

*The Bologna Process and a Reconstituted Local Education Policy Field at UCD*

Orna O'Brien

University College Dublin, Ireland

0080

The European Conference on Education 2013

Official Conference Proceedings 2013

Abstract

This article investigates the policy process at University College Dublin (UCD) and its constituent School of Business when it modularised its programmes from 2005. The introduction of a policy of modularisation was used to investigate how supranational agencies interact with national policy entities and individual institutions in Ireland. This paper reviews how regional and supranational processes and discourses (including European integration and the work of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) affected UCD's institutional dynamics and policy production. The production of this modular policy suggests that policy is shaped predominantly by local policy actors and global influences situated, suggesting that the nation-state's role in some cases may be overstated in debates in some circumstances. This paper sustains the suggestion of a global policy field (Lingard, Rawolle & Taylor, 2005) and proposes a reconstitution of the local education policy field.

**Keywords:** Europeanisation; global policy field; vernacular globalisation; Bourdieu; modularisation; Bologna Process.

## **Introduction**

The rise of the 'European Education Space' signifies that trans-national governance has altered the roles of national system policy actors (Lawn, 2006). Enders (2004) noted the impact of such governance changes for the micro/institutional policy processes has been under-researched. In light of a European/global dimension to the policy cycle, the political structures operating beyond the nation state, namely the European Union (EU) and Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) are increasingly acknowledged. As a result, this concept of a 'global education policy field' was developed from Bourdieu's (2003) concept of a global economic field (Rawolle and Lingard, 2008: 736). Shifts in the development and institutional implementation of education policies, as the values promoted by national systems of education are not just established by the policy actors within the nation state but forged through transnational and global entities (Rizvi and Lingard, 2010). There are often reductionist accounts of global effects on education policy which do not take account of historical context.

Modularisation provided a tangible policy outcome to review how supranational agencies arbitrate national policy entities and individual institutions. From 2005, there has been an unprecedented change in the nature, role and purpose of the policy capacity at University College Dublin (UCD). UCD provides an outward-focused case study to explore such relationships at a micro level. The pursuit and implementation of modular policy demonstrates the capacity of non-national political structures, particularly the Bologna Process to shape not only national policy (Henry, Lingard, Rizvi, and Taylor, 2001) but also institutional governance and policy. Neither the convergence or divergence theses of globalisation provide sufficient insight into this process, suggesting evidence of a vernacular globalisation, in this case of education policy outcomes (Appadurai, 1996). While this literature is useful, often it is explored without historical context and neglects the institutional policy transfer arising from European integration.

## **Globalising Education Policy: the Literature**

The globalising of the policy cycle was acknowledged to reflect the global diaspora of policy ideas (Lingard, 2000). The assumption that the state always retains political authority may be questionable. For example, Ireland might be exceptional as in this case local and national processes are contested at a particular time in matters governing globalisation processes. The construction of a global education agenda (Dale, 2009; Lawn & Lingard, 2002) reconfigures the state's authority and instigates new communication models which permeate across national boundaries. More generally, national policy responding to global pressures, is increasingly a process of bricolage, where policy is borrowed and copied from elsewhere, drawing on and amending locally approaches (Ball, 2008:30). The process of globalisation exports ideas, trends and policy.

---

From the global education policy discourse emerges the pursuit of restructuring based upon neo-liberal tenets, e.g. accountability, lifelong learning, international competitiveness, etc., (Ozga & Lingard, 2006). Nations have different capacities to mediate and ameliorate the effects of global pressures and globalised education policy discourses produced by supranational agencies (Ozga & Lingard, 2006). For example, the OECD's ability to set the agenda for national education systems was recognised, though less documented (Rinne, Kallio & Hokka, 2003). The OECD has

no legal power over states, yet exerts influence on the policies of its member in a variety of different, indirect fashions. The EU also demonstrates a capacity to reorient national systems. Its multilevel governance is not a deterministic model, but a complex web of policy-making involving agents across the local, national and global policy landscapes (Brine, 2006). Endorsing education policies is formally beyond the EU's responsibility, to the principle of subsidiarity<sup>1</sup>. Instead the EU uses 'Open Method of Coordination' (OMC) to collaborate with member states on economic and social objectives (Ball, 2008). Resulting from such soft law mechanisms, there are no official sanctions for those who do not attain the goals.

