

## FROM BERLIN 2008 VIA HANOI 2009 TO COPENHAGEN 2011

Status Report of the ASEM Education Secretariat

for the

### 3. Asia-Europe Meeting of Ministers for Education (ASEMME3)

Copenhagen, 9/10 May 2011,

#### 1. Short history of the ASEM Education Process

Education has played a vital role in the ASEM process since its early beginnings in Bangkok (1996). In their London Summit (1998), the ASEM Leaders welcomed the establishment of the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) as the only permanent institution of the overall ASEM process, and commended its work in promoting people-to-people contacts and enhanced intellectual and cultural exchange between the two regions. The Leaders tasked ASEF to implement “ASEM Education Hub” to promote educational exchanges between Asia and Europe. During the third Summit in Seoul (2000), the Leaders endorsed the ASEM DUO fellowship programme as new ASEM initiative. The ASEM Lifelong Learning Initiative, which was proposed by Denmark at the fourth Summit in Copenhagen (2002) and approved at the fifth Summit in Hanoi (2004), led to the official establishment of the ASEM Education and Research Hub for Lifelong Learning (ASEM LLL Hub) in 2005.

In the course of the ASEM 6 Summit in Helsinki (2006), the Heads of State and Government declared to establish a “continued dialogue and exchange of best practices on questions related to education and training” at the ministerial level. They emphasised ASEM’s continuing role as a framework for dialogue and cooperation, serving as a prime point of convergence between Europe and Asia. For the second decade of ASEM, the Leaders defined some key policy areas including education, science and technology. In this context, the German Government proposed to organise the first ASEM Education Ministerial conference, which was held in Berlin on 5/6 May 2008 (ASEMME1). In this meeting, the Ministers agreed to set up a strategic Asia-Europe education partnership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century and to strengthen the ASEM dialogue and cooperation in the field of education including stakeholders at all levels and to convene a second Ministerial Meeting on Education in Hanoi 2009.

In October 2008 another milestone in the ASEM Education Process gained ground when, for the first time, the university stakeholders at the highest level convened at the first ASEM Rectors’ Conference in Berlin. The Conference launched the systematic exchange between the ASEM leaders and civil society stakeholders on higher education trends and issues.

In May 2009, the Ministers met again in Hanoi (ASEMME2) to deepen discussions and continue cooperation on a permanent basis. To support their activities and to ensure a sustainable development of the ASEM Education Process, the Ministers agreed to establish a rotating ASEM Education Secretariat (AES) and welcomed Germany’s offer to host the AES for the following four years. The German Federal Ministry of Education and Research set up the Secretariat at the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) in Bonn. The AES started its work in September 2009 with 5

experts from China, Indonesia, the Benelux and Germany. The Ministers also agreed on a number of concrete actions in different educational areas which meanwhile have taken place or are underway.

## **2. ASEMME3 in 2011**

In their Hanoi meeting, the Ministers welcomed Denmark's offer to host the next Ministerial meeting (ASEMME3) in Copenhagen on 9/10 May 2011. Two Senior Officials' Meetings (SOM) are intended to prepare ASEMME3. The first SOM took place in Copenhagen on 24/25 January 2011, the second one will take place immediately prior to the Ministerial meeting.

In order to update the ASEM members on the state of play of ASEM education activities implemented since 2008, the AES has produced the following status report at the request of the Danish host. In this report, the AES summarises the conclusions and tasks resulting from ASEMME1 and 2 and reviews their implementation status. This part of the report is followed by an analysis of the ASEM members' responses to the questionnaire on the four main topics of ASEMME3, defined by the Danish host by agreement with the Senior Officials.

## **3. Conclusions and tasks resulting from ASEMME1 (Berlin 2008) and ASEMME2 (Hanoi 2009) and their implementation status**

### **3.1 In Berlin, the Ministers agreed on the following conclusions and tasks:**

- 3.1.1 Setting-up a strategic Asia-Europe education partnership;
- 3.1.2 Forming an EU-Asia working group including Senior Officials and stakeholders from the education sector;
- 3.1.3 Establishing of a bi-regional forum involving stakeholders from the education and economic sector;
- 3.1.4 Setting up a regular exchange of experience on how to promote knowledge, skills, and competences relevant to the labour market;
- 3.1.5 Enhancing a more balanced exchange by strengthening national, bilateral and multilateral mobility schemes;
- 3.1.6 Promoting all kinds of structural education cooperation among ASEM partners in both regions;
- 3.1.7 Intensifying EU-Asia cooperation in the field of lifelong learning;
- 3.1.8 Increasing visibility of the education systems and institutions of both regions by improving information and stimulating joint marketing initiatives.

### **3.2 In Hanoi, the Ministers agreed on the following conclusions and tasks:**

- 3.2.1 Implementing three pilot groups of experts on credits and learning outcomes, quality assurance and qualification frameworks;
- 3.2.2 Supporting transnational initiatives and activities that aim to enhance the attractiveness, accessibility, profile, image and visibility of, and accessibility to Asian and European Higher Education in the world;
- 3.2.3 Organising meetings of relevant Quality Assurance Agencies in Asia and Europe to exchange experience and good practice;
- 3.2.4 Deepening the common understanding of Lifelong Learning and to expand the membership in ASEM LLL Hub;
- 3.2.5 Endorsement of a detailed proposal and budget for the ASEM Education and Research Hub for LLL and invitation to member countries for voluntary contributions;
- 3.2.6 Setting up of an ASEM University-Business Forum;
- 3.2.7 Exchanging information on skills forecast among ASEM countries;

- 3.2.8 Linking existing European Network for Quality Assurance in VET (ENQA-VET) with initiatives in Asian countries in order to exchange experience and practices on the implementation of QA in VET;
- 3.2.9 Enhancing the visibility of the education systems and institutions of both regions and establishing an EU - Asia portal providing information on jobs and learning opportunities in ASEM;
- 3.2.10 Establishing an ASEM Education Secretariat.

