

HERE Seminar Report

“Research-based teaching and learning: from national and institutional policies to practice”

May 28-29, 2018

University of Montenegro, Podgorica

This report has been produced within the framework of the ERASMUS+ Programme of the European Union. This report reflects the views only of the authors; the European Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained herein.

Table of contents

1. Introduction	3
1.1 The topic	3
1.2 Objectives / Learning Outcomes.....	4
1.3 Attendance.....	4
2. Preparation for the seminar	4
2.1 Summary of pre-survey results.....	4
3. Highlights from the seminar sessions	5
3.1 Thematic orientation	5
3.2 Changing institutional missions	6
3.3 Addressing the disparities between research and teaching career pathways.....	7
3.4 Implementing research-based learning.....	7
3.5 Supporting academic staff in course design, with particular reference to internationalisation, ICT, and the specificities of the three Bologna cycles.....	8
3.6 National policy approaches	8
4. Conclusions and recommendations for HERE, HE institutions and systems	9
5. Annexes	12
Annex I – Summaries of break-out sessions	12
<i>Basic Skills/21st century skills</i>	15
<i>Use of AI in research</i>	15
<i>eLearning</i>	15
<i>ICT for the access/approach to research</i>	16
<i>Tools for research</i>	17

1. Introduction

1.1 The topic

Recent decades have seen ever stronger emphasis placed on the capacity of higher education systems to contribute to economic growth – by narrowing the gap between fundamental and applied research, by prioritising innovation and by encouraging close collaboration with business and industry. In many countries, the rise of the professional researcher has created an institutional culture in which the teaching function has been relegated to second place, in terms of funding and esteem, to the detriment of the student experience.

In Europe, the stress placed by Bologna ministers on student-centred learning seeks to reverse this trend. Promoting critical inquiry, particularly at the level of the first cycle, requires learning and teaching to be re-integrated with research. This often has profound implications for funding, career structures, staff development, pedagogy, and course design.

The Montenegro HERE seminar set out to explore these implications in depth. It offered plenary and break-out sessions devoted to the following topics:

- Institutional missions
- The disparities between research and teaching career pathways
- Research-based learning
- Supporting academic staff in course design, with particular reference to internationalisation, ICT, and the specificities of the three Bologna cycles
- National policy approaches

The seminar was a follow-up to a study visit to the University of Milan in 2017, in which HEREs were able to see how a research-intensive institution approached the concept of research-based teaching. It also set the scene for the study visit to King's College London and the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) (scheduled for September 2018), which will be tightly focused on academic staff development practices.

This report summarises the results of a pre-survey of participants, as well as the seminar presentations and discussions. It also sets out a number of conclusions. Attached in Annex I are more detailed summaries of break-out group discussions.

1.2 Objectives / Learning Outcomes

1. Clarify terminology and approaches to different facets of research-based teaching, in order better to explore institutional strengths and weaknesses in HERE countries.
2. Explore good practices in institution-driven, strategic approaches on how to integrate research and education missions.
3. Generate ideas on how to build the capacity of faculty members to implement research-based teaching and to create a research-based learning environment. This includes both research-oriented didactics and teaching students to use investigative approaches.
4. Analyse national frameworks, policies and funding that may help or hinder the development of research-based teaching in diverse types of institutions.

1.3 Attendance

The seminar was attended by 62 participants, including seven from Montenegro. The group was made up of 15 NEOs, five guest speakers, three members of the SPHERE organising team, and HEREs (mainly academics) from 17 countries. For the first time, the seminar also welcomed seven Bologna Promoters from five EHEA countries; their contributions were much appreciated. (For the full list of participants, see Annex II).

2. Preparation for the seminar

In order to shape the event in accordance with participants' needs, the SPHERE team undertook a pre-survey and called on participants to share good practice on the integration of research with learning and teaching, via short case studies. During the seminar, participants from Armenia, Jordan, Russia and Ukraine gave presentations on various aspects of the topic.

2.1 Summary of pre-survey results¹

Participants were first asked to select the best definition(s) of research-based learning. The 46 respondents opted as follows:

- Learning which generates research outcomes – 10
- Learning about research methodology – 17
- Learning which applies research methodology – 23
- Learning from existing research – 26

¹ A PowerPoint summary is available at <http://supporthere.org/montenegro2018/page/documents-9>

This proved to be a good platform for probing the definitions and for investigating in what contexts they might reinforce each other. Other responses helped shape the debates:

- 65% reported the prevalence of rote-based learning in their secondary systems;
- 61% said that their HE systems required academics to possess teaching qualifications;
- 41% reported the linkage of institutional research policy to international staff and student mobility strategies;
- 59% said that their institutional practice went beyond national requirements.

