) is a key element for developing the international mobility of students and trainees. France, having signed "Agreements of Mutual Recognition of Studies and Degrees" with Asian countries, considers it was a key factor for boosting balanced mobility between France and these countries, which was -in some cases- multiplied by 10 over a period of 7-8 years. Such Agreements find their ground on firm QA process in Higher Education.	France fully agrees with this proposal for facilitating the integration of young people in the labour market, improving their further education opportunities and social integration. France would recommend exchange of experience and good practices (e.g. the French "Agreements of Mutual Recognition of Studies and Degrees", international seminars on QA in Higher Education as for instance the one organized in Sèvres, France, in November 2012, and those organized in Cyprus, China and Thailand). During the formal meetings, a series of conclusions may be drawn from the ideas and experiences shared during these seminars for suggesting implementation of further measures.
Germany	Current priority areas should be maintained.	• Other events back-to-back with the ministerial meetings • Further stakeholder meetings	Obstacles:	• Envisage development of ASEM mobility programme

	1.	**2.**	**3.**	**4.**
	Germany suggests TVET being a separate priority area.	• Meetings and sessions between students and Ministers • Discussion rounds with student representatives and representatives from the industry sector.	• Missing recognition of qualifications and study periods • Missing comparability of qualifications and learning outcomes • Language barriers • Missing knowledge about foreign countries • High competition on available funds • Administrative burdens. It is important to implement ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration and establish National Information Centers in member countries.	• Monitoring and enlargement of implementation of the ASEM Curriculum adopted during ASEMME4.
Greece	The main targets and priority areas remain of great importance for the Hellenic Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs, especially towards the great efforts to meet the socio-economic challenges of our times and to develop the internationalization of the education system.			
Japan	Current priority areas should be maintained.			

	1.	2.	3.	4.
Lithuania	Current priorities are still important (especially quality assurance and recognition). Others priority areas should be included, when the current ones have been fully accomplished.	• Establish relations and hold a dialogue at all levels (policy-making and policy-implementation) • Organize regular meetings (e.g. once a year) of policy-making and policy-implementation organizations to plan joint activities and share experience.	Obstacles: • Countries lack the knowledge about: - higher education systems - conferred qualifications - traditions • Lack of trust • Different principles in recognition of qualifications • Finances. There is a necessity for: • Observing the criterion of acceptability rather than equivalency • Various support schemes • Very clear and coherent strategy • Bilateral agreements for recognition of diplomas.	Yes and no. On one hand, main advantage a person derives from the higher education is basic transferable skills and competences. On other hand, in some study fields, most often in activities related to regulated professions, special professional skills are crucial in quality training.
Malaysia	Current priority areas should be maintained. Malaysian community colleges are still making inroads into these areas (e.g., colleges' programs are in the process of being evaluated to obtain Full Accreditation). Also engaging business and industry in education, allows to conclude that colleges' programs based on the TVET framework and emphasizing hands-on learning	• Further integration of the quality assurance framework among ASEM member countries • Concerted effort in creating a more balanced mobility of students and academics between European and Asian countries • Placement of education policy makers on a short term basis between European and Asian countries to learn about the	Obstacles: • Diverse education systems, culture and languages • Fair recognition of qualifications, study periods and comparability of qualifications, learning outcomes will facilitate balanced mobility Thus, more efforts should be paid to finding the commonality of the education systems between Asian	More balanced mobility among students and academic staff should be promoted. There should be implemented a joint degree program in some common areas of studies (e.g. tourism and hospitality, security, green technology).

	1.	2.	3.	4.
	need to be constituently reviewed and updated.	best practices among participating countries • Wider access, funding support and mutual recognition among ASEM education institutions.	and European or even among Asian countries.	
Malta	The four priority areas should be retained. Suggestions: • It might be required to have comparability exercises and subsequent conversion/adaptation provisions for recognition of qualifications for specific roles • Notwithstanding interest of different stakeholders in influencing curricula and educational provision, there might still be more need for taking on a greater responsibility on their behalf in the active formation of the student population It is necessary to nurture mobility within a globalized context, whilst recognizing the need to protect contextual needs.	• Peer-review visits focusing on a specific area resulting in a closer and perhaps more effective collaboration (these initiatives would be aimed at exchanging accrued experiences in smaller groups and in the process offer opportunities for the development of collaborative relationships amongst participating countries).	One obstacle is the fact that adoption of the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) beyond Europe requires a valid and rigorous, commonly accepted harmonization with other international frameworks.	ASEMME5 could facilitate the establishment of partnerships aimed at the development of specific projects of mutual benefit to participating countries. These may include the organization of blended forms of professional development programmes.

	1.	2.	3.	4.
New Zealand	New Zealand supports the four main priority areas and has a particular interest in quality assurance and recognition. It is also undertaking referencing projects with China, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Australia and European Qualifications Framework.		Obstacles: • Unfair recognition of qualifications hindering mobility of students and skilled workers • Status and recognition of countries qualifications' and qualification systems • The robustness of quality assurance • The cost of studying or living in a country • Language barrier • Access to appropriate visas and to labour market.	Any activities for ASEM education cooperation should build on the work projects already underway in Asia and Europe.
Norway	Four main priority areas are still important.			
Romania	Current priority areas should be maintained. In Romania there is a need for: • Development of the partnership between the education and the business sector • Quality assurance and improvement in the roles fulfilled by economic partners Increasing the participation of people in trainings.	• Development of sectorial framework strategies; • Promoting the development of basic professional and transferable skills in prioritized economic sectors, especially for youth; Organization of ASEM associations/networks at different levels of stakeholders, bringing together representatives of the participating countries.	• Difficulties in financing schemes and programs • Different capacities of mobilizing human and financial resources • Different levels of political maturity • Varying degrees of experience • Differences in the harmonization of procedures for the recognition of qualifications and study periods	Potential joint activities: • Exchange of experiences and best practices • Thematic meetings on issues of common interest • Launching of public debates • Joint schemes and programs dedicated to HE • Academic and research exchanges • Portability of grants and bank loans for studies

	1.	2.	3.	4.
			• Different description of qualifications in ASEM countries • Lack of mutual recognized credit transfer systems • Fear of potential brain-drain • Security and fear of potential terrorist attacks • Learning difficulties of national or international languages.	• Social insurances regarding calculation of retirement rights of teaching and research staff, participated in international mobility • Stimulating an increased mobility of highly qualified human resources.
Russian Federation	These priority areas should be supported continuing the work in accordance with the determined objectives because each of them leads to the strengthening dialogue and cooperation between Asia and Europe.	• Establishment of a database network resource for methodological and factual information exchange between the ASEM members • Monitoring of creating and developing a common education space for permanent analysis of advances in gaps in ASEM cooperation • Encouraging the networking and interactivity to increase the percentage of the interested persons in lifelong learning • Establishing research laboratories aimed at consolidating scientific knowledge and experience from all the ASEM members	The recognition of qualifications and study period based on transparency and comparability of the educational process structure is a key factor of the balanced mobility development. Especially, the short-time mobility should be based on the study period recognition.	• Facilitate a dialogue on common qualification framework • Engage students into the professional activity during the educational process • Encourage the establishment of the international cross-cultural student centers in the ASEM countries helping foreign students and young professionals to socialize.

	1.	2.	3.	4.
		for high-technology's development For student mobility development: • Focusing on bilateral and multilateral cooperation in the balanced mobility development area • Developing common educational projects and international research activities • Involving business into the common projects and financing of researches.		
Sweden	Current priority areas should be maintained. Sweden has a particular interest in mobility.	Involvement of stakeholders is important, both in the ASEM process but also as a responsibility of each member state in their activities related to the ASEM cooperation.	Fair recognition is an important obstacle to mobility among others. Sweden has emphasized the importance of recognition by using the principles of the Lisbon Convention for recognition of students from all countries.	Sweden is positive to optional cooperation among the ASEM countries. • Basing ASEM initiatives on national decisions and the autonomy of HE institutions • Aiming initiatives to strengthening quality and mobility in HE through exchange of experiences and knowledge rather than through regulations and other governing commitments.
ASEF	ASEF supports the continuity of the four priority areas of the ASEM Education Process, but also encourages being open to	Create a tool to monitor the developments and progress of ASEM Education process (use as		

	1.	2.	3.	4.
	reviewing the topics addressed by four priorities • Currently, ASEF's projects cover mostly areas 2, 3 and 4. • Inclusion of a 5th priority area (Education and Sustainable Development - ESD) could be considered ESD (educational efforts to foster attitudes, knowledge, skills behaviors among citizens that are indispensable for creating a sustainable future) has gained much importance worldwide. Another topic pertinent to both Asia and Europe is youth unemployment, which could be addressed as a key topic under the priorities.	example ISOM 2014 presentation matrix). Also 2013 Stocktaking Report by the ASEM Education Secretariat proposes the following tools, which could be reviewed and/or further developed to complement initiatives and create synergies: • Programmes – to fill the ASEM Education Process with 'life' • Knowledge bases – built through surveys/studies to share experiences and information as well as to increase visibility and transparency • Initiatives – to foster outcome-driven activities; • Expert groups – to assist in policy/ project formulation and to support the design and implementation of possible reforms.		

	1.	2.	3.	4.
ASEM LLL HUB	The four priority areas should be maintained. The focus should be laid on lifelong learning. ASEM LLL Hub every two years organizes a large forum on this topic (upcoming working title: Renewing the Agenda for Lifelong Learning) and is aiming for a Copenhagen Consensus Meeting in 2015, where some of the world's top researchers within lifelong learning will meet.	ASEM LLL Hub supports the idea of complementary measures. ASEM LLL Hub will from 2015 have produced its two first ASEM Reviews of National Policies for Lifelong Learning. These reports will enable generation of higher standards in education and laying the focus on democratic values, civic participation, equality and non-discrimination.		

Summary Report of the 1st Senior Official Meeting (SOM1)

10-11 November 2014
Riga, Latvia
Ministry of Education and Science
of the Republic of Latvia
www.izm.gov.lv

Ministry of
Education and Science
Republic of Latvia

Latvian Presidency
of the Council of the
European Union

EU2015.LV

1st Senior Officials' Meeting (SOM1)
of the 5th ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting (ASEMME5)

SUMMARY REPORT

Last updated: 26.11.2014

1. The Senior Officials on education issues of Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) countries met in Riga on 10 and 11 November 2014 in order to prepare for the fifth ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting (ASEMME5) to be held in Riga on 27 and 28 April 2015. The meeting was organized by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Latvia under the Latvian Presidency of the Council of the European Union (EU). At the meeting 89 participants from 33 countries in Europe and Asia, the ASEM Education Secretariat, the European Commission and the European External Action Service (EEAS) as an overall coordinator of the ASEM process were present. In total, 44 delegations participated, including 8 stakeholders: the European University Association, the ASEM Education and Research Hub for Lifelong Learning (ASEM LLL Hub), the European Association of Higher Education Institutions (EURASHE), ASEM-DUO Fellowship Programme, the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the South-East Asian Ministers of Education Organization, the Regional Centre for Higher Education and Development (SEAMEO RIHED) and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) University Network Secretariat.

2. SOM1 was held in a plenary format with participants expressing their opinions and broader discussions taking place within two parallel sessions to prepare proposals for the ASEM Education Process policy agenda and to provide substance for the ASEMME5 Conclusions by the Chair.

3. In her welcome speech, Ms Sanda Liepina, the State Secretary of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Latvia, who was also the Chair of the SOM1, stressed that "with SOM1, we have chosen to stick to a format which promotes contribution by all ASEM members. Each session will be followed by discussions; all opinions will be heard and taken into account [..]. Our joint task for the coming days is to develop a road map and arrive at proposals for ASEMME5 policy agenda and ASEMME5 Conclusions by the Chair that will form the work that needs to be taken up by all of us in our respective countries after 2015 and leading up to 2017".

4. Ms Inga Skujina, Under-Secretary of State for European Affairs of European Union Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Latvia, in her welcome address mentioned that during the Latvian Presidency of the Council of the EU the focus will be laid on three priorities: Competitive Europe, Digital Europe and Engaged Europe. The aims of these priorities are closely linked to the cooperation between Europe and Asia in the framework of ASEM. During the Latvian Presidency of the Council of the EU, the strengthening of the role of education and training in promoting economic growth and

well-being will be high on the agenda. The Latvian Presidency of the Council of the EU will also focus on grassroots sport and physical activities for children and young people as an essential element for quality education.

5. In his speech Prof. Dr. Aris Junaidi, the director of the ASEM Education Secretariat (Indonesia) welcomed the new ASEM members that have joined recently - Kazakhstan and Croatia. Prof. Dr. Junaidi expressed the hope that with increasing numbers of committed countries, the Education partnership in Asia and Europe will be strengthened and broadened more.

6. In his presentation Mr Einars Semanis, Ambassador–Director General of Bilateral Relations Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Latvia elaborated the role of ASEM Education in the overall ASEM process. Cooperation in the field of education is essential part of ASEM. Mr Semanis stressed the role of leaders' summits and various ASEM Ministerial Meetings where the strategic documents of ASEM are approved. Referring to the 11th ASEM Foreign Ministers' Meeting, Mr Semanis emphasized ministers welcoming the initiative to encourage ASEM members to achieve the result, oriented towards tangible outcomes. Ministers supported the tendency to incorporate a wider stakeholding amongst business, civil society, media and academia. Mr Semanis also underlined the importance of the remarks by the President of the European Council Herman Van Rompuy at the 10th ASEM Summit: "Future development is also dependent on quality education, which fosters innovation and employment and thereby contributes to economic growth. Cooperation in this key area is also an investment in our joint development through cross-fertilisation of ideas and better mutual understanding. These issues will be further developed [..] by the Education Ministerial in April in Riga, Latvia."

7. The Chair Ms Liepina stressed the necessity to share a common understanding of the ASEM Education Process when reflecting on the developments and looking to it's future. The Chair invited Prof. Dr. Junaidi to highlight the results and benefits of the ASEM Education Process since 2008. The presentation showed the ASEM Education Process as being about making education systems in Asia and Europe more compatible, with exchange and mobility. Over the years, the discussions have mainly focused on the way and extent higher education, as well as technical and vocational education and training (TVET) and lifelong learning could contribute to developing high quality human resources and increasing the mobility of students and staff within and between the ASEM regions.

8. The SOM1 Deputy Chair Liga Lejina, Deputy State Secretary, Director of the Department of Policy Initiatives and Development of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Latvia noted that one of the key documents to summarize the various activities and results since ASEMME4, serving as a crucial basis for drafting the Chairs' conclusions for ASEMME5, is the Stocktaking Report. The Deputy Chair Ms Lejina invited Prof. Dr. Junaidi to present the draft Stocktaking Report. In order to obtain more information on the progress of programmes and also further initiatives, the Stocktaking Report was circulated to all the members. The upcoming programmes and initiatives proposed by the members were also listed in the Report. Through the following discussion Denmark suggested the necessity to create a working group between ASEMME5 and ASEMME6, reviewing the ASEM Education Process in order to create a robust conceptual framework. Indonesia stressed that AES should have a more detailed overview of the projects both in Asia and Europe.

9. The Deputy Chair invited Ms Anita Vahere-Abrazune, Deputy Director of the Department of Policy Initiatives and Development of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Latvia to present the results of the Early Consultation carried out from June to October 2014 to identify possible priorities and activities for the post-ASEMME5 period

and the ASEMME5 agenda. All parties involved in the ASEM Education Process were invited to participate in the consultation process. The results show that the four main priority areas should be maintained and evaluated at the ASEMME5. According to the views expressed, it is important to see the progress and outcomes of the current activities. It could be useful to focus on one core aspect per priority and to review the topics covered by the current priority areas. The focus points during ASEMME5 should be: "quality assurance and recognition" and "the obstacles to balanced mobility". It is important to continue and to strengthen the activities already underway. After the ASEMME5 more attention should be paid to promoting the development of basic, transferable, professional skills of individuals, but without a too excessive focus on the employability issue. A number of joint activities were proposed to encourage cooperation among ASEM countries to promote development of basic, transferable and professional skills of individuals.

The participants of the Early Consultation recommended various complementary measures that might be necessary to promote closer cooperation among education policy makers, higher education institutions, student organizations, employers and other stakeholders within the ASEM Education Process. ASEM members and stakeholders also explained the obstacles to balanced mobility and offered solutions.

10. As the Chair Ms Liepina underlined in her welcome speech, it is important for the participants to have an opportunity to have an outside look at the ASEM issues discussed in other formats in other fora, thus contributing to the decisions on the policy agenda. The results of the Early Consultation also indicate proposals to consider when making the decisions on the policy agenda.

11. The Deputy Chair Ms Lejina remarked that at the ASEMME4 education ministers emphasized the need to engage in dialogue with all the stakeholders and invited ASEM members and stakeholders to widen the scope for the discussion with presentations about: Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), "Education for All" (EFA), Contributions by ASEF to the ASEM Education Process, ASEM and OECD cooperation and EU-ASEM cooperation in the area of higher education.

12. Two important points for the further promotion of ESD at the global scale were emphasized: Global Action Programme on ESD and the UNESCO's continuous initiative for promoting ESD. With regard to the EFA programme, there was put forward the proposal that ASEMME should cooperate to address EFA through a joint task force. ASEF drew attention to an upcoming research project under the ASEF Education Policy Programme intended to be conducted over the next two years by ASEF together with the British Council. The research is focused on the role of higher education institutions in promoting social entrepreneurship. The OECD underlined the importance of not only higher education, but also of secondary and early childhood education, and offered OECD support in addressing issues of skills development and the contribution of education and skills to social and economic development. The EU programmes have promoted Europe-Asia cooperation, education and mobility. The new programme "Erasmus+" offers funding opportunities for higher education cooperation between Asia and Europe.

13. During the ASEM SOM1 Ms Vahere-Abrazune presented the draft of ASEMME5 agenda to streamline the discussions and to come back to agenda on the next day. Ms Vahere-Abrazune also put for discussion the theme of the 5th ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting - "Harmonising ASEM Collaboration for Results".

14. Ms Vahere-Abrazune invited Mr Jordi Curell Gotor, the Director in Directorate-General Education and Culture of the European Commission to elaborate on the Information day on "Erasmus+" for ASEM, scheduled for 29 April 2015 as a side event for ASEMME5. Mr Curell Gotor underlined that the new programme "Erasmus+" can be used in a very strategic manner, both by countries and higher educational institutions themselves as it

offers a pack of actions which can be a very useful complement to the international strategies of different universities worldwide – to combine credit mobility with the joint degrees and capacity building. Mr Curell Gotor believes it is essential to bring ministers' attention to the importance of that as they will have responsibility implementing processes on the national level and in terms of disseminating information about the new possibilities offered by "Erasmus+". In addition, this programme can make a major contribution to the four priorities of the ASEM Education Process. Mr Curell Gotor informed that the audience to be brought together on the Information day is those who participate in the Ministerial Meeting, university associations and representatives of the ASEM Rector's Conference, student organizations, universities and "Erasmus Mundus" alumni. During the Information day the new possibilities offered by the "Erasmus+" programme will be presented in a very hands-on approach in relation to the themes, such as credit mobility and capacity building.

15. As stated by the Chair Ms Liepina, it is important to link the ASEM Education Process to the on-going broader ASEM dialogue and process, ensuring that the work of Senior Officials for education can be seen in a broader context of Asia-Europe education. ASEM Cooperation in education is a part of the overall ASEM Cooperation, contributing to the strengthening of cooperation and development between both regions.

16. The Chair Ms Liepina invited Mr Michael Matthiessen, Principal Advisor of EEAS to give an insight into the Asia-Europe cooperation. Mr Matthiessen drew attention to the importance of paragraph 31 in the Final Chair Statement of the 10th ASEM Summit "Responsible Partnership for Sustainable Growth and Security" and annexes, highlighting the Annex 3 – "List of Interested ASEM Members for Tangible Cooperation Areas". Mr Matthiessen explained: "Paragraph 31 is extremely important because it is about education. Even if this text is not legally binding, all 53 leaders, representing 60% of the world's population, 60% of world trade and 60% of global GDP have agreed to this text. Paragraph 31 is some kind of guidance for you in the work that you will be doing in the future as you prepare the Ministerial in Riga."

17. After the presentation, discussion started on the matter of the Annex 3 of Paragraph 31 of the Final Chair Statement of the 10th ASEM Summit, raising concerns that some countries are not on the list of interested ASEM members for cooperation. Mr Matthiessen commented that as ASEM is often criticized for being a "talk show", it is recommended for ASEM to implement more tangible and operational activities. The countries interested in some specific areas are encouraged to cooperate in a joint work. Mr Matthiessen also emphasized the importance of coordination between line ministries and Ministries of Foreign Affairs.

