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1. Introduction by Tuning Management

Tuning Educational Structures in Europe is a university driven project which aims to offer higher education institutions and subject areas a concrete approach to implementing the **Bologna Process**.

The Tuning approach, explained in more detail in the accompanying booklet, consists of a methodology to (re-)design, develop, implement and evaluate study programmes for each of the three Bologna cycles. It has been tested in several continents and found fruitful and can be considered valid worldwide. Furthermore, Tuning serves as a platform for developing reference points at subject area level. These are relevant for making programmes of studies comparable, compatible and transparent. The reference points are expressed in terms of intended learning outcomes and competences.

Learning outcomes are statements of what a learner is expected to know, understand and be able to demonstrate after completion of a learning experience. According to Tuning, learning outcomes are expressed in terms of the **level of competence** to be obtained by the learner.

Competences represent a dynamic combination of cognitive and metacognitive skills, knowledge and understanding, interpersonal, intellectual and practical skills, and ethical values. Fostering these competences is the object of all educational programmes which build on the patrimony of knowledge and understanding developed over a period of many centuries. Competences are developed in all course units and assessed at different stages of a programme. Some competences are generic (common to any degree course); others are subject-area related (specific to a field of study). It is normally the case that competence development proceeds in an integrated and cyclical manner throughout a programme.

To make levels of learning comparable the subject area groups/Thematic Networks have developed cycle (level) descriptors, which are also expressed in terms of competences.

According to Tuning, the introduction of a three-cycle system as brought about a change from a staff centred approach to a student-oriented approach. It is the student who have to be prepared as well as possible for their future roles in society. Therefore, Tuning has organized a Europe-wide consultation process including employers, graduates and academic staff to identify the most important competences that should be formed or developed in a degree programme. The outcome of this consultation process is reflected in the set of reference points – generic and subject specific competences – identified by each subject area.

Besides addressing the implementation of a three-cycle system, Tuning has given attention to the Europe wide use of the student workload based European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS). According to Tuning, ECTS is not only a system for facilitating the mobility of students across Europe through credit accumulation and transfer; ECTS can also facilitate programme design and development, particularly with respect to coordinating and rationalising the demands made on students by concurrent course units. In other words, ECTS permits us to plan how best to use students' time to achieve the aims of the educational process, rather than considering teachers' time as a constraint and students' time as basically limitless. According to the Tuning approach credits can only be awarded when the learning outcomes have been met.
The use of the learning outcomes and competences approach might also imply changes regarding teaching, learning and assessment methods which are used in a programme. Tuning has identified approaches and best practices to form specific generic and subject specific competences.

Finally, Tuning has drawn attention to the role of quality in the process of designing or redesigning, developing and implementing study programmes. It has developed an approach for quality enhancement, which involves all elements of the learning chain. It has also developed a number of tools and has identified examples of good practice, which can help institutions to boost the quality of their study programmes. Launched in 2000 and strongly supported, financially and morally, by the European Commission, the Tuning Project now includes the vast majority of the Bologna signatory countries. The work of Tuning is fully recognized by all the countries and major players involved in the Bologna Process.

At the Berlin Bologna follow-up conference which took place in September 2003, degree programmes were identified as having a central role in the process. The conceptual framework on which the Berlin Communiqué is based is completely coherent with the Tuning approach. This is made evident by the language used, where the Ministers indicate that degrees should be described in terms of workload, level, learning outcomes, competences and profile. As a sequel to the Berlin conference, the Bologna follow-up group has taken the initiative of developing an overarching Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area (EQF for HE) which in both concept and language is in full agreement with the Tuning approach. This framework has been adopted at the Bergen Bologna follow-up conference of May 2005.

The EQF for HE has made use of the outcomes both of the Joint Quality Initiative (JQI) and of Tuning. The JQI, an informal group of higher education experts, produced a set of criteria to distinguish between the different cycles in a broad and general manner. These criteria are commonly known as the “Dublin descriptors”. From the beginning, the JQI and the Tuning Project have been considered complementary. The JQI focuses on the comparability of cycles in general terms, whereas Tuning seeks to describe cycle degree programmes at the level of subject areas.

An important aim of all three initiatives (EQF, JQI and Tuning) is to make European higher education more transparent. In this respect, the EQF is a major step forward because it gives guidance for the construction of national qualification frameworks based on learning outcomes and competences as well as on credits. We may also observe that there is a parallel between the EQF and Tuning with regard to the importance of initiating and maintaining a dialogue between higher education and society and the value of consultation -- in the case of the EQF with respect to higher education in general; in that of Tuning with respect to degree profiles.

In the summer of 2006 the European Commission launched a European Qualification Framework for Life Long Learning (LLL). Its objective is to encompass all types of learning in one overall framework. Although the concepts on which the EQF for HE and the EQF for LLL are based differ, both are fully coherent with the Tuning approach. Like the other two, the LLL variant is based on the development of levels of competences. From the Tuning perspective both initiatives have their value and their roles to play in the further development of a consistent European Education Area.

This brochure reflects the outcomes of the work done so far by the History Subject Area Group.
(SAG), encompassing both Teacher Education and Education Sciences. The outcomes are presented in a format that was developed to facilitate readability and rapid comparison across the subject areas. The summary aims to provide, in a very succinct manner, the basic elements for a quick introduction into the subject area. It shows in synthesis the consensus reached by a subject area group after intense, prolonged and lively discussions in the group.

The Tuning Management Committee
2. Introduction to the Subject Area: History

Why History?

History is one of the least recognised but most powerful forces in forming social and political attitudes, in building our perceptions of ourselves and of others. Received ideas of the past influence each person in his or her interaction with society and with other individuals, in deciding on action to be taken and values to be observed or enforced. Strangely, for something so pervasive, history is often thought of as remote and unconnected with daily life. It is usually absorbed in the form of general ‘knowledge’, and often assumes the form of generally shared convictions, orientations and prejudices which derive from national narratives formed in past political and cultural contexts in each country, but of which we are hardly aware. The present context of European unification, enlargement and consolidation creates particular challenges and opportunities for history and for historians. Because pre-existing national elaborations of history are still prevalent in national educational systems, European citizens may not be aware of how little their ‘knowledge’ or ideas of the past resemble those of their neighbours. And yet, Europe is truly founded on its history. The European Union is a unique polity, built on the historical experience of tragic wars and conflicts between and within the countries that compose it or may join it in the future.