These and other responses suggested that participants' systems and institutions were aware of the challenges and addressing them positively. However, the pre-survey also revealed that:

- Only 37% reported the existence of funding instruments targeted at the consolidation of research-based learning and teaching;
- Only 35% regarded their quality assurance systems as adequate for this purpose.

The relatively high response rate illustrates the usefulness of the pre-survey. It revealed the contours of the context, while at the same time stimulating discussion by inviting participants to reflect on the positions of their own systems and institutions.

3. Highlights from the seminar sessions

3.1 Thematic orientation

The scene was set by Professor Wyn Morgan, Professor of Economics and Vice-President for Education at the University of Sheffield (UK). Drawing on the outcomes of the EUA's Learning and Teaching Initiative² and his own experience as the initiator of Sheffield's Programme Level Approach to learning and teaching³, Professor Morgan laid down the basic parameters of subsequent discussions by participants⁴:

² Loukkola, T. and Dakovic, G. (2017) *EUA's Learning and Teaching Initiative: Report from the thematic peer groups 2017*, European University Association, Brussels <http://www.eua.eu/Libraries/publications-homepage-list/eua-s-learning-and-teaching-initiative---report-from-the-thematic-peer-groups-in-2017>

³ See <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/staff/learning-teaching/our-approach/programme-level>

⁴ His presentation is available at <http://supporthere.org/montenegro2018/page/documents-9>

- Research-based learning involves the joint creation of knowledge by students and teachers; it is not a one-way transmission of knowledge from researcher to student, but a process allowing the classroom experience to feedback into the research activities.
- It encompasses a wide variety of practical approaches. Partly this is because the approaches are dependent on national, legislative, financial and disciplinary contexts, as well as by – critically – the extent of academic autonomy inscribed in institutional governance; partly it is because research-based learning is characterised by inquiry and by the scope it necessarily gives to improvisation.
- The teacher-researcher becomes a mentor and facilitator, fostering the development of students' skills through and of critical inquiry. This model of reflective practitioner requires that the academic career pathways be re-thought and that staff development programmes be comprehensive and effective.
- Research-based learning and teaching maximises the need for a programme-level approach in which individual modules reinforce each other and operate cumulatively to achieve programme-level learning outcomes. Because it is holistic rather than atomistic, it requires an institutional commitment to staff development based on agreed objectives and values.

3.2 Changing institutional missions

The seminar heard presentations on the Armenian, Irish and Russian institutional contexts. These gave valuable insight into how the relationship of research with learning and teaching could be creatively managed, in the context of evolving institutional missions. The main points were the following:

- In the early 1990s some countries had transited abruptly from command economies into an entrepreneurial culture in which higher education was called upon to play an important role. The change of paradigm and the relentless speed of scientific progress meant that successful employability policies came to rely heavily on the critical and innovative aptitudes of graduates.
- Hence the need to promote a culture of collaborative research from the undergraduate level onwards, driving effective knowledge transfer and nourishing the development of university-business-industry clusters.
- Since then, employability has assumed high priority throughout the EHEA, particularly following the financial crisis of 2008 and the urgent need to re-boot economic growth. Strong links with business and industry are at a premium.
- Competence-based curricula designed in collaboration with employers, notably in the STEM disciplines, are now emerging in greater numbers. They should be conceived in a learning-outcomes-based approach and duly monitored by quality assurance.

- Effective and relevant staff development is a pre-requisite for such course development. The seminar heard examples of performance-based funding designed to support it.
- A more holistic view of research is now essential, bringing it into the mainstream of the universities' learning and teaching vocation and diffusing it throughout the qualification levels. It should also link constructively with community engagement, the third pillar of the higher education mission.
- It is widely acknowledged, however, that institutions benefit from a clear, over-arching and well-resourced national strategy. While guaranteeing scope for institutional autonomy to respond appropriately to regional needs, a national strategy can energise and can provide a framework in which good practice can be identified and shared.

3.3 Addressing the disparities between research and teaching career pathways

Despite the evident need to bring research and teaching closer together, in reality they continue to diverge in many higher education systems. There is still a gulf between researchers and teachers, in which enhanced access to resources has inflated the prestige of the former to the detriment of the latter. The seminar heard presentations from Italy and the Ukraine which indicated how the problem might be addressed.

