Support LRC compliant recognition practices in HEIs

Outcomes of the I-Comply Peer Learning Activity

26 November 2019, IUAV, Palazzo Badoer, Venice, Italy

June 2020

Table of Content

Executive Summary

Higher education institutions in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) make the majority of recognition decisions for the qualifications of incoming foreign students. At the same time there is evidence that the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) is not always followed.

This report contains the outcomes of the Peer Learning Activity (PLA) held 26 November 2019 in Venice, which aimed to address the support national authorities can offer to higher education institutions to recognize foreign qualifications following the principles of the LRC.

The PLA consisted of a plenary and breakout sessions that focused on the following questions:

1. "How can ENIC-NARIC centres support HEI in their countries to practice recognition according to the Lisbon Recognition Convention?"

2. "How can ENIC-NARICs (and possibly other national actors) support HEI in regards to: 1) turnaround time, 2) information provision and 3) the implementation of the Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), standard 1.4.".

The plenary addressed the role of the European Network of Information Centres (ENICs) to assist higher education institutions in their country with Lisbon Recognition Convention compliant recognition principles and procedures. Next the current state of play in the ENIC-NARIC Networks was presented, showing various examples of linkages and room to further strenghten these. After, three case studies were presented from Sweden, Croatia and Germany, showing how ENIC-NARICs, Ministries and Rector's conferences can support LRC compliant practices. The second part of the PLA consisted of two rounds of three breakout sessions that dealt with question 2.

The report includes many detailed recommendations. Some general recommendations include:

- Assisting higher education institutions requires systematic contact with national higher education institutions and national funding should be available to all ENICs to secure the fulfillment of this task;
- A good practice model to create a structural dialogue between ENIC-NARICs and HEIs, is to establish a national admissions officers network;
- All ENICs in the European Higher Education Area, should provide clear guidance to higher education institutions and quality assurance and accreditation agencies in relation to standard 1.4 of the Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG);
- ENIC-NARIC centres should ensure their centre is catering to the needs of higher education institutions. This also contributes to their relevance and visibility;
- Information provision using the "Guidelines for national online information systems, 2019", as well as offering seminars, webinars and trainings are key activities to offer support;

- Support to higher education institutions as belonging to the remit of the ENIC centres should be further promoted within the ENIC-NARIC Networks, and the ENIC Bureau and NARIC Advisory Board should facilitate this.

The PLA was organized as part of the European Commission Erasmus+ Key Action 3 EHEA Reform project "I-Comply". This project aims towards both legal and practical compliance with the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA).

1. Introduction

About the PLA

This publication is the outcome report of the Peer Learning Activity (PLA) "Support Lisbon Recognition Convention compliant practices in higher education institutions" in Venice, Italy in November 2019. The PLA was the first of the three PLA's organized as part of the Erasmus+ Key Action 3 EHEA Reform project "I-Comply". This project aims for legal and practical implementation of the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA).

The PLA addressed the challenges of practical implementation of the LRC on the level of higher education institutions as identified in the Bologna Implementation Report 2018. This reports highlights that it is particularly problematic that higher education institutions not always follow the LRC, given that in 39 systems in the EHEA they make the final recognition decisions. This is a serious weakness in achieving actual 'practical compliance' with the LRC in the EHEA.

One of the tasks of the 57 European Network of Information Centres (ENICs) is to support implementation of the LRC. Therefore the objective of this PLA was to identify and design models of good practice to structurally support LRC compliant recognition practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) from national (ENIC-NARIC) level. Therefore, different examples were presented and next discussed by 30 participants from 19 countries including two umbrella organizations for higher education institutions and accreditation.

The PLA was structured around two main questions:

- Question 1: "How can ENIC-NARIC centres support HEI in their countries to practice recognition according to the Lisbon Recognition Convention?"
- Question 2: "How can ENIC-NARICs (and possibly other national actors) support HEI in regards to: 1) turnaround time, 2) information provision and 3) the implementation of the Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), standard 1.4.".

The first question was addressed in the plenary and the outcomes are reflected in chapter two of this report. The second question was addressed in the breakout session, which outcomes are included in chapter three. Chapter 4 summarizes the main takeaways of the event. The annexes provide information about the agenda.

2. Plenary

The plenary consisted of five presentations. The first focused on the role of ENIC-NARICs in supporting HEIs as part of the LRC. The second presentation provided an overview of how ENIC-NARIC centres currently support HEIs. Next three case studies were presented from the perspective of an ENIC-NARIC (Sweden), Ministry of Education (Croatia) and Rectors' Conference (Germany).

These three perspectives were chosen because recognition can be organized differently between countries, with different stakeholders taking roles to work towards compliance with the LRC.

2.1 Setting the stage: the role of ENIC-NARICs in supporting HEIs

By Allan Bruun Pedersen, Ministry of Higher Education and Science Denmark and Vice President of the Lisbon Recognition Convention Committee Bureau

The goal of the presentation was to open the PLA with a presentation on the role of ENIC-NARICs in supporting HEIs. The specific request from the organizers was to highlight the following two points:

- The support to HEIs as part of an ENIC task (Lisbon Recognition Convention and ENIC-NARIC Charter);
- The main FAIR conclusions from the FAIR project that are relevant for the central questions of the PLA.

Therefore, the presentation first focused on a shared understanding of the role of the ENIC-NARIC networks in supporting higher education institutions, as laid down in the LRC and the ENIC-NARIC Charter. Next, support in the three specific areas of the PLA were discussed: information provision, turnaround time and the Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher EducationArea (ESG), standard 1.4.

2.1.1 ENIC-NARIC centres

National information centres on recognition of foreign qualifications established in accordance with the Lisbon Recognition Convention. The centres are quite diverse and range from centres with 1-3 persons mainly informing on how and where to get recognition to centres with many employees making recognition decisions or statements to holders of foreign qualifications.

ENIC-NARIC centres have responsibilities in relation to citizens with foreign qualifications, foreign competent recognition authorities asking for information on national education systems and qualifications, employers and higher education institutions.

2.1.2 The LRC and the ENIC-NARIC Charter

Article IX.2 in the LRC:

- facilitate access to authoritative and accurate information on the higher education system and qualifications of the country in which it is located;
- facilitate access to information on the higher education systems and qualifications of the other Parties;

- give advice or information on recognition matters and assessment of qualifications, in accordance with national laws and regulations

Moreover, the Charter mentions ENIC-NARICs "serve as the main information point on the recognition of higher education and higher education access qualifications at national level".