### 3.3 Implementation status of conclusions and tasks

Conclusions/tasks	Status+/ - *	Actions
3.1.1 Setting-up a strategic Asia-Europe education partnership	+	Regular meetings of ASEM Ministers for Education: <i>ASEMME1, Berlin 2008</i> <i>ASEMME2, Hanoi 2009</i> <i>ASEMME3, Copenhagen 2011</i>
3.1.2 Forming an EU-Asia working group including Senior Officials and stakeholders from the education sector	+	<p><i>ASEM expert seminar in Frankfurt, December 2008 on "Enhancing mobility by removing obstacles"</i></p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. National surveys on real visa-related barriers (-)</li> <li>2. Design of an ASEM QA and Recognition system (-)</li> <li>3. Design of an ASEM credit Transfer System (-)</li> <li>4. Forum on QA best practice in ASEM (-)</li> </ol> <p>+</p> <p><i>Biennial meetings of the ASEM Rectors' Conference: (1) Berlin 2008, (2) Seoul (2010)</i></p> <p>Berlin recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ASEM university platform (+)</li> <li>2. Enhancement of information exchange and knowledge on higher education and research policies such as launching of a regular report on higher education in Asia university partnerships (-)</li> <li>3. Transparency of national system and higher education institution, through concrete progress in recognition of qualification, cooperation in the areas of qualification framework, learning outcome and quality assurance (+)</li> <li>4. Research collaboration (-)</li> <li>5. Setting up an institutional partnership programme, similar to past programme such as Asia-link and AUNP, as complement to other current scheme (-/+)</li> <li>6. Providing financial support for networking activities of higher education institutions and organisations (-/+)</li> </ol> <p>Seoul recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recognise and support universities as motors for economic growth and for the creation of knowledge societies</li> <li>2. Foster effective knowledge transfer and knowledge sharing</li> <li>3. Support curricular reform and education for global citizenship</li> <li>4. Widen perspectives for mobility</li> <li>5. Support student involvement in the programming of the ASEM Education Process</li> </ol> <p>+</p> <p><i>Annual meetings of the ASEM LLL Hub Advisory Board bringing together 25 national Ministries and 5 international organisations in order to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- create mutual understanding and strengthen partnerships</li> <li>- share experiences and facilitate policy learning</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- intensify research activities relevant to policy challenges</li> <li>- disseminate and utilise the research results in national context.</li> </ul> <p>+ <i>Annual meetings of the ASEM LLL University Council consisting of senior leaders from 36 ASEM universities in order to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- create dialogue between research and education policy making</li> <li>- strengthen research cooperation between universities across countries</li> <li>- reinforce commitment and support to the research activities of the five network under the ASEM LLL Hub</li> <li>- to facilitate student and staff exchange</li> </ul> <p>+ <i>1<sup>st</sup> Asia-Europe Education Workshop "The impact of the Financial Crisis to higher education", Manila 2010</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Commission pilot studies on higher education funding in ASEM (commensurable data) (-)</li> <li>2. Monitor effects of crisis, funding, governments, mobility (-)</li> </ol>
<p>3.1.3 Establishing of a bi-regional forum involving stakeholders from the education and economic sector</p> <p>3.2.6 Setting up of an ASEM University-Business Forum</p>	<p>+ <i>ASEM University-Business Forum in Bangkok, March 2010</i></p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establishing permanent ASEM University-Business Dialogue Forum (+)</li> <li>2. Organising seminars on specific UBC topics including exchange of examples of good practices at least once every two years (-)</li> <li>3. Promoting UB mobility between Asia and Europe (-)</li> <li>4. Improving information on ASEM universities and industry cooperation as well as information on funding opportunities in both regions (-)</li> <li>5. Strengthening communication between universities and industry (-)</li> <li>6. Identifying areas of mutual interests in RD &amp; innovation (-)</li> <li>7. Interconnecting ASEM UB Forum with the EU UB Forum and the ASEM Business Forum (-)</li> </ol> <p>+ <i>2<sup>nd</sup> ASEM Rectors' Conference, Seoul, October 2010</i></p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Foster effective knowledge transfer, i.e. enhance collaboration between higher education institutions and industry partners, e.g. by support for international internships at national and international level</li> <li>2. Knowledge transfer for societal impact and for public goods must respond to needs. This being a two-way, multidisciplinary process, ASEM should commission studies or pilot projects involving higher education institutions and governments for measuring knowledge transfer and effectiveness</li> </ol>	
3.1.4 Setting up a regular exchange of experience on how to promote knowledge, skills, and competences relevant to the labour market	+	ASEM LLL Hub research network (no. 2) on Workplace Learning, 10 country national and comparative report, reported at the Vietnam Forum on Lifelong Learning, December 2010
3.1.5 Enhancing a more balanced exchange by strengthening national, bilateral and multilateral mobility schemes	+	<i>ASEM-DUO Fellowship Programme</i>
	+	<i>Presentation of ERASMUS Mundus programme by the AES at the Bologna Ministerial Policy Forum in Vienna, April 2010</i>