In the past historians assisted in creating the ‘national’ and nationalistic attitudes that contributed to those conflicts. Today their knowledge and perspective is needed in order to contribute to building reciprocal knowledge and understanding among Europe’s peoples. If the challenge is great, so are the opportunities. We now have the possibility of designing and implementing incisive action through pan-European collaboration on a variety of levels. For all disciplines, perhaps, the Bologna process by which educational systems of European countries come into ever closer contact opens new opportunities. For none however are the changes, the challenges and the opportunities greater than for History.

Tuning and History

Tuning Education Structures in Europe is a large-scale pilot project, which accompanies and gives substance to the Bologna Process. Supported by the European Commission, it is designed and implemented by Universities and other Higher Education Institutions. It is based on the realisation that, in final analysis, only higher education staff – collaborating with students and working in a pan-European setting – can give real meaning to the general architecture set up by the Bologna Process.

The Tuning project and CLIOHnet, the History Thematic Network, share common roots. The ‘prehistories’ of both go back to the History Subject Area Group of the EC TS Pilot Project, which began operation in 1988-89. Today the two Networks each count a very large number of members and their activities extend beyond Europe, to other countries and even to other continents.

Nine subject areas participate directly in Tuning (Business, Chemistry, Education, European Studies, Geology, History, Mathematics, Nursing and Physics); others do so through the Erasmus Thematic Networks.

In this brochure we present three key Tuning documents produced by the History Subject Area: the “History Template” (a general summary); “Common Reference Points”, elaborated in the first phase of Tuning, and “Learning, Teaching and Assessment”, published as part of Tuning, Phase 2. These documents are updated, taking into account further work accomplished. Furthermore, we are proud to present -- in draft form -- the results obtained on the third 'doctoral' cycle, in collaboration with the History Thematic Network CLIOHnet2 and the History research Network of Excellence, CLIOHRES.net. Tuning is work in progress. Further results will be available in the future. For now, we hope that this brochure will prove interesting and useful.
The European History Network

CLIOHnet is an Erasmus Thematic Network devoted to enhancing an innovative critical perspective in History in Europe. The Network itself has its roots in the process of convergence and the growth of interaction between educational systems in Europe which began in the late 1980s. Many of the core members started their collaboration in 1988-89 as the History subject area group of the ECTS pilot project (which developed the framework for international student mobility, creating the bases for the present European Credit Accumulation and Transfer System). Subsequently, as new opportunities for collaboration emerged thanks to the Socrates-Erasmus programme, the group was able to expand both its membership and its activities, using the knowledge it had gained in previous years about the profound diversities in the ways history is viewed and taught in different European countries. When it became possible to include central and eastern European countries in the partnership, understanding took another leap forward. The group organised curriculum development projects (CLIOH), publishing initiatives (Clioh's Workshop) and then CLIOHnet, the European History Network. Today, the Thematic Network is known as CLIOHnet2; and it has given rise to a Sixth Framework Programme Network of Excellence, including 180 researchers from 45 Universities, CLIOHRES.net.

The objective of the History Networks is to use the remarkable opportunities presented by the creation of the European Union, its expansion and consolidation, to put into contact the different national traditions and historiographies, with the view of renewing the way history is learned, taught and studied.

Tuning and collaboration with CLIOHnet2 and CLIOHRES.net

Thanks to the Tuning project, the History Networks have been able to contribute to establishing common reference points for history programmes at all levels and have gained much knowledge about the diverse roles occupied by history graduates in different countries. In some countries a first or second cycle degree in History is a common general degree, often taken by young men and women who do not plan a career in history teaching or research. In others it is considered mainly of interest for future teachers. In most of the former, history studies seem to be in good health or even in expansion. In many of the latter, there is pressure to reduce the number of history students in order to make it correspond to the availability of teaching posts.

In the Tuning project, the History group found that history studies give excellent preparation for a variety of careers. Civil service and administration, foreign service, personnel management and journalism, international organisations, international relations, communications are all areas in which history degrees provide a strong basis for careers. History training provides both general culture and understanding of how the world has developed. To receive a history degree, young people must learn to write, speak and use information and communications technology effectively. They often have knowledge of at least one other modern language, and many, optimally, of an ancient language as well. Those who choose to study history are normally interested in people, in politics, in the way the world works.

They normally have training in some related subjects such as geography, philology, anthropology or economics. They are able to place human events in a chronological framework and they are aware of the importance of changing cultural and political contexts. They are well equipped for becoming aware citizens and gaining personal satisfaction from their education.

Learning, Teaching and Research

Many of the competences explicitly formed in history training are useful in all walks of life and are valued by employers. These include the ability to use documentation critically, to retrieve information from a variety of sources and to use documentation to compose critically founded and coherent narratives. Historical training enhances the capacity for analysis and synthesis, and provides a good basis for multicultural understanding. Historians learn to avoid anachronistic thinking when studying
the past. This provides excellent training for seeing issues from different points of view in the present as well.

Among the strong recommendations of the History group in the Tuning project, discussed and validated in CLIOHnet, is that from the most general and elementary course unit in history, to highest level of research training, the learner should have direct contact, even if quantitatively limited, with original documents and with professional historiographical work. This means that learning/teaching and research, in history are intimately connected. The historical mindset is in essence enquiring, and multidisciplinary. The historian uses whatever conceptual or documentary tools are available to resolve the problems which appear relevant. There is no ‘corpus’ of knowledge, or group of tools to be defined or acquired once and for all. History by its nature is a science of change, and itself in continuous transformation. Teachers who do not have the opportunity of doing original research themselves cannot transmit to students the questioning critical attitude towards past and present which is one of the hallmarks of the historical view of reality.

In the pages of this brochure, the reader will find the list of ‘subject specific’ competences (those regarding history training specifically) and ‘cycle level descriptors’ (that is, indications of what a student should know, understand and be able to do at the end of a single course unit, a double major, a first or a second cycle degree in History) from Tuning. This list was the object of a broad consultation with academics throughout our Network, and we were able to ascertain that in all countries there was general agreement on the following:

- every history course, even the most elementary or general, for students of any Faculty or subject area, should communicate the ‘historical’ attitude toward reality;
- more technical knowledge is to be gained during further study according to the particular period or diachronic theme studied;
- every history course, even the most elementary or general, for students of any Faculty or subject area, should give direct contact with original documents and professional historiographical research.

The results of the work of the History group in Tuning is available on the Tuning website (http://unideusto.org/tuning)
3. The History Template
A Summary of Results

1. Introduction to the subject area

On the simplest plane History is the study of the past. It is widely present in higher education institutions as well as in schools. It constitutes not only an academic subject or research area, but also an important aspect of ‘general culture’. Above all, a training in History creates flexible individuals with the analytical, critical and communications skills essential to the emerging knowledge society.