18. The Chair came back to the proposals for ASEMME5 policy agenda (including side events) and the ASEMME5 Conclusions by the Chair. The Chair drew attention to the proposed theme of the 5th ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting "Harmonising ASEM Collaboration for Results" and the title "5th ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting". The Chair explained the reason behind the necessity to change the title of the meeting, asking delegations for their comments. There has been no unity in the way the Education Ministers' Meetings have been named since 2008. Therefore, the proposal is to start using the same titling as for other Ministerial Meeting's formats such as the Foreign Ministers' Meeting.

19. Various consultations and discussions have confirmed that there is an eagerness for fewer speeches and more of real conversations and exchange between ministers at ASEMME to allow for the pressing issues of the day to emerge and to allow for the real policy setting to be done by the ministers. ASEMME5 policy agenda will be built on four blocks: Dialogue and Continuity; Commitment and Collaboration for results - specific themes identified and discussed in detail; 10th ASEM Summit, Chair's Statement – response of

education ministers; Post-ASEMME5 conceptual framework and new priorities. These areas to be covered during ASEMME5 meeting should also be taken into account in the process of forming the Chairs' Conclusions.

Policy agenda and priorities for the post-ASEMME5 are mainly based on three inputs: Early Consultation process; input from discussion groups SOM1 and the Stocktaking Report. Conclusions by the Chair will include assessment of the progress made, priorities for the post-ASEMME5 and activities and measures for the next years.

20. The SOM1 Chair summarized dates and tasks relevant for the preparation of the Ministerial Meeting in Riga:

-**26 November 2014**: sending out the SOM1 minutes/summary "1st Senior Officials' Meeting (SOM1) of the 5th ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting (ASEMME5) Riga, 10-11 November 2014"

-**22 December 2014**: receiving the proposals/inputs/comments of the ASEM members and stakeholders, based on the discussions that have been taking place at SOM1 in Riga (on 10 and 11 November 2014)

-**22 January 2015**: sharing the first draft of the Chairs' Conclusions and final ASEMME5 agenda

-**12 February 2015**: receiving comments on the Chairs' Conclusions of the ASEM members and stakeholders in order to proceed with the second draft

-**27 February 2015**: sharing the second draft of the Chairs' Conclusions and final ASEMME5 agenda

-**20 March 2015**: receiving comments on the second draft of the Chairs' Conclusions and final ASEMME5 agenda

-**10 April 2015**: sharing the final (third) draft of the Chairs' Conclusions and final ASEMME5 agenda

-**26 April 2015**: ASEMME5 SOM2 meeting in Riga for discussion of the draft Chair's Conclusions

21. The meeting was followed by the reports from the discussions in two parallel sessions among the ASEM members and stakeholders, held on the first day of the SOM1 meeting. The aim of the discussion was to summarize the views on expected outcomes of the collaboration taking place within the ASEM Education Process, to prepare proposals for both the future policy agenda and substance to the Chair's Conclusions of the ASEMME5. Discussion was based on the results of the Early Consultation with the ASEM members and stakeholders and participants' experience and/or expectations, as well as on the results of the previous discussions and presentations of SOM1. A concise summary below represents the conclusions and constructive recommendations made during the discussions.

The main outputs and benefits resulting from ASEM Education collaboration are as follows:

-ASEM as a platform for dialogue and exchange of perspectives for mutual understanding and learning (based on this dialogue, ASEM members defined a number of priority issues and developed joint initiatives; some of them led to concrete activities (e.g. pilot projects));

-working group "Quality Assurance and Recognition" and Working Group on Innovative Competences and Entrepreneurial Mindsets;

-wide array of proposals for cooperation; best practices and exchange of information (models to pick and choose; stimulus and inspiration for local and national education strategies);

-multi-stakeholder approach (direct link between policy makers and the education community);

-mobility exchanges;

-opportunity for multi- and bi-lateral exchanges.

ASEM Education collaboration benefits ministries, the higher education community, Quality Assurance agencies and other bodies and stakeholder groups.

With regard to the expectations of the ASEM members from the ASEM Education Process and mutual collaboration the participants of the discussion mentioned:

-acknowledgement of different needs and priorities by ASEM members on a local, national and regional level (better assessment of areas which could/should be jointly tackled and areas which could/should be solved on a national or bilateral level);

-strengthening of the multi-stakeholder approach (education community - rectors, teachers, students and their relevant associations, as well as business sector); involvement of the stakeholders also within the national context;

-close cooperation within the official ASEM Process for better synergies (exchanges between the relevant Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Education, Culture, Labour, etc.);

-keeping the identified topics - continue to follow them up;

-keeping it a multifaceted, multipurpose process (principally open to all topics, but setting clear priorities; several countries would like to focus more on quality assurance and recognition and student mobility);

-ensuring an informal process and information exchange, but at the same time identifying the issues which require clear policy commitment by the participating countries;

-consistency of the processes where all the parties involved in the ASEM Education Process are engaged in, for example, Bologna process (in order to avoid the overlapping of the efforts in the different processes for the same objectives);

-common understanding of concepts and objectives (e.g. the kind of mobility discussed).

Regarding the concrete measures to be taken when developing the ASEM Education Process, the participants of the discussions mentioned:

-vision document: including 1) shared understanding of education, and explaining the importance of education exchanges for the Asia-Europe process; 2) road map – framework to be agreed;

-Two Pillars system within the ASEM Education Process (Pillar 1: dialogue-oriented to provide a platform for mutual learning; Pillar 2: result-oriented; pilot projects with commitments);

-clear, realistic objectives and result-oriented activities (e.g. ASEM DUO Fellowship Programme, joint curriculum development);

-refocusing the objectives within the existing priorities (e.g. mutual engagement of the sectors – higher education and business and industry instead of engaging business and industry in education);

-strategic reflection on the ASEM Education Process (e.g. an external assessment in order to put up pressure and get a clear self-evaluation of the process; focus on uniqueness of the ASEM Education Process in order to set priorities);

-planning ahead, for example, 2018 - ten year anniversary;

-more coordination, making the process of common work more robust (perhaps the need for another institution helping to manage the complex process, where so many countries, problems and wishes exist); coordination between organizations (linking the work); appointing coordinators for the working groups;

-the need for communication strategy; the importance of exchange of information about the activities and projects;

-promoting the visibility of the ASEM Education Process through better online communication (e.g. ASEM Education Secretariat website; ASEM Infoboard (www.aseminfoboard.org); members of the ASEM Education Process could also contribute to the relevant ASEM task force on visibility).

Considering the priority areas for post-ASEMME5, the participants suggested the continuation of the four existing priorities of the ASEM Education Process for continuity and stability. The participants of the discussion proposed the integration of additional topics within the framework of the existing priorities: TVET; Teacher education; EFA; ESD; Community engagement as responsibility of higher education institutions; (Social) entrepreneurship in higher education. At the same time it was also suggested to establish the Two Pillars system instead of asking whether four priority areas should be maintained or strictly concentrating on two thereof.

Sharing opinions on developing and establishing monitoring system or guidelines for implementing the ASEM Education priorities and reflecting their progress in the countries, participants agreed that firstly, there is a need to define a joint vision. From there, goals and specific objectives can be determined, milestones set and a road map developed. The proposal of Two Pillars approach was also pointed out as the system where the monitoring could take place (in the framework of the Pillar 2).

As assessment of intangible results, or impact, poses challenges when it comes to the evaluation, the members of the working groups emphasized the need for a better visibility and communication. It was pointed out to reinforce the role of AES (for instance, the role of website) for improving visibility.

The members of the discussion suggested that the existing monitoring/reporting tool the AES Stocktaking Report, could be further enhanced and promoted, for example by including statistics or by formulating indicators of progress for the various activities. It was recommended to reinforce AES to strict stocktaking and following up all the initiatives.

Some participants considered that at the moment there is no need for monitoring at all. During the SOM1 it was repeatedly recommended to use the initiatives and tools which already exist, integrate and improve them, as well as to make them more visible. Meanwhile there was expressed an opinion that the ASEM Education Process does not need monitoring since one of its primary functions is facilitating dialogue.

Furthermore, some other recommendations were expressed regarding the ASEMME5 agenda. The point was made that it is important to demonstrate the benefit of the ASEM process to the ministers, for instance, in the form of Working group "Quality Assurance and Recognition" presenting their work at ASEMME5. The participants of the discussion also agreed that the meeting aspect is important for the ministers and that interesting and impressive topics should be chosen (for example, balanced outputs, such as education, mobility, curricula; outcomes of the 10th ASEM Summit in Milan; open access – virtual mobility (MOOCs)). Some countries believe that the Ministerial Meeting should focus on one theme or challenge. In addition, it was proposed for the ministers to decide on the broad goals or even the vision. Furthermore, it was also suggested to invite inspirational speakers, as well as other stakeholders (for example, real students, teachers, representatives of non-governmental organizations and ASEM Rectors' Conference) who have benefited from the ASEM Education Process to the ASEMME5.

To recap, during the group discussions there was expressed a broad support to the Two Pillars system within the ASEM Education Process, the proposal for developing the vision document and involvement of stakeholders, especially students, rectors and teachers in the ASEM Education Process. Throughout the discussion there was also stressed the

importance of the visibility and coordination of the ASEM Education Process. The delegations recommended focusing on clear, realistic objectives and result-oriented activities, at the same time keeping it a multifaceted, multipurpose process.

22. The Chair concluded that according to the views expressed during the discussion held after presentations of the group discussions the ASEM process should include various educational levels, not only higher education. The delegations suggested not putting out the topics by the level of education, but looking at cross-cutting themes, for example, technological developments, balanced mobility, employability and skills.

23. The participants representing European countries proposed to change the theme of the ASEMME5 from "Harmonising ASEM Education Collaboration for Results" to "ASEM Education Collaboration for Results" or "ASEM Education Convergence for Results" as the word "harmonisation" in Europe has a very clear meaning and is frequently linked to the EU processes (for example, harmonising regulations, approaches and implementation). The word "harmonising" has a different meaning in Asia. Prof. Dr. Junaidi explained that the title "Harmonising ASEM Education Collaboration for Results" has been proposed because it continues the titling of the ASEMME4 "Strategizing ASEM Education Collaboration" and harmonising in this context means implementing the strategies together.

24. The Chair came back to the draft of ASEMME5 agenda and asked the delegations for comments. The Chair concluded that during the discussions about the proposals for ASEMME5 policy agenda (including side events) and the ASEMME5 Conclusions by the Chair the majority of delegations supported the proposal to have a one full day meeting for the ministers. Regarding the content to be discussed during the Ministerial Meeting it was proposed to present several extensive reports, for instance covering the open access issues or qualification frameworks. Apart from that, it was suggested to discuss the educational levels to be included in the ASEM Education Process.

25. It was recommended to focus more on choosing the theme of the discussion of working lunch of Ministers. There were proposed some potential topics of the discussion: request by the leaders and statements made at the 10th ASEM Summit and the cross-cutting themes, for example, technological developments, quality assurance and recognition, European area of skills and qualifications.

The presentations of the SOM1 are available at the following link: http://files.fm/u/byhckdx.

Summary Report of
ASEM Education Vision Survey

ANNEX 5

Asia-Europe Meeting

"New Visions for the ASEM Education Process"
Preparation for SOM2 on 26 April 2015 in Riga

VISIONS

How would you like to see the ASEM education cooperation in 5 years and beyond? In your view what developments, results and benefits the ASEM Education Process would bring about? What major obstacles to the ASEM Education Process do you see in the next 5 years?

Denmark is highly values the informal structure of the ASEM cooperation and belief that it is important to continue to support ASEM as a forum of dialogue between the countries involved. Denmark also agrees that a joint vision for the ASEM education process could serve as a constructive frame for the future collaboration in the context of ASEM. Denmark would like to increase the mobility of students and faculty as well as increase the number of strategic partnerships between institutions of higher education between Denmark and the ASEM countries. Denmark also would like the education cooperation process to focus on two overall themes in the coming years: 1) quality assurance and recognition of international activities 2) Reducing legal, administrative and educational barriers in study and placement mobility and joint and double degrees. Even though the emphasis in the cooperation will be on higher education it is essential to maintain a wide scope for the cooperation enabling member countries to work together and network in other educational domains to share mutual challenges and gain inspiration from one another. Denmark consider the major obstacles to the ASEM education process are quality assurance and recognition of international activities and national barriers that complicates international activities between the ASEM countries.

Croatia suggestions are as follows:

1. Increase the number of students at European Higher Education Institutions studying Asian languages or majoring in Asian studies;

2. Increase teacher and student mobility between Europe and Asia notably using EU programme Erasmus+ (International Mobility);

3. Increase Europe-Asia cooperation among higher education institutions and private companies.

Austria would like to stress that ASEM Education Process is and should remain a platform for dialogue and information exchange on topics of common interest.

Indonesia's expectation for further ASEM Education process is the acknowledgement and recognition of educational system among ASEM member countries, although the system itself cannot be equivalent.
The main obstacles are:

- Indonesia is still less commit to the programs
- For some program, there are lacks of result dissemination. Whereas other members also need to know the result or the main achievement of the program in order to be well informed.

Cyprus would like to see the ASEM education cooperation further expand on the following issues in 5 years:

a) development of clusters of Asian and European institutions and university partnership;
b) joint development of curricula and study programmes;
c) development of programmes in Asian languages at European universities and in European languages at Asian universities;
d) establishment of corresponding National Qualifications Framework in Asian and European countries;
e) establishment of a national ASEM Quality Assurance and Recognition System;
f) mutual recognition agreements between European and Asian Universities;
g) development of an inter-regional credit transfer system based on ACTS and ECTS and the establishment of an ASEM Credit Transfer System;
h) adaptation of EUROPASS to the needs of Asian –European exchange;
i) widening of EHEA in Asian countries;
j) introduction of more subjects related to European/Asian culture, history, politics, languages at universities as an extra incentive for mobility;
k) introduction of a scholarship policy for students from Asia/Europe;
l) establishment of an ASEM Open University; and
m) greater involvement in joint research programmes between universities across countries and involvement of local industries and businesses;

Cyprus believes that above mentioned cooperation would increase the balanced mobility between Asia and Europe, mobility of underrepresented groups, encourage distance learning and lifelong learning as well as sustainable human resource development and engagement of business and industry in education.

The Major obstacles observed by Cyprus are language barrier, lack of financial resources due to economic crisis in Europe/socioeconomic differences, different legislative contexts, immigration restrictions and recognition matters.

Latvia suggest to set concrete and realistic targets and objectives, as well as to follow their implementation without the cooperation losing its informal nature, It is recommended to focus on the uniqueness of the ASEM Education Process (avoid overlapping with the work of other organizations). Latvia noted that there are different experiences, interests and expectations from the cooperation. Different education systems, interests, history and culture of countries make it more difficult to define concrete and measurable targets. Taking advantage of the opportunities offered by the ASEM cooperation should be ensured that whenever priorities are set, it is done following the latest developments in this field. All members and stakeholders should be given the opportunity to take part in setting priorities,

at the same time ensuring the continuity of ASEM Education Process. A great value of ASEM cooperation is the collaboration with other stakeholders, such as non-governmental organisations of students and rectors etc. Greater regard should be given to implementing the initiatives launched. When taking new initiatives, it is necessary to determine the expected objective at an early stage, follow-up their implementation and make them visible. At the very beginning, each new initiative requires one or more leading countries. Considering the informal nature of the ASEM Education Process, in certain cases one of the obstacles is the financial resources (for example, to carry out external assessment or to participate in initiatives countries are interested in). Therefore, it is also necessary to seek other forms of cooperation, for instance using of online resources since distance and travel expenses represent an obstacle. Establishing and launching too many new initiatives and not ensuring monitoring and regular exchange and availability of the results of ASEM education initiatives to ASEM members and other stakeholders, the ASEM Education Process is losing focus.

Lithuania indicated that there are need for increase in visibility of all ASEM member states and transparency of their higher education systems, growing trust in quality education and fair recognition of qualifications, well-developed cooperation relations between national recognition authorities, increase in student and staff mobility, more partnerships and joint research, and better exploitation of opportunities offered by ICT in promoting virtual mobility. Lithuania stated that the major obstacles are lack of effective coordination, overlapping initiatives that lead to dissipated resources without tangible outcomes.

Germany suggested that further progress on missing recognition of qualifications and study periods as well as comparability of qualifications and learning outcomes have to be made to create more transparency because its hinder mobility of students and staff. The quality assurances issues also need to be further discussed for the cooperation between higher education institutions. The specific group of peoples appointed by Ministries for Education needed to follow-up the discussion on the different topics of above mentioned matter.

Portugal would like to assist to a consolidation of the actual developments and activities in ASEM education process, new proposals made for ASEMME5, frequent exchange of information and better knowledge of the higher education systems. The greater consolidation will help Portugal to consider the development of more projects and cooperation's among their Higher Education Institutions. Portugal informed that the major obstacle is the lack of resources namely financial resources.

United Kingdom would like to notice demonstrable results evidencing concrete activities / progress in cooperation across the two region. United Kingdom also said that mutual recognition and understanding of quality in qualifications remain key to demonstrable success in greater institutional partnerships, raising standards in Higher Education and Vocational Education and Training. Lack of clear governance structure and accountability is major obstacle identified by United Kingdom.

Australia believes that it is time to review the ASEM priority areas. Australia has particular interest in the current priority areas of quality assurance and recognition and balanced mobility. Australia also favors considering additional priorities such as research collaboration, teachers quality and standards and measurement of teaching and learning outcome.

Estonia stated that there is need for effective dialogue between the ASEM Member countries which supports the internationalization of higher education in both regions and effective network of participating countries to share their knowledge through different

seminars, and workshops for establishment of new co-operation forms between countries and higher education institution. Estonia identified that the major obstacle is the financing of ASEM informal platform cooperation and commitment of participating countries.

Romania stated that ASEM Education cooperation need to more concrete on joint projects in regards to research cooperation; increase the mobility of Vocational Education and Training (VET) students, academic staff and researchers from Europe to Asia and develop a Quality Assurance Framework for VET/TVET based on the European Quality Assurance Framework for VET. Romania also believes that the ASEM Education Process will contribute to make the education systems in Asia and Europe more compatible. Romania identified that the major obstacles are financing the ASEM education cooperation, recognition and equivalence of studies/diplomas and the coordination at the general and the workgroups levels.

The Russian Federation would like to see the cooperation in 5 years and beyond by enhancing a global educational space, development of the network collaboration, the augmentation of students flows from Europe to Asia and augmentation of English speaking students. The developments that ASEM Education Process would bring in the future are creation of a common educational space in the Eurasian continent, creation of a global market and academic mobility ad labor mobility without borders.

Singapore indicated that it has benefitted from the open sharing of experiences and best practices from the ASEM Education Process. The diversity of member states has been key in facilitating this and each member state contributes different experiences, challenges, and expertise in the field of education. Singapore suggests that the ASEM Education Process should leverage this diversity, and continue to provide a platform to encourage open dialogue between member states in particular the sharing of best practices between ASEM member countries.

Federation Wallonia-Brussels of Belgium would like to see the ASEM-Education Process strengthened with more consistency in the activities, projects, actions led by individual ASEM member ccountries and other regional processes (the Bologna Process in Europe and any comparable process in Asia) were being linked more systematically. Federation Wallonia-Brussels of Belgium also wanted the ASEM-Education Process bring new opportunities for all higher education stakeholders and reinforce the cooperation. The major obstacles for the ASEM-Education Process are to maintain the political momentum among national governments and the funding of the ASEM-Education Process.

Spain suggested that ASEM Education Process could involve in the dissemination process of the Erasmus+ call addressed to third countries and belived that a high participation of Asian countries in the programme would be a solid foundation for future cooperation. The major obstacles of ASEM Education Process are lack of knowledge of Asian languages on the part of European citizens/students, insufficient communication among school institutions and inadequate feedback of commercial and business exchanges to education institutions.

Belgium (Flemish Community) would like to increase the mobility and the exchange of students, teachers and academic collaboration between institutions in the field of teaching, research and community engagement. The benefits should be that the mobility of students and teachers and the increased academic collaboration that graduates are equipped with the 21st century skills and that they are better equipped to operate successfully in an international/global environment. Flemish community also suggested that the European-Asian forum on quality assurance involving all stakeholders should be held to have a

compendium of the quality assurance systems. The Major obstacles are capacity, bbudgetary constraints and ddepends too much on the willingness of individual countries.