<p>3.1.6 Promoting all kinds of structural education cooperation among ASEM partners in both regions</p>	<p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p><i>Promotion of structural cooperation through EAHEP<sup>1</sup>, ASEMUNDUS<sup>2</sup> and the EURO-ASIA.NET</i>, funded by the European Commission in order to strengthen cooperation between both regions</p> <p><i>ASEF ASEM 8 Workshop, Brussels, October 2010</i> Recommendations: Monitoring the effects of the financial crisis, e.g. government funding on continuity, quality, diversity, access, equity in education, also for mobility (-)</p>
<p>3.1.7 Intensifying EU-Asia cooperation in the field of lifelong learning</p> <p>3.2.4 Deepening the common understanding of Lifelong Learning and to expand the membership in ASEM LLL Hub</p> <p>3.2.5 Endorsing a detailed proposal and budget for the ASEM Education and Research Hub for LLL and invitation to member countries for voluntary contributions</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>Conferences of the ASEM LLL Hub:</p> <p><i>Intimacy of Lifelong Learning: a Social Issue, Germany 2008;</i> <i>Asia-Europe Conference on Lifelong Learning: Frameworks for Supporting Lifelong Learning, China 2008;</i> <i>Teachers and Trainers in Adult Education and Lifelong Learning. Professional Development in Asia and Europe, Germany 2009;</i> <i>Lifelong Learning: e-learning and workplace learning, Thailand 2009;</i> <i>Increasing opportunities and removing obstacles for Lifelong Learning, Vietnam 2009;</i>  <i>Increasing Opportunities for e-Learning in Lifelong Learning, Thailand 2010;</i>  <i>Lifelong Learning and Voluntary Activities, Belgium, 2010;</i>  <i>Professionalisation of Adult Teachers and Educators in ASEM countries, Vietnam 2010;</i> <i>Vietnam Forum on Lifelong Learning – Building a Learning Society, Vietnam 2010;</i> <i>ASEF workshop on “Creating Skills and Competences for Living and Working in the ASEM Area”, Brussels 2010</i></p>
<p>3.1.8 Increasing visibility of the education systems and institutions of both regions by improving information and stimulating joint marketing initiatives</p>	<p>+/-</p> <p>+</p> <p>+</p> <p>+</p> <p>+</p> <p>+</p>	<p><i>Newsletter of the AES</i> <i>Newsletter of ASEF</i> <i>Newsletter of the ASEM LLL Hub</i> <i>Four joint research anthologies in LLL (by the ASEM LLL Hub)</i> <i>Partnership of the ASEM LLL Hub with 10 leading international journals</i></p> <p><i>Information and promotion activities through EAHEP, ASEMUNDUS and EURO-ASIA.NET</i>, funded by the European Commission in order to strengthen cooperation between both regions</p> <p><i>AES compilation of data</i> concerning higher education systems, credit systems and learning outcomes in all ASEM member countries</p>

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.eahep.org/eahep-project/workshops/quality-assurance.html>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.asem-education-secretariat.org/en/12184/>

3.2.1 Implementing three pilot groups of experts on credits and learning outcomes, quality assurance and qualification frameworks	+/-	<p>(1) <i>AES ASEM expert seminar on “Credits and Learning outcomes” in Berlin, April 2010</i>  Recommendations:  1. Improve information on developments in the regions should be deepened, based on the Seminar and the descriptions at country level (+)  2. Find out the predominant goals of mobility (-)  3. Elaborate common ground with credit systems and learning outcomes (+)  4. Promote common developments of study programmes between European and Asian universities, but not necessarily with double or joint degrees (at Ba, Ma and / or doctoral level) (-)  5. Improve cooperation between QA systems (-)  6. Improve transparency: study programmes, credit awards and learning outcomes should (also) presented online (-)  7. Set up a network of Asian and European experts of higher education for improving information and advice (-)</p> <p>(2) <i>Pilot group for quality assurance - see 3.2.3</i>  (3) <i>Pilot group for qualification frameworks – see 3.2.3</i></p>
3.2.2 Supporting transnational initiatives and activities that aim to enhance the attractiveness, accessibility, profile, image and visibility of, and accessibility to Asian and European Higher Education in the world	+	<p><i>Promotional activities of ASEMUNDUS, EAHEP and EURO-ASIA.NET</i> funded by the European Commission in order to strengthen cooperation between both regions</p> <p>+</p> <p><i>ASEF’s Asia-Europe Education Workshops</i> as a follow-up avenue for the discussions of the ASEM Rectors’ Conference</p>
3.2.3 Organising meetings of relevant Quality Assurance Agencies in Asia and Europe to exchange experience and good practice	+	<p>+</p> <p><i>Quality Assurance Roundtable</i> in the realm of <i>EAHEP workshop in Bangkok, Thailand, October 2009</i></p> <p>+</p> <p><i>ASEM seminar on quality assurance, Seoul, Korea October 2010</i></p> <p>+</p> <p><i>ASEM seminar on quality assurance and recognition in Limassol, Cyprus, December 2010</i>  Recommendations:  1. Experts from quality assurance and recognition agencies from Asia and Europe should meet and develop common principles of quality assurance and recognition to be followed by both regions (+/-).  2. Subsequent to setting these principles, all stakeholders should raise awareness of the existence of such standards and guidelines by organizing related conferences (-).  3. Networks of quality assurance and recognition agencies of both regions should be established (+/-).  4. Training seminars should be planned for Higher Education Institutions officials in Asia and promote collaboration between Higher Education Institutions in ASEM countries (-).  5. The ASEM Education Secretariat was asked to coordinate these activities and to convey the results and recommendations of the Limassol Conference to the SOM and the Ministerial Meeting in Copenhagen (+).</p>
3.2.7. Exchanging information on skills forecast among ASEM countries	-	
3.2.8 Linking existing European Network for Quality Assurance in VET (ENQA-VET) with initiatives in Asian countries in order to	+/- +	<p><i>TVET symposium in Qingdao, China, January 2011</i>  Recommendations:</p>