In the context of European enlargement and today's rapidly changing world, History faces both particular challenges and remarkable opportunities. As one of the first forms of social consciousness and group and regional identity it is an important factor of social cohesion. Indeed, History properly understood and utilised can enable us to overcome the aggressive confrontations which have set nations and groups against one another.

Of all the subject areas involved in Tuning, History has turned out to present the most varied picture in the different countries represented. National university and school systems determine a context in which quite naturally a large part of ‘contents’ taught in each country are linked to the national culture or vision of the past; furthermore, the History group has found that the theoretical and practical premises created by each national culture and teaching tradition differ, often very sharply. Hence the structure of studies, and ideas about what should be done at the beginning of degree programmes and what at a more advanced stage are quite different. For this reason, the History group did not consider it possible or useful to identify a core curriculum, but rather to create agreed reference points, based on both subject specific and key generic competences, around which programmes can be built in all countries.

Not only the intellectual premises of studies, but also the perceived role of history graduates in various European countries differs widely. In some countries a first or second cycle degree in History is a common general degree, often completed by young men and women who do not plan a career in history teaching or research. In others it continues to be considered to be of interest almost exclusively for future school teachers or as pre-doctoral preparation for university level academics and researchers. In the former, history studies seem to be in good health or even in expansion. In the latter, there is pressure to reduce the number of history students according to the availability of teaching posts.

2. Degree profiles and occupations

Typical degrees offered in History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Typical degrees offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Cycle</td>
<td>Most commonly, institutions offer specific first cycle degrees in History, although in some cases History students simply take a more general degree (Arts, Letters or Humanities for example), giving particular attention to historically oriented course units. In some countries Art History or other related subjects are considered to be part of the subject area; in others they are separate. In the different academic and cultural contexts History may be linked to other major subject areas such as Philosophy, Geography, Literature, Archaeology, Classical studies, Archival studies, Economics, Law or Library Sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second cycle degrees</td>
<td>Second cycle degrees in History are frequently offered in History are frequently offered. In almost all cases the work leading to a second cycle degree comprises both course work and a relevant piece of research presented in written form. Second cycle degrees may be in a specific chronological or thematic area. In some countries and some institutions this is specified in the degree title (e.g. Medieval or Contemporary History; Women’s History). In others the usual title is simply History, although the programme of studies depends on the area of particular emphasis. There are often second cycle degrees in such subjects as Economic History, or in History related subjects such as Archival studies, Museology, Archaeology and so forth. In some countries future teachers of History receive specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
degrees; in others the degree continues to be in History and teacher training is either included or is taken as a separate study programme.

Third Cycle
Doctorates are normally in History (or in a sub or related discipline such as Economic History or History of Law). They require examination and defence of a substantial and original piece of research described in a dissertation which normally has the dimensions and typology of a scientific monograph. The taught component of the degree varies, although at present in several countries the proportion is under discussion.

Typical occupations of the graduates in History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Cycle</td>
<td>First cycle degrees in History are useful for employment in nearly any service or communications related field: civil service, local, regional administration, personnel management, journalism, international organisations, tourism, administration and valorisation of the cultural patrimony in its various manifestations including archives, museums, libraries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Cycle</td>
<td>Second cycle degrees in History according to the specifics of the national organisation of studies may give access to employment in secondary or even higher education. They also give a good basis for positions of greater responsibility in all the sectors mentioned for the first cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Cycle</td>
<td>In most cases the doctoral degree in History is associated with an academic or research role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Role of subject area in other degree programmes

A significant part of History learning and teaching takes place in other degree programmes. For this reason the History subject area group carried out its consultations and defined competences and levels taking into account the case of even a single course unit.

Most Arts and Humanities programmes include the requirement that students complete some history course units, even a very small number of credits such as five. Particularly in the disciplinary areas that are related to History (different in different national traditions) such as Geography, Philosophy, Literary or Linguistic Studies, Art History, Archaeology, Archival Studies, Communications there are requirements for History courses. In some scientific and technological subjects or subjects such as Architecture or Law, there may be a requirement that students take a History course, or History may be an optional or elective course. History, particularly Contemporary History and non-European History is usually a requirement for Political Science degrees, and is also present in ‘area’ or European studies, in Tourism and Journalism courses.

3. Learning outcomes & competences - cycle level descriptors

Type of Description of achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History courses* for students of other subject areas *By course we intend a learning activity leading to assessment and credits.</th>
<th>A course (or courses) in History, which constitute a minor component of a degree in another subject should enable the student (to the extent possible in the time available) to develop a historical perspective on reality. This should include acquiring or experiencing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A critical view of the human past, and the realization that the past affects our present and future and our perception of them.</td>
<td>2. Understanding of and respect for viewpoints moulded by different historical backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A general idea of the diachronic framework of major historical periods or events.</td>
<td>4. Direct contact with the historians’ craft, that is, even in a circumscribed context, contact with original sources and texts produced by professional historiographical research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History as a relevant part of a degree in other or more general subjects (minor or double honours degree, degree in Letters, part of a teaching degree etc.)</td>
<td>All of the above remain the general objectives. The level expected will be higher, the contents more ample and detailed, the experience of different methodologies and historiographical tools greater according to the amount of historical studies permitted in the study course organization. In any case, to obtain mention of a relevant presence of historical studies in a degree, the student who has completed such a study programme should: 1. Have general knowledge of the methodologies, tools and issues of at least two of the broad chronological periods into which history is normally divided (such as Ancient, Medieval, Modern and Contemporary) as well as some significant diachronic themes. 2. Should have demonstrated his/her ability to complete, present in oral and written form ‘according to the statute of the discipline’ a circumscribed piece of research in which the ability to retrieve bibliographical information and documentary evidence and use it to address a historiographical problem is demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History for first cycle History Degree</td>
<td>The general objectives remain as above; however the student at the end of a first level History degree should furthermore: 1. Possess general knowledge and orientation with respect to the methodologies, tools and issues of all the broad chronological divisions in which history is normally divided, from ancient to recent times. 2. Have specific knowledge of at least one of the above periods or of a diachronic theme. 3. Be aware of how historical interests, categories and problems change with time and how historiographical debate is linked to political and cultural concern of each epoch. 4. Have shown his/her ability to complete and present in oral and written form ‘according to the statute of the discipline’ a medium length piece of research which demonstrates the ability to retrieve bibliographical information and primary sources and use them to address a historiographical problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History for a second cycle History Degree</td>
<td>1. A student completing a second cycle degree in History should have acquired to a reasonable degree the subject specific qualities, skills and competences listed below. He/she will have built further on the levels reached at the first cycle so as to: 2. Have specific, ample, detailed and up-to-date knowledge of at least one great chronological division of history, including different methodological approaches and historiographical orientations relating to it. 3. Have acquired familiarity with comparative methods, spatial, chronological and thematic, of approaching historiographical research. 4. Have shown the ability to plan, carry out, present in oral and written form ‘according to the statute of the discipline’ a research-based contribution to historiographical knowledge, bearing on a significant problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultation process with stakeholders**