Finland would like to suggest that the mobilty of students and teachers need to be emphasized in the ASEM Education Process and the quality assurance, qualifications framework and recognition need be included in the framework on mobility.
Norway recommended that the basic education and VET to be included in the ASEM Education Process for the development of ASEM Education Process

ASEM RESEARCH PILOT SCHEME

<mark>**Question 2**</mark>

Do you agree with the two-pillar model for ASEM Education Cooperation suggested at SOM1 in Riga?
Pillar 1: Platform for dialogue and information exchange on topics of common interest.
The current 4 priorities: Quality Assurance, Mobility, Engaging Business in Education, Lifelong Learning and VET.
New topics: teacher training, education for all, education for sustainable development
Pillar 2: Result-oriented concrete pilot projects.
-Which pilot project(s) does your country join at the moment?
-What new pilot project would your country like to initiate/coordinate or join in the near future?

Denmark is support the two-pillar model for ASEM Education Cooperation. Denmark is involved on the pilot project on Innovative competences and a report will submitted to the ASEMME5 in Riga, Latvia.

Croatia informed that the proposed two-pillar model for ASEM Education Cooperation is highly relevant. In addition to that, as a new member, Croatia has not yet joined any pilot projects but would like to deposit interest in projects dealing with cross-referencing mechanisms between regional qualifications frameworks in Europe and Asia, quality assurance in higher education and recognition, as well as mobility.

Austria informed that the proposed two pillar model for the ASEM Education Cooperation will surely lead to a more structured stage. The clear divide between the political discussion level and the result-oriented level of concrete pilot projects will bring forward the visibility of ASEM Education Process and its effectiveness.

Indonesia agrees with the proposal of SOM1 regarding the two pillars in ASEM Education Cooperation. The platform for dialogue is important as it will facilitate the members to share the common interest and best practices from countries. More concrete programs and results might be encouraged by the second pillar.

Indonesia is currently active in the following programs:

- Joint Curriculum Program
- ASEM Recognition on Bridging Declaration program
- Work Placement Program

Indonesia is currently developing a Joint Research Collaboration. This project will facilitate the postgraduate students or junior lecturer from universities in Asia and Europe to have international experiences from preparing until publishing research.

Latvia agrees with the two-pillar model for ASEM Education cooperation when each country is involved in the ASEM Education Process according to its interest and capacity. Maintaining political momentum is essential to ensure. Through the ASEM Education Process, it is important to discuss the current education issues and share experiences among the ASEM members, yet to have tangible results. However, Latvia sees the coordination of the two-pillar model as a potential challenge, taking into account that there should be a synergy between the both pillars.
Latvia is active in:

1) Working Group on the Implementation of the ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration;
2) Working Group on Innovative Competences and Entrepreneurship education;
3) Peer learning activities related to new approaches in quality assurance in Higher Education and/or to governance of higher education on 18-20 February in Belgium;
4) Expert Seminar "Dual Study Programmes - A Strategy to Expand Opportunities for ASEM Youth" on 31 March - 1 April 2014 in Germany
5) ASEM University-Business Seminar that will take place on 4 March in Brussels
6) 4th ASEM Rectors' Conference and Students' Forum (ARC4) on 23-27 March 2015 in Hangzhou, China

Cyprus agrees with the two-pillar model because the current four priorities and the new topics fall under the educational priorities of Cyprus. Cyprus also would like to emphasize the dialogue and information exchange on the current four priorities and on new topics of common interest (pillar 1). This dialogue and information exchange will lead to common strategies, practices and joint ventures. Cyrus also mentioned that result –oriented concrete pilot projects (pillar 2) would give European and Asian countries the opportunity to get involved in joint ventures, exchange/share information, collaborate and produce concrete results or come up with concrete suggestions.

Lithuania mentioned that there is need for make a clear division between dialogue-oriented cooperation as a platform for exchange of ideas and providing incentives for national strategies and result-oriented projects with tangible outcomes. However, Lithuania not in favour with institution-oriented but in favour with system-oriented projects which would help to understand better systems of the partner states. Lithuania currently jointing in working group on a Joint Curriculum Development Programme in Tourism and Hospitality, ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration and Interregional credit transfer mechanisms among ASEM member countries.

Germany agrees with the two-pillar model for ASEM Education Cooperation and suggested that the first pillar need to constitute a broad platform for dialogue and exchange of good practice. The second pillar need to encourage countries to develop concrete initiatives and programs where this encouragement could lead into a specific commitment to certain topics and activities and the progress of these projects/activities need to be monitored. Germany is currently involved in the working group on the implementation of the ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration; interregional ASEM Work Placement Pilot Programme; and ASEM Joint Curriculum Programme. Further to that the German Federal Ministry of Education and

Research financially supports the development of an ASEM Studies' Curriculum Module. Germany suggested that the module shall be part of a MA level programme offered in a study curriculum such as European Studies, Asian Studies, and Southeast Asian Studies. In this context, the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the German Rectors' Conference (HRK) have selected three projects.

Portugal strongly support the two pillar model and suggested that the four priority areas need be maintained as they are still pertinent and a good basis for the cooperation between the two regions. As unemployment of young qualified people is a very important issue for Portugal, they suggested a new topics for ASEM Education Process namely development of basic, transferable and professional skills which will facilitate integration in the labour market.

United Kingdom (UK) informed that the Pillar 2 is good in principle but efforts need to be made to track progress and measure impact of concrete projects. However, the mutual understanding and acceptance of qualifications remain an issue. Therefore, UK suggests that clear aims need to be agreed to and committed to in terms mutual recognition of qualifications. UK plays a lead role in developing the ASEM Bridging Declaration on Recognition of Qualification.

Australia agrees with the two-pillar model for ASEM Education Cooperation and would like to include teacher training in pillar 1 with focus on quality and standards. Australia also suggests that in the process of selecting pilot projects attention should be given to prevention of duplication. Australia is currently active in UNESCO work on development of global guidelines for the recognition of TVET recognition and ongoing implementation of the Asia-Pacific regional recognition conventions. Australia is also negotiating alignments between the Australian Qualifications Framework and both the New Zealand Qualifications Framework and the European Qualifications Framework. The New Colombo Plan is a signature $100 million initiative of the Australian Government which aims to lift knowledge of the Indo-Pacific in Australia and strengthen people-to-people and institutional relationships. The 2014 pilot phase has supported around 1300 mobility program students and forty scholarship holders to study in four pilot locations – Indonesia, Japan, Singapore and Hong Kong. From 2015, the New Colombo Plan has expanded to include over 30 host locations across the Asia-Pacific region, with 69 scholarships and around $10 million in mobility grants supported in 2015 and the 2016 round is expected to open in mid-2015.

Estonia agrees with the proposal of two-pillar model for ASEM Education Cooperation and suggests that the goal oriented common activities and the priority of "Quality assurance" need to be included in the second pillar. Estonia is considering inviting annually 2-3 specialists from ASEM member countries to participate in the process of the external evaluation of higher education institutions/study programmes both at the level of higher education and Vocational Education and Training (VET). The host will be the Estonian Higher Education Quality Agency (EKKA) a full member of the ENQA and registered in the EQAR since 2013.

Romania agrees with the proposal of two-pillar model for ASEM Education Cooperation Romania is interested to participate in both pillars according to the relevancy of the Romanian institutions of higher education and research and suggests TVET to be include in the Pillar 1. Romania also would like to initiate/coordinate/join Erasmus+ programme, project for volunteer teachers and other stakeholders to address "Education for All" (EFA) through a joint task force and development of Quality Assurance Framework for Vocational Education and Training (VET).

The Russian Federation agrees with the proposal of two-pillar model for ASEM Education Cooperation and would like to join the Cross Border Quality Assurance Network (CBQAN).

Singapore affirmed that the two-pillar model proposed at ASEM SOM1 in Riga would facilitate the ASEM Education Cooperation. The first pillar will ensure that the ASEM member countries will continue to engage each other on topics of common interest. The second pillar will allow the ASEM member countries that are interested in particular areas to take action on pilot projects. Singapore also suggests that there is important to give the member states the discretion to decide which projects they are interested in according to the diversity and different priorities of each ASEM member countries . The four priorities under the ASEM Education Process should also be reviewed regularly to ensure that the four priorities continue to be relevant to ASEM member countries .

Japan indicated that a platform for dialogue and information exchange on topics of common interest is important in order to share best practices from each member state and further to develop efforts undertaken in ASEM countries. Japan also would choose a small number of new topics after a series of debates and will proceed with specific pilot projects.

Finland is strongly support the two–pillar model and would like to suggest that the targets and priorities for the ASEM cooperation should be created in the policy dialogue, which is open to all members and sets the overall direction for co-operation. Finland is interested in joining the possible new research pilot scheme.

Belgium (Flemish Community) stated that the projects/initiatives have to be linked to the priorities and need to create a distinction between the core priorities (the current priorities) and the new topics. **Belgium (Flemish Community)** suggests that the cooperation between the European countries and the Asian countries in the field of education need to be lead to a geographical space where the trans-regional exchange and mobility of students and researchers will be strengthened. ASEM Education cooperation also need to lead to a number of concrete joint actions as with regard to quality assurance, degree structure and recognition of diplomas; actions with agreements on concrete results to be achieved. The pilot projects involved by **Belgium (Flemish Community)** are project on joint curriculum development and project on workplacements. **The Federation Wallonia-Brussels of Belgium** and **Belgium (Flemish Community)** has organized the PLA about quality assurance in higher education and the ASEM University-Business forum in Brussels. The new projects or new initiatives are interested by **Belgium (Flemish Community)** are to join on credit systems, flexible learning paths, learning outcomes, quality assurance and relevance, employability and doctoral education and doctoral schools.

The Federation Wallonia-Brussels of Belgium fully support to have more result-oriented projects and believed that such projects require in most of the cases a platform for dialogue and information exchanges. **The Federation Wallonia-Brussels of Belgium deliberate** that the ASEM-Education Process to remain politically relevant and need to tackle both political issues between both regions and provide tangible results. Currently the Federation Wallonia-Brussels of Belgium is participating in the Working Group (WG) on the "Bridging Declaration". They are interested in participating in the WG on learning outcomes and credits system and also offer to host a meeting. The future cooperation interested by **the Federation Wallonia-Brussels of Belgium are** on credit systems, qualifications frameworks and learning outcomes, institutional cooperation and recognition of foreign qualifications.

Spain indicated that a more focused and concrete approach is desirable and result-oriented concrete pilot projects constitute an excellent asset. Priority should be given to mobility and quality assurance/quality certification. The dissemination of the projects and their results also would be desirable.

Norway has participates in the project on Innovative competences and Entrepreneurship education

To fill in the absence of research in the current ASEM Education Process agenda, would your country like to support a small-scale pilot "ASEM Research Scheme" and "ASEM Research Grant" or "ASEM Scholarships"?

What major research cooperation projects with ASEM partners in the other region (Asian or European countries) does your country have? Please give 1 or 2 examples.

What research fields (e.g. bio-technology, environment, medicine, education, renewable energy, public health, etc.) would your country priorities and sponsor in a pilot "ASEM Research Scheme"? Kindly note that this scheme will only supplement your current bilateral projects, not to replace them.

Croatia indicated that, since a small-scale pilot projects proposal probably involves additional national funding, therefore Croatia would like to propose focus on existing possibilities in the framework of Horizon 2020. Croatia has an intensive bilateral research cooperation with P.R. China through co-financing joint research projects between Croatian and Chinese researchers and 50 joint projects have been implemented since 1998.Cooperation with Japan will no longer be carried out through bilateral government cooperation but in the framework of the programmes 'Vulcanus in Japan' and 'Minerva' (in the framework of the Center for Industry Cooperation EU-Japan). Croatia priority research fields for cooperation includind biotechnology, environment and renewable energy.

Austria informed that the idea of introducing pilot projects is appealing but nevertheless it has to be taken into account that these pilot projects should first address countries that are already in an advanced state in the respective area.

Indonesia is currently developing a proposal for ASEM Joint research Collaboration which will involve research center from the countries in Asia and Europe to actualize the centers of excellences. Indonesia has already established several research cooperations with countries in Asia and Europe, such as Australia, Japan, France, etc. Indonesia would priorities several research fields:

- Energy
- Food
- Health
- Biodiversity (environment, agriculture, renewal energy)
- Infrastructure
- ICT

Latvia informed that there is an ASEM-DUO programme. For them to comment on the pilot "ASEM Research Scheme" **and "ASEM Research Grant" or "ASEM Scholarships"** they would be grateful for more detailed information. Latvia has a legal framework with some Asian ASEM countries in the form of intergovernmental and interministerial agreements within which the cooperation in the field of science is possible. Cooperation with other Asian

countries is also indirect – through project of EU framework programmes. Currently Latvia is participating in EU programme's ERA-NET platform INNO INDIGO, which aims to support cooperation between researches of EU and India. For 2014 call there was submitted one project proposal for dealing with drinking water issues (LV Project Partner – Riga Technical University). It is planned to participate in 2015 call (theme – health issues like diabetes and infections). Latvia would need more information about the pilot "ASEM Research Scheme" to decide on the potential involvement.

The scientific potential in Latvia is developed on the basis of existing scientific traditions. Such traditions exist in organic chemistry, medical chemistry, genetic engineering, physics, materials science and information technologies as well as in several social and humanitarian sciences. The Guidelines on Research, Technology Development and Innovation for 2014–2020 contain the Smart Specialisation Strategy defining the main directions for transformation of the economy, growth priorities and smart specialisation areas. The key direction is economic transformation to knowledge- and technology-driven growth and catching up towards development of knowledge-based skills. The strategy also identifies the following specialisation areas: (1) knowledge-based bio-economy, (2) biomedicine, medical appliances, bio-pharmacy and bio-technology, (3) advanced materials, technologies and engineering systems, (4) smart energy and (5) ICT.

Cyprus informed that, currently does not have any research cooperation projects with ASEM partners in the Asian region. Cyprus prioritise the research fields namely energy, tourism, transport-shipping, agriculture-food, construction, health, environment, information and telecommunications technologies.

Portugal proposes a scheme of partnerships with Horizon 2020 in order to give priority to the research fields that are eligible for funding under this program.

Australia highlighted that the Australian Government's Endeavour Scholarships and Fellowships provides opportunities for citizens of the Asia-Pacific, the Middle East, Europe and the Americas to undertake study, research or professional development in Australia and for Australian to do the same in overseas. This scheme plays an important role in supporting research collaboration between Australia and countries in Asia and Europe.

Estonia believes that small scale research co-operation could be managed bilaterally between the respective countries and universities/research institutions. Currently, Estonian universities are actively cooperating with many Asian partner institutions such as a Scrub Nurse Robot for endoscopic and laparoscopic surgery was developed in cooperation between the Tallinn University of Technology (TUT), Estonia and the Tokyo Denki University, Japan and the Estonian Research Council has a three years agreement with the National Science Council of Taiwan for exchange of researches.. Besides that, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency has financed Estonia - Vietnam research project in medicine. The goal of the project was to raise the quality of higher education in medicine in Vietnamese universities.

Romania welcomes and interested to support the ASEM Research Grant in a small scale according to the topic and the funding scheme. Romania has bilateral cooperation with China, South Korea, India and Vietnam in field of education. Romania's smart specialization fields as described in the National Strategy for RDI 2014-2020 are bioeconomy, ICT, space and security, snergy, environment and climate change, eco-nanotechnologies and advanced materials, health, national heritage and cultural identity and new and emerging technologies. Romania highlighted that any of above scientific fields can be developed in a potential pilot project if agreed by programme partners.

The Russian Federation has a Russia-EU Year of Science project as major research cooperation projects with ASEM partners. The Russian Federation also indicated the scientific interest and innovation and the contribution to the collaboration among the ASEM member countries determines the priorities for a pilot 'ASEM Research Scheme".

Japan has some programs to support bilateral and multilateral joint research with European countries. Japan implemented "CONCERT-Japan" as a project aiming at promoting research cooperation between Japan and European countries under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7). In the "CONCERT-Japan" project, funding agencies from both Japan and European countries exchanged information on their funding schemes, as well as carried out joint call for proposals and joint support of Japan-Europe joint research projects in the fields of "Resilience against Disasters", "Efficient Energy Storage and Distribution" and "Photonic Manufacturing"

Finland is interested in joining the possible new research pilot scheme and hoped that there will be no overlapping with the work already done in other ASEM processes, especially in the fields of economy and innovation. Finland is also open for many fields such as health, food security and safety, water management, renewable energy and ICT.

The Federation Wallonia-Brussels needs a further consultation internally about the relevance for an ASEM research scheme. In terms policy areas, the Federation Wallonia-Brussels are active in the integration of social sciences and humanities into interdisciplinary research projects; interdisciplinary research about ageing and well-being; interdisciplinary research in biodiversity and ecosystems; digital humanities; the developments of open access, open data and more generally open science and the mobility of researchers at all level of career developments including aspects related to gender balance and training of early career researchers.

Spanish Universities are already integrated into the "Euro-Latin American Knowledge Space". There is a growing interest in research projects related to Asia scope, and some Spanish Universities are offering Asian Studies (Complutense in Madrid, Sevilla University, Málaga University and Autónoma University in Barcelona). The major research active by Spanish are areas in socio-cultural, economic and political.

HOSTING FUTURE MEETINGS

Question 4

Would your country like to host the Intermediate Senior Officials Meeting (ISOM) in 2016 in order to keep the momentum for the ASEM Education cooperation and follow up activities agreed in the ASEMME5 Chairs' Conclusion?
(ISOM 2014 in China:)

Croatia would consider hosting future meetings following some experience with the ASEM cooperation.

Germany informed that they has already hosted two SOMs and one ministerial meeting in 2008.

Estonia will consider hosting ISOM in the future but not in 2016.

The Russian Federation would like to host the ISOM in 2016.

Belgium (Flemish Community) and Federation Wallonia-Brussels of Belgium currently discussing on the possibility of hosting the ISOM 2016.

Question 5

In 2018 the ASEM Education Process will celebrate its 10 years of operation. What ideas would you suggest to plan and implement at regional and inter-regional level from this year in order to see concrete results in the next 2-3 years?

Croatia believes that peer-learning activities would lead to concrete results and benefit both EU and Asia.

Indonesia expects for the interoperability among countries. The concrete recognition should be implemented.

Latvia suggested that it is of high importance that the work is continued on the existing activities and projects in the light of rapid changes in the labour market affecting also education systems. There is a need to implement and strengthen activities related to improving development of students' skills for their better employability. For Latvia quality assurance and fair recognition will be one of the priorities both at national and international level.

Cyprus suggested that the joint university programmes, exchange of students and staffs, mutual recognition agreements between Asian and European countries and corresponding Quality Assurance System need to plan and implement at regional and inter-regional level from this year to see concrete results in the next 2-3 years.

Germany suggested that programs already announced such as ASEM Work Placement Pilot Programme and ASEM Joint Curriculum Programme need to be implemented and the Alumni of these programs need to be invited for the celebration in 2018. Further to that the ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration needs to be pushed forward and could be signed during the 2018 meeting.

Portugal proposes a preparation of publication and events including some testimonials of beneficiaries which would allow the results and impacts of the ASEM Education Process to be more visible for stakeholders.

United Kingdom proposes a publication of a comparative study on the status of mutual recognition of qualifications and quality regimes of ASEM.

For the Jubilee Year of 2018, **Finland** suggests that the Rector's Conference and Students' Forum need to extend to mobilize more people from the grass root level to the ASEM Education Process. Moreover, Spain highlighted that attention need to be given for the promotion of means to improve training opportunities, integration into the labor market and equity and social integration.

Estonia suggests that a conference devoted to the anniversary in both regions could be organised and a short booklet or information on the web site about the ASEM Education Process and achievements.

Romania suggests a set of indicators need to establish to monitor the achievement level of the activities planned within the 2-pillar model.

Question 6

Would your country like to host ASEMME7 in Europe in 2019 and ASEMME8 in Asia in 2021?

There was a suggestion that future ASEMME can be co-hosted by more than one member country. Do you think the idea of co-hosting by one Asian and one European country is realistic?

Denmark hosted the ASEMME3 in 2009 and would to propose other EU countries to host ASEMME7. Denmark informed that the idea of co-hosting is good and it is more realistic to co-host with a neighboring country.

Croatia would consider hosting future meetings following some experience with the ASEM cooperation. Croatia also believes that it is more practical to have two hosts (neighbouring countries) from either Europe or Asia and this would be very helpful for small countries.