exchange experience and practices on the implementation of QA in VET		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Making ASEM TVET Symposium a regular event is advisable to establish and enhance an international TVET policy dialogue mechanism (+/-).</li> <li>2. Establishing an expert group in order to elaborate the development of joint TVET initiatives (-).</li> <li>3. Sharing good practice between Asia and Europe on cooperation models between multinational enterprises and local vocational schools (-).</li> <li>4. Encouraging Asian and European member countries to conduct bilateral and multilateral TVET technical assistant programmes (-).</li> <li>5. Supporting Asian and European member countries to cooperate in areas such as curriculum and teacher professional development, quality assurance, recognition of prior-earning experience and learning methods (-).</li> <li>6. Documenting best practices, particularly those reflecting industry-school partnerships which can be shared by all participating countries (-).</li> <li>7. The Symposium welcomes Germany's proactive consideration in hosting the 2<sup>nd</sup> ASEM TVET Symposium (+/-).</li> </ol>
3.2.9 Enhancing the visibility of the education systems and institutions of both regions and to establish an EU-Asia portal providing information on jobs and learning opportunities in ASEM.	+/-	<i>ASEF's Deep Data Base (has to be updated)</i>
3.2.10 Establishing an ASEM Education Secretariat	+	<i>September 1<sup>st</sup> 2009 in Bonn, Germany</i>

\*+ accomplished, +/- partly accomplished, - not yet accomplished

#### **4. Preparing the Copenhagen Ministerial Meeting - Analysis of the responses to the questionnaire on the four topics of ASEMME3**

##### **4.1 General remarks**

In preparation of the third Ministerial conference in Denmark (ASEMME3), the Danish host sent a questionnaire to the ASEM members (including the new ASEM members Australia, New Zealand and Russia) in order to collect information on recent developments and recommendations for future action in the following four topics that have been identified by the Danish host by agreement with the ASEM Senior Officials:

1. Balanced mobility
2. Quality assurance and recognition
3. Lifelong Learning
4. University-Business cooperation

The following analysis summarises the responses given by the different ASEM members and highlights some examples of good practice in the four areas.

In total, 46 ASEM Member Countries, the European Commission, the ASEAN Secretariat, the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), the ASEAN University Network (AUN), the European University Association (EUA), The South-East Asian Ministers of Education Organisation (SEAMEO-RIHED), the Asia-Pacific Quality Network (APQN), the Asian Quality Assurance Network, the European Network for Quality Assurance (ENQA), the Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning (ASAIHL) and the European Student Union (ESU) have been asked to fill in the questionnaire. 25

country representatives of Austria, Australia, Belgium (French and Flemish Community), China, Cyprus, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Singapore, Slovak Republic, Spain, Thailand, Vietnam, as well as ASEF, the European Commission, ENQA and the EUA have responded.

## 4.2 Analysis of the responses

### 4.2.1 TOPIC 1 “Balanced Mobility of Students and Staff”

More than three million students worldwide are studying at higher education institutions outside their home countries. The five top sending countries are China, India, the Republic of Korea, Germany and Turkey. The US and the ASEM members UK, Germany, France and Australia are the most important receiving countries. The number of mobile students from Asia to Europe is significantly higher than the number of European students studying in Asia. Imbalanced mobility between Asia and Europe has already been addressed as an important issue by the country reports for the ASEMME1 in Berlin 2008. In order to learn more about student mobility from and into ASEM countries more detailed information is needed. The ASEM countries, therefore, were asked to provide information on mobility (including on obstacles to mobility).

*Question: Which of the following situations for student mobility apply to your country? Please refer to the mobility between Asia and Europe*

The responses from the ASEM member countries show that there seems to be a lack of reliable and comparable detailed data especially on temporary mobility<sup>3</sup>. UNESCO, OECD or EUROSTAT data count foreign-citizen degree students. Reliable data on real international mobility, however, are lacking (with some exceptions: e.g. for EU’s ERASMUS Mundus programme). According to the ASEM members’ information, the overall situation for the exchange between Asia and Europe varies from country to country. Some countries are “net importers” of mobile students (e.g. Australia, Austria, Cyprus, Germany, Hungary, New Zealand, Spain, and the Netherlands), others are “net exporters” (e.g. China, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam). Japan is a “net importer” in the Asian region, but a “net exporter” in the exchange with Europe. Ireland and both the Flemish and the French community of Belgium report a more or less balanced mobility with Asia.

Compared to the country reports for ASEMME2, the overall picture of mobility between Asia and Europe has not changed substantially and shows great imbalances. European countries still count more incomings than outgoings, while Asian countries do the other way around (except Australia and New Zealand).

*Question: What are the main obstacles to student/staff mobility?*

All kinds of obstacles mentioned in the questionnaire (e.g. funding, recognition, language, curriculum/study organisation, legal issues, transparency, immigration restrictions and incompatibility of pension or social security system) were considered as important, although to varying degrees. Asian members identified language, study organisation, recognition and information as main obstacles to inward mobility. Lacking information, funding and language competences seem to hinder outward mobility of Asian students and staff. Malaysia and New Zealand have mainly obstacles in outward mobility. Australia seemingly does not face major obstacles to mobility. The country is a relatively popular study destination for students from Europe and from elsewhere in Asia – also Europe (at least the UK) is one of the most popular study destinations for outwardly mobile Australian students. Main obstacles for European students to study abroad are insufficient funding

---

<sup>3</sup> The European University Association (EUA) and four universities in different European regions are currently developing a mobility mapping tool of which aims at supporting universities in gathering and presenting comparable data on institutional student and staff mobility (MAUNIMO). The results of this project could be shared within the ASEM Education Process.



and recognition of the study achievements gained outside the home country, study organisation and lack of information. Difficulties for incoming Asian students (as seen by European countries) are mainly lack of funds and language competences, and immigration restrictions. From the Asian countries' perspective, European students in Asia have seemingly problems with language and study organisation. Funding and language problems as well as legal obstacles seem to negatively affect mobility of staff from both regions.