Of particular interest is the Bologna Process. The Bologna Process commenced in 1999 and is an ongoing process of ministerial meetings and agreements between European countries. Its objective is to provide comparability in the standards and quality of higher education qualification in Europe. European ministers responsible for higher education met in Bologna to lay the basis for establishing a European Higher Education Area by 2010 and promote the European system of higher education globally. It based upon six key objectives to;

1. adopt a system of easily readable and comparable degrees
  2. adopt a system with two main cycles (undergraduate/graduate)
  3. establish a system of credits (such as ECTS)
  4. promote mobility by overcoming legal recognition and administrative obstacles
  5. promote European co-operation in quality assurance
  6. promote a European dimension in higher education
- (Joint Declaration of the European Ministers for Education, 1999)

The Bucharest Communiqué extended the Process until 2020, recognising the Bologna Process as an element of a wider initiative for the European knowledge based economy and supports EU initiatives, e.g. the Europe 2020 strategy and Strategic framework for the Open Method of Coordination in Education and Training (ET2020). The Bologna Process itself is endorsed by the European Ministers of Education (Robertson, 2009). Inter-ministerial meetings were set-up on a biennial basis. Outside of these meetings, the Bologna Process was managed through the Bologna Follow-up Group (BFUG) and supported by the member states and consultative members including the EC, The Council of Europe, the EUA, EURASHE (European Association of Institutions of Higher Education), ESIB (European Students Information Bureau – now European Students Union) and UNESCO/CEPES (Centre for Higher Education). The role of the EU in the process is important, as the Commission are sensitive to claims of interfering in 'national' affairs.

### **Conceptualising Policy with Bourdieu**

Bourdieu highlighted the effects of policies produced by agencies external to the nation within different nations possessing varying amounts of national capital. Bourdieu's concepts of capital, practice field and habitus have contributed to understanding education policy sociology in the global context (Rawolle & Lingard, 2008). Some construe it as deterministic, nebulous and tenuous. However, Bourdieu's tools permit empirical investigation of the construction of the global economic market. Bourdieu helped with the deliberations of education policy as a

text, which was produced in a field of policy text, underpinned by its specific logics and operationalised in a professional practice field with different logics of practice (Rawolle & Lingard, 2008).

Using Bourdieu's concept of capital, Lingard, *et al.*, (2005) suggest the amount of 'national capital' held by a nation within the global field helps determine its resistance to autonomy. The amount of economic, political or cultural national capital retained by a nation within these global fields contributes to the spaces of resistance and degree of autonomy for policy development within the nation. As Rizvi and Lingard (2010) suggest that the Global South (i.e. the developing world) is positioned differently from the Global North (i.e. the developed world) regarding the effects of education policy from international agencies. National capital can mediate the amount to which nations are able to be what Appadurai (1996) called 'context generative' in the global field. Each state manages differently its 'national interests' and utilises diverse capacities to manage its interests in higher education. Bourdieu called the environment of an agent's habitus is expressed in practice the 'Social Field'. Within such 'fields', agents fight for unequally distributed resources of 'capital'. Social fields conceptualise social arrangements as various quasi-autonomous fields informed by their own logic of practice, spanned by a field of power, connected to the field of economics and a field of gender (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Bourdieu spoke of a university field, which

... is, like any other field, the locus of a struggle to determine the conditions and the criteria of legitimate membership and legitimate hierarchy, ... (Bourdieu, 1984:11).