2.1.3 Assisting higher education institutions – information provision

When it comes to information provision, ENIC-NARICs can assist higher education institutions in the following ways:
- Provide clear links to national legislation on recognition and the LRC and its subsidiary texts
- Provide information on assessment methodology: principles and procedures of recognition – EAR HEI Manual
- Provide information on turnaround time, refugees with undocumented qualifications, appeals procedures, RPL
- Provide links to information on foreign educational systems and recognized institutions and qualifications
- Provide information about the concept of substantial differences related to the 5 elements of a qualification

2.1.4 Assisting higher education institutions - turnaround time

ENIC-NARICs can assist higher education institutions to achieve a fast turnaround time by:
- Providing access to general recognition standards in country profiles/country handbooks
- Setting up possible hotlines for higher education institutions
- Providing information on automatic recognition: concept and consequences
- Helping with structuring standardized recognition processes throughout all faculties of higher education institutions

2.1.5 Assisting higher education institutions – Internal Quality Assurance

ENIC-NARICs are also uniquely positioned to support the implementation of Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area, specifically standard 1.4 dealing with admissions. ("ESG 1.4"). In particular they can facilitate to familiarize higher education institutions with ESG 1.4 and its consequences for internal and external mechanisms for quality control of recognition and admission procedures.

Assistance in defining what needs to be monitored in internal QA systems of recognition based on the core principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention:

- Turnaround time – decisions within reasonable time
- Appeals procedures
- Recognition unless substantial differences
- Information on procedures and principles for applicants
- Handling refugees with undocumented qualifications

2.2 Survey on ENIC-NARIC centres' assistance to HEIs

By Jenneke Lokhoff, Nuffic

The LRC tasks ENIC-NARICs with supporting the implementation of the LRC in their national context. Higher education institutions make the overall majority of recognition decisions in the EHEA and are therefore crucial in achieving full implementation.

In Spring 2019, the ENIC-Bureau and NARIC Advisory Board (EB/NAB) circulated a survey in the ENIC-NARIC networks to map the connection of ENIC-NARIC centres with higher education institutions. The aim was to create transparency in these connections and in doing so, take the discussion on this topic in the networks further.

The survey had 32 responses from 56 centres, showing that 27 centres provide evaluations to higher education institutions, with an equal distribution between legally binding decisions and non-binding evaluation/advices.

The survey covered six areas:

3. Means of contact

4. Type of support activities

5. Support to comply with ESG standard 1.4?

6. Collaboration with other national stakeholders

7. Other organizations providing training

8. Identify areas to strengthen ties between the centre and the higher education institutions

The outcomes showed that almost all respondents pursue to have ties with higher education institutions and pursue to strengthen these, while also indicating room for improvement to further strengthen these ties.

It should also be noted that no centre is alike and the remit of operations depends on the place the centre has been given in the national structure. In the next paragraphs the outcomes are summed up in more detail.

Q 1. How are you in contact with the HEIs in your country?

The first question was focused on how ENIC-NARICs are in contact with higher education institutions. The highest score was for 'via the credential evaluation services' (22 respondents). This is likely to be higher since 27 offer evaluations.

Other "high" scores, included:

▪ Face to face and online training (18)
▪ National events for admissions officers (19)
▪ Newsletters (12).

Eight centres indicated they had a national admissions officers network, while 9 centres were in contact via social media. Only 1 centre indicated they were not in direct contact with higher

education institutions, which can be explained from the place of the centre in the national context.

Figure 1

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Via the credential evaluation services offered by your centre	68.75%	22
Via face-to-face or online training offered by your centre	56.25%	18
Via national events for admissions officers (ie seminars, conferences), organized by your centre	59.38%	19
Via national events for admissions officers (ie seminars, conferences), organized by others	50.00%	16
Via your social media channels (LinkedIn group, Facebook, Twitter)	28.13%	9
Via newsletters issued by your organization	34.38%	11
Through participation in external quality assurance processes	12.50%	4
Via national networks and associations for admissions officers	25.00%	8
Our center is not in direct contact with HEIs	3.13%	1
Other (please specify):	37.50%	12
Total Respondents: 32		

Q 2. What type of activities do you undertake to assist HEIs to apply the LRC?

For question two, the responses were similar. Twenty-five out of 27 indicated to provide information about the LRC via their website and online publications. The next highest scores were for national events (22) and face to face and online training of admissions officers (19). The amount of newsletters was higher (13) than the previous question. "Distribute publications and other materials on the application of the LRC" (11). Only three centres indicated no activities were undertaken.

Figure 2

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Provide general information about the LRC (ie via website and online/paper publications)	78.13%	25
Offer face-to-face or online training in recognition methodology to admissions officers and others in HEIs responsible for recognition of foreign qualifications	59.38%	19
Organize/coordinate national events (ie seminars, conferences) for admissions officers to discuss good practice in recognition	68.75%	22
Distribute publications and other material on the application of the LRC	34.38%	11
Inform admissions officers via newsletters/social media about latest reports/developments	40.63%	13
None - no assistance activities are undertaken	9.38%	3
Other (please specify):	21.88%	7
Total Respondents: 32		

Q 3. Do you support HEIs to comply with ESG standard 1.4?

The majority of respondents indicated not to support higher education institutions to comply with ESG standard 1.4 (13 respondents answered 'not applicable' and 7 said 'no').

The 7 respondents that answered yes, specified their support as follows:

- We are in charge of issuing a certificate that accredits the access document to higher education;
- Through project activities and stretching the importance of QA and good practice;
- We regularly guide them on correct procedures of recognition based on LRC principles and on [X] procedures;
- Our legislation regarding HE is very much based on the Bologna Process and the ESG. As a result, all foreign private HEIs (offering BA, MA) as well as the secondary school offering short cycle programmes are accredited through an EQAR-registered QAA and re-accredited every 5 years;
- Seminars, information on implementation of LRC;
- Through face-to-face training in recognition methodology, participation in external quality assurance processes, etc;
- We agreed with the Agency for Higher Education and Quality Assurance to train panels related to standard 1.4;
- We support/apply with a lot of studies for ESG standard 1.4 as part of their external quality assurance process;
- Revising of the national legislation so that it complies with the Lisbon Recognition Convention and the Recommendation on Recognition of Higher Education Studies and Qualifications;
- Encouraging the higher education institutions and quality assurance agencies to evaluate institutional recognition procedures both internally and externally;
- Promoting the European Recognition Area (EAR) manual;
- Inform about the importance of the principals indicated in the ESG standard 1.4 (i.e. student admission and timely recognition).