The initial consultation carried out in the Tuning 1 phase was, as with all subject area groups, directed towards graduates, employers and academics. Our consultation had three specific characteristics: 1) because a large percentage of graduates in History are not employed in work directly related to History, there were complexities in identifying employers of History graduates; 2) because we were able to work with the History Thematic Network, academics from all present member states and candidate countries were consulted; 3) because History studies foster generic competences which are of interest for citizenship and personal satisfaction as well as employment we included three of these in our generic competence consultation, and we found that they were indeed considered very important by graduates, employers and academics.

The Tuning results at all stages have been shared and discussed with the History Thematic Network
(CLIOHnet, www.clioh.net) members and illustrated and discussed in national contexts in all countries eligible for Socrates. At present such meetings continue and through the member institutions of the History Network associations and reviews are involved in the discussion and hence the validation of the results. In the countries where curricula are now being reformed according to the Bologna structures, specific recommendations based on Tuning-CLIOHnet results have been applied.

4. Workload and ECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>ECTS Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>180 is the most common, although some programmes use the 240 model for the first cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Most common is 120.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Credits are not always used. The minimum for a third cycle degree is generally three years although in some countries the period of study is longer, de jure or de facto. The variation in the overall time required seems to be in relation to whether the completion of the third cycle degree and the approval of a substantial research dissertation is seen as a sine qua non to begin an academic career or whether, as is the case in some countries, it is possible to have a University teaching or research post while working towards the third cycle degree. In the latter case the process may take longer as the programme of study and research is not fulltime.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Learning, teaching & assessment

The Subject Area has found that in various countries there are widely different systems for creating the appropriate learning environments for the acquisition of key competences in History. It seems clear that each national system has its own coherence and internal balance, in which, within the normal conventions of University learning/teaching- and assessment in each country, professors and students create specific strategies for developing the necessary competences. This means that each system is to a large extent self-contained, and that partial or episodic imports of particular features from other systems may not have the desired results. It follows that the examples of ‘good practice’ indicated below have been selected among the many possible to show a variety of approaches.

Hence there is no prescriptive intent in listing certain examples of good practice. Rather, overall, the Subject Area agrees on certain principles to be applied in all countries:

- that each student should experience many different approaches to learning and teaching, both because this is the best way to provide appropriate environments for students who may learn more or less successfully in various contexts; and because the different generic competences are formed in different teaching and learning environments;

- that teaching of History must not be separated from research: from the most general and elementary course unit in History, to highest level of research training, the learner must have direct contact, even if quantitatively limited, with original documents and with professional historiographical work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters of competences</th>
<th>Approaches to learning/teaching and assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic general knowledge of the subject; analysis and synthesis; awareness of differences in historiographical outlook in different periods; awareness of the on-going nature of</td>
<td>[Bologna] Case studies are presented in lectures on the basis of the personal research of the teacher or using examples from scientific journals, of how historiographical problems can be identified; different methodologies for resolving them are discussed. Ways in which the discovery of new documentation influences understanding of existing sources are highlighted. In small group seminars, students are asked to look for sources of information for a given historical problem; they are also asked to define historical problems by themselves. Students are shown that all possible solutions and sources must be considered even if these contradict the working hypothesis. Thus intellectual honesty and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historiographical debate; ability to identify historical problems; capacity to find new ways of using sources; capacity to connect and compare.</td>
<td>Students are encouraged to use the scientific method. Students are required to work out their own hypotheses with rigorous scientific method. Students are asked to compare and connect the methodology and knowledge acquired in different subjects in order to be able to transfer innovative practice from one field to another. Students are asked to define a problem, identify sources, analyse them rigorously and give their results in written form. Whereas in the seminars the discussion is not assessed, in order to produce an environment of maximum openness and intellectual exchange, the written results are assessed for clarity, coherence and method; and the final exam is an oral exam where the student discusses general and specific questions with both the teachers and other staff members. In this context it is possible to both assess what has been achieved and guide the student in understanding critically the full implications of the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of the necessity of analysing any information, view, source or method critically; awareness of the complex nature of information, attitudes and values; ability to express critical views in a constructive way; ability to think of one’s own values, practices and perspectives critically.</td>
<td>[Turku] Students take a first course in historiography. It focuses on the characteristics of ‘knowing’ the past and at the same time shows how values, knowledge and views are connected to cultural contexts and so change over time. The initial course is a lecture course but includes exercises and discussion on examples of historiographical texts taken from different centuries. In methodological courses critical and self-critical thinking is encouraged and assessed. After the initial stages of study, students participate in seminars (writing critical analyses of sources in their papers and expressing constructive criticism orally when their papers and those of other students are presented. In the second year pro-seminar, each student has to take the role of ‘opponent’ or critical discussant of the research paper of another student and to lead a seminar discussion. Courses are usually assessed through written examinations (two or three essays written during an exam session of several hours. Assessment is on the basis of the research papers, discussion and the written exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical and self-critical abilities; a critical awareness of the relationship between current events and processes and the past; awareness of and respect for points of view deriving from other national or cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td>[CLIOHnet] The History Network has placed on line (<a href="http://www.clioh.net">www.clioh.net</a>) a unit formed of experimental web-based materials under the title “Core of the Core”. The module requires from 50 to 60 hours of time for the normal student, and hence can be considered to carry 2 ECTS credits. The materials may be used as an intensive unit to be offered over a very short period of time; they can be utilised by themselves for e-learning, for group work or as a base for classroom teaching/learning; they may be used as the introductory part of a larger module, or broken up into separate teaching units. The specificity of the learning environment ‘Core of the Core’ lies in its pan-European and comparative character. The materials themselves are the result of collaborative work of teachers and students from the many countries participating in Socrates. They are designed to stimulate students to compare other national views of history with their own. Further work on Tuning competences and reference points in e-learning has been carried out in CLIOHnet Task Force C and in the e-HLEE pilot project, coordinated by the University of Turku for the History Network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To conclude, we emphasize that one of the most useful aspects of Tuning is the sharing of knowledge and experience about approaches to learning and teaching. Especially in all situations where mobility of staff or shared experience can take place (Socrates mobility, Intensive programmes) staff and students
can achieve a much higher degree of understanding of their own systems, their strengths and weakness, and or the usefulness of certain solutions used in other countries. It is significant that on the competences to be formed, including the overarching general competences which should be the objective of any History studies, however circumscribed, all members of the Subject Area Group and all those consulted are very much in agreement. The paths utilised to achieve those ends are, however, strikingly different.