Bourdieu's concept of a social field has also primarily a national focus but Rawolle and Lingard (2008) suggested that the concept can be applied to social structures operating beyond the nation-state. Within the global policy field, the national fields of power in the education policy field have become more heteronomous (Maton, 2005). Educational policy appears to be less independent and driven by an economic agenda advocated by supranational agencies, (which would seem to support the observations above regarding the Bologna Process in particular). Nation states developed mechanisms regarding the process of globalisation through various interactions with the emergent education field. What appears to determine the nation's response is the extent of national capital which a nation had and drew upon to mediate the global field. This assumes that the nation (i.e. national government and its agencies) were the locus of origin for public policies in education. The case of UCD suggests that this is not always so.

### **Methodology**

Insight into UCD's process was evidenced by collecting data through textual analysis of fifteen policy documents and the semi-structured interviewing of 23 key policy actors at UCD and other influential national and global policy agencies between 2008 and 2010. The content of the policy documents were analysed using Nvivo software: common phrases and key themes were identified and used for content analysis purposes.

Organisations who participated in this study included Irish Universities Association, Higher Education Authority, Department of Education and Science, European Universities Association, European Commission and Organisation for Economic and Cooperation Development. Research commenced with those working at UCD and

progressed as key policy makers were identified as influential. Interviewing commenced with staff involved at UCD's School of Business and progressed some months later to those working with the European Commission, European Universities Association (EUA) and the OECD. In terms of textual analysis, the UCD 2005-8 Strategic Plan as the first document analysed and any document referenced by it were then also analysed itself. This approach helped provide insight into the parameters of the policy field within UCD.

### **Global Vernacularisation?**

UCD is Ireland's largest university with over 25,000 students. Since 2005, UCD reorganised its internal structures, modularised its programmes and increased research income, exemplifying the agenda to restructure Irish higher education (Barrett, 2006). Prior to 2005, UCD was perceived to be under-performing and the 'sleeping giant' of Irish universities (Irish Times, 2004). UCD's history, its size and its influence on Irish higher education promoted its selection as a site to study the policy process between an institution, the nation and supranational agencies. In his 2004 augural speech, UCD's President Dr Brady outlined a plan premised on the institution's internationalisation. He outlined the need to become one of the top universities in Europe and a university where 'international competition is the benchmark for everything ...' (UCD, 2005a:4). Subsequently, UCD experienced highly publicised changes to its statutes and structures (Lynch, 2006), with its 11 faculties being reconstituted into 5 colleges<sup>1</sup> UCD's reforms occurred in an environment of wider sectoral development. Other intended university reforms included a organisational restructuring and the alteration of the internal and external relations of university power and governance. UCD branded its new modularised undergraduate programme initiative, 'UCD Horizons'. A key message of Horizons was the opportunity for students to shape 'their own degree' by selecting modules of interest, coupled with study abroad. Modularisation offered UCD the opportunity to capitalise on its unique disciplinary diversity to reposition itself within Irish higher education and introduce a unified university curricular framework. It also supported UCD's goal to further compete internationally and implement a number of the Bologna Process objectives ubiquitously. Policy analysis found modularisation was advocated by the recommendations of a number of institutional reviews completed by various external bodies, including the European Universities Association. Modularisation is defined as:

...the process by which educational awards are broken up into component parts of a more or less standard size. These parts may then be assessed separately and independently, so that students can study individual modules in a variety of different sequences (Morris, 2000:240).

Modularisation has the capacity to broaden access and facilitate part-time and student-paced study (Thorne, 1991). Others (Brecher, 2005) are more critical of modularisation and suggest that it supports standardisation. Henkel (2000) observed that modularisation was a sign of power transfer from academics and their departments to the institution.

---

When asked about the origins of modularisation and semesterisation, UCD interviewees associated modularisation directly with the Bologna Process, as illustrate below.

I suppose from a university perspective, I guess modularisation was, as I understand it, was Bologna and the need to have conformity in terms of the curriculum, and programmes and credits, in universities in Ireland, so that students could transfer between universities within Ireland but also outside within the EU.