Austria informed that, in view of the Austrian EU Presidency in the first half of 2019, Austria gladly would like to host ASEMME7.

Latvia support that the Asian and European countries to jointly organize one of the meetings, it is necessary to agree on assignment of the responsibilities between co-hosts and the ASEM Education Secretariat, but, on the whole, we could support this idea.

Cyprus proposes that ASEMME could be organized same like BFUG (Bologna Process). The idea of co-hosting is realistic because the expenses, workload and all the practical details needed to be cared of can be shared by two countries. However, a good coordination will be necessary for the idea of co-host.

Lithuania proposes an idea of Chairmanship and Vice – Chairmanship as example of Bologna process. It could help to strengthen cooperation between the countries in the two regions and also would assure continuity of the process.

Estonia support that the ASEMME can be co-hosted by more than one member country in the future, if both participating countries agreed.

Germany thinks that the idea of co-hosting by one Asian and one European country is realistic and the Asian-European cooperation character would be underlined., but it will cause more work in advance. However, the meeting can be managed if the meeting organized every three years.

Portugal stated that it will be difficult and more complicated to have two hosts for the Ministerial meetings. Portugal is suggests to retain the meetings alternate between Europe and Asia.

Romania is in the midst of internal consultation to decide on whether able to host the ASEMME7 during the Presidency of the EU Council by Romania. Romania will inform the decision after receiving the information on what the organization of ASEMME7 would imply for the host country. In regards to the idea of co-hosting the future ASEMME with an Asian country, Romania believes it could establish a cooperation mechanism which would facilitate easy communication, division of responsibilities and tasks between ASEM Members countries.

The Russian Federation indicated that being in the same time with Asian and European country the Russian Federation will be honored by hosting ASEMME7 in its European part as well as ASEMME8 in its Asian part. The Russian Federation highlighted that the idea of co-hosting the future ASEMME will decrease the financial burden and it will also demands rationalized cooperative work to keep a balance between two hosting countries.

The Federation Wallonia-Brussels of Belgium is unlikely in the position to host the ASEMME7 in 2019**.**

Finland acknowledged that the present system having every other ministerial meeting in Asia and every other in Europe is excel lent and it would be not very practical to bring a third partner in the preparations. The co-organisation by an Asian and a European country is great sign for the ASEM cooperation based on the experiences observed for the Bologna Process. However, the **Federation Wallonia-Brussels of Belgium** suggest that need to be very careful about this option because it is logistically very difficult especially for countries from two different regions.

ASEM EDUCATION SECRETARIAT'S SERVICES

ASEM Education Secretariat (AES) has the following key functions:

   a) **Coordinate ASEM educational activities;**
   b) **Help the preparations for ASEM Ministerial Meetings; and**
   c) **Facilitate the implementation of result-oriented projects.**

What suggestions would you like to make for the Secretariat's future activities to implement the above strategic plan and facilitate effective communications to member countries and stakeholders, as well as the wider public and external organisations?

Denmark finds that it is important to keep the tasks and procedures of the AES as simple and transparent as possible. The tasks of the AES should be based on a well-documented need for support in a majority of the ASEM member countries. AES should maintain its

profile as an informal forum for dialogue, sharing of inspiration and deliberation of mutual challenges.

Croatia informed that, they are still getting acquainted with operation of the ASEM Education Secretariat.

Austria highlighted that the key functions of the AES are extremely valuable an helpful and should therefore be at the further disposal of the ASEM members.

Indonesia noted several suggestions for AES Services:

- AES should keep updating the information, especially newsletter. Thus the member will be well informed with the progress of ASEM Education Process.
- AES is demanded to be the best communicator. The persistence in informing the members must be sustained.
- All documents of activities should be well achieved; therefore the members can easily measure the progress of ASEM Education process.

Latvia commented on AES Services that:
- Support mainly in relation to the flow and availability of information and ensuring that both regions (Europe and Asia) have updated contacts on SOM participants and ministers. This will help hosts of ISOM, SOM, ASEMME when organizing the meetings.
- Primarily ensure a regular exchange and availability of information on <u>working group results</u>.
- Facilitate the implementation of result-oriented projects.
- Promoting the visibility of the ASEM Education Process through better online communication (e.g. ASEM Education Secretariat website; ASEM Infoboard (www.aseminfoboard.org);
- members of the ASEM Education Process could also contribute to the relevant ASEM task force on visibility).
- (Make updates on information in website to make available current information on initiatives and results, thus promoting both visibility of process and extent of examples of good practice.), however, it is necessary to also identify other means of communications
- Expert secondment to AES plays a significant role, promoting greater involvement in the ASEM Process, thus strengthening AES capacity.
- Preparation of analytic Stocktaking Report.

Cyprus suggests that AES need to implement the mentioned strategic plan and facilitate effective communications to member countries and stakeholders as well as the wider public and external organizations. AES also need to update AES website and establish an online platform, coordinate bilateral agreements and need to have an international composition for better coordination.

Lithuania suggests that AES need to promote better visibility of the ASEM Education process, more coordination of activities and measures and exchange information on the existing initiatives and tools available for strengthening ASEM Education Process.

Portugal suggests that the SOM meetings need to be more regular in order for ASEM member countries to express their views and exchange their practices more often and the meeting alternate between Europe and Asia.

United Kingdom preferred that AES need to be proactive in collating and communicating shared and individual interests of ASEM member countries.

Estonia suggests that AES need to have a well-functioning web site and more concentrate on policy dialogue, cooperation structures and other themes open to all. Estonia also highlights that the pilot projects need to be based on the commitment of the ASEM members countries and AES need to play role as information exchange in this type of projects.

Romania suggests that AES need to establish an executive unit/coordination structure for the development and implementation of joint projects in Asia and Europe and find a solution for a funding body for these joint projects and develop a road map and monitoring system to effectively coordinate the ASEM education process.

Japan highlighted that AES should determine a specific area of cooperation within the ASME member countries and need to be clear what is needed in terms of lobbying outside parties.

Finland point out that AES need to be actively facilitate creation of cooperation structures between Asian and EU countries and need to focus on networking with external organizations which could highly beneficial for the ASEM as a brand for wider public. The Secretariat also need to have a regularly update informative website that content all the necessary information about relevant authorities in priority fields (e.g. in recognition, mobility, qualifications frameworks) in ASEM member countries. This would facilitate a true co-operation between those structures which are operational in the priority fields in Europe and Asia.

Belgium (Flemish Community and Federation Wallonia-Brussels of Belgium) suggest that the secretariat need to have a strong support from the national ministry/government so that the secretariat has the sufficient financial and human resources to fulfill their missions. Belgium (Flemish Community and Federation Wallonia-Brussels of Belgium) also encouraged participation of seconded experts from other ASEM member countries, where it could reinforce the Asia-European character of the secretariat and strongly suggest that the AES need to be very proactive in terms of follow-up and communication towards the ASEM Education Process of the ASEM member countries.

ASEM Expert Seminar on Dual Study Program

ANNEX 6

LESSONS LEARNED:
ASEM EXPERT SEMINAR "DUAL STUDY PROGRAMME- A STRATEGY TO EXPAND OPPORTUNITIES FOR ASEM YOUTH"

Based on *ASEM Education Secretariat* Participation

1. Program Overview

    On behalf of the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the German Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training (BIBB) have organized an ASEM Expert Seminar entitled "Dual Study Programme- A strategy to expand opportunities for ASEM youth". As reflected in the Chair's Conclusion of the fourth Asia-Europe Meeting of Ministers for Education (ASEMME4), the main purpose of the seminar was to exchange experiences and lessons learnt in the field of dual education (point D.33).

    Convened in Nuremberg, Germany, from 31 March to 1 April 2014, the two days seminar was attended by representatives from ASEM Education member countries such as Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, China, Denmark, Germany, Indonesia, Latvia, Lithuania, Malaysia, the Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Spain, and Turkey. A wide range of speakers from education institutions and companies in Germany as well as Education Ministries in Asia were involved as resource persons.

2. Executive Summary

    Whether it is in Europe or Asia, the demand for skilled labours and workers remains high; finding skilled labours and workers is a real challenge for any employer. Universities recognize the need for manufacturers and other industries to find qualified workers. Supported by the government, Dual Study programmes are a triangular collaboration to solve this challenge.

    2.1. Success Factors

    a. Double qualification from academic and practical education.
    b. Mutual advantages for industries (career ready employee), universities (practitioners as part of educator), and students (training in a real working situation).
    c. High employability upon graduation.

    2.2. Primary Challenges

    a. Review of existing curriculum design and design of new curriculum.
    b. Developing a conceptual design of programmes compatible to universities and industries.
    c. Ownership and support from industries.
    d. Dual study courses are perceived as something less than traditional study courses.
    e. How to involve informal and non-formal sectors.
    f. Universal recognition.

    2.3. Top Recommendations

    a. Possible for international collaboration.

b. Forms of international collaboration: (i) student and faculty exchange; (ii) study-abroad internship tandem; (iii) Stand-Alone Programme; (iv) Special Holiday Programme; (v) Inter-country Dual Training Programme.

c. Small Medium Enterprises as potential partners.

3. Lessons Learned

3.1. The purpose of Dual Study Programmes may be different in each country. However, they seem to be an effective strategies to increase the number of skilled workers.

3.2. ASEM Education member countries acknowledge the significance of Dual Study Programmes and would have a further discussion on how to collaborate on this subject.

3.3. Future projects: the formation of networks between Higher Education and/or TVET entities to figure out cooperation possibilities on Dual Study Programmes among ASEM Education member countries.

Intermediate Senior Official's Meeting (ISOM) of the ASEMME5

ANNEX 7

Ministry of Education and Culture
Republic of Indonesia

Asia-Europe Meeting

Intermediate Senior Officials Meeting of ASEMME5
Hangzhou, 7-9 May 2014

SUMMARY ON IMPLEMENTATION:
FOUR PRIORITIES OF ASEM EDUCATION PROCESS

Prof. Aris Junaedi
Director of the AES, Jakarta-Indonesia

Activities – Based on Chair's Conclusions of ASEMME4

A. Quality Assurance and Recognition	Implementation	Initiator/Coordinator
1 Facilitating the dialogue in the field of quality assurance and recognition (Chair' Conclusions A.12)	25-26 August 2014 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia	Malaysia
2 Establishing a higher education quality assurance centre for Asia (A.12)	July 2012	Japan
3 Setting up a new working group under the ASEAN+3 Education Ministers Meeting (A.12) • 1st Working Group on Mobility of Higher Education and Ensuring Quality Assurance of Higher Education among ASEAN+3 Countries	31 Sept 2013 Tokyo, Japan	Japan
• 2nd Working Group of Promoting Mobility of Higher Education and Ensuring Quality Assurance in Asia	16 October 2014 Bali, Indonesia	Japan and Indonesia
4 Establishing a Cross-border Quality Assurance Network in Higher Education (CBQAN) (A.12)	A charter has been preliminary reviewed and a webpage (within ANICs website) has been designed	China, Malaysia, and UK

Activities – Based on Chair's Conclusions of ASEMME4

Asia-Europe Meeting

A. Quality Assurance and Recognition	Implementation	Initiator/Coordinator
5 Peer learning activities related to new approaches in quality assurance in Higher Education and/or to governance of higher education (autonomy, responsibility and accountability) (A.15)	23-24 October 2014 Brussels, Belgium	Belgium (Flemish Community and French Community)
6 Working group on the implementation of the ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration (A.16)	10-11 Dec 2013 Kunming, China	China
7 To set up a website for ASIAN NICs (A.17)- to be in close cooperation with ENIC-NARICs	In the phase of uploading information of Asian Countries	China and Indonesia
8 Expert group to discuss interregional credit transfer mechanisms among ASEM member countries (A.18)	TBD	Australia, Belgium (French Community), Brunei Darussalam, China, Estonia, Lithuania Malaysia. Portugal and Thailand

Activities – Based on Chair's Conclusions of ASEMME4

B. Engaging Business and industry in Education	Implementation	Initiator/Coordinator
1 Organising the 4th University Business Forum (UBF) and 5th UBF (B.21)	Belgium and Vietnam agree to swap. 4th UBF will be held by Vietnam (2014) while 5th UBF will be held by Belgium (2015)	4th UBF: Vietnam 5th UBF: Belgium (Flemish Community and French Community)
2 Implementing the ASEM Work Placement Pilot Programme (B.22)	TBD	Belgium (Flemish Community), Brunei Darussalam, Germany and Thailand
3 Organizing 4th ASEM Rectors Conference and Students' Forum (B.20)	23-26 Sept 2014 Bangkok, Thailand	ASEF

Activities – Based on Chair's Conclusions of ASEMME4

C. Balanced Mobility		Implementation	Initiator/Coordinator
1	Willingness to develop – in cooperation with other interested ASEM members – a strategy on better balancing mobility for ASEMME5 in Latvia. The strategy will include proposals for concrete activities to overcome the imbalance in mobility between Asia and Europe. (C.23)	Draft proposal: AEI-ASEM Summer Camps ASEM International Seminar on Balanced Mobility: 25-26 August 2014 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia	Malaysia and Asia Europe Institute (AEI)
2	Developing and disseminating the DEEP (Database on Education Exchange Programmes) database (C.24)	Phase III: ongoing	ASEF
3	Implementing the ASEM Joint Curriculum Development Pilot Scheme(C.31)	TBD	Belgium (Flemish Community and French Community), Brunei Darussalam, Germany, Indonesia, Lithuania and Malaysia

Activities – Based on Chair's Conclusions of ASEMME4

D. Lifelong Learning including Technical and Vocational Education and Training	Implementation	Initiator/Coordinator
1 Organising an expert seminar on dual study program (D.33)	31 Mar - 1 Apr 2014 Nuremberg, Germany	Germany
2 Organising an international ASEM seminar on Lifelong Learning (D.33)	25-26 August 2014 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia	Malaysia
3 Developing a programme for improving innovative and entrepreneurial skills and competences in school education (D.34) • 1st Working Group of ASEMME Program on Innovative Competences • 2nd Working Group of ASEMME Program on Innovative Competences	 30 Sept - 2 Oct 2013 Copenhagen, Denmark 27-29 Jan 2014 Singapore	Denmark (coordinator), Brunei Darussalam, the Czech Republic, Latvia, Malaysia, Norway, Korea, Singapore and Viet Nam
4 Global National Qualifications Framework (NQF) Inventory (ongoing) (D.35)	TBD	European Training Foundation (ETF), European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop) and UNESCO

- 7 partners prefers the ASEMME5 to be held: 27-28 April 2015
- 4 partners prefers the ASEMME5 to be held: 22-23 June 2015

Thank You

ASEM Dialogue and Seminar on Quality Assurance and Recognition, Balanced Mobility and Lifelong Learning

ANNEX 8

ASEM INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR ON BALANCED MOBILITY
25-26 AUGUST 2014
PUTRA WORLD TRADE CENTRE, KUALA LUMPUR

The ASEM International Seminar on Balanced Mobility was hosted by the Asia-Europe Institute (AEI), University of Malaya in collaboration with the Ministry of Education Malaysia (MOE) and ASEM Education Secretariat at the Putra World Trade Centre, Kuala Lumpur from 25-26 August 2014. The seminar had successfully attracted the interest of many participants who directly and indirectly involved in the field of higher education as it has received an outstanding response where approximately 90 participants that includes 20 international participants from ASEM member countries, Professors, representatives from Higher Education Institutions, governments, media and other related stakeholders attended the Seminar.

Encompassing both local and international presenters, the Seminar was able to discuss on a broader aspect of issues relating to balanced mobility. The Seminar was interactively conducted based on two major themes. For the theme on the relations between Asia and Europe in educational matters, topics on how to facilitate and increasing the number of students and researchers from Europe to come to Asia through ASEM Fellowship Programme, and how to achieve balance mobility between Asia and Europe through ASEAN Erasmus Mundus were discussed. The presenters involved were Professor Emeritus Dr. Surin Pitsuwan from Thammasat University, Thailand and Professor Dr. Reimund Seidelmann, former professor of University of Giessen, Germany.

For the theme on promoting mobility among student and researcher in Asia

and Europe, the session was utilised with presentations on the mechanisms that can be used to promote balanced mobility between Asia and Europe and the cross-cultural mobility initiatives done by Korea University to help promoting balanced mobility. The seminar also has been brightened up with the presentation on how student mobility programmes is so successful in Europe from Malaysia Quality Assurance (MQA) perspective, how University-Industry Partnership for Entrepreneurial Skills as a ways to promote Balanced Mobility, and the value of cross cultural experiences. The speakers for the session involved Professor Dato' Dr. Mohd Amin Jalaludin, Vice Chancellor of University of Malaya, Professor Dr. Sung Jin Kang from Korea University, Professor Zita Mohd Fahmi from Malaysia Qualification Agency, Dato' Zurainah Musa from Berjaya Corporation Berhad, and Associate Professor Dr. Marco Buente from Monash University, Australia.

The two-day event witnessed an in-depth sharing of ideas and feedbacks on balanced mobility and initiatives that are being undertaken to promote the strategies and activities that can accelerate the mobility of students and researchers from Europe to Asia, thus strengthening the socio-cultural partnership among the ASEM member countries. The interactive sessions have promoted better understanding on the importance of having a balanced mobility as mobility does not entail just the physical movement of students and staffs but also the movement of ideas

The seminar facilitate to strengthen Malaysia's position and capabilities in coordinating international discussions that involves respected scholars from ASEM member countries as well as promoting Asia-Europe academic programs and activities to attract more European students to study in Asia. In line with these national agendas, AEI is prepared to be the local entry point in spearheading Malaysia's ASEM Balanced Mobility strategy. The institute is expected to host the international students from ASEM member states for its

inaugural Summer Camp program in 2015. At the same time, AEI is also exploring possible collaboration pathways for the post-2015 Summer Camp program with other potential Asian partners by drawing upon various suggestions made by the speakers in the recent ASEM International Seminar on Balanced Mobility. This will be highly significant in strengthening the Summer Camp program in the long-term.

ASEM INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR ON LIFELONG LEARNING
25-26 AUGUST 2014
PUTRA WORLD TRADE CENTRE, KUALA LUMPUR

The ASEM International Seminar on Lifelong Learning was hosted by the Ministry of Education Malaysia (MOE) in collaboration with ASEM Education Secretariat at the Putra World Trade Centre (PWTC), Kuala Lumpur from 25th until 26th August 2014. The seminar was attended by 143 participants from 16 ASEM member countries as well as two international organizations comprises of academic representatives and experts in the field of higher education and industrial relations.

The seminar consisted of a forum followed by four plenary sessions with specific themes:

1) Forum: Collaborative Effort In Promoting Lifelong Learning: Issues, Challenges and The Way Forward

2) Plenary Session 1: National Strategies For Lifelong Learning

3) Plenary Session 2: Intensification of Online Learning: Formulating Effective Strategies and Policies: Issues and Challenges

4) Plenary Session 3: Developing Workplace Learning: Workplace as Learning Spaces; and

5) Plenary Session 4: Industry and Community Participation in Lifelong Learning and Collaboration with Service Providers

The seminar came out with several conclusions. Keynote Address highlights

that Lifelong Learning (LLL) has become a platform for the development of professional manpower along the mainstream of the development of human capital. During the forum on 'Collaborative Effort in Promoting Lifelong Learning', it has been proposed by the members of the forum that LLL to be made as an agenda of sustainable development in national policies with an emphasis on UNESCO Guidelines on Recognition, Validation and Accreditation (RVA).

The Seminar's Plenary Session 2, presented by Prof. Dr. Mohamd Amin Embi from Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM), deliberates on the intensification of LLL and learns about how the big league universities are doing on Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) as well as developing workplace learning. It was agreed that by optimizing the use of ICT, the agenda of developing workplace learning can generate a long-term productivity effect as well as increased skills and knowledge of workers. This will also broaden the coverage of LLL and incorporate best practices through knowledge-sharing between ASEM member countries. National Open Education Resource Bank-OER is one of the proposed initiatives in order to achieve the agenda.

In Plenary Session 3, Dr. Helen Bound as the presenter also share several best practices that can be adopted to promote learning in the workplace such as pedagogy, cultural organizations and individual readiness based on studies that have been carried out in Singapore. The Fourth Plenary Session, touched on the topic of participation of industry and community in LLL was presented by Dato' Amir Md Noor, the Director General of Department of Community College Education, Malaysia. Members of the session agreed that collaboration, cooperation and joint venture are one of the ways in order to promote as well as making the implementation of LLL possible. Increasing collaborations between universities, industries and society through smart sharing are expected to empower strength and avoid redundancy. In addition, these collaborations will also create niche and specialization for each

university. With more international networking through curriculum development will lead to sharing of expertise and resources that will include renowned institutions within the aspects of research.