A final aspect which deserves mention is that it seems to be very useful to share knowledge among different subject areas on how to foster, encourage and assess the generic competences.

---

**Generic competences**

In the first phase of Tuning, a broad consultation on the importance of ‘generic competences’ and the degree to which they are formed in existing higher education programmes was carried out. Several thousand employers, graduates and academics were contacted. To prepare learners adequately for employment and citizenship in a rapidly changing world, skills and competences not traditionally considered in university teaching must be cultivated and enhanced.

Thirty such competences were taken into account. These include ‘instrumental competences’ such as ‘capacity for analysis and synthesis’, ‘information management skills’ and ‘problem solving’; ‘interpersonal competences’ such as ‘teamwork’, ‘interpersonal skills’ and ‘appreciation of diversity and multiculturality’; and ‘systemic competences’, such as ‘research skills’, ‘creativity’ and ‘capacity to learn’.

The Subject Area Groups examined the ways that such competences can be formed in the course of learning/teaching activities. Further information on this and other aspects of Tuning is available in the publications furnished on the Tuning site.

---

**6. Quality enhancement**

History Subject Area reference points and competences have developed in close synergy with actual on-going debate on quality of programmes and delivery. The possibilities of direct interaction have been particularly incisive because members of the subject area have been able to interact with the History Thematic Network, gathering experience in the use of Tuning tools in programme design, delivery, monitoring and improvement. On the one hand, in the many countries where the Bologna process was being applied, members of the Subject Area Group were involved in drawing up new programmes based on competences and learning outcomes, and in building in useful elements for ensuring quality. Thus they could bring their concrete experience to the Subject Area Group; on the other hand, the pan-European results (reference points, competences, shared knowledge about learning, teaching and assessment) of Tuning could be used and evaluated in local and national contexts.

Furthermore, the History Subject Area Group, through the History Thematic Network, CLIOHnet, had the important opportunity of being able to participate in the TEEP 2002 project supported by the European Commission and carried out by ENQA (European Network of Quality Assurance Agencies). The TEEP 2002 project allowed us to test the applicability of our Tuning findings in a ‘hands-on’ quality assurance context. The project consisted of an experiment in transnational evaluation, based on Tuning criteria and reference points, in which five CLIOHnet institutions carried out a self-evaluation exercise; subsequently site visits were made by Tuning-CLIOHnet members working in cooperation with QAA. This experience gave useful practical knowledge about non-invasive, non-prescriptive ways of furnishing institutions with a methodology and support to develop quality. The History Network is now engaged in making these findings available to its member institutions and to other institutions.
4. Annex to the History Template: Subject Specific Skills and Competences

1. A critical awareness of the relationship between current events and processes and the past.
2. Awareness of the differences in historiographical outlooks in various periods and contexts.
3. Awareness of and respect for points of view deriving from other national or cultural backgrounds.
4. Awareness of the on-going nature of historical research and debate.
5. Knowledge of the general diachronic framework of the past.
6. Awareness of the issues and themes of present day historiographical debate.
7. Detailed knowledge of one or more specific periods of the human past.
8. Ability to communicate orally in one’s own language using the terminology and techniques accepted in the historiographical profession.
9. Ability to communicate orally in foreign languages using the terminology and techniques accepted in the historiographical profession.
10. Ability to read historiographical texts or original documents in one’s own language; to summarise or transcribe and catalogue information as appropriate.
11. Ability to read historiographical texts or original documents in other languages; to summarise or transcribe and catalogue information as appropriate.
12. Ability to write in one’s own language using correctly the various types of historiographical writing.
13. Ability to write in other languages using correctly the various types of historiographical writing.
14. Knowledge of and ability to use information retrieval tools, such as bibliographical repertoires, archival inventories, e-references.
15. Knowledge of and ability to use the specific tools necessary to study documents of particular periods (e.g. palaeography, epigraphy).
16. Ability to use computer and internet resources and techniques elaborating historical or related data (using statistical, cartographic methods, or creating databases, etc.)
17. Knowledge of ancient languages.
18. Knowledge of local history.
19. Knowledge of one’s own national history.
20. Knowledge of European history in a comparative perspective.
22. Knowledge of world history.
23. Awareness of and ability to use tools of other human sciences (e.g., literary criticism, and history of language, art history, archaeology, anthropology, law, sociology, philosophy etc.)
24. Awareness of methods and issues of different branches of historical research (economic, social, political, gender related, etc.)
25. Ability to define research topics suitable to contribute to historiographical knowledge and debate.
26. Ability to identify and utilise appropriately sources of information (bibliography, documents, oral testimony etc.) for research project.
27. Ability to organise complex historical information in coherent form.
28. Ability to give narrative form to research results according to the canons of the discipline.
29. Ability to comment, annotate or edit texts and documents correctly according to the critical canons of the discipline.
5. Common Reference Points for History
Curricula and Courses

Preliminary considerations

Defining common European reference points for History is an extremely delicate task. In contrast to the situation in some other subject areas, the ways in which History is conceptualised, structured and taught and its relationship to other disciplines are very different in the various European countries. The problems posed and the insights gained are nonetheless of more general use in defining strategies for other areas including those collaborating in the Tuning Project. The Tuning Subject area group began its work on this theme attempting to define a ‘core curriculum’ for History. The term itself is very much open to discussion in general; in the case of History it became quite immediately clear that at present it means, or is taken to mean, widely different things in different national and institutional contexts.

For this reason the group has decided to utilise the insights that have come out of mapping existing curricula with the objective of taking them into account in the formulation of general guidelines and reference points for the disciplinary area. In general terms we may say that ‘core curriculum’ most often is taken to mean those contents and learning offers and outcomes which students are obliged learn, take up or achieve in order to receive a History degree. More specifically, it is usually taken to refer to those outcomes in the field of History which students must have achieved in order to receive a History degree. (In some cases it is mandatory) for History students to take courses in other related areas such as Geography or Art History, or to achieve skills in other areas such as Informatics, Languages, or Pedagogy.

These courses, although they may be part of the requirements for receiving a History degree, do not seem to be considered part of what is normally understood to be the ‘core curriculum’ for History students. Nonetheless, it seems reasonable to consider them too in any future recommendations).