UCD staff outlined there was little direct pressure on UCD to reform pre-2005. This was echoed by the Director of Academic Affairs at the Irish University Association, who indicated:

UCD had developed into a multi-speed, fragmented institution. That would be my assessment of it and not everyone had kept up with anywhere near the times. Some had and some were trying and some might not have been trying very hard. There was little pressure on them, as the perceived national leader in most areas, at least at undergraduate level and they were the first choice for many students across the country, so there was little impetus or external impetus for change.

Pre-2005, the policy process was described as ‘bottom-up’: individuals aware of Bologna *‘had a go’*. Post-2005, interviewees acknowledged a top down approach was required to avail of the full strengths of modularisation. While modularisation was associated with a ‘top-down’ approach, a UCD Teaching Development Officer perceived more autonomy was awarded to individuals concurrently

... there is an interesting thing about autonomy because in one way it was very top down, in other words, it is was very like ‘you have to have five credit [ECTS] modules, you have to have so many core, you have to write the module descriptor form in this way’. So that was prescriptive, no doubt and I suppose it had to be to all, again, to be equal.... But there was huge flexibility. In fact, it was very encouraged to choose whatever teaching and learning methods and assessment you wanted, within that. And in fact, I think all of staff were quite liberated within that structure...

Prior to modularisation, academic governance was the responsibility of the School. UCD’s *‘fragmented, multi-speed’* approach meant that then 11 ‘faculties’ individually managed their programmes’ duration, regulations and structure differently. Pre-2005, some Faculties introduced their own version of modularisation. There were pockets of modularisation but no unified university modular curriculum. Modularisation was the first widespread academic process, connecting academic and professional staff across all the disciplinary boundaries and levels of UCD. Due to the ‘concurrent implementation’ of the new modular curriculum and academic structures, ‘opportunities and challenges’ were presented (UCD, 2005c:1). Simultaneously, the eleven faculties were restructured. While modularisation was considered a programmatic initiative, it demanded centralised governance to exploit its full advantages. Pre-2005, each Faculty decided upon its programme structures at periodic Faculty meetings autonomously and made decisions regarding new programmes,

changes to programme regulations, etc. During the process of modularisation, School autonomy was devolved to a School Programme Board regarding low level decisions e.g. admissions, delivery, assessment and quality assurance. All programmes then had to be approved by a central body, the University Programme Board and then Academic Council (UCD School of Business, 2005).

The 'concurrent implementation' of a new modular curriculum and new academic structures, created different 'opportunities and challenges' for UCD and its management (UCD, 2005b:1). According to staff at the School of Business, the introduction of modularisation was associated with a more complex internal policy environment which was top-down, centrally driven and specifically associated with the appointment of a new Registrar. Despite a perceived strong identity within the university, interviewees at the UCD School of Business reported governance changes, including a more complex policy process, more bureaucracy, less flexibility for students and decreased School autonomy. The central university authorities became more involved, overseeing all academic governance. UCD staff interviewed reported a reconstitution at institutional level of policy capacity as the modular framework was constructed. Traditionally, power and authority in universities are dispersed (Birnbaum, 1991) but strategic changes at UCD, including its modular framework, facilitated the redirection of power centrally. As outlined, the policy process was fragmented with each Faculty managing its own rules and regulations, with no centralised policy core, facilitating a bottom-up approach to policy development by individuals. As the modular framework became more sophisticated, policy became centralised and driven from the top-down. Specific policy units and the development of a university policy capacity were developed and expertise recruited to formulate the modular framework, as outlined by the then Registrar:

The rationale for professionalizing the support of policy development in the university was to enable some strategic initiatives, such as, we want to modularise.

Governance for more routine policy areas was awarded at School level, with more strategic policy areas becoming the responsibility of central university units, as outlined in Table I.