- While the need for staff development is clear, many academics have overloaded timetables and have limited scope for research. Students inevitably suffer as a result. One solution – and the seminar heard the example of UNIROMA (Sapienza) – is to 'de-privatise' the teaching activity, opening it up to scrutiny and participation. In practice, this means a shift to student-centred learning in which researchers participate and in which research activities are prioritised. It implies an inter-disciplinary focus with scope for team teaching, as well as a higher intensity of critical inquiry; learning and teaching should be rooted in dialogue. It also implies greater synergies between the academics' research and teaching duties, thus allowing more productive use of their time.
- Bottom-up initiatives should be fostered and encouraged by top-down facilitation. Staff development should feature as a priority at system level, either as a mandatory provision or as a well-incentivised voluntary activity. Research productivity and pedagogical skills must be enhanced in conjunction if, as the new Ukrainian law puts it, staff are required to develop the 'autonomy, initiative and creative abilities of students'.

3.4 Implementing research-based learning

The seminar also addressed the complex topic of research-based learning, and how this could be better fostered. Participants heard two examples of top-down and bottom-up initiatives. The first, in the Sorbonne, showed how a modular undergraduate course structure can accommodate

interdisciplinary provision featuring research-based learning. From the first year of the BSc programme, students work on problem-solving tasks with supervision by researchers from two disciplines. The curriculum is defined by learning outcomes, which are reinforced in the evaluation and assessment processes. Work placements play an important role in assuring the relevance of the provision and have led to the setting up of student start-ups.

The second, in the University of Jordan, involves a cohort of pharmacy students who set up a research club in reaction against the established teacher-centred approach. 150 undergraduate students were successfully integrated into 60 research projects and participated in the production of published papers. The initiative won the support of the Dean, who ensured that appropriate academic credit was given and brought national policy makers on board.

3.5 Supporting academic staff in course design, with particular reference to internationalisation, ICT, and the specificities of the three Bologna cycles

Implementing research-based learning requires academic staff support and professional development opportunities. The institutional framework for staff development will not work effectively if it fails to provide the necessary time and space (intellectual and physical) for teaching and research functions to be integrated. As one positive example, the Centre for the Integration of Research, Teaching and Learning (CIRTL) at University College Cork works alongside other internal agencies (adult education, continuing professional development, online course design) to provide a spectrum of development possibilities ranging from the structured and accredited to the informal and unaccredited. It maps the research content of the University's programmes, by counting keywords in the programme descriptions and intervening as appropriate. In-service postgraduate programmes are available on an optional basis for academic staff to enhance their teaching competence; importantly, these are relevant to promotion opportunities. The institutional centrality of the CIRTL has helped it raise substantial financial support from European and domestic funding bodies.

3.6 National policy approaches

The seminar heard an academic reflection on Croatian national higher education policy, coupled with a formal policy statement by the Montenegrin government spokesperson. In Croatia, research shows that the criteria on which academic promotions are based have evolved significantly between 2005 and 2017. Greater weight is now given to the integration of research and teaching. However, prejudice and resistance to change continue to pose problems, although less so in the humanities and social sciences and among women academics. Montenegro, for its part, endorses the need for learning and teaching to synergise effectively with research activities in higher education and is keen to share good practice with other national systems and with institutions.

4. Conclusions and recommendations for HERE, HE institutions and systems

Thanks to the good practices presented in detail by academics, researchers, policy makers and the student representative, the seminar was able to gain a clear view of the potential benefits of re-thinking the relationship of research to learning and teaching. The salient characteristics of the new paradigm are the following:

- It operates at the level of the programme, rather than in isolated modules, and offers a holistic experience; it requires coherent and developmental linkage between the learning outcomes defined at modular level and those defined at programme level.
- It generates ‘knowledge created with students’; it favours problem- or inquiry-based learning and requires specific pedagogical skills on the part of teacher-researchers, as well as infrastructural support including flexible physical and virtual space.
- It creates a virtuous circle, in which research informs learning and teaching and, reciprocally, may be reshaped by them; it implies the existence of a holistic institutional strategy which can clearly identify which synergies are permitted by the existing context and in what ways the context might be adapted.
- It is characterised by so many variables (legal and cultural framework, level, discipline, group size, availability of learning resources etc.) that no single prescribed model can exist. While good practice can and should be shared, the bringing together of research and teaching happens not in the abstract but in a sharply defined context.