It is equally or even more important for the History subject area to define ‘core curriculum’ in another of its Common Reference Points possible definitions, that is, the basic knowledge, skills and outlook which any student taking a History course should be given access to and hopefully make his or her own. This is because History is very often part of general education and the single student may be required or wish to take a small number of credits in History. This is quite as important for the subject area as the issue of curricula for History students. On the basis of these preliminary considerations it seems appropriate to speak of ‘core curricula’ in the plural, and to approach the topic first by mapping the present situation and considering the variety of logics and strategies represented.

Methodology

Because of the widely varying structure of the discipline as taught in the different participating countries, it seems reasonable first to try to understand where differences and analogies actually lie in the present systems. This endeavour regards both what is actually taught or learned, in terms of contents, skills and outlook, and how the teaching/learning experience is described and justified. Other issues to be addressed are the progressive order (if any) in which certain contents are to supposed to be learned, the relationship of teaching/learning and research, and the specific issue of the History ‘core’ for students whose main area of study is not History. Further specific questions which should be investigated are, what are considered necessary or appropriate History studies for those who will become teachers at different levels? What are the related or even unrelated subjects, including ancillary subjects of various sorts which are recommended or required for History students? What linguistic knowledge, including that of ancient languages and of one’s own language, is necessary or recommended?

What is the place of the national or local history in the curriculum? Are there recommendations which can or should be made about history teaching/learning in an informal or life-long learning context? A final aspect which is tightly related to all the above is that of teaching, assessment and evaluation methods. For clarity these will not be discussed in detail here as they are considered in a separate line of
Findings

The History subject area group dedicated an important part of the second Tuning meeting (held in Roskilde) to explaining and 'mapping' possible ways of understanding the concept of 'core' in the different participating universities. The results are contained in an annex to the minutes of that meeting. This endeavour continued in the third meeting (Gent) along with the discussion of the first draft of the present document. The second draft was prepared by incorporating the modifications suggested; furthermore a questionnaire for academics was prepared and circulated; a draft of a general formulation of outcomes to be expected at the various levels considered (first cycle, second cycle, courses of study in which history forms a relevant part, history courses for students of other subjects) was prepared and circulated.

The present version incorporates the results of the final discussion in the Tuning History Subject Area group, which took into account the comments and suggestions formulated in the Spring Plenary meeting of CLIOHNET, the Erasmus Thematic Network for History (www.clio.net).

The main conclusions which have emerged to date may be summed up as follows:

- Each national system must be seen as a coherent whole, in which the order, the contents, the teaching-learning and assessment methods are related to each other.
- A unanimous conclusion is the importance of defining the general ethical and heuristic reasons for studying-learning-teaching History.
- The elements that are in agreement (that is, which appear in all existing curricula) should appear in any proposed ‘core curriculum’: this would not be simply the minimum common denominator, but rather an agreement on necessary kinds of contents.
- It is important to point out the advantages the study of History offers to society and to individuals who study it as a degree programme or as part of their studies.
- The group underlines particularly the importance of comparison and connection (geographical, chronological) in historical teaching/learning and research.
- Other disciplines and competencies (the mother language, foreign language, Philology, Archaeology, Social Sciences etc.) are essential or advisable for the formation of a historian or more generally for the formation of a critical historical mentality.

Problems and insights

In general, it emerges from the survey carried out that there is something of a basic division between those systems in which the objective is first of all to transmit basic knowledge about different periods of history, often in a prescribed or in chronological order, subsequently dealing with more specific research topics and methodologies, and those which from the beginning seek to communicate a certain attitude or mindset, and deal immediately with research topics, giving less systematic attention to building up a framework of general knowledge. In the first case, with some degree of exaggeration, we might say that History is conceived of as an existing corpus of knowledge which can be arranged according to more basic or more specialised contents, and that the direct knowledge or experience of historiographical practice or research techniques should come in a second or third phase of studies. In the second case, notwithstanding quite relevant variations, we can say that history is understood to be a way of approaching reality which should be transmitted immediately, usually through actual examples of research or group work; whereas learning ‘basic’ contents is less immediately important, either because it is considered the task of secondary school studies or because it is thought that the essential thing is that the student know how to find and acquire such knowledge when needed. We can usefully conceive of this division in terms not of dichotomy but of a range of possible combinations, each with its specific characteristics. The range of combinations, which includes other factors as well, can be represented in simplified form: At one extreme we find several countries where either by law or in
practice, courses of study are organised to begin with general mandatory studies in History according to large chronological divisions (i.e. Ancient, Medieval, Early Modern, Modern, Contemporary or recent), and where the student begins to have autonomous contact with original documents in the second part of the course of studies. At the other extreme we find two typologies: the one hand Germany (where after the initial Grundstudium phase, the teaching/learning offer is articulated on the basis of specialised themes according to the interests and expertise of the teaching staff) and Italy where, until the current reform, courses did not need to be taken in a particular order and choice of subject matter was based to a large extent on research interests of staff although general knowledge had to be demonstrated at some point before receiving the final degree), and on the other Roskilde (not typical of Denmark insofar as it developed as an experimental University, but with some analogies to Uppsala), where the students from the very beginning of their University studies are asked to organise autonomous research groups in which themselves must define their theme, find the necessary materials to deal with it and prepare reports.

All other systems fall somewhere between these extremes. In countries such as Germany and Italy where the existing system is very far from what we might consider the French or Spanish model, the tendency in adapting the systems to the Bologna-Prague process seems to be to define a progressive series of general contents, hence coming closer to the Franco-Iberian model. The traditional British and Irish system insists from the outset and in all courses on creating the necessary conditions for the student to accede to the historical perspective or mindset, which is considered to be of general ethical-political value for all citizens and not just those specialising in the subject. We may note that such widely differing experiences and concepts of how the subject area is or should be organised make it necessary to build up new common reference points which take into account the various points of view. For this reason the UK benchmarking document is useful as a 'checklist' to compare with the results of the autonomous work of the group rather than as a starting point to be modified on the basis of specific insights. A general problem is that of articulating definitions and recommendations for 'core curricula' in levels. This must be done for a variety of levels: first and second cycle both for History students and for students who will take History as a second or minor subject. Also, as stated above, it seems appropriate to consider general objectives for single courses offered to students doing general studies.