**Table I - Governance Before and After Modularisation  
At UCD School of Business**

In reviewing this policy's development, there is a notable absence of Irish national agencies, e.g. the Department of Education and Science (DES) and national Higher Education Authority. In this vacuum, UCD drew upon international agencies to inform its policy trajectory. Key policies underpinning UCD's reform included the EUA 2005 Sectoral Review and the 2004 OECD Review of Higher Education which were commissioned by the state agencies in the perceived absence of a national state policy field. The EC was also notable by being implicitly and explicitly involved in the dissemination of the Bologna agenda e.g. through staff engagement with the Tuning Process, EUA workshops, etc. Policies from 'benchmark' universities in the UK, USA and Canada, were also particularly influential. Despite an apparent vacuum state policy capacity encased by the DES and the HEA, UCD's modularisation led to the advancement of the institutional implementation of the Bologna Objectives. The

Bologna Objectives were perceived to be of critical importance by staff and in some cases, so pervasive that it was assumed to have a legislative mandate, as the dialogue with a senior member of staff here highlights:

Interviewee: I thought it [the Bologna Process] was legal? Is it not?

Interviewer: No, there is no legal mandate over education in the European Union, at all. It is through soft methods of compliance essentially.

Interviewee: No. Why were we signing up? No, why were we signing up to it. What was the big deal? That was the carrot, or thing or wand that was thrown by us that Bologna, was that we had to comply with.

## **Discussion**

This paper recognises national, European and global policy fields. The evidence of the globalisation phenomenon within local and national contexts demonstrates how the policy process is affected from a bottom-up and top-down perspective and facilitates study of the 'pays réel' of the Bologna Process (Neave, 2005). Bourdieu's tools illuminate the reconstitution of policy fields outlined above. Lingard *et al.* (2005) argued that the quantity of 'national capital' retained by a nation is a determining factor in the resistance to the global field. This study highlights that the state passively engaged with external agencies, instigating reviews which premised national and institutional policy development. These external influences affected UCD to the extent that there was scope to negotiate an institutional response, of UCD as an institution and individual staff members, to these international organisations, e.g. OECD and the Bologna Process. It implies there was a way for UCD to respect the role of these institutions without accepting their entire ideological agenda. It implies that the agenda is not entirely defined by these external agencies, but also by the capital of UCD as an institution. To date, the concept of institutional capital has not been proposed in the literature. It captures how an institution with a strong historical background and relative autonomy from the state engaged directly with the global and European policy fields. Institutional capital describes the capital retained by UCD contributing to its actions; including its resistance and advances in policy development.

If the argument of the constituted global policy field is sustained (and it appears it is), this research proposes a consequent reconstitution of the local education policy field. UCD's policy capacity and at least one of its schools was reconstituted as the university responded to internal and external policy agendas. In reviewing the different policy spaces or 'policy fields', Bourdieu's concepts provides tools to investigate this complex dynamic. The use of Bourdieu's concepts of field convey a sense of determinism, overlooking the role of key individuals. The introduction of modularisation to UCD demonstrates that the agency of individuals, still wield some 'willful power' in policy production (Ritzer & Goodman, 2003:534), despite the global educational policy field's influence. This study highlights the reconstitution of the local policy field and rescaled institutional governance, resulting from engagement with the global and regional higher education policy fields. It provides empirical evidence that Irish higher education is not primarily shaped by the nation state, as suggested by de Wit (2002) and Enders (2004). UCD had a significant amount of institutional capital and autonomy to determine its policy trajectory, particularly within the Bologna Process. For example, UCD leveraged its strengths,



including its size and disciplinary breadth, to develop its brand of modularisation called 'UCD Horizons' compatible with the Bologna objectives.

The policy 'harmonisation' of module offerings brought about convergence of policy and practice (McNeeley & Yun-Kyung, 1994; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). The process of modularisation inculcated consistency across the university to ensure transfer across programmes but also the potential for module transfer at a national and international level. Here a 'vernacular globalisation' (Appadurai, 1996) appeared in two phases: first as the university's developed its model of modularisation; and second when modularisation encountered existing programmes in the respective students. Often the term vernacular globalisation insinuates the national adaption of a global policy in a top down fashion and might be used to label UCD's experience. However, modularisation is the domestication of a global policy by an institution in a bottom-up fashion; the policy agenda was set by the Senior Management Team at UCD in response to local, national, international and global pressures. This occurred in a national context where the state was not a dominant actor. This current utilisation of the term vernacular globalisation does not capture this dimension as it often refers to the nation state's adaptation of a global fashion, not an institution's. A university appears to be a unique entity in the Irish education field context, as apart from universities, very few institutions have the necessary autonomy and resources to initiate and implement 'vernacularisation' of policy. Here, the conceptual device 'global vernacularisation' is a more appropriate description to highlight the influence of a global process at the level of the institution and within certain parts of the institution. UCD adopted the policy of modularisation and instituted it into the organisation, in response to a largely internally generated reform agenda.