Figure 3

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Not applicable	40.63%	13
No	21.88%	7
Yes (please specify)	37.50%	12
TOTAL		32

Q 4. Does your centre collaborate with other national stakeholders involved in academic recognition of foreign qualifications?

17 responded no, 1 mentioned not structurally and 14 centres confirmed. The answer to the open question may reveal this question has been interpreted differently by different respondents,

because a multitude of stakeholders were mentioned (ministries, accreditation organizations, higher education institutions, organizations arranging national admissions and other). This shows that many ENIC-NARICs do have active collaboration with direct stakeholders.

Figure 4

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
No, there are no such organizations or associations in my country	53.13%	17
There are such organizations and/or associations but my centre does not structurally collaborate	3.13%	1
Yes, my centre collaborates with other associations and organizations involved. Please specify briefly the organization, what they do and how you collaborate	43.75%	14
TOTAL		32

Q 5. Are there other organizations providing training to HEIs in your country on how to recognize foreign qualifications?

There were only two respondents where other organizations than the ENIC provided training on how to recognize foreign qualifications. This was due to the way the recognition infrastructure had been designed.

Q 6. Do you see areas to strengthen the ties between your centre and the higher education institutions in your country?

The full question here was: "Do you see areas to strengthen the ties between your centre and the higher education institutions in your country within the remit of your centres' mandate?".

Here 8 respondents indicated they saw no room for improvement, while 21 respondents provided the following suggestions:

- Implementation of the ESG 1.4;
- Continuous work on updates of our country-info and recognition info to HEIs. Take part in annual conferences for HEIs with "Intro to credential evaluation"-seminars. Promote the use of the translated EAR-HEI;
- Organising seminars and trainings on national level on recognition more often;
- Organize seminars and training programs;
- Regular and structured collaboration with HEIs: periodical publications, newsletters etc. with up-to-date information on good practices in recognition; national events (conferences, seminars, webinars) with involvement of competent experts from other countries; projects with HEIs;
- At the moment, we are working on a draft document through which we will decentralize the process of recognition of studies and qualifications for further studies at higher education institutions. We will organize workshops and training seminars and will request regular reports on the number of recognized acts;
- More resources for more training, we also occasionally participate in external evaluations and could more actively participate in auditing processes (QA);
- Training sessions regarding automatic recognition and authenticity of diplomas;

- Additional trainings because academic officers are not familiar with all provisions of the LRC especially related to recognition of different learning paths;
- e. g. Organisation of events regarding recognition issues;
- We already have a very strong tie with the HEIs but there is always room for improvement. Strengthening the triangle between the HEI's, the accreditation authorities and the ENIC-NARIC could be a future objective.

2.3 Case 1: The Swedish Model for cooperation with and between HEIs

By Cecilia George, Swedish Council for Higher Education

There are around fifty universities, university colleges and other institutions in Sweden. The majority of all higher education institutions are public authorities, and all institutions are regulated by the Higher Education Law and Ordinance. Higher education is free of charge for students, but since 2011 there are application and tuition fees for applicants from countries outside EU, EEA and Switzerland.

The admissions process to all courses, programmes and levels of study in higher education institutions in Sweden (except PhD-studies) is coordinated through one joint "entry". Coordinated admissions, administered by an external service authority has been a reality since over 30 years for entry to Bachelor programmes and academic recognition of foreign access credentials. Currently this service is organised within the same authority as the Swedish NARIC, i.e. the Swedish Council for Higher Education (UHR).

The main reason for coordinating the process from the start was to share the (in those days) hard-to-get knowledge and information on foreign credentials and grades between HEIs. One prerequisite for an effective common process is the legislation and ordinance on entry requirements to higher education, where a division of access and admission requirements has been in place since 1993, if not before.

Since 2006 admissions is a digitized process with online applications and scanned credentials. Information on the process and deadlines, access and admission requirements is available through two websites: www.universityadmissions.se for international students, and www.antagning.se for Swedish students. General information and a course catalogue is available at www.studera.nu

The year 2006 was also the year for the (official) implementation of the Bologna adjusted master's degree, and the coordinated online admissions process was extended to include also admissions to master programmes.

2.3.1 Coordinated admissions process for foreign qualifications

When institutions cooperate like described above, there's a need for shared assessment guidelines. Since the start of the coordinated admissions process, there has been a working group for formulation of these guidelines regarding the applied assessment and grade conversions of (older Swedish and) foreign qualifications. The group is appointed by The Association of Swedish Higher Education Institutions, i.e. the Swedish Rectors' Conference. There are representatives (experts) from HEIs admission offices and UHR as well as from ENIC-NARIC Sweden in the group.

The digitalisation of the process has allowed a virtual organisation of the admission officers who assess the qualifications. Admissions staff at HEIs from all parts of Sweden and UHR work together

with all applications in a digital tool. They sit in their own workplace but are organised in teams online, who specialise in credentials from specific countries. All staff work with applications, regardless of which HEI the student applied to.

The virtual organisation assesses the secondary/access credential for entry to Bachelor programmes. In applications to master programmes they look at programme access, i.e. the degree awarding HEI's recognition status, the degree level and workload and if applicants fulfill the language requirements.

The HEI which the student actually applied to, then takes over the process, but only for the "approved" applications, and checks for programme specific requirements and selection of candidates.

Even if the process is common and the HEIs work on behalf of each other in the virtual organisation, each HEI is autonomous and is responsible for its own admissions decisions. Each HEI is also responsible for responding to rejected students if they appeal.

2.3.2 Keys to success in the Swedish model

When HEIs cooperate as tight as they do in Sweden, there are of course some negative consequences too.

There is a set application deadline for all programmes in the same batch, and a joint schedule for the whole process, including a common date when admission letters are sent. This makes it difficult for institutions to give a formal quick response to individual applicants.