Suggestions and proposals

As stated above, in the various national systems history studies are organised according to different basic criteria. Since the general objective of any European core curriculum must be to use to maximum effect the rich diversity of the teaching/learning and research traditions, it is obvious that the first principle is to preserve that diversity while giving teachers and students (and to the extent possible, the broader public) an awareness of it and hence of the specificity of their own national outlook. All systems have drawbacks and advantages and in practice have their own ways of achieving an appropriate balance. Nonetheless we wish to formulate a general recommendation that various basic factors listed below be present in a balanced way, both in the first and the second cycle, and even in single courses designed for general students. Hence:

I. Overarching objectives specific to History

1. It seems reasonable to propose that all history teaching, in whatever quantity and at whatever level, have certain general overarching objectives. These naturally can be pursued in any framework, but should not be ignored. These may be defined as acquiring a rational, critical view and insight into the past in order to have a basis for understanding the present and for informed citizenship.

2. It seems reasonable that all history teaching, in whatever quantity and at whatever level, have among its objectives that of furnishing some precise knowledge of events, processes of change and continuities in a diachronic perspective. It is essential that the student, however early put into contact with original research, be able to orient him/herself in the more general chronological framework of the past.
3. It seems reasonable that all history teaching, in whatever quantity and at whatever level, transmit so far as is possible an awareness of the basic tools of the historian’s craft, a critical approach to historical documents and an awareness of how historical interests, categories and problems change with time and in diverse political and social contexts. These general elements should be kept in mind whenever Historical studies are planned, executed or evaluated. At whatever level, it is important to transmit the concept that History is a perspective and a practice which has its own history, rather than a definitive corpus of knowledge which can be acquired incrementally, piece by piece.

II. Articulation in cycles
A particular problem appears to be defining realistic objectives or desired learning outcomes for the first and second cycle. It seems reasonable to calibrate the system starting from the objectives for the second cycle and adjusting those of the first cycle appropriately in order to avoid unrealistic expectations for the first cycle and a lack of distinction between the two. In this regard the definitions contained in the Scottish benchmarking document has been helpful; the differentiations contained in the legal definitions of the two levels in the new Italian system have also been of use. A formulation of the outcomes to be achieved at the various levels can be found in this brochure.

III. Other disciplines in history curricula
Although this is not universally the case today, there is some degree of consensus that history students should have adequate knowledge of some other disciplines related to the historical sciences (such as, purely as examples, geography, archaeology, statistics, and/or other literary, scientific or technical subjects according to the branch of history pursued). Although reality is today much different from the ideal, linguistic abilities also are of particular importance for history students. Appropriate levels of written and oral expression and understanding of one’s own language are obviously essential, although in no country is such knowledge automatic. History teaching should include attention to the specific statutes of writing and oral presentation within the discipline. Students also need ideally to have knowledge of several languages in order to utilize fully the historiographical literature and to approach research in a critical fashion. Even if their area of interest is their own country in a recent period they will benefit by being able to compare other realities with their own. Specific objectives for language training for history students can be defined (reading ability, scientific historiographical vocabulary, understanding of the formation of national languages as an historical process, etc.).

IV. National, regional, local History; European history; World History
In some systems national history is taught along with general history; in others there is a strong separation, and the national history is taught in different courses by different professors, even belonging to separate departments. In either case the student should be given the opportunity to accede to the insights which can be gained by studying both, albeit in different proportions. Something of the same nature can be said for the relationship between history regarding prevalently the regional, national, European or broader world history. Mapping the strikingly different emphasis on history of different areas of the world in different universities and national contexts would provide interesting material for future analysis. In any case it is reasonable that the student have the opportunity to widen his/her horizons in both directions, as the comparative approach to the teaching/learning of History is invaluable whether on a micro or macro scale. This could take the form of a recommendation.

The question of how European history itself may best be taught/learned is a subject which has receiving specific attention from the History Thematic Network CLIOHnet, developed on the basis of a curriculum development programme carried out by 38 Universities operating under the name of CLIOH. In this regard it seems reasonable for Tuning and CLIOH to collaborate, to give greater force to their reciprocal activities, insights and conclusions. Synthetically stated, CLIOH has prepared and is preparing a variety of tools and materials which make up an ‘offer’, an ‘arsenal’ which teachers and students can use to create ‘CORE’ modules (5 or more credits in general history for history and non-history students) which are based on the perception and the experience that the diversity of European
traditions and historical narratives provides a privileged entrée into the way historical knowledge is constructed. In addition to studying European history in this way, CLIOH proposes similar resources for teaching/learning about European integration and the ways the concept of Europe has been used and developed. Once again it seems reasonable to look for synergies with this pilot project in recommendations about teaching/learning European History in a comparative historical perspective.

V. General skills
In defining the objectives of core curricula it is well to remember a series of skills and competencies which will be useful for all graduates, whether or not they will become professional historians. Such considerations will certainly have an effect on recommendations regarding teaching learning methods: self-confidence, independent judgement, ability to make decisions, to gather information and to work with others for example can certainly be developed more effectively in some teaching formats than in others, and such aspects will need to be taken into considerations. Furthermore, the use of teaching methods which encourage capabilities not universally taken into account today (such as ability to work in teams, ability to organise projects) as well as those which enhance qualities more generally assumed to result from the study of History (such as mental discipline, effective writing and speaking, precision and intellectual honesty) should in practice improve the quality of the transmission of disciplinary knowledge as well.

VI. Lifelong Learning aspects
This topic has not yet been thoroughly discussed by the group. Nonetheless it may be pointed out that the general criteria outlined above under point I in this paragraph (overarching objectives specific to History) should apply to the teaching/learning activities, informal and formal, which may be offered in any context including Life-long learning programmes. This point is important, because there may be a potential clash between ‘heritage’ or ‘identity’ history and the rational critical historical outlook which is being proposed here. This problem regards the entire field, but perhaps is particularly important in the context of cultural or educational initiatives taking place outside normal academic institutions.
6. Learning, Teaching and Assessment and the Subject Area Competences

Introduction

In Tuning 1 the History group found that national and institutional traditions and practices as regards learning/teaching and assessment are quite different. In all cases the overarching objectives of all History programmes and course units which the group set out in its Common Reference Points paper (pages XXX in this brochure) and in its “cycle level descriptors” are accepted as general goals and as significant learning outcomes; however the ways of reaching them are innumerable. Each national system has its own consolidated ways of transmitting subject specific skills (such as knowledge of how to utilise certain types of sources or approach certain historiographical problems) as well as general strategies for nurturing a critical scientific approach and historical perspective. There are of course analogies and similarities and thus specific solutions or techniques developed in different institutions can be usefully shared.

However each system envisages a complex of approaches to learning/teaching and assessment which has evolved as a coherent whole. Therefore the adoption of specific partial solutions is likely to require various adjustments.