Vernacularised education policy (Ozga and Lingard, 2006) suggests a divergence thesis where international policies are mediated by the nation to provide a unique policy and presumes evidence of a strong national field. They argued that nation states develop mechanisms in relation to the process of globalisation by engaging with the developing logic of the education field. This presupposes the national field as the primary point of response, rather than the institution. This case demonstrates how an apparently weak national state policy field existed during a strong institutional response due to institutional capital. It could highlight that institutional policy and national policy did not kept pace with each other. Equally, it could be that national governments are happy to sign up to the Bologna Process as a means of bringing external pressure/rationalisation to bring about domestic changes that they could not otherwise have achieved.

Perhaps Ireland experienced the lack of a policy capacity for multiple reasons, as a small peripheral country which traditionally was intrinsically influenced by the production of policy by external influences, the protection of university autonomy in the Universities Act 1997 or third level education was seen as of less political importance than other education sectors and was accordingly less well resourced to formulate policy. This coupled with the universities' statutory autonomy and national disposition to look externally for policy developments, contributed to its delicate national higher education policy field. In this study, the state itself reacted to the competitive global higher education market by seeking a policy agenda from external agencies operating at European and global level. Ireland experienced the lack of a policy capacity for multiple reasons, perhaps including the habitus of Ireland, as a

small peripheral country which traditionally was intrinsically influenced by the production of policy by external influences, the protection of university autonomy in the Universities Act 1997 or third level education was seen as of less political importance than other education sectors and was accordingly less well resourced to formulate policy. This coupled with the universities' statutory autonomy and a national disposition to look externally for policy developments, contributed to its delicate national higher education policy field.

### **Conclusion**

This research investigated how supranational processes and policy making affected UCD's policy production as it implemented a policy of modularisation. This case demonstrates the embedding of a policy of internationalisation arising from a global discourse and the pursuit of the 'European Education Space', demonstrating trans-national changes in governance of national system policy actors. It shows the effects of globalisation manifest in UCD's modular policy responded to internally generated reform and agencies external to the state. The pursuit and implementation of this policy demonstrates the capacity of non-national political structures, e.g. the EUA, OECD and Bologna Process, to shape not only national policy (Henry, *et al.*, 2001) but also institutional policy. This study highlights the fluid nature of policy making, involving diffuse actors from within and outside of the nation-state and demonstrating the Irish nation-state's increasingly nuanced role. In this case, this role may be less influential than anticipated in the literature for a number of reasons, particularly the Universities Act 1997.

As this university engaged with dominant global discourses, specifically internationalisation, they had a tangible effect on UCD's policy process. Modularisation, as a policy originating outside of the state, was endorsed by a number of external agencies and was perceived to attend to a number of national and institutional policy agendas, including internationalisation. In response to modularisation and a number of associated reforms, academic governance was rescaled at UCD. A reconstitution of the local policy field was instituted, as UCD engaged with the global policy field. A recalibration in the power relations within the university also ensued impacting on university governance and its policy capacity. Thus, the policy of modularisation was not only about pedagogical programmatic developments but changes in academic governance. Researching the local policy process provided empirical evidence of the policy relationship between the university and national, regional and global policy agents. This revealed a complex policy process predicated upon an intricate web of influences from within and outside the state. This transverse sectional approach highlights the university's autonomy from the state, especially regarding teaching and learning policy, and emphasises the absence of explicit state involvement from this publicly funded institution. This autonomy from the educational national state field occurred for a number of likely reasons: primarily the statutory independence of Irish universities and institutional habitus. This study demonstrates that Appadurai's (1996) term 'vernacular globalisation' does not sufficiently reflect UCD's experience, as it tends to refer to the state's adaption of a global policy. It assumes a more active state involvement in the policy process. Consequently, the term 'global vernacularisation' captures how an institution adapts a policy originating outside of the nation. This research reconceptualises the effects of globalisation with a 'bottom-up' approach to highlight the effect of the global and European fields on the local policy process. It