The seminar noted the distinctions between learning which is research-based, research-led, research-tutored and research-oriented⁵. It was suggested that whatever mode was appropriate to the institutional context, a basic aspiration should be for all institutions to become ‘research-inclusive’. Clearly, a number of institutions would remain or become research-intensive. What was desirable that modes of research-based learning and teaching should be generalised across higher education systems, creating an embedded culture.

While the contexts are multiple, the seminar showed that good practice was identifiable. It could therefore be exchanged, adapted to context and sustained by broad consensus. It was possible to specify a number of pre-requisites. It is crucial to:

- *Engage students and all other stakeholders.* Institutional leadership needs to be familiar with good practice elsewhere, in order to formulate a strategy which is sufficiently

⁵ Jenkins, A. & Healey, M. (2005) *Institutional Strategies to Link Teaching and Research* (York: The Higher Education Academy). http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/York/documents/ourwork/research/Institutional_strategies.pdf

evidence-based to identify and command the support and participation of the full range of stakeholders. Their task will be easier if they are backed and resourced by a national policy framework.

- *Base programme design firmly on learning outcomes.* It follows that course design should likewise involve an appropriate range of stakeholders: employers when relevant; students, on the basis of their perceptions of the quality of provision and their role in institutional governance; and research-active teachers.
- *Articulate research-based learning with quality assurance and enhancement.* The pre-survey indicated that institutions currently fall a long way short of ensuring that their quality assurance practices are able to accommodate and nurture the new paradigm. National agencies have an important part to play in disseminating the good practice available in other higher education systems.
- *Focus on undergraduate programmes as the platform on which Master and doctorate levels can build.* Here there are certain assumptions: that the productivity of Master and Doctoral levels will increase if the students who access them are already well versed in research methods; that the teachers at the higher levels should also operate at undergraduate level, both in the classroom and in the process of course design; that their success will be greater if inquiry-based learning is already present in the secondary system.
- *'De-privatise' teaching by strengthening its collaborative dimension.* A holistic strategy will flourish educationally if it can maximise the research and teaching strengths of all members of the academic community. This implies an ethos of teamwork which is itself dependent on enhanced transparency and accountability.

The seminar discussions generated a number of recommendations⁶. Managers, policy makers and social partners at system and institutional levels should be encouraged to:

- Use funding and budgetary instruments to secure parity of esteem for research and teaching activities;
- Structure career pathways and workload accordingly;
- Extend academic autonomy to the level at which programme design becomes the responsibility of the practitioners.

As for the academic community as a whole, it should strive to

- Develop a methodology to assess the incidence of gender sensitivity in research-based learning, since this is an issue relevant both to professional opportunity and to student performance;

⁶ These are set out in more detail in Annex 1.

- Develop over time ways of measuring and demonstrating the value-added of research-based learning, both as a basis for further raising standards and for constructing the evidence base needed to inform policy-makers;
- Use its leverage on policy-makers to influence the fostering of research-based learning in the secondary education sector, the importance of which cannot be over-estimated.

5. Annexes

Annex I – Summaries of break-out sessions

1.1 There were two sets of break-out sessions. The first followed plenary 3 and examined the **disparities between research and teaching careers**. Composite conclusions are set out below:

Participants reached a large measure of agreement on the context:

- There are wide variations in practice and policy, which militate against the adoption of good practice in the area of the integration of research and teaching
- Research and teaching are not always located in the same physical environment; nor do they necessarily operate within the same governance and funding structures
- Modern management practice, which prioritises return on research investment, tends not to recognise the need to invest in learning and teaching
- The overload of teaching timetables inhibits research activities

They also agreed that good practice nevertheless exists. For it to be generalised, a number of conditions need to be satisfied:

- There must be programmes of targeted investment, designed to integrate learning and teaching with research
- These imply the fostering of existing and innovative teaching skills, an appropriate reward system, and the identification of relevant quality indicators
- Governments and institutions must embark on awareness-raising programmes, in order to show that employability in a rapidly evolving job market is dependent on critical thinking and enhanced research skills
- The teaching activity should be ‘de-privatised’; it should be open to scrutiny and accountable; it should be set within a course design framework which has sufficient academic autonomy to organise provision on a collective basis, taking into account the expertise of individuals and avoiding all discrimination (particularly on grounds of gender)
- Course development by self-managing teams should integrate individual teaching and research competences and create greater opportunities for inter-disciplinary work

The second cluster of break-out groups dealt with three separate topics and the edited reports are reproduced below. The seminar organisers thank the rapporteurs for their valuable contributions.