*Question: Has your country implemented a specific policy to remove existing obstacles for students/staff mobility since 2008? If yes, please specify.*

Most of the European respondents mentioned initiatives and measures to remove obstacles to student and staff mobility. Special efforts have been made by some countries to improve funding for outgoing and incoming students by implementing grant systems. Other European countries are trying to increase inward mobility by offering more courses taught in English and presenting their national higher education system in international education fairs. For example, the French community of Belgium established the information and promotion agency (Wallonia-Brussels-Campus). Under the coordination of Wallonia-Brussels International, higher education institutions have been participating in specific attractiveness missions (higher education fairs and academic ministerial and economic missions) especially in Asia (China, India and Vietnam). France has set up an agency (CampusFrance) dedicated to informing foreign students about learning opportunities in France. Similar activities are carried out by agencies from other European countries (e.g. DAAD/Germany, Nuffic/Netherlands, British Council/UK). In some cases, countries changed their immigration regulations and set up information platforms on mobility issues. In order to improve information on study opportunities in the EU, the European Commission supported a "study in Europe" campaign and the development of a website ([www.studyineurope.eu](http://www.studyineurope.eu)). As regards outward mobility, European countries have implemented scholarship schemes and national actions plans for recognition and work on improving the portability of pensions. Vietnam provides scholarships to outgoing students and staff to study and teach overseas. Access to study visa has been made easier for incoming students. Thailand implemented a policy to promote mobility. China developed a new programme called "Study in China" in order to encourage foreign language teaching, brand building and to attract more international students. Japanese government has addressed comprehensive actions for both inward and outward mobility. Among various actions, Japan starts "short-term visit and short-term stay program" from 2011 to raise students' motivation for learning and foreign languages, as well as leading students to the longer challenge of study abroad. In order to achieve internationalisation of universities, Japan has continually carried out a project named „Project for Establishing University Network for Internationalisation (G30)“ since 2009. With this project Japan supports universities that promote internationalisation by taking actions, such as expansion of degree-granting programs in which classes are taught in English, employment of international faculties and staffs, and high quality Japanese language courses.

In addition, Japanese government has also promoted the establishment the international research centre and various programs to invite and send researchers . For example, The program "World Premier International Research Centre (WPI) program" launched in 2007, provides concentrated support for projects to establish and operate research centres that have at their core a group of very high-level investigators. The budget for this program is about \$82million in FY2011. The Australian Government makes available \$200 million per annum in scholarships to incoming students, in addition to scholarships offered by individual universities. Specific Endeavour Europe awards are available to postgraduate students from Europe.

*Question: With regard to a balanced mobility, are there any initiatives since 2008 which have strengthened/enhanced cooperation between your country and Asia/Europe? If yes, please specify.*

The responding European member countries report only a few initiatives specifically aimed at achieving a more balanced mobility with Asia or Europe. France seeks to promote student mobility to Asia through schemes such as bilateral training programmes, joint diploma agreements or the establishment of annexes of French universities and engineering schools in Asian countries. Many

European countries have launched country-specific initiatives. Germany set up two programmes (“New passage to India” and “India – Country and Economy”) to familiarise young German academics with India's culture, economy and industry through a study and traineeship period in India. The Irish International Education strategy makes a provision for Government scholarship funding to allow students to participate in mobility actions with countries where the Irish position on outward mobility has not traditionally been strong, including Asia. The Netherlands offers Huygens grants to excellent students, including PHD grants for students from China. Latvia has recently concluded a bilateral agreement on recognition of qualifications and degrees with China. A small budget for participation in ASEM DUO has been made available by the Flemish Community of Belgium. Some European countries are involved in the Erasmus Mundus projects ASEMUNDUS and EURO-ASIA.NET, which promote the participation of excellent Asian and European students and staff in joint degree programmes. The Asian member countries have either formulated favourable policies or provided financial support to enhance balanced mobility. The Republic of Korea mainly participated in the ASEM-DUO Fellowship Programme and EU-ICI Education Cooperation Programme as well as issuing the Global Korea Scholarship. The Singapore Government has sponsored 309 students from Europe and Singapore for student exchange under the ASEM Duo Fellowship Programme since 2002. China is facilitating the mutual recognition of academic credentials and degrees between its colleges and academic institutions from more countries and regions. In 2010, a new programme called “double hundred thousands students plan” was launched. Both China and the ASEAN countries will accept 100,000 foreign students by 2020. Vietnam now offers more courses taught in English. With its National Research University Initiatives Thailand promotes research exchange and collaboration with foreign countries. In order to enhance understanding of higher education system and quality assurance between Japan and EU, Japan quality assurance agency, NIAD-UE started a dialogue with several quality assurance agencies in EU in 2010. Australia hosts regular visits by EU delegates to promote Erasmus Mundus to Australian students and staff. Since 2003 Australia has co-funded student mobility exchange programmes under the EU-Australia Partnership Framework.

*Question: Do you have any proposals to achieve a better balanced mobility between Asia and Europe? Do you have any good practice example you can describe in this context?*

For the majority of countries, which have answered, improving mutual recognition of higher education qualifications is a key factor for a more balanced mobility. Bilateral agreements on recognition and the implementation of Networks of Information Centres and National Academic Recognition Information Centres (NARICs) in all ASEM countries could be supportive measures. Availability of more scholarships and better information on and visibility of foreign higher education systems are crucial. Students with an Asian or European experience could become “ambassadors” for Asian higher education in Europe or European higher education in Asia. Study programmes should include mobility windows and more programmes need to be taught in English both in Asian and in European institutions. Joint programmes, joint diplomas, summer schools and traineeships seem to be suitable instruments to achieve a more balanced mobility. Building on existing programmes, such as ASEM DUO or bilateral schemes, could be a useful way to promote greater student and staff exchanges between European and Asian countries. Strengthening the mobility of university teachers and researchers seems to be a key factor to improving academic cooperation and achieving a more balanced mobility between institutions in Asia and Europe.