It may also be difficult for the local HEI to maintain the broader competence on foreign credentials, when admissions officers specialise in the teams in the virtual organisation. Each HEI may become less flexible and perhaps reluctant to sidestep joint admissions regulations in individual cases.

But as a whole, the coordinated admissions process and the virtual organisation have to be considered a success, which builds on a combination of cooperation and trust. To be able to work in a joint process with joint assessment guidelines, it is also necessary to implement a division of tasks with assessment of the access requirements in the joint process, and the assessment of programme specific requirements at each HEI and/or programme.

This organisation and model provides for compliance with the LRC and improves the consistency in decisions (a Bachelor is a Bachelor is a Bachelor, when it comes to access). It provides for transparency of information and requirements, since students find information in one place. Documentation, translation and language requirements are the same for all HEIs. It saves time and money – students' credentials are only assessed once. And last but not least, it enhances quality in the admissions process: staff can share information and get organised training, are allowed to specialise, and can have a career development in the organisation.

2.3.3 ENIC-NARIC Sweden supports the admissions process

ENIC-NARIC Sweden has had a permanent membership in the working group for assessment guidelines since the start, and has good relations with the Admissions department at UHR as well as the HEIs in the virtual organisation. The ENIC-NARIC takes part in annual info-sessions and gives

training to the virtual organisation staff. The coordinated process has the advantage that the need for training can be formulated in advance and can be delivered to all HEIs.

There is also an ongoing dialogue on the implementation of automatic recognition of the Bachelor level of EHEA qualifications.

Information is provided to the HEIs through different databases:

- "Bedömningshandboken" on evaluation of secondary/access credentials
- "Naric Portal" (requires a login) with info on recognition methodology, the EAR Manual and information on foreign systems of education, etc.
- Online Q&A Forum regarding specific credentials. ENIC-NARIC can research institutions, degrees, credits etc. and publish an online response, which is searchable for future needs.
- "Bedömningstjänsten" database with general level recognition information (currently over 50 countries, 700 qualifications)

Facts regarding the admissions process to international Master programmes starting Fall 2019:

- 72.000 applications in total
- 32.000 applications handled by virtual organisation
- Assessed qualifications from 165 countries
- 17 October 2018: Online application service opens
- 15 November 2018: virtual organisation kick-off meeting. Work begins
- 15 January 2019: Application deadline for international programmes
- 15 March 2019: Deadline for the virtual organisation's work
- 4 April 2019: Admission Notifications are published in www.universityadmissions.se
- Last week of August 2019: Fall semester commences

2.4 Case 2: Implementing the LRC in Croation HEIs. The EPER project
By Marina Crnčić Sokol, Ministry of Science and Education, Croatia

Since 2003 Croatia has been working hard in order to improve its system for recognition of foreign educational qualifications. The procedure for recognition of educational qualifications has been changed in line with the Lisbon Recognition Convention as of 1 July 2004. The legal basis for recognition is provided through the Act on the Recognition of Foreign Educational Qualifications (OG 158/2003, 198/2003, 138/2006, 45/2011) which defines competent authorities, recognition procedures, conditions for the recognition, appeal procedures...

The Act defines recognition for the purpose of continuation of education - academic recognition (which is under the authority of higher education institutions) and recognition for the purpose of employment - professional recognition (which is under the authority of the Agency for Science and Higher Education, ENIC-NARIC Office).

In line with the provision in the Act, higher education institutions have developed their own legal frameworks for academic recognition. Common features of the regulations adopted by higher education institutions are that the academic recognition procedures are centralized at the university level (academic recognition offices and commissions for evaluation) and that recognition practice and decisions are inconsistent and often unfair (resulting in appeal procedures).

The Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Croatia detected the clear need to provide assistance and support to higher education institutions in order to improve their recognition provisions and practice. The Ministry decided to help higher education institutions and enable them to learn about good practice and share their experience nationally and internationally.

Therefore, in the period between 2015 and 2017 the Ministry participated in the Erasmus+ project 'Focus on Automatic Institutional Recognition' (FAIR). The goal of the project was to improve institutional recognition procedures by implementing elements of automatic recognition. The FAIR project included partners from 6 countries: Belgium (Flemish Community), Spain, Italy, Germany, the Netherlands and Croatia. Beside the Ministry of Science and Education 4 Croatian universities also participated in the project: Zagreb, Osijek, Rijeka and Split. The FAIR project activities included, among others, assessment of existing practice in academic recognition, recommendations for improvement, implementation at higher education institutions level and impact assessment.

Project findings and recommendations were produced for each country (national level) and for higher education institutions (institutional level). When analysing Croatian higher education institutions it was concluded that procedural separation of recognition and admission is a challenge, procedures are time consuming with an uncertain outcome and there is an evident lack of information for applicants in English language (institutional admission requirements, procedures and legal provision). Procedures for recognition of prior learning and admission of refugees without documentation still needed to be developed at all higher education institutions in Croatia.

Bearing in mind the results from the FAIR project, the Croatian Ministry of Science and Education developed Erasmus + project Effective partnership for enhanced recognition (EPER) which is being implemented in the period 2019-2021 with the aim to further improve legislation in Croatia (enhancement of procedures for academic recognition, quality assurance), to support cooperation in recognition procedures in South East Europe and to initiate full implementation of Council of Europe Recommendation on Recognition of Qualifications Held by Refugees, Displaced Persons and Persons in a Refugee-like Situation. The project partners include national authorities for recognition from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Croatia.

The EPER project will also provide support to higher education institutions in their self-assessment in reference to FAIR recommendations (identifying challenges and obstacles in implementation of FAIR recommendations) and enable capacity building so that the quality of legal provision and practice for academic recognition is improved.

Even though the Croatian Ministry of Science and Education has had a leading role, the Croatian ENIC-NARIC office has been included in all project activities and has been considered an important partner. Aside from the before mentioned activities, the national ENIC-NARIC office can provide support in better understanding of the Lisbon Recognition Convention principles as well as assistance and advice to higher education institutions to develop a clear and efficient recognition practice. Create conditions for mutual learning and exchange of positive experience/best practice between higher education institutions, improve the role of quality assurance in recognition and stimulate discussion on quality of recognition would be a pivotal task for the national ENIC-NARIC office.