Through the seminar Malaysia shared the latest developments and methods that are effective in building strategies and collaboration with experts in the field of LLL. At the end of this two-day event, many topics has been touched and peeled such as challenges faced and proposals proposed by various speakers that helps the ASEM member countries to implement the LLL better.

ASEM DIALOGUE ON QUALITY ASSURANCE AND RECOGNITION
25-26 AUGUST 2014
SUNWAY PUTRA HOTEL, KUALA LUMPUR

The ASEM Dialogue on Quality Assurance and Recognition hosted by the Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA) in collaboration with the Ministry of Education Malaysia and ASEM Education Secretariat at the Sunway Putra Hotel, Kuala Lumpur from 25-26 August 2014. This Dialogue had successfully attracted the interest of many participants who directly and indirectly involved in the field of quality assurance in higher education. The Dialogue received an outstanding response where 75 participants from 11 Europe countries, 14 Asian countries and 12 international organizations involving ASEM experts and representatives from quality assurance agencies, recognition organisations, higher education institutions, governments and other related stakeholders attended the Dialogue.

The Dialogue was interactively conducted based on three major themes:
1) Regional Quality Assurance Framework and Regional Qualifications Framework – Commonalities and Differences;
2) Cross Border Higher Education; and
3) Strengthening Partnership and Cooperation in Implementing Initiatives towards Facilitating Recognition.

Encompassing both local and international presenters, the Dialogue was able to deliberate on a broader aspect of issues relating to quality assurance and recognition. For the theme on Regional Quality Assurance Framework and Regional Qualifications Framework – Commonalities and Differences, topics on interregional recognition of quality assurance agencies and the

complexities, demands and impacts on qualifications framework were discussed. The presenters involved were Mr. Josep Grifoll from the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), Professor Zita Mohd Fahmi from the Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA) representing ASEAN Quality Assurance Network (AQAN), Mr. Jens Bjornavold from the European Center for the Development of Vocational Training (CEDEFOP) and Ms. Teresita R. Manzala from the Professional Regulation Commission, Philippines representing the ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF) Task Force.

For the theme on Cross Border Higher Education, the session was utilised with presentations on the evolution of transnational education, new approaches on regulating the quality of cross-border education and the cross border quality assurance network in higher education. The speakers involved in the session are Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rozilini M. Fernandez-Chung of HELP University, Malaysia, Mr. Anthony McClaran of Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA), United Kingdom and Dr. Lin Mengquan of the China Academic Degrees & Graduate Education Development Center (CDGDC).

The theme on Strengthening Partnership and Cooperation in Implementing Initiatives towards Facilitating Recognition involved discussions on bridging declaration, interregional credit transfer, comparability exercise and recognition of transnational qualifications. Presentations were delivered by Mr. Wang Lisheng of China Academic Degrees and Graduate Education Development Center (CDGDC), China, Dr. Taiji Hotta of Hiroshima University, Japan, Professor Zita Mohd Fahmi of the Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA) and Mr. Che Weimin of Chinese Service Center for Scholarly Exchange (CSCSE).

The two-day event witnessed an in-depth sharing of ideas and feedback on current policies and ongoing initiatives in relation to quality assurance and

qualifications systems, recognition, and cross border higher education among ASEM members. The interactive sessions have promoted better understanding on establishing a parallel quality, standards and outcomes in order to address the fast changing global movements as well as to look into the possibility of mutual recognition on the quality assurance and qualifications systems between regions. The participants look forward to more dialogues between ASEM member countries in the future to enhance the existing collaborations as well as to increase the level of awareness, appreciation and common understanding of issues related to quality assurance and recognition.

The 2ⁿᵈ ASEAN Plus Three Working Group on Mobility of Higher Education and Ensuring Quality Assurance of Higher Education

ANNEX 9

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SECOND ASEAN PLUS THREE WORKING GROUP ON MOBILITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND ENSURING QUALITY ASSURANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

16 October 2014, Bali, Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

1.   The Second ASEAN Plus Three Working Group on Mobility of Higher Education and Ensuring Quality Assurance of Higher Education was held on 16 October 2014 in Bali, Indonesia. The Meeting was attended by delegates from Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Viet Nam as well as China, Japan and Republic of Korea (ROK). Representatives of the ASEAN Secretariat, the ASEAN University Network (AUN) Secretariat, and SEAMEO Regional Centre for Higher Education and Development (RIHED) were also in attendance. The list of delegates appears as **ANNEX 1**.

OPENING FORMALITIES

2.   Prof. Dr. Djoko Santoso, Director General of Higher Education, Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia, officially delivered his opening remarks and officially opened the Meeting. In his opening remarks, he highlighted that partnership in higher education especially in the area of student mobility among ASEAN Plus Three countries is constructed based on understanding and trust that will be mutually beneficial. He also expressed hope that the deliberation of the Meeting will further facilitate the efforts in strengthening cross-border mobility and internationalisation of education between ASEAN countries and China, Japan and Republic of Korea (ROK).

3.   Ms. Ji Young Park, Director of International Education Cooperation Division, Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea (ROK), as the Co-Chair expressed her appreciation to Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia and the ASEAN Secretariat for organising the Meeting with a view to enhance mutual benefits and strengthen the relationship between ASEAN countries and China, Japan and Republic of Korea (ROK) by promoting mobility of higher education for the development of human resources throughout the region.

4.   Prof. Dr. Djoko Santoso, Director General of Higher Education, Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia, and Ms. Ji young Park, Director of International Education Cooperation Division, Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea (ROK), were elected as the Chairman and Co-Chair of the Second ASEAN Plus

Three Working Group on Mobility of Higher Education and Ensuring Quality Assurance of Higher Education, respectively.

MEETING DISCUSSIONS

Report on the First Meeting of the ASEAN Plus Three Working Group on Mobility of Higher Education and Ensuring Quality Assurance of Higher Education

5.   Japan briefed the Meeting on the outcomes of the First Meeting of the ASEAN Plus Three Working Group on Mobility of Higher Education and Ensuring Quality Assurance of Higher Education held in Tokyo on 30 September 2013. The slide presentations of Japan on the outcomes of the Working Group Meeting appear as **ANNEX 2**.

6.   With regard to the cooperation in Quality Assurance of higher education in the region, the ASEAN Secretariat informed the Meeting that the ASEAN Quality Assurance Network (AQAN) has yet to be affiliated to ASEAN.

ASEAN-Wide Initiatives on Mobility

7.   The Meeting noted the shared information by the ASEAN Secretariat on the ongoing initiatives related to ASEAN mobility of higher education and ASEAN Cross-Pillar Mobility, which appears as **ANNEX 3**.

Lesson Learned from Guideline on AIMS Programme

8.   Dr Chantavit Sujatanond, Special Advisor of SEAMEO RIHED, briefed the Meeting on their mobility scheme programme, ASEAN International Mobility for Students (AIMS), where it is tied-up with the higher education system and Quality Assurance mechanisms. Dr Chantavit also shared with the meeting the operational guidelines for the AIMS programme. The SEAMEO-RIHED's presentation appears as **ANNEX 4**.

Progress and Future Plans on the TOR Revision

9.   The Meeting agreed to rotate Chairmanship alphabetically (Ⅳ. 5. in TOR).

10.   ROK suggested deleting the term "permanent organizer" with the aim to encourage more balance and active participation from member countries and proposed the revision of TOR to set the role of Co-Organizer accordingly.

11.   China sought further clarification on the role and responsibility of the Organizer. As the Working Group has been established and it has two co-chairs, China believe that, for high efficiency, there is no need to have permanent organizer and hosting country respectively. Instead, permanent organizer and hosting country could be combined as hosting country, which could be hosted by "10+3" member countries by turns in voluntary basis and permitted by the working group. Under the guidance of the ASEAN

Secretariat, the hosting country should be responsible for sponsoring working group meetings, draft the meeting agenda, and preparing the reports (Ⅳ. 6. in TOR).

12.   The Meeting agreed to submit the revised TOR following the 3ʳᵈ APT WG to the APT EMM for notation, which appears as **ANNEX 5**.

Discussion on Matrix of ASEAN Plus Three Draft of Student Exchange Guideline

13.   The Meeting discussed and agreed on the elements of the Draft of the ASEAN Plus Three Guidelines on Student Exchange based on Japan's presentation, which appears as **ANNEX 6**. On that note, the Meeting agreed with the following principles:

- The guidelines are designed to provide generic guidelines of mobility programme in APT countries which will be able to accommodate most of existing mobility programmes in the region.

- Given the fact that the guidelines are non-binding in nature, there is a need to soften the language in the Draft of the ASEAN Plus Three Guidelines on Student Exchange.

- The aim of the "Guidelines" is to solve the general and common questions faced with Asian students mobility and strive to provide service to all kinds of Asia students mobility and promote the barrier free mobility.

- All the standards, credit transfer system, financial support as stated in "Guidelines" should not be obligatory, but respect regulations of the involved countries.

- There is a need to verify the curriculum and diploma, providing evidence for the students' mobility so that the study achievements could be used after leaving campus.

- There is a need to do research into the QA guidelines of students' mobility to make sure the curriculum and diploma is quality-assured.

- "CREDIT AND CREDIT TRANSFER SYSTEM" needs to be out of "STUDENT EXCHANGE AND MOBILITY" and set as a basic element of the guidelines.

- "FINANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY" needs to be separated into two elements: "Finance" and "(other) Student Support".

- "OTHERS" need to be changed to "MONITORING".

- Some statements in "REMARKS" need to be classified into the other elements.

- The revision exercise which will elaborate on the details of guidelines will be led

by Japan in consultation with other member countries through correspondence.

- The Guidelines will be submitted to the APT EMM for their adoption by 2017.

Progress of ASEAN Plus Three Quality Assurance (APT-QA) Meeting

14.	The Meeting noted the brief presentation by the representative of the National Institution for Academic Degree and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE), which appears as **ANNEX 7**.

Future Direction of ASEAN Plus Three Working Group on Mobility of Higher Education and Ensuring Quality Assurance of Higher Education

15.	The Meeting noted on the presentation by the Ministry of Education and Culture, Republic of Indonesia on the future of the APT WG, which appears as **ANNEX 8**. The Meeting noted that quality assurance of mobility program should cover not only academic quality but also interaction between international dan domestic students to facilitate exchange of culture, ideas, and perspective. It was also mentioned that to minimise physical burdens, the proliferation of online lessons and materials would allow students to be virtually mobile, with the key catchphrase being 'from Bricks to Clicks'.

Date and Venue of the 3rd Working Group

16.	The Meeting welcomed the offer by Thailand to host the 3rd ASEAN Plus Three Working Group on Mobility of Higher Education and Ensuring Quality Assurance of Higher Education in 2015.

17.	The Meeting also welcomed Japan's proposal to designate ROK and China as the co-organisers of ASEAN Plus Three Working Group on Mobility of Higher Education and Ensuring Quality Assurance of Higher Education.

18.	The Meeting also noted that Lao PDR will be the Chair of the next Meeting and China will be the Co-Chair.

CLOSING

19.	The Meeting ended with closing remarks presented by the Chair and Co-Chair, thanking the participants for their active contributions and the fruitful discussions.

20.	On a final note, the participants expressed their appreciation to Ministry of Education and Culture, Republic of Indonesia for the warm hospitality and excellent arrangement rendered. The Meeting also expressed its appreciation to the ASEAN Secretariat for its support and invaluable assistance extended in the conduct of the Meeting.

***

Result of 2nd Working Group of 10 the ASEM Joint Curriculum Development Programme in Tourism and Hospitality

ANNEX 10

The ASEM Joint Curriculum Development Programme
in Tourism and Hospitality
Conclusions of the second meeting

12-13 March 2015, Bonn

2. Workshop
12 – 13 March 2015

Conclusions of the Master Working Group

The participating higher education representatives agreed on:

Structure of the double degree/certificate/diploma (bilateral agreements between all universities):

- 1. semester: study at home institution
- **2. semester: study at foreign partner institution**
- 3. semester: study at home institution
- 4. semester: study at home institution*

*applicable for FH Stralsund, Gajah Mada University, Udayana University, and Trisakti Institute of Tourism

The study abroad semester will be carried out during the 2. semester of the double degree/certificate/diploma

Conclusions of the Master Working Group

The participating higher education representatives agreed on:

- Academic degree: MA with tourism orientation
- Preliminary denomination of the programmes:
  Asian-European Tourism Development
- Duration of the Master: 3-4 semesters (16 weeks per semester)
- Credit points: 90-120 ECTS/72 SKS
- Framework of the degree profile: LO as described in the Dublin descriptors
- The learning concept: Bloom Taxonomy

Conclusions of the Master Working Group

The participating higher education representatives agreed on:

- Language of tuition: English

Tentative schedule for the study abroad semester

Indonesia	Kleipeda 1	Jade 1	Stralsund
Tourism in practise (case studies)	Management and planning for tourism destinations	Decision making	Implementation (case project)
Tourism destination	Sustainable development analysis for tourism destinations	Cultural and environmen-tal responsibility	Tourism Management
Strategic HRM (Managing people)	Financial management of events, funding and sponsorship	Corporate culture and diversity management	Strategic HR Management

Study Abroad Semester

Indonesia	Kleipeda 1	Jade 1+2	Stralsund
Entrepreneurship (Personal Skill Development)	Scientific research 2	Innovation and change management	Strategic HR Management
Sustainable tourism management)		Sustainable tourism	Global Business development

Conclusions Master working group:

Student Exchange will be balanced:

- participating Indonesian universities will send 15 students (5 from Udayana, 5 from Gajah Mada, 5 from Trisakti) to the European partner universities per year. The distribution will be as follows:
- 5 students to Klaipeda
- 5 students to FH Stralsund
- 5 students to Jade University

The exchange will be reciprocal.

- 5 students from Klaipeda
- 5 students from FH Stralsund
- 5 students from Jade University

will spend one semester at the Indonesian partner universities

Conclusions Master working group:

will spend the study abroad semester together at one Indonesian partner university (to be specified)

Steps to be taken:

- MoU
- Take decision which Indonesian university hosts the first group of European students in 2016
- Transcript of records
- Module descriptions for the acknowledgement process
- Discuss the possibility of reciprocal teaching/staff exchange in the near future
- Discuss the admission procedure and criteria

Steps to be taken:

- Conversion tables for credits and marks
- Next meeting in Lithuania in January/February 2016

"Appreciated Indonesia's contribution to host a 1st meeting of ASEM member countries (Belgium (Flemish Community), Brunei Darussalam, Germany, Lithuania and Indonesia) willing to develop a Joint Curriculum Development Programme in Tourism and Hospitality at bachelor and master level. The Ministers thanked Germany for hosting a second meeting in order to discuss further steps. Representatives from Germany, Indonesia and Lithuania agreed upon a 3-years pilot tourism Masters' programme based on common learning outcomes starting in 2015/2016 with a first balanced approach. Other ASEM member countries are asked to join the programme.

Representatives from Belgium (Flemish community) and Indonesia agreed upon a 3-years pilot tourism and hospitality Bachelor programme based on common learning outcomes starting in 2015/2016 with a first balanced student exchange including mutual internships. Other ASEM member countries are asked to join the programme.

In this context the Ministers underlined the importance of the ASEM Joint Curriculum Development Project and viewed it as an instrument to enhance international collaboration among ASEM universities".

Result of the 1st Expert Meeting of the ASEM Work Placement Pilot Program

ANNEX 11

**REPORT OF THE 1ˢᵗ EXPERT MEETING OF THE
ASEM WORK PLACEMENT PILOT PROGRAMME
29 – 30 January 2015
The Sukosol Hotel
Bangkok, Thailand**

INTRODUCTION

1. The 1ˢᵗ Expert Meeting of the ASEM Work Placement Pilot Programme was held during 29-30 January 2015 at the Sukosol Hotel in Bangkok, Thailand.

2. The Meeting was attended by representatives from four countries: Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Germany, and Thailand, as well as the Director of the ASEM Education Secretariat. The list of participants appears in Annex 1.

OPENING CEREMONY

3. Ms. Aporn Kanvong, Deputy Secretary-General for Higher Education Commission, Thailand welcomed all the participants to the meeting and stated that this kick-off meeting will contribute to drafting a guideline for launching the ASEM Work Placement Pilot Programme. She hopes that with the collective efforts and concrete collaboration of the participating countries the pilot programme will be launched soon and could significantly contribute to the ASEM Education Process.

4. Prof. Dr. Aris Junaidi, Director of the ASEM Education Secretariat expressed his deepest gratitude and appreciation to the Thai Office of the Higher Education Commission for hosting the 1ˢᵗ Expert Meeting of the ASEM Work Placement Pilot Programme. He stated that, through collaborative efforts, the participants have the opportunity to exchange and develop ideas for the implementation of the pilot programme. He hopes that the representatives from Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Germany, and Thailand will continue to work together in the future in order to ensure the success of the programme.

PRESENTATION ON "THE ASEM WORK PLACEMENT PROGRAMME AT A GLANCE" by Ms. Nina Scholle-Pollmann, German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)

5. Ms. Scholle-Pollmann gave an overview of the ASEM Work Placement Pilot Programme outlining the background of the programme, the benefits for stakeholders involved, and possible modalities. The presentation appears in Annex 2.

COUNTRY INFORMATION EXCHANGE: POLICY AND PRACTICE, AND CURRENT STATUS ON PROMOTING WORK INTEGRATED LEARNING AND WORK PLACEMENT PROGRAMME

6. Belgium (Ms. Patricia Burssens, Ghent University)

   There is a growing attention toward internships and internship mobility in Belgium. By 2020, the goal is to raise international mobility from 11% to 20%. Students can benefit from engaging in international internships through acquiring specific professional competences and intercultural skills, as well as increasing their probability of employment. Along with international mobility, traineeship mobility is an additional way for students to gain professional and international experience. The Flemish Consortium for Traineeship Mobility was approved, has a total of 18 partnerships, and aims to create a central Flemish platform for international traineeship mobility. Future goals include: (1) collecting data for policy advice, (2) developing a dialogue among higher education institutions, companies, and other relevant organizations, and (3) expanding the database of traineeships. The presentation appears in Annex 3.

7. Brunei Darussalam (Dr. Mohd Ayub Sadiq, Universiti Brunei Darussalam)

   The Brunei Government advocates the teaching approach of action learning (i.e., experiential learning). Experiential learning consists of four options: study abroad programs, internships (i.e., work placement), community outreach, and innovation and incubation projects. The GenNEXT Programme is an education framework that is designed for students to excel through a trans-disciplinary learning platform. Furthermore, students have the opportunity to explore different environments and be exposed to the real world of work. The three areas of focus include entrepreneurship, leadership and innovation, and environmental awareness. Dr. Sadiq emphasized that, through such a comprehensive education, the goal is for students to eventually create more jobs in the future. Every year, funding from the government is limited. As a solution, it is important for higher education institutions in Brunei to engage with industries and invite them to be involved in helping students. The presentation appears in Annex 4.

8. Germany (Prof. Dr. Alexandra Angress, Aschaffenburg University of Applied Sciences and Mr. Brian Trenaman, Center of Competence, Karlsruhe University of Applied Sciences)

The Universities of Applied Sciences are very much involved in work placements, internships, and traineeships. Furthermore, there is a long tradition with industry employers being actively involved in vocational education and training. For example, students at Aschaffenburg are required to engage in a compulsory traineeship for 18 weeks and can as well undertake a voluntary traineeship for two months. The European Network of Consortia and Higher Education Institutions LEO-NET (association registered with Secretariat at TU Eindhoven) serves to find and ensure transnational work placements. The Center of Competence is another resource for students that aim to create a link between students and companies. The trusted employers that students work with have high expectations and are expected to provide: (1) sufficient resources, (2) a qualified supervisor, (3) quality assurance, (4) a learning plan with expected outcomes and means of achieving those outcomes, (5) a contract, (6) access information, and (7) information or logistic support. In return, employers expect to hire students with an excellent combination of personality, practical experience, and grades. With these expectations in mind, it is crucial to develop an education system that focuses on developing students' personal, professional, and academic characteristics in order to best prepare them for the world of work. The presentations appear in Annex 5.