demonstrates the need for investigations into education policy processes and their ramifications in light of the increasingly pervasive global policy agenda affecting higher education institutions, not only in Europe but worldwide.

### **Notes**

'Faculties' existed in UCD until 2005. In 2005, the university was restructured and the number of faculties reduced. The Faculty of Commerce became the School of Business in 2005.

In Ireland, under the Universities Act 1997, universities retain autonomy for management of their own affairs. The Higher Education Authority is a statutory body under this Act and the Higher Education Authority Act 1971. The HEA Act (S3, a-e) awards general functions for higher education development and assisting in the co-ordination of State investment in higher education.

## **Bibliography**

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Ball, S.J. (2008). *The education debate: Politics and Policy in the 21st Century*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Ball, S.J. (1998). Big policies/small world: an introduction to international perspectives in education policy. *Comparative Education*. 34 (2): 119-130.

Barrett, S. (2006). The Economics of Restructuring Irish Universities. *Administration*. 54(2), 43-62.

Birnbaum, R. (1991). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Homo Academicus*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1988). Vive la crise: For heterodoxy in social science. *Theory and Society*. 17 (5):773-787.

Bourdieu, P. (1998): *Practical Reason*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Bourdieu, P. (2003). *Firing back: Against the tyranny of the market 2*. London: Verso.

Brecher, B. (2005). Complicity and modularization: How universities were made safe for the market. *Critical Quarterly*. 47(1-2):72-82.

Brine, J. (2006). Lifelong learning the knowledge economy: those that know and those that do not - the discourse of the European Union, *British Educational Research Journal*. 32(5):649-665

Dale, R. (2009). Contexts, Constraints and Resources in the Development of European Education Space and European Education Policy. in R. Dale and S. Robertson (Eds), *Globalisation and Europeanisation in Education* (pp23-43). Oxford: Symposium Books.

de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe, A historical, comparative and conceptual analysis*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Enders, J. (2004). Higher Education, internationalisation and the nation-state: recent developments and challenges to governance theory. *Higher Education*. 47(3):361-382.

European University Association (EUA) (2005). Institutional Quality Review of University College Dublin. EUA Reviewers' Report February 2005

Henry, M., Lingard, B., Rizvi, F. and Taylor, S. (2001). *The OECD, Globalisation and Education Policy*. London: Pergamon.

Henkel, M. (2000): *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers

Irish Times (2004): One hundred days of change, *The Irish Times*, 04 Apr 2004

Joint Declaration of the European Ministers for Education (1999): 'The Bologna Declaration of 19<sup>th</sup> June 1999', Retrieved from [http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Declarations/BOLOGNA\\_DECLARATION1.pdf](http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Declarations/BOLOGNA_DECLARATION1.pdf)

Lawn, M. (2006). Soft Governance and the Learning Spaces of Europe. *Comparative Education*. 4, pp 272-288.

Lawn, M. and Lingard B. (2002). Constructing a European Policy Space in Education governance: the role of transnational policy actors. *European Educational Research Journal*. 1(2):290-307.

Lingard, B. (2000). It is and it isn't: Vernacular Globalisation' in N. Burbles and C. Torres (Eds.), *Globalisation and education: Critical perspectives* (275-296), London: Routledge.

Lingard, B., Rawolle, S. and Taylor, S. (2005). Globalizing policy sociology in education: working with Bourdieu. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(6):759-77.

Lynch, K. (2006). Neoliberalism and marketisation: the implications for higher education. *Educational Research Journal*. 5(1): 1 -12.