2.5 Case 3: Promoting the LRC in Germany. The example of the NEXUS project

By Tilman Dörr, head of project, German Rectors' Conference (HRK)

The German Rectors' Conference (HRK) with the support of the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) is running the project "NEXUS – Forming Transitions, Promoting Student Success" (2014-2020) in order to help universities with the continued implementation of the European Study Reform. The project addresses the most important stages in the 'student lifecycle' and aims to facilitate transitions such as access to university, recognition of credits and prior learning to enhance mobility in a transparent process and to ensure that graduates are successful on the employment market.

Selected groups of experts from the field of engineering, economic and business sciences, and healthcare/medicine work with NEXUS to develop generic solutions. Each discipline hosts a "Round Table", in which problems and potential solutions are explored in greater detail. The Round Tables bring together professors, teachers in HE, educationists and students of each respective discipline and experts from other institutions. A fourth round table is concerned with recognition of academic qualifications and recognition of prior learning in formal, non-formal and informal settings.

Concerning recognition, the project carries out several activities, such as:

- providing advisory service for universities („Service desk") and expertise for other institutions,
- online information (https://www.hrk-nexus.de/themen/anerkennung),
- national and regional conferences for various stakeholders and multipliers (https://www.hrk-nexus.de/aktuelles/tagungsdokumentation),
- on demand inhouse consulting for strategic management and training activities for academic advisors, credential evaluators and others (https://www.hrk-nexus.de/themen/anerkennung/beratung-und-fortbildung),
- promotion of good practice including a „database of good practice" (https://www.hrk-nexus.de/material/gute-beispiele-und-konzepte-good-practice)
- publications (https://www.hrk-nexus.de/material/publikationen):
    - o Recognition manual (short print, long web)
    - o Guidelines on criteria with FAQ
    - o Recognition of prior learning manual
    - o Information leaflet for students
    - o Translation EAR HEI manual (in print)

In 2018 an external evaluation had been conducted which proofs that NEXUS had a significant role in rising awareness and giving more visibility for the need of better recognition procedures and that it helped setting standards for better and more transparent recognition processes. Even though NEXUS addresses due to its voluntary character mainly like-minded people and multipliers, the evaluation points out that it had a strong and positive impact on the recognition culture and practice in higher education institutions. The expert interviews highlighted the materials and the consulting service as very helpful and as a good basis for solutions in higher education institutions.

Furthermore, the external report underlines that the position of NEXUS as a project of the German Rectors' Conference and the participation of many experts from member institutions is one of its

strengths: it is from universities for universities and this enhances the project's credibility. This aspect may also facilitate the activation of crucial networks which seems to have positive effects on reaching the project's goals.

An important aspect to convince university staff to implement transparent procedures based on the Lisbon principles is to promote an added value, such as more efficient procedures. This requires to investigate motivation and interests of stakeholders and institutions and to accept that there are different ways in different institutions and no one-size-fits-all solution. Important aspects for higher acceptance and impact may also be different offers for various target groups, promoting good (which means tested and easily adaptable) practice.

3. Breakout sessions

Two rounds of three parallel breakout sessions were organized on: 1) turnaround time, 2) information provision, and 3) the implementation of the Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), standard 1.4."

This chapter provides a summary of the outcomes of each session, each following a similar structure:

- background information that served as starting point of the discussion;
- questions discussed;
- outcomes including recommendation.

3.1 Session 1: Turnaround time

Chair: Einar Meier, NOKUT

Presenter: Angela Lambkin, QQI

Rapporteur: Maja Milas, NAKVIS

3.1.1 Background information

The results of the FAIR project indicate that the turnaround time is often related to the selection procedure and, ultimately, the internationalisation policy of an institution. Some institutions use a model in which all applications are processed at one moment in time. Thus, regardless if a student registers in February or in June, information about the recognition and admissions decision is provided just before the start of the new academic year. Other institutions prefer to handle applications according to the order of entry.

Overall, the FAIR trials show large differences in the turnaround time of applications. Turnaround times can also vary widely within institutions. The LRC underscores the importance of fast and fair recognition of qualifications and stipulates that decisions on recognition shall be made within a reasonable time limit.

FAIR recommendations:

- Speed up the case processing time, i.e. by ensuring the implementation of the LRC principles and a proper recognition infrastructure (databases, efficient communication channels). Both allow for a structured and smoother organisation of the workflow;
- Only evaluate a qualification based on its five main elements (level, quality, workload, profile and learning outcomes), and where possible (i.e. qualifications from within the EHEA) standardise decisions on level and quality. This way, a flexible form of 'automatic recognition' may be introduced into the evaluation of foreign qualifications. The good practice in the EAR-HEI manual should be used to quickly go through the various steps of the evaluation process;
- Information on the turnaround time should be publicly available, so students know how to submit their request in a timely manner.

3.1.2 Questions

Participants in session 1 were asked to prepare the following questions:

1. **What structural measures does your ENIC-NARIC/Ministry apply to support HEIs to achieve a fast turnaround time, in particular regarding:**

- Speeding up their case processing time?
- Implementation of the LRC and basing evaluations on 5 elements of a qualification?
- Promotion of the publication of the turnaround time on the HEIs website?

Please shortly explain:

- Why you have chosen these measures?
- Whether you consider these to be successful and why?
- What other support measures could be taken to achieve a fast turnaround time in HEIs?

2. **What do you consider the biggest challenges for HEIs in your country and the EHEA, to achieve a fast turnaround time? What do you consider the most successful support measures from national level and what is needed to achieve this?**

3.1.3 Outcomes discussion

Recognition decisions should be made within a reasonable time limit. Most centres guarantee a maximum turnaround time from one week to four months or more.

However, due to the admissions process and internationalization goals, admissions offices are sometimes under pressure to deliver faster decisions.

The participants discussed the role of HEIs, ENIC-NARICs and QA agencies in achieving faster turnaround time. The participants also discussed this in the light of standard 1.4 of the Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). They identified some common concerns:

- lack of centralised systems at the HEIs;
- information and database differ from one to another country;
- lack of data and user-friendly information regarding recognition procedures;
- variety of approaches carrying out recognition;
- different criteria in the quality assurance procedures (types of procedures);
- peer – review experts in the field of recognition practices & their support (trainings, materials) are not widely supported;
- systematic analysis and recognition topics are not widely implemented;
- systematic cooperation between relevant stakeholders (HEIs, QAs, ENIC NARICs, others) is still a problem;
- complex administrative procedures.