9. Thailand (Prof. Dr. Wichit Srisa-an, President of the Thai Association for Cooperative Education)

The Cooperative and Work-Integrated Education (CWIE) in Thailand aims to follow the goals of the Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education and Professional Standards. Graduates are expected to possess firm theoretical knowledge, practical skills, and readiness for employment immediately after graduation. Such skills lead to a higher probability of employment, as well as greater career development. Currently, the Office of the Higher Education Commission fully supports CWIE and relies upon Suranaree University of Technology (SUT) and the Thai Association for Cooperative Education (TACE) to set the CWIE standards and assist with CWIE initiatives. The International CWIE serves as an ideal way to prepare for the integration of the ASEAN Community in 2015, as it is able to enrich the work-integrated learning experience of Thai students in a foreign country. The formation of the ASEAN CWIE Network is needed in order to strengthen and promote more student exchange and specific CWIE initiatives. The presentation appears in Annex 6.

BRAINSTORMING ON HOW TO DRAFT THE ASEM WORK PLACEMENT PROGRAMME

10. The meeting discussed extensively the characteristics and model of the pilot programme and agreed that the target group of the programme should be both undergraduate and master students with the priority given to the master

students. Regarding the number of students to participate in the pilot programme, it was agreed that for the year 2015 - 2016, each participating country will send 5 - 10 students to join the programme, and the balanced exchange between Asia and Europe needs to be taken into account. The duration of the exchange should be 2 - 6 months [full-time] and the programme should be voluntary or embedded in the curriculum to allow the flexibility for the students.

11. In order to provide quality service to both students and companies, educational pamphlets or additional documents should be offered to help foster their intercultural awareness and to inform the students of the big pool of companies they could work with. The meeting sees the need to develop one common training agreement for both Asian and European sides, and a service and information package for workplace, universities, and students. The meeting also views that a certificate should be given to the students upon their completion of the programme for marketing the programme and for increasing the students' employability chances.

12. To allow the programme to run smoothly and efficiently, adjustment of the implementation where applicable is necessary, and this could be done through an annual meeting with alumni and stakeholders. Monitoring and follow-up on the implementation of the programme should also be undertaken, including the arrangement for the participating students to submit their final reports additionally to the ASEM body.

13. For the purposes of programme publicity and communication, a communication or conversation platform is to be developed. The meeting requested the ASEM Education Secretariat (AES) to host the website, and members of the consortium will design the countries' specific websites. The AES website should have a link to each respective country's website. The ASEM Education Secretariat will explore a possibility to create a webpage of the programme with the links to each participating country's programme website. In addition, each participating country is requested to nominate a national coordinator and an institutional coordinator to coordinate the programme implementation. It was noted that the institutional coordinator should engage the participation of the work places.

14. With regard to the funding to support the implementation of the programme in the pilot stage, the meeting agreed that a 3-year funding scheme should be set at that stage and at least travel expenses for the students should be provided (also taking the national settings into account). In addition, staff costs for administrative support should be taken into account in the participating countries.

15. For the next steps, it was agreed that the calculation of the costs for running the programme should be completed by 27 February 2015 by each participating country.

16. The Meeting welcomed Indonesia to participate in this programme.

17. The Meeting agreed that the Director of the ASEM Education Secretariat will contact the Latvian host to report on the progress of the ASEM Work Placement Pilot Programme to the 2nd Senior Officials Meeting.

18. Ms. Aporn Kanvong, Deputy Secretary-General of OHEC expressed her appreciation to all participants for their valuable contribution to the Meeting.

The 3rd Working Group for Implementing ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration

Report of the Working Group for Implementing ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration

1. Referring to the *Conclusions by the Chair* of the 4th Asia-Europe Meeting of the Ministers for Education (ASEMME4), China was tasked to establish a Working Group to explore concrete steps to implement the *ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration*. The Working Group is composed of representatives from 12 ASEM countries—China, Austria, Belgium (French Community), Brunei Darussalam, Estonia, Germany, Indonesia, Malaysia, Latvia, Lithuania, Republic of Korea and the United Kingdom. Japan participated in the second and third meetings of the Working Group.

2. The Working Group has held three meetings. The first meeting took place in December 2013 in Kunming, China; with the second in November 2014 in Riga, Latvia; and the third in March 2015 in Hangzhou, China.

3. The Working Group has drawn up a *Terms of Reference* to clarify its purpose and obligations ensuring an effective and smooth operating mechanism.

4. The Working Group has been working on the following three action plans:

➢ to build Asian National Information Centres Coordinating Website (ANICCW);
➢ to draft Guidelines, Principles and Practices on Recognition in the ASEM Region;
➢ to establish Cross-border Quality Assurance Network in Higher Education (CBQAN).

5. The ANICC website is primarily a professional platform for qualification recognition (QR) for the Asian countries. Participating countries are expected to designate one collaborative organisation as the administrator of its country page, managing its page contents. The website helps to provide QR information, acting as a platform for QR

professionals to exchange information including collaborative initiatives, joint research and cross-border education quality assurance. In addition, it serves as a communication channel for the participating countries between Asia and Europe. Furthermore, it is also a source of practical information concerning study overseas, scholarships, visa application and other practical matters.

The design of the website is now complete and approved by the Working Group. To date, Asian countries—China, Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Malaysia and Japan have provided their country information. It is expected that the ANICC website will be launched officially at the ASEMME 5 in Riga, 2015.

The Working Group has held discussions with the UNESCO Asia-Pacific office (Bangkok) to explore ways of strengthening collaboration of websites between ANICCW and APARNET. A preliminary consensus was reached. The Working Group also agreed to forge closer links with the established ENIC-NARIC Networks.

The Working Group highlights the importance of continued efforts to ensure the effectiveness and the impact of the website.

6. The Guidelines are intended to provide a central reference point on qualification recognition, criteria, process and procedures, promoting mutual recognition among ASEM countries. The Guidelines can be used as an essential tool for government organisations, national information centres, higher education institutions and other QR bodies, and qualification holders.

The Working Group constituted the roadmap content structure of the Guidelines based on thorough and intensive research and analyses of existing tools. The Working Group concludes that the structure of the Guidelines is sufficiently comprehensive and fit-for-purpose, and the work will need to continue taking into consideration of emerging and common challenges in order to produce an ASEM Guidelines for Recognition of Qualifications.

7. With the increasing economic globalisation and education internationalisation, cross-border education has experienced tremendous growthin scale and diversity. Quality of cross-border education has also become increasingly a cause for concern. Through CBQAN, the Working Group aims to build a platform to forge a "dialogue" between QA and

QR bodies, and in turn promotes balanced and quality-assured mobility of students and academics.

The Working Groupagreed to the proposed organizational charter (draft). Accordingly, the webpage of CBQAN has been designed and launched on the ANICC website. Organisations in Brunei Darussalam, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Thailand, the United Kingdom and Chinahave joined CBQAN as the first batch of members. Organizations from France, Belgium (French Community), Romania, Germany, Indonesia and Latvia have expressed their interests to join in the network.

The Working Group agrees that after the ASEMME5, accelerating efforts should be made to disseminate information about CBQAN and to encourage wider participation of the ASEM member countries. Meanwhile, annual meetings, forums and other activities should be organized in order to increase the added value of the network.

8. In conclusion, the Working Group takes note of the progress with tangible results and pledges a strong commitment of pushing ahead with the three action plans after theASEMME5 to ensure continuity andsustainability of work undertaken.

In addition, the Working Group embraces openness for other countries and international organisations in order to ensure wider participation and greater impact of the action plans of relevant ASEM priorities.

ASEM University-Business Seminar

ANNEX 13

ASEM University-Business Seminar

Brussels, 4 March 2015

Ministry of Education and Training

Conscience Building

Koning Albert II-laan 15, 1210 Brussels

Background

The ASEM University-Business Forum was agreed during the ASEMME4 ministerial conference in Kuala Lumpur in May 2013.

The Chair's conclusions of the fourth Asia-Europe Meeting of ministers for Education (ASEMME 4) the ministers welcome Belgium's willingness to organize the 4th University-Business Forum (4th UBF) and Vietnam's readiness to host the 5th UBF. The ministers invited both Forums to discuss how to combine study with work-based learning. The ministers also asked the European Commission to give special attention to the ASEM Education Process in its European University-Business Forum.

Due to the election in Belgium and in the European Union we decided to postpone the 4th UBF.

The European Commission is organizing the next European University-Business Forum in Brussels, 5 and 6 March 2015. In order to fulfil our commitment we have decided to organize a half day ASEM University-Business seminar in the evening before the European UBF.

The ASEM seminar will focus on the education side of the University-Business cooperation according to the wish of ASEM ministers for Education. How can higher education contribute better to the social, economic, technological and cultural innovation through education? To what extent could trans-regional and cross-border (Asia-Europe) university-business cooperation enhance the effectiveness and the impact on innovation, taking into account the global nature of business and the fact that many companies have branches in the other region? To what extent trans-regional university-business cooperation could better ensure that the graduates can successfully operate in international/global environments).

It is our expectations that the speakers and the participants will touch upon some of the following topics:

- Entrepreneurship and the student as a young entrepreneur;

- Workplacements and if possible cross-regional workplacements – internships – hosting and employing students;

- Work-based learning opportunities – hosting and employing students;

- Link between practical work and theory : balanced curriculum and dual study programmes;

- The role of employers and the role of HEIs and in particular in case of cross-regional work placements;

- The university-business cooperation in LLL;

- Higher education as an engine for social, technological and cultural innovation;

- Higher education and community engagement and regional development.

The seminar will be hosted by the Flemish Ministry of Education and Training.

Central assumption: trans-regional university-business cooperation could ensure that the graduates can successfully operate in international/global environments.

Questions to all speakers:

- What have been your experience in university-business cooperation? What do you have learnt?
- What are the opportunities today and tomorrow to reinforce the UB cooperation and partnerships with regard to education and to delivering high quality and highly relevant curricula?
- What could you recommend to improve the cross-border and cross-regional UB partnerships in the area of education?

Summary report

The ASEM University-Business Forum was agreed during the ASEMME4 ministerial conference in Kuala Lumpur in May 2013.

The Chair's conclusions of the fourth Asia-Europe Meeting of ministers for Education (ASEMME 4) the ministers welcome Belgium's willingness to organize the 4th University-Business Forum (4th UBF) and Vietnam's readiness to host the 5th UBF. The ministers invited both Forums to discuss how to combine study with work-based learning. The ministers also asked the European Commission to give special attention to the ASEM Education Process in its European University-Business Forum.

The 4th ASEM University-Business Forum/Seminar was held in Brussels, 4th March 2015. It has been postponed due to the elections in Belgium and in the EU in 2014.

The ASEM seminar focussed on the education side of the University-Business cooperation according to the wish of ASEM ministers for Education. How can higher education contribute better to the social, economic, technological and cultural innovation through education? To what extent could

trans-regional and cross-border (Asia-Europe) university-business cooperation enhance the effectiveness and the impact on innovation, taking into account the global nature of business and the fact that many companies have branches in the other region? To what extent trans-regional university-business cooperation could better ensure that the graduates can successfully operate in international/global environments).

There were 6 presenters: 4 from academia (1 from Japan, 1 from China, 1 from Spain and 1 from Finland), 1 from a Consulting company and 1 from business (Samsung). The seminar was attended by some 75 people.

Ms Chen (China) told us that China has entered the Era of University-Business cooperation 2.0: from university-run enterprise to university-networked innovation base. Universities have to nurture entrepreneurship through an entrepreneurial ecosystem that includes the following components: government policy, regulatory framework and infrastructure, funding and finance, culture, mentors, advisors and support systems, universities as catalysts, education and training, human capital and workforce, local and global markets. The Peking University build upon alumni's initiatives to invest on student entrepreneurship (1898 Café of Peking University, meeting place of students and alumni).

Comparing Finland with Malaysia Mr. Parkkinen from Finland made it clear that the industrial infrastructure plays an important role: in Malaysia the industrial structure is more production based than knowledge based and there is a somewhat more protective environment (restrictions to give internships to foreign students). Also the example of a good practice of the a Erasmus + MSc program was presented (COSI: Colour in Science and Industry). The programme includes 4 European and 5 Asian universities as well as 15 associate industrial partners across the globe.

Mr. Mora (Spain) told us that some teaching and learning modes are more effective in developing the competencies and skills that are more and more required to be successful on the labour market, in particular problem-based learning, facts and practical knowledge, participation in research projects and internships. He also pointed to some examples of good practices in Europe: UAS Cologna and the Deutsche Bahn, Endowed chairs in some particular fields of study.

Mr Thelen (Germany) drew our attention to the differences between academic education and corporate learning. He presented also some examples of good practices in particular the Carl Benz Academy (China, US and Germany): it is a corporate academy with degree and non-degree education and with the possibility of credit transfer to the regular university programmes. It is a joint international education program lead by Mercedes-Benz (China) Ltd and Mercedes-Benz Auto Finance Ltd, and in cooperation with the renowned universities PKU (Peking University / Guanghua School of Management) (Beijing, China), Woodbury University (Los Angeles, USA), DUW (Deutsche Universität für Weiterbildung / Berlin University for Professional Studies) (Berlin, Germany) and INA (International Academy for Innovative Pedagogic, Psychology and Economics at the Freie Universität Berlin) (Berlin, Germany).

Mr. Yonezawa (Japan) told us that the national campaign in Japan for fostering 'Global Human Resources' certainly changed the perspectives and attitudes of universities and industries and students to be more active in getting international experiences for getting better employability in the globalized labour market. But still the customs and the mindsets of students and even young employees need to change. Universities, business and the government have to make great efforts in

order to achieve the objectives of the Global Human Resources Development programme (recruitment of graduates from outside Japan, programs taught in English to Japanese students, financial support for mobility).

Mr Dijkman from Samsung Benelux pointed to the efforts of Samsung in reaching the young people through digital academies (VET and university partnerships) for developing digital skills: app development, service engineering and teacher training. Samsung runs also local programmes focussing on (continuing) education in hospitals, museums and sports. Samsung Smart Classrooms gave some 16.000 young people (6-16 years) and their teachers access to ICT and a chance to develop their digital skills with a special focus on pupils from disadvantaged background.

Finally I would like to draw your attention to the ASEM pilot project on Workplacements. The pilotproject includes the following countries: Belgium (Flanders) Brunei Darussalem, Germany, Thailand and Indonesia. It was agreed that for the year 2015 - 2016, each participating country will send 5 - 10 students to join the programme, and the balanced exchange between Asia and Europe needs to be taken into account. The duration of the exchange should be 2 - 6 months [full-time] and the programme should be voluntary or embedded in the curriculum to allow the flexibility for the students. One common training agreement for both Asian and European sides, and a service and information package for workplace, universities, and students will be developed. A certificate should be given to the students upon their completion of the programme for marketing the programme and for increasing the students' employability chances.

Programme:

16.00-16.30: registration

16.30: welcome and introduction to the theme of the seminar

16.40-17.30: 3 introductions:

- Prof. Akiyoshi Yonezawa from the Nagoya University in Japan: 'Fostering Global Human Resources, Policies and Debates'
- Udo Thelen from Udo Thelen Consulting: 'University-business Cooperation in LLL: strategies, formats and constraints in cross-regional perspectives'
- Michiel Dijkman, Manager Public Affairs and Corporate Citizenship, Samsung

17.30-17.50: discussion

17.55-18.40: 3 introductions:

- José-Ginès Mora visiting professor in the Institute of Education University College London and emeritus from the Technical University of Valencia and one the project leaders of the GOODUEP-project (Good Practices in University-Enterprise Partnerships): 'University-Enterprise Partnerships for improving skills'

- Ms Shuang-Ye Chen, assistant professor in the dept. of Education Administration and Policy at the Chinese university of Hong Kong: 'Chinese universities: supporting a new knowledge economy'
- Prof. Jussi Parkkinen from University of Eastern Finland: 'University - industry cooperation, experiences from Finland and Malaysia'

18.40-19.00: discussion

19.00-19.15: conclusions

The seminar will be chaired by Paul Temple from the Institute of Education University College London.

Introductory remarks by Paul Temple:

The questions posed for this seminar by the ASEM Ministers of Education include:

- How can higher education better contribute to social, economic and technological innovation?

- To what extent can trans-regional university-enterprise cooperation enhance innovation and its spread?

- What more needs to be done to ensure that graduates can operate effectively in international environments?

Universities have been international institutions, concerned with innovation, since their creation in 11th and 12th century Europe: universities such as Bologna, Paris and Oxford attracted students from across Europe and prepared them for professional careers. The international recruitment of both academic staff and students remains a key objective for universities today which wish to be vibrant, relevant institutions. Their international characters are important in allowing them to prepare their students for a changing, globalising world.

But both universities and employers need to be aware that a key function of university teaching is to prepare students for jobs that do not exist, working in companies that do not exist, yet. What universities can do is to give their students the intellectual foundations – being critical, analytical, empathetic, and so on – that will enable them to do these currently non-existent jobs. Personally, I'm delighted when a former student tells me how much they gained from their university days, and then gives me a totally mystifying account of their present job.

Universities are about both teaching and research – the mix of the two is what distinguishes them from other sorts of educational institutions. (The nature of the interaction between teaching and research is a source of continual academic debate.) Their research, as various studies (including one involving Professor Mora and me) have shown, can be greatly

strengthened when it is carried out in conjunction with the enterprises which will be involved in applying the research: this is sometimes known as "Mode 2 knowledge", in contrast with Mode 1 knowledge, created in isolation from potential users. Knowledge can often actually be created by the to-and-fro exchange between university researchers and end-users in the enterprise. Both universities and enterprises have much to gain through such interactions – though their management can raise difficulties for both parties.

Let me make a few brief comments about the organisational form of the university (generalising wildly here). They are, or should be, deeply ethical institutions – because trust, and a belief that they will act in the wider interest, not just the narrow interest of the present leadership – is what gives them the right to be heard, and to support individual academics who may propose controversial ideas. As I mentioned they are international organisations – yet they are also regional ones, usually with strong regional roots, supporting regional economic and social development. These two contrasting roles should not be in conflict, but should be a source of synergy – just as teaching and research can complement each other.

Report of ASEM Peer Learning Activities

ASEM-Education Process

PEER LEARNING ACTIVITY
ON NEW APPROACHES TO QUALITY ASSURANCE IN THE ASEM COUNTRIES
19-20 February 2015, Brussels

Report

Table of content

Executive summary

Following the commitment of Minister Mr Pascal Smet and Minister Mr Jean-Claude Marcourt, in charge for higher education respectively in Flanders and in the Federation Wallonia-Brussels (Belgium), at the ASEM-Education Ministerial Meeting (ASEMME) held in Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia) on 13-14 May 2014, the Flemish Ministry of Education and Training and the Ministry of the Federation Wallonia-Brussels organised a Peer Learning Activity (PLA) entitled "New approaches to quality assurance (QA) in the ASEM countries" in Brussels on 19-20 February 2015. The PLA was attended by 32 experts in this field coming from five Asian countries and five European countries (namely Austria, Brunei, China, Denmark, Germany, Indonesia, Latvia, New Zealand, Portugal and Russia – plus Belgium as organiser) as well as regional and international organisations (namely the ASEM-Education Secretariat – AES, the Asia-Pacific Quality Network – APQN, the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education – ENQA, the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education – EQAR, and the European Commission). Those experts were representing ministries for higher education, quality assurance agencies (QAAs) and higher education institutions (HEIs).

As explained more in details in section (1), the PLA aimed at further developing a common QA understanding and language between both Asia and Europe, focusing thus on the common aspects, specificities, challenges as well as the current developments and new approaches in both external and internal QA systems and procedures. In building the PLA, the organisers had carefully taken into consideration the outcomes of previous ASEM-Education conferences and seminars related QA, in particular: the ASEM-Education conference "QA and recognition in higher education: challenges and prospects" (Cyprus, December 2010), the ASEM-Education seminar on regional QA (Bonn, July 2011), the ASEM-Education seminar on QA in higher education (Sèvres, October 2012).

During one day and a half, the participants learned from the various regional organisations involved in QA through specific policies, programmes and projects. The participant had the opportunity to present and discuss their respective QA system and procedures with the view of fostering cooperation and inter-linkages at international and interregional level.

Previous to the meeting, a survey was carried out among all ASEM countries to gather comprehensive information on the national initiatives, projects and views relating to QA systems and standards, cross-border evaluation and involvement of the stakeholders. In addition to the countries participating to the PLA, some other ten ASEM countries responded to this survey. As further explained in section (2) of this report, the main results showed that despite the diversity between countries and regions, common approaches and orientations can be underlined for which the common (regional) standards, guidelines or principles play a crucial role.