1.2 How to connect research and education at the different levels of study (BSc, MSc, PhD)?

Research-Based Teaching/Learning (RBT/L) is not a very new approach and differs from country to country, from institution to institution. In some education systems this kind of approach is used at kindergarten or primary school level. It should be transferred to secondary schools. The independent thinking that is necessary to do research is not currently a competence that is given in school. It is necessary to start as early as possible to have students with appropriate competencies in research at higher levels of education.

Key issues in this area to solve are:

1. How to make this process dynamic?

There can be no results with inactive parties, either teacher or student. Every student should work with an active academic staff member. The teacher should play the role of facilitator. Success depends on the creativity of teachers and students. The teacher needs special skills to succeed, to be more effective in engaging students in the process. The issue of the combination of teacher and researcher in one person depends on factors such as individual preferences and competences, system and institutional regulations, infrastructure etc. But the key factor is the teacher's level of qualification.

One very important condition of success is the student's motivation for engagement in research. But there are two contradicting issues:

- *If research is not mandatory, there is no any motivation*
- *If it is forced, then creativity decreases.*

Students' motivation in post-soviet countries is a special issue, as even in choosing a thesis topic it is sometimes still a professor who proposes, not the student.

2. How to define RBT: as a pure science or just project-oriented and student-oriented approaches in teaching?

Doing research is not limited to higher education levels. Research skills are basic skills. Knowledge without research skills is nothing. It is necessary to find best balance of research in the curriculum at each educational level.

There are following starting points:

- 1) *Level of education*
- 2) *What exact amount of research skills, knowledge and competencies do students really need to do research: ability to research, critical thinking, analysis, evaluation, assessment etc. And it is very good if there is a possibility to introduce additional research skills.*

There should be flexibility in the regulation and execution of RBT/L as follows:

- *Does every course have to include research?*
- *Is there space in the curriculum?*
- *What are the possibilities of knowledge application?*
- *How far should we go with Learning Outcomes (LO) and Diploma supplements? How to organise good constructive alignment in LO via all education levels? Research*

knowledge, skills and competencies should be defined in LO and should be appropriate for different education levels. Professors are not very familiar with working out LO for education levels, who should do this?

No	Level of education	Difference in research needs	Recommended approaches in organisation of science research	Level of academic autonomy
1	<i>Bachelor</i>	<i>requires research topics which allow students to become involved in the research process</i>	<i>Group work</i>	<i>Low</i>
2	<i>Master</i>	<i>requires research topics plus the set of professionally oriented abilities</i>	<i>Combination of group and individual work, less team work</i>	<i>Middle</i>
3	<i>PhD</i>	<i>PhD activity is a science by definition; the researcher has to have the full range of research skills and competencies.</i>	<i>Individual work, less team work</i>	<i>High</i>

Best practice in RBT/L as suggested by seminar participants:

Attitude:

- *students are the part of the research discipline;*
- *flexibility in execution of projects;*
- *top-down approach in the organisation of student scientific process;*
- *softly guided learning in communication;*

Organisation:

- *student scientific circles with seminar at the end as an organisational form;*
- *student scientific councils and clubs with strong cooperation with leading researchers;*
- *scientific centres held by international experts;*

Quality assessment:

- *rigorous and accurate choice of research topic: (for thesis, articles, reports etc.)*
- *environment that consists of the best students and academic staff*
- *keeping students up-to-date with most relevant researches*
- *ensuring the results in the form of published papers, conference proceedings etc.*

3. *Funding is a relevant issue at all levels. Best practice lies in strong links between university and industry (industry oriented research topics, internships, guest lectures from industry professionals, combined curricula in cooperation with industry professionals etc.).*

1.3 How to use ICT in research-based education?

The session can be summarised by the following main topics:

Basic Skills/21st century skills

We started with a discussion of whether ICT skills are something still to be addressed in higher education or if they can be presumed, taken for granted (“digital natives”). Most participants agreed that there is still a list of skills to be taken care of, i.e. 21st century skills, like ...

- *how to find information*
- *how to evaluate information*
- *how to make digital artefacts (e.g. in a portfolio)*
- *copyright issues*
- *mutual respect*
- *not: take the first page that comes; i.e. how to assess information*
(Students think that finding something on the internet is research; they have no awareness of what it means to be an expert.)