The group also discussed how students often complain that recognition procedures are problematic in Erasmus+ mobility because their credits are not recognized. The role of ENIC-NARIC centres is widely praised. Agencies in general assess this issue both in accreditation applications and in the field in stakeholder interviews (international offices at the HEIs). However, they could work better with ENIC-NARIC centres.

The group agreed that there is a need to:

- address each of the relevant target groups: higher education institutions, quality assurance agencies and ENIC-NARIC centres;
- define their role and aspects of mutual cooperation and communication;
- cooperate with ministries in regard to regulated professions;
- cooperate with ENIC-NARICs in regard to recognition of foreign higher education qualifications.

In addition, the quality assurance agencies are recommended to:

- include recognition in regular quality assurance procedures;
- improve the capacity of peer review experts and thematic analysis;
- monitor the implementation on mobility programmes and recognition practices, transnational higher education and joint study programmes;
- improve communication between different stakeholders in regard to recognition procedures;
- support and share the information (from ENIC-NARIC, HEIs) about the recognition practices.

3.2 Session 2: Information provision

Chair: Hélène Bekker, France Education International (former CIEP)

Presenter 1:   Gunnar Vaht, Archimedes Foundation

Presenter 2:   Helene Peterbauer, European University Association

Rapporteur: María Blanco Palencia, Crue Universidades Españolas

3.2.1 Background information

The results of the FAIR project show that quick wins can be made regarding the information provision to applicants. In order to ensure the recognition procedure is transparent and fair (i.e. provides applicants the opportunity to present an argued case in the event of an appeal) the following is recommended:

- Public (online) information should be provided about all aspects of the recognition procedure, including the turnaround time, procedures for refugees with no or insufficient supporting documentation, recognition of prior learning and the appeals procedure.
- Communication to individual applicants should be standardised (i.e. it is advised letters should have a single format and the same terminology should be used).
- Essential characteristics of the national education system, which are relevant for admission of foreign applicants into higher education programmes, should be explained and made available at the national level.

3.2.2 Questions

Participants in session 2 are asked to prepare the following questions:

1. **Does your ENIC-NARIC/Ministry support HEIs to:**

- provide public (online) information about all aspects of the recognition procedure, including the turnaround time, procedures for refugees with no or insufficient supporting documentation, recognition of prior learning and the appeals procedure?
- standardize communication to individual applicants?

If so, please explain:

- The strategies you apply;
- Why you have chosen these measures?
- Whether you consider these to be successful and why?
- What other support measures could be taken to achieve a fast turnaround time in HEIs?

2. **What do you consider the biggest challenge for HEIs to comply with the above recommendations?**

3. **How could your ENIC-NARIC center assist in solving these? Are other national stakeholders involved?**

3.2.3 Outcomes Discussion

Shared and identified examples of good practice

The case of ENIC-NARIC Ukraine was presented. The following good practice was highlighted:

Since 2014, Ministry and HEIs in Ukraine are both recognition authorities. Before the sole authority was the Ministry. HEIs are newcomers in the process of recognition and there are differences in terms of pro activity towards improving recognition processes in HEIs. The ENIC-NARIC provides organisational and methodological support to the Ministry and to the HEIs:

- ENIC-NARIC has the opportunity to monitor the recognition decisions of the Ministry and of the HEIs - they trace recognition cases;
- The ENIC-NARIC publishes essential information on recognition on the website, including information on the ENIC-NARIC networks, the system of education (secondary, professional, HE), links to different databases. Information is kept up to date and provided in three languages (Russian, Ukrainian and English);
- I-Comply project triggered ENIC-NARIC to identify the problems and initiate a range of activities to seek further compliance with the LRC. An example is the establishment of the Ukrainian admissions network.

Opportunities identified in the debate

There are various ways in which ENIC-NARIC centres can support their higher education institutions to implement the LRC. The actions chosen will depends on the way recognition is organized nationally. Some examples of support actions are:

- ENIC-NARIC centres provide organisational and methodological support to the Ministry and to the HEIs;
- Establishing networks at national level (admissions officers) and relations with relevant stakeholders (ie QA agencies);
- Seminars and training organised in a structured manner. The need for more structure is debated as a possibility, particularly in terms of identifying an annual calendar, or the needs of HEI.

Challenges identified in the debate

1. Challenges related to the information provision on ENIC-NARIC's webpages

The updated LRC guidelines for information provision provide very clear advice to ENIC-NARICs what information should be included on their webpages.

The following elements were highlighted during the discussion:
- Publishing information about the national education system (secondary, professional higher education);
- Importance of providing information in the local language(s) and wide spoken language(s), particularly in English, because information is targeted not only by national stakeholders but also at other ENIC-NARICS and prospective foreign students;
- Provide clear and user-oriented information to identified stakeholders (students, HEIs, other ENIC-NARIC offices). Therefore, consider specific entry for these stakeholders if this allows to further target to users and their needs.

2. Challenges in relation with HEIs

While there was consensus ENIC-NARICs should cater to the needs of higher education institutions, it was acknowledged that in some cases there was no structure to engage with HEIs to provide structed feedback about their needs. ENIC-NARICs are recommended to find structural ways to collect this feedback.

3. Challenges related to heterogeneity

3.1 Heterogeneity amongst HEIs and who is responsible for recognition processes

- ENIC-NARICs should enter into dialogue with HEIs on how to organise recognition within the institution to best serve fast and fair recognition as promoted by the LRC. One model that seems successful is to establish a central admissions office;
- There is a need to identify a centralised point of contact in HEI that will enable to know the strategies and processes of recognition within institutions.

3.2 Heterogeneity in terms of information provision:

There is in many cases a variation of information provision on recognition within higher education institutions. For example, between different faculties - some providing a lot of information on recognition, others almost none. A national dialogue or alternatively a one on one dialogue between ENIC-NARICS and institutions to streamline information provision across the institution provides is recommended.

3.3 Heterogeneity of national contexts:

There is large variation between countries and institutions how recognition is organized. This can complicate strategies to channel or streamline information and communication with HEIs.