At the closing of the PLA, the participants endorsed the conclusions of the rapporteur, Mr Lucien Bollaert, in particular the proposals for follow-up actions which include:
- further structuring and systematising the exchange of information on QA but also on qualifications frameworks (QFs) and recognition through various activities such as PLAs, seminars and conferences;
- exploring the potentials of the cross-border initiatives in supporting the common understanding of QA in both regions;
- linking more closely the developments of quality assurance and qualifications frameworks.

The present report will be sent to the ASEM-Education Secretariat for further dissemination to the participating countries and organisations to the ASEM-Education Process. It will be suggested distributing the report for information to the ASEM-Education Ministers at the occasion of the ASEMME5 to be held in Riga (Latvia) on 27-28 April 2015.

(1) Rationale for organising a PLA on new approaches to QA in the ASEM countries

– Lucien Bollaert

The EHEA and the Asia-Pacific region in a global society

Since the 1990s the societies have gone through some fundamental changes. After the so-called third industrial revolution driven by informatics and its use in technology, and after the implosion of socialism in the Soviet area, the society has grown global in most of its basic activities in farming, industry, and services. These changes can be summarized in the following words: globalization of activities, massification of social participation while at the same time individualization of activities, responsabilities and roles, global immigration and multi-cultural cooperation against conflicts, climatologic changes which make ecology and sustainability necessary, innovation through application of new knowledge.

The global economic and financial crisis has only accelerated those fundamental changes, their challenges and the necessity to react in proper ways.

The new mission of higher education in the global knowledge society

Higher education (HE) has gone through some essential changes, precisely due to the global fundamental changes. Next to internationalisation and massification, students are addressed more and more as individuals that need to be prepared to function well in the new global society as responsible citizens. Therefore, the addition of knowledge by research, one of the essential characteristics of HE, is combined with education and services to society whose importance have grown in the mission of HE. Students need to be educated and trained not only as future researchers, but primarily as global citizens who have achieved the competences needed in the 21st century. Skills and attitudes such as the ability to apply knowledge through insights in new contexts and creative thinking, the ability to analyze critically and come up with innovative solutions, the ability to communicate world-wide both with experts and non-experts, the ability to function in international and multicultural teams, and last but not least the eagerness to learn life long, have become essential. Thus, HE has been confronted with a fundamental paradigm shift in order to answer these new realities and goals in the right way.

HEIs are needed to be managed in another way, leaving their ivory tower and *laissez faire* policies – sometimes reduced wrongly to the concept of autonomy. Instead they need to open up to the global society with all its new characteristics, need and challenges. New Public Management has definitely entered HEIs in order to face the manifold challenges, including the competition for the best students and staff. By the introduction of internal and external quality assurance, HEIs have tried to combine the necessary quality enhancement of their educational and research processes and results with the accountability to their stakeholders and societies who subsidise them. All these changes were introduced and realized in an economic and financial crisis by which their subsidies were generally lowered and in a political and cultural context in which trust and esteem are not taken for granted anymore but need to be proved with evidence.

The added value of cooperation between Europe and Asia

Since the changes and challenges are global, the possible answers should be as well. Both Europe and Asia are confronted with the same global evolutions. Most of the challenges and changes mentioned above were identified and addressed in what has become known as the Bologna Process (BP) in

Europe since 1999. After 10 years, the HE ministers of the 47 participating countries could speak of a European Higher Education Area (EHEA) – and, for the 28 EU Members States, the European Research Area (ERA) – in which the goals and action lines were clear, but implemented in quite different ways, times and certainly not all yet at the grassroots of the HEIs.

The same process has started in Asia. As far as diversity is concerned Asia is even more diverse in cultures and HE than the EHEA. It counts tens of thousands HEIs delivering education in over 100 different languages. Notwithstanding, the region has developed a strong cooperation underpinned by growing massive mobility. Especially the theme of QA has been a major development, through APQN (see below), and thanks to funds by the World Bank Development Grant Fund (DGF) and UNESCO's Global Initiative for Quality Assurance Capacity (GIQAC).

During the financial crisis, the economic balance of both regions has recently changed towards Asia. While the old Western Europe was confronted with its own traditions and nationalism, even tendencies to close up, the new opening towards Central and Eastern Europe coming out of an era of stagnation needed, to be helped. On the other hand, Asia has enjoyed an economic boom indeed, yet uneven, and has got a new generation eager to learn and progress internationally. While Europe knows a reduction of the birth rate of natives and is confronted with immigration and a rising birth-rate of immigrants putting multicultural diversity and its participation in society and HE on the agenda. In the meantime the Asian region enjoys a boom in native birth-rate and wants to open up to the world through economy and HE.

Evolutions so far

A lot has already been prepared by the Asia-Europe Dialogue in Education started in Berlin 2008, which was continued on ministerial level in Hanoi 2009, Copenhagen 2011 and Kuala Lumpur 2013. In the conclusions of the latest meeting (ASEMME4), the ministers reiterated the importance of education, cultural diversity and social cohesion in both regions, and, therefore, acknowledged the necessity to invest in all sectors of education and training in order to further improve the quality and attractiveness of education and training systems, to provide opportunities for lifelong learning and to contribute to the development of highly qualified and active citizens who have a strong sense of social responsibilities, are open-minded and respect cultural diversity. The ministers also wished to give additional political momentum to the ASEM-Education Process by asking Senior Officials to meet yearly in order to discuss the implementation and follow-up of the ASEM activities. It is in this context that the Ministers of Belgium, both of the Flemish and French Communities, decided to organize a PLA on new approaches in quality assurance in HE in connection with autonomy, responsibility and accountability.

Within the BP, QA has been identified not only as one of the major themes, but also as one of the most successful. Certainly with the approval of the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) by the Ministers in Bergen 2005, external QA has been implemented in all countries and regions of the EHEA. In some countries this meant a kind of follow-up of the already existing internal QA systems. In other countries, internal QA was stimulated by the development and design of the external one. Since 2000, ENQA has gathered most European QAAs in order to cooperate on the European (policy) level as well as to learn from each other. The European Consortium for Accreditation in Higher Education (ECA) has concentrated on bilateral and multilateral cooperation in order to recognize their decisions cross-border. With the founding of EQAR in 2008, the ESG have become even more recognised as European framework for QA, since QAAs can only be registered if they are and function in substantial compliance with them. The Bucharest Ministerial Communiqué has put the international recognition of QAA decisions through EQAR on the agenda. For the moment, the ESG are being revised in order to be even clearer to be used and to be updated.

Indeed, QA has become a global issue. More than 100 countries across the globe have established education related to QA mechanisms of various types based on purposes and processes. The International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies (INQAAHE) gathers most of them on the basis of their good practices. The Asian national QAAs are now being challenged for the quality of their own operations to meet some externally determined international standards. Before 2003 in most systems quality was implicit in HEIs. Quality and assurance were both internal. In 2003, APQN was founded in order to make focus and discourse on quality more explicit by developing external QA. APQN's mission states it wants "to enhance the quality of higher education in Asia and the Pacific region through strengthening the work of quality assurance agencies and extending the cooperation between them". APQN's constitution states the following purposes:

(1) To promote good practice in the maintenance and improvement of quality in higher education in the Asia-Pacific region;
(2) To facilitate research in the region into the practice of quality management in higher education and its effectiveness in improving the quality of higher education in the region;
(3) To provide advice and expertise to assist the development of new quality assurance agencies in the region;
(4) To facilitate links between quality assurance agencies and acceptance of each others' decisions and judgments;
(5) To assist members of APQN to determine standards of institutions operating across national borders;
(6) To permit better informed international recognition of qualifications throughout the region;
(7) To assist in the development and use of credit transfer schemes to enhance the mobility of students between institutions both within and across national borders;
(8) To enable members of APQN to be alert to dubious accrediting practices and organisations; and;
(9) Where appropriate, represent the region and promote the interests of the region, e.g. vis-à-vis other networks and international organisations.

Those purposes are still very current and could be formulated for the EHEA and ENQA/ECA as well. APQN too developed the so-called Chiba Principles in 2010. Recently Ms. Yung-Chi Hou, vice-president of APQN and professor at the Fu Jen Catholic University in Taiwan, identified the challenges that Asian QAAs are facing, including "hardly making time for internal QA of their own", "difficulties in setting criteria and benchmarks for internal QA and external QA", and "budget constraints".

Sheer magnitude of complexity and diversity of cultures and HE systems make the task of the regional network more challenging, at the same time more rewarding in terms of great learning from each other. It is essential that the European and Asian-Pacific experiences and are not only shared, but that their activities meet in a global context.

At the same time, QA returns again on focusing more on internal QA and quality culture, while it tries to limit the administrative burden. In both areas comparable shifts can be observed in new approaches towards QA.

The risk-based approach was first implemented in Australia then in England from 1st October 2013. The move of external QA from study programme level to institutional level is clear. In some systems, as in Flanders, the concept of self-accrediting institutions is being introduced. As in the Federation Wallonia-Brussels, the stress on learning outcomes (LOs), both in internal and external QA, is thus most noteworthy. Some systems, as the Swedish, merely focus on the achieved learning outcomes by re-assessing the theses, while others, as in the Netherlands and Flanders, make a distinction between intended LOs and achieved LOs. Another very important new dimension for international trust and recognition is the link between international qualifications frameworks, national or regional ones,

discipline or domain's LOs and the LOs the study programmes actually define. These new tendencies and approaches in QA also touch upon the way of governance, the autonomy, responsibility and accountability of HEIs. The time is right to go deeper into these themes in relation to the global context and challenges.

Outcomes of the previous ASEM-Education activities

We would like to build the forthcoming PLA upon the outcomes of previous activities on QA organised from an inter-regional perspective.

The ASEM-Education conference "QA and recognition in HE: challenges and prospects", held in Limassol (Cyprus) on 6-7 December 2010 agreed on the following recommendations:
- Experts from QA and recognition agencies from Asia and Europe should meet and develop common principles of QA and recognition to be followed by both regions;
- Subsequent to setting these principles, all stakeholders should raise awareness of the existence of such standards and guidelines by organizing related Conferences;
- Networks of QA and recognition agencies of both regions should be established;
- Training seminars should be planned for HEIs officials in Asia and promote collaboration between HEIs in ASEM countries.

The participants in the ASEM-Education seminar on regional QA, held in Bonn (Germany) on 5-6 July 2011 made the following propositions in terms of enhanced interregional cooperation in quality assurance:
- To explore the possibility to fund more inter-regional curriculum development programmes in line with a cross border QA procedure;
- To stimulate mutual recognition of QAAs in Asia and Europe and their QA decisions/results within and between Asia and Europe, in order to facilitate the recognition of qualifications;
- To promote the inclusion of regional and/or international assessors in peer review procedures, e.g. that assessors/peers from Asia can participate in European site visits, and vice versa;
- To observe and widen sub-regional approaches in internal QA procedures; progress in the ASEAN-QA project should be observed and could be presented in a follow-up seminar on QA.

Finally, we would like to refer to the topics discussed during the ASEM-Education seminar on QA in HE, held in Sèvres (France) on 11-12 October 2012 and recommendations made by participants in this seminar:
- The necessity of opening up the national QA systems in order to develop mutual understanding and trust;
- The importance of joint projects between QAAs and professionals from both regions in order to develop QA further and to settle the necessary international dimension of QA activities;
- The need for an all-inclusive dialogue, open to all the QA stakeholders;
- Within the ASEM framework the need for flexibility in developing instruments.

The participants feel the necessity to develop a common quality language and understanding that would seek commonalities between the CHIBA principles and the ESG. Furthermore, the participants recommend promoting joint cooperation such as sharing of information and good practices, to undertake joint projects and to promote the exchange of quality assurance professionals between the regions. Other propositions include the following:
- To promote capacity building concerning QA by developing joint training programmes for QA, by undertaking trans-regional projects involving several countries or by supporting the development of quality assurance in a single country;
- To develop concrete cooperation between QA and recognition professionals.

Aims and intended outcomes of PLA

The ultimate aim is to get to know each other better in order to set up precise, practical and thematic cooperation schemes between Asia and Europe. Therefore, all the categories of stakeholders of HE are invited and following themes are identified from the ASEMME4 Chair's conclusions and from the outcomes of previous seminars:

- To further develop a common quality assurance language and understanding;
- To share information and good practices related to quality assurance;
- To discuss new approaches and cooperation in QA, both internal (governance) and external, as well as the inter-linkages;
- To bring further international and interregional recognition of external QA decisions/accreditation through networks, such as APQN, EQAR, etc.;
- To develop a common understanding of the key role learning outcomes and qualifications frameworks play in internal and external QA as well as on a European, Asian and international level;
- To discuss how joint interregional projects with regard to quality assurance could be undertaken.

(2)   Between diversity of practices and similarities of approach: results from a survey on the new approaches to Quality Assurance in the ASEM countries
– Marc VANHOLSBEECK

Key points
- There is a diversity of QA practices, notably with regard to the possibility of using a QAA from abroad to assess national higher education systems;
- Some common approaches and orientations emerge though, with regard to the coverage of external QA procedures (issues to be included as well as types of HEIs covered), its main outputs and its potential impact on funding, and relating to the participation of students and academic staff in external QA review teams;
- There is a certain lack of information of the respondents about a few topics, particularly with regard to internal QA mechanisms established by HEIs.

Brief introduction and methodology

Twenty countries participated to the survey, some of them through different organisms: Austria, Belgium (Flanders), Belgium (FW-B), Denmark , France, Germany (3), Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Australia, Brunei, China (3), Indonesia, Japan (2), Malaysia, New Zealand, Philippines, Russia (3) and Thailand.

The survey has been accessible on line between July 2014 and February 2015. Respondents had to answer closed-ended questions but were also allowed to contextualise some of their answers through qualitative answers (open text). Because some responding countries (Belgium, Germany, China, Japan and Russia) gave multiple answers through different organisms, the results are somehow biased in favour of what happens in those national contexts. Although we are well aware of the little number of responses this survey is based on, we still use percentages in the following analysis of the survey. It seems indeed the best way to standardise the presentation of the results, not all respondents having answered all the questions.

The regional representativeness is not statistically sufficient to allow a comparative approach at regional level. Nonetheless, the results allow emphasising some general trends observed in the Asian and European QA landscapes: the diversity in QA practices on the one hand, and some shared approaches and orientations on the other hand. The survey also delivered some interesting qualitative elements.

Diversity in QA practices

The diversity in QA practices between as well as within both regions remains important in some respects. In particular, for 39% of the respondents, it is a single independent agency which is responsible, within their QA system, for the QA provision, while 32% of respondents answer that several independent agencies are responsible for it, and 21% of them, a government dependent agency or the Ministry itself. There is a balance between respondents whose QA system does and does not have a specific external QA system for research at national level (46% and 54% respectively). Similarly, the national QA system of one respondent in two does not allow choosing a QA agency from outside the country (54%), while such a "choice" is possible for assuring the quality of all institutions for 33% of the respondents, and for assuring the quality of some institutions for 13% of them. There are also very diverse modalities of involvement of students, international experts, academic peers and employers in the external QA procedures.

Commonalities in approaches and orientations

The survey also reveals some interesting communalities in QA approaches and orientations.

For most respondents, the main aspects to be taken into account in external QA are: the use of LOs in curricula development and student assessment (for 96% of the respondents), student support services (91%), employability (91%), students' progression, dropout and completion (91%), internal QA (87%), as well as teaching and learning methods (87%). The main outcome of external QA is a decision granting permission for the institution or programme to operate, or a decision which is a prerequisite to operate (for 75% of the respondents).

External QA procedures generally cover all types of HEIs, according to the answers provided by 82% of the respondents. The external QA review has an impact on the funding, at least "in some cases", for 7 respondents in 10.

There are formal requirements for HEIs to develop internal QA system/processes in the national QA systems of 8 respondents in 10. Besides, HEIs are responsible for focusing internal QA processes according to 74% of the responses.

Rankings of HEIs are not used in QA processes according to 83% of the respondents. 70% of them also indicate that their QAA(s) has/have been evaluated against the ESG, the "Chiba Principles" or other similar types of standards and guidelines, and in most cases it was for the purpose of a membership in ENQA, APQN, ASEAN University Network (AUN)-Quality Assurance Network.

Although the involvement of students, international experts, academic peers and employers vary from one country to the other, for almost one respondent in two, students are required to be involved in the preparation of self evaluation reports (48%), as full members in external review teams (43%) or in governance structures of national QAA (39%). For 35% of the respondents, international experts are required to be involved as full members in external review teams. Academic staff is required to be involved as full members in external review teams in the QA systems of 65% of our respondents, as well as in the preparation of self evaluation reports, according to 48% of them. Four respondents in ten also answer that employers are required to be involved in governance structures of national QAA, as well as to act as full members in external review teams.

Qualitative elements from the survey

The answers to the open questions allow us to gain a deeper understanding of some national situations. So, it appears that different QAAs may be used for different types of HE, as it is the case in China (distinct agencies for under- and post-graduate education) or New-Zealand (specific agencies for university and non-university HE).

In some cases, as in Australia, the link between funding and QA is strong: "As per the Australian Higher Education Support Act 2003, HE providers must be approved before they are able to receive Government funding or their students can receive Government assistance. HE providers are subject to quality and accountability requirements which if breached may result in loss of Government funding." In other cases, as in Austria, the link between QA and funding works only for the programme accreditation of universities of applied science.

In different countries, some issues are included in QA reviews only when they relate directly to the evaluated study programmes, such as research – in Portugal: "research is included in external QA reviews depending on the type of degree programme (e.g. masters and PhD)" – or lifelong learning

(LLL), as in the Belgian Federation Wallonia-Brussels: "LLL is part of the evaluation when considering adults resuming formal education, but all the provision in LLL is not assessed."

In some (rare) cases, as in Australia, students are "not involved in any formal assessment of a HEI" but are well "able to lodge complaints with the Tertiary Education and Quality Standards Agency".

Lack of information

Finally, the survey reveals a certain lack of information from the respondents with regard to some of the surveyed topics. In particular, a majority of respondents was not able to answer questions related to the conditions for the choice of a foreign QAA, the results of application of the QA, the publication of quality policies by HEIs, the arrangements taken by HEIs for internal monitoring of the quality of the programmes, as well as the publication by HEIs of critical outcomes coming from internal QA.

In our opinion, this apparent issue of "information gap" may advantageously be further studied in future research on the topic of QA in the ASEM countries.

(3)   Conclusions of the ASEM-Education PLA

– Lucien Bollaert

Context

Both in the rationale of the PLA as well as in the discussions the attendants observed a changing global context of their work. The shifts were summarized in the 3 words: globalisation, technology and economic and financial crisis. The globalisation definitely brought internationalisation in HE with a higher mobility and international cooperation in a context of massification and increasing diversity. Technology introduced informatics and digital communication causing a worldwide need of computer skills and the ability to deal with an oversupply of information in a global knowledge society as well as widening the provision of education with online teaching and learning. However, due to the economic and financial crisis, HE suffers from budget cuts while the global competition has increased.

Due to those fundamental changes, the participants concluded that QA is in a transitional phase, in which there is even more need for exchanging information and international cooperation. As a consequence of the globalisation, the participants clearly observed a rise in internationalisation of QA, both in activities and scope, still with opportunities and challenges or strains, in the context of a more open market versus a more regulated by international standards, guidelines or good practices. There is a rise of international platforms and networks of QAAs, while the international recognition of QA decisions is only starting. The globalisation also causes the need of global learning outcomes or competences for the 21st century.

While technology has helped to create international digital platforms and communication, electronic overviews of QA systems, decisions and state of affairs in HE are far from complete. Technology has also challenged QA how to deal with on-line learning, such as MOOCs.

Finally the economic and financial crisis raised the need to decrease the financial and administrative burden of QA on HEIs as well as on QAAs. Inspired by this, there is a trend to move external QA to institutional level using more open and policy-inspired standards, while on the other hand there is a tendency to move away from trust to more evidence-proof control from the ministries subsidising HE with tax-money. At the same time, a rise of a risk-based approach can be observed, using specific indicators in order to focus the external QA activities. Last but not least, the use of employability or social relevance as QA standards is a still debated consequence of the crisis, with as possible answer the achievement of LLL competences needed in the 21st century.