Example 1: Since 2003, Australia and the EU have jointly funded 16 student mobility exchange programmes, involving 47 Australian and 43 European educational institutions. More than 900 students and 75 scholars studied in partner institutions as a result.

Example 2: Korea attracted prestigious research institutions from Europe (Germany, France, Finland), actively engaging in the exchange of talented human resources between Korea and Europe in the field of science and technology.

Example 3: Germany (DAAD) supports the development of double or joint degree programmes between German universities and partner institutions abroad (including from Asia).

#### **4.2.2 TOPIC 2 “Quality Assurance and Recognition”**

Discussions so far in ASEM conferences clearly demonstrate that quality assurance issues are very high on the political and institutional agenda in Asia and Europe. Good quality of institutions and study programmes creates trust between higher education institutions and strengthens mobility between the two regions. Some ASEM seminars already dealt with different aspects of quality assurance (see 3.2.3). Also, recognition of qualifications and degrees has been a key issue of the Ministerial meetings and needs further attention.

Note: All European ASEM countries (and Russia) are members of the Bologna Process. For detailed information on the Bologna goals and the state of play in quality assurance and recognition see:

[http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/conference/documents/Stocktaking\\_report\\_2009\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/conference/documents/Stocktaking_report_2009_FINAL.pdf)

*Question: Who is the responsible body in your country for the recognition of higher education degrees?*

In the responding Asian countries, recognition of higher education degrees is mostly given by the higher education institutions themselves or by the Ministry of Education (e.g. Thailand). In Australia, non self-accrediting higher education institutions are registered and accredited by State and Territory Government Accreditation Authorities. All publicly funded universities are self-accrediting and therefore recognition of higher education degrees is by the universities themselves. This is also true in New Zealand. Australian Education International - National Office of Overseas Skills Recognition provides advice on how Australian and overseas qualifications compare to help overseas qualified people study and work in Australia. In Europe, often the Ministries for Education decide on the recognition of degrees and the institutions decide on the admission of students. In most European countries, the European National Information Centres (ENICs) and National Academic Recognition Information Centres (NARICs) support the recognition of foreign degrees (exception in Hungary: the recognition of the foreign Candidate of Science and Doctor of Science degrees under international agreements). In Ireland, it is the National Qualification Authority of Ireland (NQAI) which is responsible for international qualification recognition.

*Question: Who is responsible in your country for the recognition of study periods abroad?*

When it comes to the recognition of study achievements gained abroad, most of the European member countries which have answered leave it up to the higher education institutions to decide. Only in very rare cases, ministerial approval is required. This is also true in Australia. In the responding Asian member countries recognition of study periods abroad is regulated by the corresponding government bodies.

*Question: Who is the responsible body in your country for the accreditation of study programmes and/or institutions?*

External quality assurance of study programmes and/or institutions is in place in most of the countries questioned. Much progress has been made in this area and many countries have implemented independent bodies (e.g. accreditation agencies) to do external QA. Some countries distinguish between the quality assurance for study programmes offered by private and public universities or other institutions. For example, the New Zealand Qualifications Authority is responsible for the QA system for tertiary education organisations other than universities.

*Question: Has your country implemented the OECD/UNESCO guidelines for quality provisions in cross-border higher education or the European Standards and Guidelines(ESG) for Quality Assurance?*

Several European countries have implemented both the OECD/UNESCO guidelines and the ESG (e.g. Belgium, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Portugal). The Republic of Korea, Japan, Thailand and New Zealand have implemented the OECD/UNESCO guidelines.

*Question: Does your national Quality Assurance Body cooperate with any regional and/or international network for QA? Please name (any supranational networks)?*

All respondents stated that their national quality assurance bodies work internationally. The national QA agencies are mostly members in international, sometimes even interregional quality assurance networks. The most popular partners for Asian agencies are APQN (Asia-Pacific Quality Network) and AQAN (ASEAN Quality Assurance Network) and for European agencies ENQA (European Network for Quality Assurance), ECA (European Consortium for Accreditation) and in some cases EAQAN (Eurasian Quality Assurance Network). Concerning interregional cooperation, INQAAHE (International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education) is most common. The Chinese government has signed with about 30 countries and regional governments a “mutual recognition of higher education and degree agreement”. A group of QA agencies from Korea, China and Japan cooperates to promote mutual understanding for QA between the three countries and Asia and to support the exchange between universities with quality assurance through cooperation.

*Question: Has any QA initiative been taken by your country since 2008 which has strengthened/enhanced higher education cooperation with Asia/Europe? If yes, please specify.*

*Question: Do you have any good practice examples in the field of QA between Asia and Europe. Do you have any suggestion to further improve cooperation between Asia and Europe in the field of QA?*

The last two ASEM Ministerial Meetings have identified mutual recognition of qualifications and quality assurance as crucial for mobility and cooperation. Since then, a number of countries have taken initiatives to improve the situation. Some countries have started to cooperate regionally; others have even taken initiatives to cooperate inter-regionally. However, there is no systematic approach to intensify Asian-European cooperation in QA. Occasionally, study visits or an exchange of opinions take place. Two German QA agencies are members of APQN. Conferences such as the ASEM QA seminars in Korea and Cyprus or dialogue platforms such as the annual APQN conference and the Europe-Asia Higher Education Platform were very well received and seen as a step to improve cooperation in the future. More and better information and transparency as well as the development of joint principles of QA for both regions are important issues on the respondents’ wish list. Some Asian countries are exploring opportunities for Asia-Europe cooperation in QA. China set up a “Joint Education Accreditation Council” in Shanghai for Sino-foreign cooperation. Korea proposed the expansion of joint degree programmes between Korea and Europe in order to improve recognition of Korea’s quality education in Europe. Malaysia is partner in the “Joint QA Capacity Building Project” for ASEAN countries, initiated by Asian and European agencies (AQAN, AUN, DAAD and SEMEO RIHED).