It is recommended ENIC-NARICs address HEIs in a centralised manner, for example through national rectors conferences (NRCs), or at a European level through the EUA. Alternatively, establishing an admissions officers' network is a direct way to communicate.

4. Challenges of visibility

ENIC-NARIC offices are not always visible in the national context. The following recommendations were made to improve this situation:

- ENIC-NARICs should make a greater effort in reminding higher education institutions about their role and providing information on the LRC and good practice in recognition;
- Greater visibility for the role of the ENIC-NARIC in improving recognition processes can be created by catering to the needs of institutions, for example through seminars, training or capacity building initiatives;
- In some cases, there is a need for ENIC-NARICs to take a pro-active role and bring stakeholders together how to organise the recognition procedures at a national level.

3.3 Session 3: Implementation of ESG standard 1.4

Chair: Katrien Bardoel, Nuffic

Presenter: Aurelija Valeikiene, SKVC

Rapporteur: Eva Fernandez de Labastida, UNIBASQ

3.3.1 Background information

The results of the FAIR project show that the quality assurance of the recognition process, both internally and externally, is in most cases not very developed. However, with the inclusion of standard 1.4 in the revised Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG, 2015), it will become increasingly important for higher education institutions to be able to show the quality of their recognition and admissions policy.

ESG standard 1.4 explicitly refers to the recognition of foreign qualifications:

"Institutions should consistently apply pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of the student "lifecycle", e.g. student admission, progression, recognition and certification".

In the context of the FAIR project, discussions were started on the conditions that allow for quality assurance of the recognition process and on the performance indicators that could be used to assess the quality of the recognition practice.

Based on these discussions, the following is recommended:

- Recommendation to the Ministry of Education and the ENIC-NARIC centres
- Familiarise higher education institutions with ESG 1.4 and support a national discussion about the implementation of internal and external mechanisms for quality control of recognition and admission procedures.

Recommendation to the higher education institutions:

- An information management system (for recognition decisions and processing times) is a prerequisite for improving quality assurance procedures.
- The higher education institution should define key performance indicators to benchmark and assess the quality of their admissions and recognition procedure, which may be used in the

internal and external QA procedures. These performance indicators should be in line with the revised ESG standard 1.4.

- Feedback from the faculties and programme directors on their recognition decisions and on the performance of foreign students should be provided in a systematic way to the admissions office, in order to fine-tune the requirements for students with foreign qualifications.
- This information may also be published on the admissions webpages, so that prospective students will be able to find clear information on the admission criteria.

3.3.2 Questions session 3

Participants in session 3 are asked to prepare the following questions:

1. Does your ENIC-NARIC/Ministry support higher education institutions to:

- Establish and keep an up-to-date information management system?
- Define key performance indicators to benchmark and assess the quality of their admissions and recognition procedure?
- Organize feedback on their recognition decisions and on the performance of foreign students in a systematic way to the admissions office?
- Publish information about the admissions procedure so that prospective students will be able to find clear information on the admission criteria.

If so, please explain:
- How do you do this?
- Whether you consider this to be successful and why?
- What other support measures could be taken to achieve a fast turnaround time in HEIs?

2. What do you consider the biggest challenges for HEIs to comply with the four recommendations above? How could your ENIC-NARIC centre assist in solving these? Are other national stakeholders involved?

3.3.3 Outcomes Discussion

General observations

Access qualifications are missing in the ESG and this gap needs to be filled. Further, the recommendations from LIREQA project should be followed:

- Streamlining of national recognition procedures and structures;
- Information provision, tools, documents and training;
- Development of services;
- Collaboration with quality assurance agencies to develop indicators;
- Inclusion of ENIC-NARICs in the advisory group for the ESG.

This report on break out session 3 includes country specific experiences.

Answers to session questions: Does your ENIC-NARIC/Ministry support HEIs to…

1. Establish and keep an up-to-date information management system?

Different situations from centralized systems to institutional database to still to develop systems:

- Lithuania: institutional tools to collect data. From the ENIC-NARIC centres they ask specific information. A centralized application platform, an electronic system for recognition will in the future (EPE) connect with the National Student Register and the Agencies platform, which will help monitoring;
- Croatia: since 2006 Office for Academic Recognition, there is a national application system for lower qualifications. ENIC-NARIC is together with the quality assurance agency (ASHE) and they collaborate to approach recognition in HEIs from the quality assurance point;
- Germany: there are institutional databases, integrated databases (UniAssist), credit mobility, additional solutions (could be improved - integrated);
- Norway: study administration system by the government where the public universities have to insert their data and the colleges and private providers can add. NOKUT is uploading their recognition decision;
- Poland: results in a system - recruitment through an electronic system - transfer to the outcomes system possible;
- Spain - RUCT: at the FAIR project the Spanish partners realized that the standard was new to the HEI and that quality assurance agencies did not know how to address it. Difficulties to get the data regarding the admission - different levels of databases.
- Italy: no centralized system - each university has its own database, even at faculty level.
- Denmark: national system for study administration and specific indicators regarding recognition in the institutions;
- Slovenia: data lacking regarding appeals and regarding the need of English version. Institutions have their own database;
- Ukraine: situation changing rapidly, new law in education and higher education. There is a unified student register, if they are admitted their documents are in the unified register of education. They can monitor the decisions.

2. **Define key performance indicators to benchmark and assess the quality of their admissions and recognition procedure?**

Responses from participants included:
- KPI's should stick to the basics, not adding more bureaucracy;
- Same indicators as for the Bologna process and the ones proposed in the FAIR project;
- Turnaround time;
- Information provided, language;
- Visibility;
- Effective collaboration with ENIC-NARICs;
- Number of appeals or whether there is a procedure in place (availability of appeals procedure);
- Recognition unless substantial difference and use of substantial differences to explain;
- Recognition of refugees' qualifications;

National level:
- Lithuania: legal requirements for the HEI that want to do recognition on their own instead of having the centre doing it - the staff should be sufficient and adequate. Internationalisation strategies. Administrative level staff and committee - admission officers and academics.
- Germany: new procedure for accreditation; no checklist regarding recognition anymore. More flexibility. More freedom to define.

- Croatia: there is an issue with committees regarding recognition which are not really trained or briefed regarding LRC. They need to take the decision very quickly. Differences sometimes between the admission centre and the faculties. ENIC-NARIC could help with the information provision to help taking the decision.