Main obstacles or challenges

During the PLA, several obstacles or challenges to fruitful cooperation between European and Asian HE and QA were formulated and discussed. The most important ones were identified as:
- Lack of information about the HE and QA systems, about monitoring practices in internal and by external QA, about the on-going changes in systems and practices, and particularly in international or cross-border HE;
- The huge diversity that ranges internationally among and within the stakeholders both in European and Asian HE and QA, and between the two areas;
- The lack of agreement among the QAAs and their stakeholders, for example as far as the interpretation and use of employability is concerned;
- The lack of concrete and effective projects;
- The lack of capacity both within our regions as well as for the cooperation between both regions;
- The lack of bridging international EU-Asian QFs and national QFs;

- The lack of (the acknowledgement of) common standards & methodology, procedures and practices in QA, while in reality there could be more similarities discovered;
- Last but not least, precisely caused by the above-mentioned obstacles, a lack of trust.

In connection with those obstacles and challenges the cooperation between Europe and Asia should be able to answer the next questions raised specifically by the Chinese participants, which were felt to be urgent:
- How can existing national and international QA systems and instruments address the quality of programmes offered by transnational education providers?
- Can the accreditation of the exporting institution be transferred to the franchised or validated foreign institution or the branch campus?
- In what ways is it ensured that the quality in the delivering institution is the same as in the receiving institution?

Steps to overcome the obstacles and find more cooperation and synergies

In order to overcome the above obstacles more structured exchange of information, more real and effective cooperation in order to find more synergies are needed. Therefore, the PLA attendants thought of following concrete points of attention, steps and projects:
- In order to understand the different languages it is essential to find common definitions (cf. QACHE project) and look at or open up to each other's historical, political and cultural contexts;
- Urgently start with projects where there is already international collaboration existing, such as student/staff mobility, joint programmes and institutional cooperation or branch campuses with a special focus on recognition of successful study periods and QA decisions;
- Establish an international pool of QA peers or experts who join international assessment panels where cooperation exists and organize a reflection on the cooperation on top of the assessment of programme/HEI taking into consideration the diversity, both in context and in quality culture;
- Establish international QA projects on capacity building where needed.

Concluding recommendations for further cooperation

In order to remove the above obstacles and come to answers to the three specific questions raised, the need was felt to search for and build up common ground and exchange and collaborate in practice with the ultimate goal to of building up trust in the graduates' competences in a context of diversity and a global knowledge society.

In order to reach this essential goal the PLA concluded to propose following actions:
- Structure an exchange of information through ASEM-Education Process and activities such as this PLA, other seminars and conferences on HE and QA in HE specifically.
- Establish a Cross-Border Quality Assurance Network (CBQAN) which should work out a compendium of QA systems in the two regions and compare them as well as try to find common grounds in methodology or approach and in standards referring to the QACHE, CBHE, ESG and OECD principles.
- Strengthen and structure the exchange of information and cooperation in the establishment of QFs and the exchange of information and cooperation between the European overarching Qualifications Frameworks (EHEA-QF and EQF-LLL) with the Pacific one as well as their coming updates. Make sure that the learning outcomes described in those QFs contain or are linked to the transversal global competences of the 21st century.

- Establish a methodology in order to deal with QA in transnational education and the recognition of both QA decisions such as accreditation through a single, international assessment, as well as successful study/learning periods based on the learning outcomes.
- Organise every two years an ASEM QA conference where the concrete projects are presented as good practices and lessons are learnt, as well as the following steps and goals are formulated.

All in all, the PLA attendants felt that both regions are growing towards each other due to the globalisation of the knowledge society. There is a need to recognise its consequences on QA in HE through concrete projects of cooperation underpinned by comparable QA methodologies, standards and practices, as well as global competences.

(4)   Annexes

Annexe 1: programme of the PLA

18 February   Arrival of the participants
                         Welcome reception at the Thon Hotel Brussels City Centre (7 PM)

19 February

9.00-9.30   Welcome by Chantal KAUFMANN (Director General, Ministry of the Federation
Room 2200   Wallonia-Brussels) and Noël VERCRUYSSE (Senior project manager, Flemish
(2nd floor)   Ministry of Education and Training)

                         Tour de table

9.30-10.30   Introductory speeches
Room 2200   ▪ "Progress in Quality Assurance for Higher Education in the European Union"
(2nd floor)   by Margaret WATERS (Deputy Head of Unit, European Commission)
                           ▪ "Developments and trends in Quality Assurance in Asia" by Dr Jagannath
                             PATIL (President, Asia Pacific Quality Network) (by video conference)

10.30-11.00   Coffee break
(2nd floor)

11.00-11.45   Presentation of the survey results by Marc VANHOLSBEECK (Attaché, Ministry of
Room 2200   the Federation Wallonia-Brussels)
(2nd floor)

11.45-12.30   Presentation of the Belgian Quality Assurance systems by Caty DUYKAERTS (Head
Room 2200   of the executive unit, AEQES) and Lucien BOLLAERT (Board member, NVAO)
(2nd floor)

12.30-13.30   Lunch
(2nd floor)

13.30-15.30   Presentation study cases in two parallel groups
Room 2200   ▪ Group 1 moderated by Belgium/Flanders: Austria, Brunei, China, Latvia,
(2nd floor);   Portugal
Room 1300   ▪ Group 2 moderated by Belgium/Wallonia-Brussels: Denmark, Germany,
(1st floor)   Indonesia, Russia, New-Zealand

15.30-16.00   Coffee break
(2nd floor)

16.00-16.30   Wrap-up from study cases' sessions
Room 2200
(2nd floor)

20 February

9.30-10.15
Room 3100
(3rd floor)

Presentation of projects related to the international/interregional cooperation in Quality Assurance:
- Presentation of the RIQAA project's results by Melinda SZABO (Project Officer, EQAR) and Colin TÜCK (Director, EQAR)
- Presentation of the QACHE project's preliminary results by Paula RANNE (Project Manager, ENQA)

10.15-11.45
Room 1300
(1st floor);
Room 2300
(2nd floor);
Room 3100
(3rd floor);
Room 3200
(3rd floor)

Thematic discussions in four working groups, including:
- Links between internal and external QA
- Synergies between European and Asian QA standards/guidelines
- Interregional and international QA cooperation
- Recognition of QA decisions
- Impacts of QA systems (funding, transparency, etc.)

11.45-12.15
Room 3100
(3rd floor)

Wrap-up from working groups

12.15-12.30
Room 3100
(3rd floor)

Concluding remarks by Lucien BOLLAERT (Board member, NVAO)

12.30-13.30
(3rd floor)

Lunch

Annexe 2: list of participants

Title	First Name	Surname	Country	Organisation	Email
Dr	Achim	HOPBACH	Austria	AQ Austria	Achim.Hopbach@aq.ac.at
Mr	Lucien	BOLLAERT	Belgium	Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO)	l.bollaert@nvao.net
Ms	Caty	DUYKAERTS	Belgium	AEQES	caty.duykaerts@aeqes.be
Mr	Kevin	GUILLAUME	Belgium	Ministry of the Federation Wallonia-Brussels	kevin.guillaume@cfwb.be
Ms	Chantal	KAUFMANN	Belgium	Ministry of the Federation Wallonia-Brussels	chantal.kaufmann@cfwb.be
Ms	Yoneko	NURTANTIO	Belgium	AEQES	yoneko.nurtantio@aeqes.be
Mr	Marc	VANHOLSBEECK	Belgium	Ministry of the Federation Wallonia-Brussels	marc.vanholsbeeck@cfwb.be
Mr	Noël	VERCRUYSSE	Belgium	Department of Education and Training	noel.vercruysse@ond.vlaanderen.be
Mr	Adinin	MD SALLEH	Brunei	Brunei Darussalam National Accreditation Council	adinin.salleh@moe.gov.bn
Dr	Abby	TAN	Brunei	Universiti Brunei Darussalam	abby.tan@ubd.edu.bn
Ms	Danhua	LIU	China	Chinese Service Center for Scholarly Exchange (CSCSE)	n/a
Ms	Xuyan	LIU	China	Chinese Service Center for Scholarly Exchange (CSCSE)	n/a
Ms	Haiying	YU	China	Chinese Service Center for Scholarly Exchange (CSCSE)	hyyu@cscse.edu.cn
Mr	Kristian	KLAUSEN	Denmark	Danish Accreditation Institution	krk@akkr.dk
Dr	Olaf	BARTZ	Germany	German Accreditation Council	bartz@akkreditierungsrat.de
Mr	Frank	NIEDERMEIER	Germany	University of Potsdam	frank.niedermeier@uni-potsdam.de
Mr	Aris	JUNAIDI	Indonesia	ASEM Secretariat Jakarta - Ministry of Education and Culture	arjunavet03@yahoo.com
Mr	Brian Arieska	PRANATA	Indonesia	ASEM Secretariat Jakarta - Ministry of Education and Culture	pranata83@gmail.com
Ms	Illah	SAILAH	Indonesia	Minister for Research, Technology and Higher Education	isailah@yahoo.com

Mrs	Enda	WULANDARI	Indonesia	Ministry of Education and Culture	e.wulandari@yahoo.co.id
Mrs	Baiba	RAMINA	Latvia	Academic Information Centre	baiba@aic.lv
Ms	Eve	McMAHON	New Zealand	New Zealand Qualifications Authority	Eve.McMahon@nzqa.govt.nz
Dr	Jagannath	PATIL	Organisation	Asia Pacific Quality Network	jp.naacindia@gmail.com
Ms	Paula	RANNE	Organisation	ENQA (European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education)	Paula.RANNE@enqa.eu
Ms	Melinda	SZABO	Organisation	EQAR (European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education)	melinda.szabo@eqar.eu
Mr	Colin	TÜCK	Organisation	EQAR (European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education)	colin.tueck@eqar.eu
Mrs	Margie	WATERS	Organisation	European Commission	Margaret.Waters@ec.europa.eu
Dr	Sónia	CARDOSA	Portugal	Agency for Assessment and Accreditation of Higher Education (A3ES)	sonia.cardoso@a3es.pt
Mrs	Leonor	SANTA CLARA	Portugal	Directorate General for Higher Education	leonor.santaclara@dges.mec.pt
Dr	Amélia	VEIGA	Portugal	Agency for Assessment and Accreditation of Higher Education (A3ES)	amelia.veiga@a3es.pt
Mr	Gleb	KUROCHKIN	Russia	Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the European Union	rusateu@gmail.com
Mrs	Vera	SKOROBOGATOVA	Russia	State expert centre of education evalutaion	svi@glavex.ru

Annexe 3: presentations given by the participants

All presentations are available via the following link: http://bit.ly/1CC4rEh.

ARC4 Students Forum Policy

Policy Recommendations for the
5th ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting (ASEM ME5)
27-28 April 2015, Riga, Latvia

The ARC4 Students' Forum on *"University-Business Partnerships: Asia and Europe Seeking 21st Century Solutions"* took place on 23-24 March 2015 at Zhejiang University in Hangzhou, China. On this occasion, 51 students from all ASEM member countries developed Policy Recommendations on how universities and the business sector can better cooperate to equip students with employability skills, to cultivate entrepreneurship, and to innovate learning environments through information and communication technologies. The students convey the following Recommendations for consideration of the ASEM Ministers for Education at the upcoming 5th ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting on 27-28 April 2015 in Riga, Latvia. Four Student Representatives personally handed over these Policy Recommendations on 27 March 2015 to the Minister for Education and Science of the Republic of Latvia, Ms Mārīte SEILE, at the Closing Ceremony of the 4th ASEM Rectors' Conference (ARC4). The students also address these Recommendations to their university and business leaders and relevant institutions amongst other stakeholders in ASEM countries.

The participants of the ARC4 Students' Forum have identified the following issues as priorities and commit themselves to promoting and finding ways of applying them. They call upon the ASEM members to engage them in working towards delivering tangible outcomes for the 6th ASEM Education Minister Meeting (ASEM ME6).

University-Business Partnerships for Employability Skills

- Curriculum design processes should take a student-centred approach and be developed in partnership with students to provide flexible learning pathways and opportunities for soft skill development. This should be done in consultation with businesses and external stakeholders when deemed useful, without jeopardising academic integrity. Opportunities to develop soft skills outside of the classroom, including student-led activities, need to be actively supported technically and financially, promoted, and the learning completely recognised by relevant stakeholders.

- Transparent, independent and updated programme information for all Higher Education Institutions must be made accessible on centralised public platforms and available nationally and internationally to students, potential students, parents, teachers and employers. Career guidance services must also be available at all levels and adequately resourced. ASEM members should implement measures and provide resources to strengthen the role that universities and businesses take in supporting such services.

- University-Business Partnerships which deliver quality work-placed learning opportunities must ensure decent working conditions, be incentivised, practically supported by long-term national strategies, and designed by relevant stakeholders. Partnerships must ensure that expected learning outcomes are achieved, recognised academically, and that students are compensated for the completed work.

University-Business Partnerships for Entrepreneurship

- The institutionalisation of entrepreneurship within university curricula, in partnership with businesses (SMEs and MNCs), is a must. This should include teaching material enriched with actual business cases, inter-disciplinary courses, and the creation of start-up incubators in universities that provide mentorship and advisory services.

- Universities, businesses and communities should work together to explicitly promote social entrepreneurship and develop business models that create shared value. This addresses problems in societies, encourages sustainable development and the notion that entrepreneurship is not exclusively for profit-making, but has a social role to play ultimately for the benefit of everyone.

- An improved funding system for university start-ups and entrepreneurial activities is needed. This includes tax incentives for investors, a system of preferential loans for entrepreneurs, and improved seed-funding channels, which allow universities to access more external funding and provide venture capital funding for entrepreneurial activities.

University-Business Partnerships for New Learning Environments through Technology

- Universities should have a policy framework that emphasises access to technology and training of faculty and students. This should include the establishment of strategic centres at universities to continuously improve technology use on campuses. Such activity should be supported by an international network to share good practices and close interaction with businesses.

- Flexible approaches to institutionalise recognition of online learning as a complement to traditional education in universities, such as through Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) or other Open Educational Resources (OERs) are needed. For instance, these should be accredited and/or used as a supplement for admission applications to university.

- Universities and businesses should support national and international student initiatives in leveraging on technology to create opportunities aimed at acquiring additional experiences and skills. Examples include administrative support and funding for online workshops, cross-university forums, networking meetings and other innovative projects.

Hosted by Zhejiang University, the ARC4 Students' Forum was co-organised by the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. The International Association of Universities and the ASEAN University Network contributed as ARC4 partners, and Chulalongkorn University and the Office of Higher Education Commission of Thailand as supporters.

For further information, please visit the website of the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) at www.asef.org

Further information on the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) process is available on the ASEM InfoBoard at www.aseminfoboard.org

ARC4   ASEF   ASEM InfoBoard

Rectors Conference Policy

4th ASEM Rectors' Conference (ARC4)
University-Business Partnerships:
Asia and Europe Seeking 21st Century Solutions

26-27 March 2015, Hangzhou, China

#ARC4

Policy Recommendations for the
5th ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting (ASEM ME5)
27-28 April 2015, Riga, Latvia

The 4th ASEM Rectors' Conference (ARC4) on *"University-Business Partnerships: Asia and Europe Seeking 21st Century Solutions"* took place on 26-27 March 2015 at Zhejiang University in Hangzhou, China. More than 100 university leaders and representatives from 43 ASEM member countries jointly developed Policy Recommendations in 3 parallel working groups on how universities and the business sector can better cooperate to equip students with employability skills, to cultivate entrepreneurship, and to innovate learning environments through information and communication technologies. The Policy Recommendations were handed over to the Minister for Education and Science of the Republic of Latvia, Ms Mārīte SEILE, at the Closing Ceremony as a contribution to the deliberations at the 5th ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting (ASEM ME5) on 27-28 April 2015 in Riga, Latvia.

The participants of the 4th ASEM Rectors' Conference (ARC4) identified the issues below as priorities for ASEM policy-making with regard to university-business collaboration. They committed themselves to promoting 21st century-oriented university-business partnerships and to seeking solutions to possible challenges to cooperation. They called upon the ASEM members to engage them in working towards delivering tangible outcomes for the 6th ASEM Education Ministers' Meeting (ASEM ME6).

<u>University-Business Partnerships for Employability Skills</u>

In order to promote the development of employability skills among graduates, the state plays a dual role.

- In their legislative and administrative capacities, the ASEM members should
  1) remove barriers to international mobility for study and internship purposes, including those linked to visa matters and payment regulations for students;
  2) encourage initiatives to enhance Ph.D. students' employability in diverse careers; and
  3) promote student-centred and problem-based learning and practical training through internships, entrepreneurial courses, and inclusion of soft-skills as well as transversal competencies in all programmes.
  To better address the above issues, ASEM members shall establish and/or enhance various platforms for dialogue between universities, businesses, government institutions and communities.

- In their financial and service roles, the ASEM members should
  1) provide tax benefits, subsidies, insurance schemes and/or other incentives to encourage the provision of internships and practical training for students in businesses, community organizations and in the public sector;
  2) enable the development of open-access databases on Higher Education programmes to facilitate informed decisions by students; and
  3) better recognise the value of and investment in extra-curricular activities, and support these by facilitating an infrastructure of career-guidance centres, business incubators, innovation hubs, technology parks and student-led start-ups.

University-Business Partnerships for Entrepreneurship

A university-wide entrepreneurial culture is vital to address the dynamic transformations societies are undergoing. While continuing to ensure academic excellence, fostering entrepreneurship has to be positioned as a core mission of universities. ASEM education policies should be formulated to support this endeavour.

- ASEM members should support universities to develop ecosystems to enable entrepreneurship. Universities should be empowered to develop policies and measures, within respective national contexts, to transform the university environment accordingly through
  1) broadening the curriculum to include entrepreneurship education;
  2) strengthening applied research and technology transfer;
  3) facilitating faculty development to embrace a new innovative mindset;
  4) supporting cross-cultural student mobility and leadership development; and
  5) introducing enhanced technologies and facilities, as well as incentives to drive innovation and entrepreneurship.

- Partnerships with governments, businesses and communities need be strengthened to foster the development of "engaged universities" for social betterment, for example through a "triple-helix plus one" partnership model. ASEM members should also provide incentives to encourage the business sector to provide mentorship, internship and research opportunities, and funding support for entrepreneurial student initiatives.

- ASEM members shall incorporate innovation and entrepreneurship as part of their national policies and strategies. This includes the facilitation of their infrastructures, which support entrepreneurship, such as the introduction of tax incentives, creation of knowledge transfer and innovation funds, local and regional incubators, entrepreneurship resource centres and platforms, development of finance instruments to support start-ups, and efforts to help them find new market opportunities locally and internationally.

University-Business Partnerships for New Learning Environments through Technology

- ASEM members should facilitate and support universities to develop and execute clear policies that foster an environment and culture conducive to university-business partnerships, including the transfer of technology and knowledge. These policies should draw from evidence-based practices of existing effective university-business partnerships across Asia and Europe. The practices may include new metrics for evaluating faculty, such as
  1) recognition and reward for effective engagement with businesses;
  2) utilization of technology-based collaborative platforms to share information/resources and encourage cross-sector and cross-disciplinary dialogue; and
  3) funding models that allow universities, businesses, and/or governments to support the development and sustainability of university-business partnerships.

- ASEM members should encourage universities to provide flexible and innovative learning environments for students. Such learning environments should include, amongst others, external curricular options, such as online courses/platforms in MOOCs and possible credit recognition for students.

- ASEM members should support universities in developing strategies for evaluating university-business partnerships to assure the sustainability of high quality and effective partnerships. Based on policies, existing frameworks, and specific ecosystems within countries, these evaluation strategies may include
  1) the facilitation of technological platforms for communication to assure efficient networking across sectors as well as across countries;
  2) professional development for faculty and students to better understand the affordances of technology and effectively use technology in a learning environment; and
  3) continuous quality assurance indicators that include the students' voice.

_____

Hosted by Zhejiang University, the ARC4 Students' Forum was co-organised by the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. The International Association of Universities and the ASEAN University Network contributed as ARC4 partners, and Chulalongkorn University and the Office of Higher Education Commission of Thailand as supporters.

For further information, please visit the website of the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) at www.asef.org

Further information on the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) process is available on the ASEM InfoBoard at www.aseminfoboard.org

ARC4   ASEF   ASEM InfoBoard

Asia-Europe Meeting
ASEM Education Secretariat

Minsitry of Education and Cultrue of the Republic of Indonesia
Jalan Jenderal Sudirman Senayan
Building C, 6th Flor
Jakarta 10270

Phone +6221 571 1144 ext 2601
Fax: +6221 574 6395

Email: asem.education@kemdikbud.go.id
http://asem-education-secretariat.kemdikbud.go.id