Maton, K. (2005). A question of autonomy: Bourdieu's field approach and higher education policy. *Journal of Education Policy*. 20(6):687-704.

McNeeley, C. and Yun-Kyung, C. (1994). Worldwide educational convergence through international organisations. *Educational Policy Archives*. 2(14)

Minister for Education and Science (2005). Implementing the OECD Report, on the occasion of the launch of the European University Association 'Review of Quality Assurance in Irish Universities' Sectoral Report, Retrieved from <http://www.education.ie/home/home.jsp?maincat=&pcategory=10861&ecategory=40276&sectionpage=12251&language=EN&link=link001&page=4&doc=27921>

Morris, H. (2000). The Origins, forms and Effects of Modularisation and Semesterisation in Ten Uk-Based Schools. *Higher Education Quarterly*. 54(3):239-59.

Neave, G. (2005). Euro-philiacs, Euro-sceptics and Europhobics: higher educational policy, values and institutional research. *Tertiary Education and Management*. 11:113-129.

Ozga, J. and Lingard, B. (2006): 'Globalisation, educational policy and politics' in B. Lingard and J. Ozga (eds.), *The Routledge Falmer Reader in Educational Policy and Politics* (278- 284), London: Routledge

Rawolle, S. and Lingard, B. (2008). The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu and researching education policy. *Journal of Education Policy*. 23(6):729-741.

Rinne, R., Kallio, J., and Hokka, S. (2003). Too eager to comply: OECD education policies and the Finnish Response. *European Educational Research Journal*. 3(2)454-485

Ritzer, G. and Goodman, D. (2003). *Sociological theory*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Rizvi, F. and Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing Education Policy*. London: Routledge.

Robertson, S. (2009): 'Europe, Competiveness and Higher Education: an evolving project. Globalisation and Europeanisation', R. Dale and S. Robertson (eds.), *Globalisation and Europeanisation in Education* (65-83), Oxford: Symposium.

Thorne, C. (1991): 'Modularisation and geography: A JGHE arena symposium' *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 15(2): 177-79

University College Dublin (2005a). Strategic Plan 2005 to 2008: Creating the Future. Retrieved from [www.ucd.ie/strategic](http://www.ucd.ie/strategic)

University College Dublin (2005b). Modularisation and academic restructuring: governance and management of programmes and modules. Dublin: University College Dublin.

University College Dublin (2005c): *Modularisation and academic restructuring: governance and management of programmes and modules*, Dublin: University College Dublin.

UCD School of Business (2005): *Staff Information Manual*, [www.ucd.ie/business/doc/Information\\_Manual.doc](http://www.ucd.ie/business/doc/Information_Manual.doc), (Accessed 16<sup>th</sup> June 2009)

Vaira, M. (2004). Globalization and higher education organizational change: A framework for analysis. *Higher Education*. 48:483-510. Veiga, A. and Amaral, A. (2006). The open method of coordination and the implementation of the Bologna Process. *Tertiary Education and Management*. 12(4):283-295.

**Table 1 Governance Before and After Modularisation**

<b>Policy Process</b>	<b>Before</b>	<b>After</b>
Responsibility for Policy Production	At School level in consultation with the Registrar's Office (i.e. 'Centre').	Centrally reviewed in conjunction with School.
Support of policy centrally	Ad hoc between School and 'Centre'	Policy Officers appointed centrally. Academic and Policy Development Unit' established.  Vice-Principals for Teaching and Learning appointed.
Uniformity of Programme Structure	Fragmented and varied per programme	Generally uniform; some opportunity for derogations
Involvement of Academic Staff	All academic staff	Restricted to Programme Board members and election to university committees
Regulatory Framework	Regulations for each academic programme	Single University Regulations with limited derogations
School Governance	Through a School Faculty meeting and then centrally approved	More centrally focused with devolution of responsibility for issues, e.g. admissions; leave of absence, etc. through a Programme Board. Greater central responsibility and involvement in programme governance and development
Programmes consistent with Bologna objectives and ECTS	Ad hoc across programmes and Faculties.	Yes

---