Example: Today, huge amounts of research publications are accessible to everyone (open access), but this makes it even harder to stay focused on reading something. → How to stay concentrated?

Moreover: Today’s youth only know the surface of ICTs, they use them but have little or no understanding about how things work, about the underlying processes. → Our students are not digital natives as they are reported to be, they lack basic ICT skills.

Interesting observation: Teacher education students learn about how to use ICT but do not use them later in the real-life classroom.

Use of AI in research

- *Machine learning (AI) is shifting the boundaries; is revolutionising knowledge acquisition and treatment.*
- *... in a way that cannot be interpreted by humans; AI-learning is difficult to understand for humans; non-intuitive conclusions; ...*
- *We must be careful not to let human skills deteriorate; and not to let machines take over.*
- *Students nowadays have AI tools close at hand; they only adjust some parameters and get results; but they have little understanding of the underlying principles.*
- *But AI can help to break down barriers between disciplines (interdisciplinary research as a field for RBT/L).*
- *In general, deep reflection on the implications of AI is needed.*
- *Machine learning (AI) must be addressed in education.*

eLearning

eLearning is something that has been talked about for nearly two decades. The hype is long gone. In the context of RBT/L eLearning can be of use in scenarios like the following:

- *use online eLearning for students to acquire greater volume of learning (Wyn Morgan)*
- *flipped classroom (Wyn Morgan)*
 - *Fung (2016): Using a programme of online learning which runs in parallel with face- to- face elements, but which provides structured opportunities for students to make connections along the full spectrum of topics.*

- *Example: Statistical learning/methodology courses in Kyrgyzstan.*
- *to collect feedback (e.g. clicker-systems)*
- *to organise and provide feedback*
- *for collaboration (Google docs, online-brainstorming, discussion boards, wikis, portfolios, ...)*
 - *Example: Wikispaces was a great tool and a great source of ideas, examples, ... But currently it's closing down.*
- *virtual labs*
 - *solution for hazardous experiments or for educating large number of students*
 - *chance for bigger groups of students*
 - *depends on the kind of lab*
 - *saving resources*
- *but many eLearning scenarios consume too much time of the teachers for preparation, coaching etc.*

“This finding reflects the hermeneutic principle that dialogue is the key to developing understandings (Chapter 1). It is human interaction that allows the questioning and testing of prior knowledge and the development of new knowledge: that is, the widening and even merging of knowledge horizons.” (Fung, 2016)

ICT for the access/approach to research

ICT might be of help to get access to research in the field. See Citizen Science projects: Gain research data by input of non-research (civil) population. This might provide students with projects.

Examples:

- *Bird watching; data on bird populations;*
- *Research on cultural heritage*
 - *Example from Egypt: Public makes photos from cultural heritage; photos have all the relevant geo-tags etc. so that photos can be shown on a map. Much data to be analysed by students.*
 - *Example from Lebanon: student developing tools*
- *Example from Montenegro: Classroom observations by teacher training students*
- *Etymology: open call for population; dealing with local use of language*

But there is a danger of exploiting students as cheap workforce.

Open Access Journals

Digital humanities as a field of study, examples/thoughts:

- *linguistics, etymologies*
- *how to digitalise cultural heritage*
- *how to search sights*
- *analyse text corpuses*
- *automatic translation*

Tools for research

Online laboratories

Making use of new analytical software

Students often are more motivated to test, to play around with new software.

1.4 How to connect research-based education with mobility, joint programmes, international cooperation?

The Chair began by presenting the Italian strategy for the internationalisation of universities through Joint Programmes at Master and PhD levels; the strategy was first elaborated by Minister Berlinguer in 1998. The discussion that followed led to a number of observations and conclusions:

- 1) Only a few of the Universities in countries represented in the break-out group can be considered research-intensive universities; rather they are only research-oriented.*
- 2) Despite Bologna follow ups, legislations differ considerably in the EHEA; most are legally binding and some are very recent.*
- 3) Some countries in which with research-intensive universities are strongly differentiated from research-oriented universities are developing joint research activities; virtual research-led teaching activities are also growing.*
- 4) EU Framework Research Programmes require high standards from most of the European countries. The participation of scientists from less developed countries in EU-funded projects should be FURTHER implemented.*
- 5) Only a few universities in few countries have the financial resources for internationalisation and for Joint Programmes.*
- 6) Strategic partnerships are not considered relevant by the governments of some countries.*
- 7) All participants are interested in developing Joint Programmes with research-led teaching as a core activity.*