#### **4.2.3 TOPIC 3 “Lifelong Learning”**

Globalisation, demographic transformation and rapid technological developments are posing new challenges to societies and knowledge-based economies in all parts of the world. New or updated skills, competences and qualifications are required to ensure the employability of the labour force. Lifelong learning is an important and most effective response to these challenges. The Hanoi Ministerial Meeting acknowledged lifelong learning as a solid framework for sustainable human resource development, which deserves specific attention for intensified cooperation among the ASEM countries, and welcomed the work of the ASEM LLL Hub and some ASEM members in this area. Against this background, it was only logical that the Danish host has put lifelong learning on the agenda of ASEMME3. Overarching Qualifications Frameworks describe what learners know, understand and are able to do (learning outcomes), and apply to all levels of education, training and qualifications. They contribute to better understand and compare qualifications of different

countries and their education systems across the entire lifecycle of learning and thus facilitate mobility and recognition of qualifications.

Note: Lifelong learning has been an important topic of the Bologna Process since many years. The ASEM LLL Hub officially started its important work in 2005. In 2007, the EU launched its Lifelong Learning Programme (2007 – 2013). The European University Association (EUA) published its “European Universities’ Charter on Lifelong Learning” in 2008. Several Asian ASEM countries (e.g. Thailand, Vietnam, China) organised lifelong learning conferences between 2008 and 2010.

*Question: Do you have a Qualifications Framework?*

*Question: Which levels of education are included in your QF (eg: primary education, secondary aso)?*

*Question: Is your QF based on Learning Outcomes?*

Qualifications frameworks based on learning outcomes are an important instrument to describe competences and improve recognition, mobility and lifelong learning. In Europe, many countries are developing national qualification frameworks (NQFs) that comply with the EHEA-wide framework of qualifications for higher education. In Asia, some countries (e.g. the Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines and Thailand) have already a NQF in place and an ASEAN regional QF is being explored. Australia and New Zealand do have NQFs. Australia was one of the first countries to implement a national qualifications framework in 1995. The Australian Qualifications Framework brings together qualifications issued by the school, vocational education and training and higher education sectors into a single comprehensive system of titles and standards, and maps pathways between qualifications. The Australian Qualifications Framework is currently being strengthened to ensure national consistency, contemporary relevance and national and international portability of qualifications.

The European countries have to make their NQFs compatible with the European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning (EQF LLL) that includes all education sectors and thus contributes to enhance the permeability between different education sectors (e.g. between vocational and higher education). As qualifications frameworks also facilitate the transfer and recognition of qualifications across different countries and education and training systems, they are also important for ASEM cooperation and exchange. In preparation of ASEMME1, one Asian country already suggested to establish an ASEM Qualifications Framework following the EQF LLL. The concept of learning outcomes is known in Asia and Europe, but not implemented in all countries. Moreover, the understanding of learning outcomes differs greatly between Asia and Europe and even within both regions. The strengthened Australian Qualifications Framework will define qualifications in terms of learning outcomes, specifically in relation to knowledge, skills and application of graduates. Qualifications will prepare graduates for both work and further learning, ensuring clear pathways through different qualification types and levels.

*Question: In the future, international experience becomes more and more important. What do you think could be done by ASEM in order to enable people in higher and vocational education to go abroad? Can you provide us with any good practice example?*

Most of the responding countries ask for better information on cooperation and exchange opportunities and propose an increase in international joint degree programmes (ERASMUS Mundus type) and more grants in order to promote mobility. Thailand suggests the establishment of an International Education and Mobility Association between Asia and Europe in order to enhance, monitor and evaluate mobility. It should also be envisaged to closely cooperate with employers to highlight the importance of international experience for the later career of students. Malaysia called for a common ASEM initiative for personnel exchange and the formulation of a common qualification standard. A suitable tool to make the individual learning path more transparent is the EUROPASS which could be adapted to the needs of Asian-European exchange. Transparency tools such as Diploma Supplements have the potential to assist students who wish to travel abroad. They present

information on a student's academic achievements and also the structure of the country's tertiary education system. Finally, developing a common understanding of learning outcomes and credits between Asia and Europe seems to be key to improve recognition and thus promoting mobility.

#### **4.2.4 TOPIC 4 "University-Business Cooperation"**

University-business cooperation becomes more and more important in a globalising world for improving the employability of students and graduates. During their Berlin meeting, the ASEM Ministers agreed to establish a bi-regional forum involving stakeholders from the education and economic sector to strengthen the dialogue and cooperation between education and industry at local, national and international level. The Hanoi ministerial meeting asked for specific steps to set up an ASEM University-Business Forum. This forum has taken place in Bangkok (March 2010), where university leaders as well as representatives from the world of work came together to discuss new ways for cooperation. In view of the importance of university- business cooperation for the future development of Asian and European societies, the Danish host has put this topic on the agenda of ASEMME3.