Some HEI do have indicators, but not systematically:
- Ukraine: starting actively working with the HEIs to establish their procedures and support them
- Croatia: ENIC-NARIC brief their colleagues and panels regarding recognition.
- Denmark: less bureaucracy for the institutions. Quality assurance procedures are very scrutinizing and should be based on trust. Limited to the very basic of the recognition and not to the details of the recognition procedure. Applying the principles of the LRC consistently should be enough;
- Norway: NOKUT also favors an institutional approach which is more efficient from the point of view of quality. The survey of the LIREQA project showed that most institutions didn't have a quality policy including recognition;
- Lithuania: risk based approach.

3. **Organize feedback on their recognition decisions and on the performance of foreign students in a systematic way to the admissions office?**

Responses from participants included:
- A feedback loop that reports back on the admissions officer after the student once he/she is accepted (success rate, etc) is often considered successful;
- In some cases institutions have tracking systems of their students, but there is no reporting mechanism to the admissions office or those in charge of recognition to allow for improvements based on the feedback;
- In some cases only the success rate of students from specific regions (international students) was being monitored.

4. **Publish information about the admissions procedure so that prospective students will be able to find clear information on the admission criteria.**
   There was no time to collect specific information regarding this topic.

Challenges for ENIC-NARICs

What do you consider the biggest challenges for HEIs to comply with the four recommendations from the FAIR project as discussed? How could your ENIC-NARIC centre assist in solving these?

- Need to develop a general information system for the whole student-life-cycle.
- Communication and capacity building improvement - Introducing all the tools available to the institutions.
- Defining substantial difference. Not so many foreign students.
- Peers are not very interested.
- Quality Assurance does not find recognition an important aspect to look into.

Actions for ENIC-NARIC centres

- Dialogue with higher education institutions: non-bureaucratic manners, not imposing, presenting good practices;

- LRC experts - defining together what should be monitored or not - structure of implementation - pragmatic approach;
- LIREQA project - need to connect quality assurance agency and ENIC-NARIC - development of indicators;
- Lithuania - thematic evaluation regarding recognition which will be sent to the peers who review the specific institutions practices. Innovation - survey to all the international students - support / satisfaction. Next year they start with the new cycle of institutional reviews;
- Training;
- Internationalisation codes of HEIs - need to include references to LRC and EAR manual;
- Collaboration improvement when in the same organization - centre and quality assurance agencies;
- Talk and share information with all the involved actors.

4. Conclusions

The two main questions of the PLA were explored during the plenary (question 1) and breakout sessions (2):

1. "How can ENIC-NARIC centres support HEI in their countries to practice recognition according to the Lisbon Recognition Convention?"

2. "How can ENIC-NARICs (and possibly other national actors) support HEI in regards to: 1) turnaround time, 2) information provision and 3) the implementation of the Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), standard 1.4.".

The following general concluding remarks were made:

- It is within the remit of all ENICs to assist higher education institutions in their country with Lisbon Recognition Convention compliant recognition principles and procedures. This requires systematic contact with national higher education institutions and national funding should be available to all ENICs to secure the fulfillment of this task. Although most centres indicate they do have systematic contact there are still some that do not or maybe not have this organized in a systematic way;
- One model of good practice to create a structural dialogue between ENIC-NARICs and HEIs, is to establish a national admissions officers network. Bringing all recognition professionals together makes a centralized dialogue easier, and allows for peer to peer learning in the national context. ENIC-NARICs can promote the establishment of these networks by higher education institutions in their country, and either opt for coordinating the network or encourage institutions to do so;
- All ENICs in the European Higher Education Area, should provide clear guidance to higher education institutions and quality assurance and accreditation agencies in relation to standard 1.4 of the Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), which includes recognition. These should be the core principles and procedures of the LRC;
- Relevance and visibility of the ENIC-NARIC centres is sometimes a challenge. This can be strengthened by reminding national stakeholders about the role of the ENIC-NARIC and even more so by ensuring the centre is catering to the needs of higher education institutions. For example in terms of information and services offered. Structurally collecting feedback (through dialogue, activities, surveys) from higher educations is essential to identify these needs;
- The foundation for online information provision by ENIC-NARICs is the LRC subsidiary text "Guidelines for national online information systems, 2019". Furthermore, structural offerings of seminars, webinars and trainings are effective ways to support implementation of the LRC in the national context;
- The ENIC Bureau and NARIC Advisory Board should facilitate a dialogue in the Networks to promote the support of ENIC-NARIC centres to higher education institutions.

Annex 1: Agenda PLA

Tuesday 26 November 2019

08.30 - 09.00	Registration	-
09.00 - 09.10	Welcome host	Gianluca Zucconelli, IUAV
09.10 - 09.15	Welcome PSG2	Chiara Finocchietti, CIMEA
09.15 - 09.20	Welcome on behalf project	Lucie de Bruin, Nuffic
09.20 - 09.25	Introduction Day	Jenneke Lokhoff, Nuffic
09.25 - 09.40	"Setting the stage": The role of ENIC-NARICs in supporting HEIs	Allan Bruun Pedersen, Ministry of Higher Education and Science Denmark
09.40 - 10.30	Plenary	
	Outcomes survey on ENIC-NARIC centres' assistance to HEIs	Jenneke Lokhoff, Nuffic
	Case 1: The Swedish model of cooperation with HEIs	Cecilia George, Swedish Council for Higher Education
	Case 2: Implementing the LRC in Croatian HEIs: The EPER project.	Marina Crnčić Sokol, Ministry of Science and Education Croatia
10.30 - 10.50	Coffee break	
10.50 - 11:15	Plenary (continued)	
	Case 3: Promoting the LRC in Germany. The example of the NEXUS project	Tilman Dörr, Hochschulrektorenkonferenz
11.15 - 12.15	Parallel breakout sessions (round 1) on:	
	1. turnaround time,	
	2. information provision	
	3. implementation of ESG standard 1.4	
12.15 - 13.00	Lunch break	
13.00 - 14.00	Parallel breakout sessions (round 2)	
14.00 - 14.20	Coffee break	
14.20 - 15.15	Reports & Reflections. Finding agreement on main outcomes	Jenneke Lokhoff
15.15 - 15.30	Wrap Up / Closing of the meeting	Lucie de Bruin

Colofon