*Question: What action is taken by your country to identify skills sought by employers?*

*Question: Do higher education institutions in your country cooperate with employers in curriculum design? If so, please specify.*

In all responding countries, university-industry cooperation is already in place in one way or another. Employers are involved in accreditation, the development of curricula (at all levels), as teachers in higher education institutions, in providing student placements in companies, in collaborative research projects, in sponsoring chairs and scholarship programmes, etc. In some countries, specific types of higher education institution (e.g. universities of applied science, hogeschoolen) deliver a more practice-oriented education combining theoretic knowledge with practical work experience. Sometimes dual study programmes, leading to both a vocational and an academic degree, are jointly offered by higher education institutions and companies enabling students to combine academic studies and vocational training. Some countries have implemented career offices at universities (e.g. in France, the governing board of each university must include at least one business leader) for connecting graduates with labour market and helping employers to identify best candidates. Only a few countries conduct research on the acceptance of university graduates on the labour market (e.g. in France and Germany). Hungary has developed a career guidance system, a national career tracking system and a graduate career monitoring system. Since 2006, a systematic career tracking of the graduating students is obligatory for all Hungarian HEIs. An Expert Group on Future Skills Needs (composed of representatives of business, education etc) was established in Ireland in 1997. This group advises the Irish Government on current and future skills needs of the economy. Vietnam has signed several MoUs on educational cooperation with international businesses and also encourages MoUs between higher education institutions and national business communities in human resource development for the need of the world of work in key areas like banking, finance, tourism; ICT and technical training (that applies to Australia as well). Japan has set up a Business-Academia Partnership for Human Resource Development, including Ministries, University Associations and Industry and particular skills sought by employers were identified. The Korean Sectoral Human Resource Development Council was founded in 2003 to predict industry-specific human resource demand and develop education programmes. The Industrial Technology Innovation Act of Korea mandates colleges to take into account industry demand when designing curricula and to employ professors with experiences in industry first. Only universities and institutions that comply with the law can receive government funding. In the framework of the Intel Higher Education Project, more than 100 Chinese universities cooperate with Intel in the field of curriculum development and research collaboration.

*Question: Are work placements (internships et al.) part of university business cooperation? Could you give some examples of good practice?*

In European countries work placements are a widespread element of higher education. In some countries they are even compulsory, depending on the subject area. Traineeships are often mandatory in study programmes offered by universities of applied science. Some countries offer study programmes where students write their thesis in the company they will be working for after graduation. In some Asian member countries, work placements seem to be less integrated in higher education. Vietnam, for example, states that internships are not very common except in study courses like in medicine and healthcare, tourism and technical fields. However, there are exceptions. In Singapore, where higher education is closely aligned with its economic needs, work placements are common across degree and diploma programmes. Its universities also offer undergraduate practice opportunities programmes to equip students with skills for their internships. In China and Malaysia work placements are an important part of university-business cooperation. The China-Intel cooperation project also includes student internships. Most Malaysian universities have special units dealing with work placements. In Australia, individual universities negotiate placements with business as appropriate.

*Question: How do higher education institutions support the development of an entrepreneurial mindset?*

Almost all Asian and European respondents reported that their higher education institutions support the development of an entrepreneurial mindset. In Austria, three universities have departments for entrepreneurship, others have chairs for entrepreneurship or offer individual courses covering topics such as business planning, intellectual property rights set up in field work. To ensure employability of graduates of special study programmes (such as arts and music) complementary courses have been integrated into study programmes (e.g. business management for self-employed artists). Institutions of some countries offer special degree programmes on entrepreneurship, post-university courses in management education and joint university-business fairs for students and graduates. The Latvian State standards of professional higher education define that an entrepreneurial module should be included in the curriculum of study programmes. In Germany and Portugal active participation of non-academic members in the governance structure of higher education institutions is permitted and raises awareness of the need to provide students with practical experience within their coursework. The Irish Government set up a Strategic Innovation Fund (SIF) for promoting entrepreneurial education. The Korean Government offers regular courses and runs entrepreneur centres in universities to nurture entrepreneurship of students and people who just started their own business. The Chinese government set up a Student Business Plan for the cultivation of technology-based entrepreneurs. The Malaysia Ministry of Higher Education has established an Entrepreneurship Unit to plan, implement and monitor relevant programmes/activities amongst higher education students.

*Question: Do you have any good practice examples in the field of UBC between Asia and Europe? Do you have any suggestion to further improve cooperation between Asia and Europe in the field of UBC?*

Some respondents recommend more efforts to boost exchange and information sharing among ASEM members in the UBC area. EU's University-Business Forum mainly involves institutions, companies, intermediaries and public authorities from Europe, enabling them to exchange information and good practice, discuss common challenges and build closer working relationships. Organising the ASEM University- Business Forum (first meeting in Bangkok 2010) on a regular basis could contribute to create a similar platform for ASEM members.

Others suggest more opportunities for practical experience and traineeships in Asia and Europe. There are arrangements at institutional level, but only a few work placement schemes for students exist at national or transnational level. The Vulcanus placement programme of the EU with Japan and the global placement schemes IAESTE (for students with technical experience) and AIESEC (for students in areas of management, technology, education, and development) were mentioned as examples of good practice in this area. Germany offers a specific scheme to promote domestic graduates who want to participate in a one and a half year language course combined with practical experience in a Chinese or Japanese company. The UCD Confucius Institute works with the Irish

Government, businesses, and academics to develop strong educational, cultural and commercial links between Ireland and China. In view of lacking comprehensive work placement schemes for Asia and Europe and the importance of practical experience in an international environment, the development of a new ASEM Placement Programme has been proposed

Besides university-business cooperation in the field of placements, there are also other forms of cooperation, such as transnational education where European companies provide funds for endowed chairs, scholarships, lecture halls and laboratories (e.g. at Tongji University), research (e.g. Rolls Royce's joint research with Singapore's Nanyang Technological University) and internships (e.g. the National University of Singapore-EADS Internship Programme).

## **5. Concluding remarks**

The ASEM Education Secretariat would like to express its sincere gratitude to all ASEM countries that have responded to the questionnaire and contributed to this report. Looking back to the last two years, it is remarkable how much progress the ASEM Education Process has made and how many national and international activities have taken place since 2008. However, much remains to be done to achieve a real ASEM Education Area in the long run. Much will depend on the initiative and support of each ASEM member. A step by step approach is necessary to create transparency, improve information and achieve common understanding by learning from each other, in order to educate the internationally trained human capital for tomorrow's world of work and global citizens for our societies in Asia and Europe.

Bonn, 4-5-2011