In many countries the present phase of application and extension of the Bologna process provides a context in which innovation in curricular design and rethinking overall modes of delivery and planning and coordination of specific course units is possible, desirable and – indeed – inevitable. By linking approaches to learning/teaching and assessment to particular competences we can create powerful tools for change and positive innovation as well as elements on which quality can be built, monitored, evaluated and enhanced.

In Tuning 1, the History Group defined 30 subject specific competences (reproduced here on page XX). Some of these are of interest in all programmes of study; others only in some. To exemplify, competence 17 (“Knowledge of Ancient Languages”) is considered necessary in many countries for students of Ancient, Medieval and even Early Modern History but not for Contemporary History students; whereas competence 5 (“Knowledge of the general diachronic framework of the past”) to a greater or lesser extent will be required of all graduates of any history programme. Some subject specific competences will be formed to an increasing extent during the entire course of studies, in the first, second and third cycles. Others are more likely to be targeted in certain moments. For example, competence 29, “Ability to comment, annotate or edit texts and documents correctly, according to the critical canons of the discipline” is considered more important for second cycle students, although in some courses of study (a first cycle degree that prepares for the publishing industry or for work in local archives) it might be considered useful at the end of a first cycle programme. The first step in curriculum design is the definition of the final learning outcome – required and desired – appropriate to the degree profile of the qualification to be awarded (the “educational outcome”). This outcome is to be formulated in terms of competences, subject specific and generic. Subsequently, in designing the many modules or course units which will lead to that final result, through activities which will require a specified number of hours of student workload measured in ECTS credits, it will be necessary to focus, for each course unit, on a certain number of key competences.

In practice, each actual course unit will form several or even many competences. This means that competences will normally be obtained in clusters, rather than one by one.

Since certain approaches to learning/teaching and assessment are most appropriate for forming certain subject specific competences (and certain generic competences), it follows that a variety of approaches to learning/teaching and assessment will be useful in order to form a broad range of competences, and also to provide students, with their individual abilities and propensities, with a range of possible ways of acquiring the necessary competences.

In order to explore the ways that different institutions currently form subject specific competences (or the ways that they could be formed in the future), and to exchange information about them, the
History Group chose 15 of the thirty competences, and examined them comparatively and analytically. Two members of the Subject Area Group described each of the chosen competences, looking at how the competence is understood, what learning and teaching approaches are used (or could be used) in their institution to enhance it, what assessment methods are (or could be used) to evaluate students’ achievement and how the students themselves perceive the competence and how they can be sure they have obtained it.

The results are discussed below and summarised in table form. Of course the fifteen do not comprise the entire range of competences that any single student will actually need.

They are simply examples of how specific learning, teaching and assessment methods are or can be explicitly linked to the formation of certain competences.

2. Different l/t approaches (types of course unit)

For clarity we consider the main kinds of learning and assessment activities separately. In practice many course units include several kinds of learning and teaching environment and several kinds of assessment. For example, a part of a course unit may be based on lectures and a part on working groups; assessment might be in part on the basis of a final exam and in part on participation in group discussion.

The kinds of courses used most commonly are the following:

By **lectures** we intend various learning or – at least – teaching environments in which a teacher speaks to a group of students, and interaction during contact hours is mostly in one direction, teacher to student. In practice lectures can be very formal or quite informal; classes may be very large, running even to hundreds of students, or quite small. In some traditions, and for some individuals, it is normal to read from a text or notes to the students; in others a more informal approach is used; reading lecture notes is frowned on; hand outs are given and discussion is encouraged.

In the category of **tutorials** we may place a variety of specific ways in which a teacher is regularly available in certain hours for more or less precisely programmed activities. The teacher may ‘tutor’ a small group or individual students. Tutorials may consist of discussion of subject matter presented in lectures; in discussion and correction of written or oral presentations, work on texts or other materials. Often tutorials are linked to lecture courses in order to furnish a chance for personalised discussion and explanation to facilitate the students.

**Workshops** may be associated with a lecture course or a series of workshops may constitute an entire course unit. In workshops a variety of techniques are used, all of which aim at giving the students the opportunity for informal and practical ‘hands-on’ learning. The teacher may present materials (hand-outs, documents, images) and ask the students to form small groups for discussion and elaboration of an outline, a report or a verbal presentation, which is presented in a final plenary part of the session.

**Seminars** vary more than might be imagined, but have some basic common characteristics in most systems. They foresee the presence of relatively limited number of students (but with variations from 3 or 4 to 30 to 40) in a less formal context than that of the lecture. Discussion is encouraged. In some countries, institutions, or specific course units, the seminars are organised by assigning to each student the task of preparing and making a presentation on a specific aspect of the general problem or theme considered; during a part or even all of the teaching period, the students make their presentations, one or more per session, and the other students are invited to ask questions and make observations. In other cases the seminar consists of presentations made by the teacher; in this case too questions and observations are encouraged and participation in discussion is often taken into consideration in assessment of the student’s performance.

**Group work** may be of different kinds. An entire course unit may consist of group work, or the group work may be part of several activities carried out for the course unit. In other disciplinary areas groups are often formed in order to implement “Problem- or Task-based” learning (PBL; TBL). In this case there are group sessions with a teacher in which the problems to be solved by the group (or
individually) or the tasks to be performed are presented; the groups or the individuals in the groups, perform the tasks or attempt to resolve the problems in the time intervals between the class meetings. Although this approach is not widespread in the History subject area, there are some examples in which group work has an important role. The work may be student defined and driven, in others cases the organising activity is up to the teacher. In the case of student driven learning (as in Roskilde) the groups decide themselves what problems or themes to study and the contact with the teacher has the form of a periodic tutorial or discussion and guidance session. The second typology (teacher defined and driven) is more common and provides more guidance, ensuring that the efforts of the group are directed towards relevant historiographical problems; however the former gives greater autonomy to the students and allows them to develop their independent judgement and self-reliance. Overall, both forms appear to be relatively rare in History teaching and learning whereas they would seem to be potentially very useful in forming many of the key competences.

Excursions (archives, museums, libraries, study trips and visits) are used to enhance specific competences or to present original materials or environments pertaining to the field of study. They are widely but not universally used.

Placements are an option or are obligatory in many systems. Theoretically the placement should give the student actual ‘on the job’ experience. Common placements for History students are in libraries or archives; or, for those who intend to become teachers, as substitute or assistant teachers.

E-learning and ODL combine various course categories mentioned above. Especially seminars and group work are well adapted to e-learning since in essence it offers exceptional possibilities for discussion, shared writing and learning processes and group formation. The number of higher education history institutions using e-learning is increasing and there are already some history institutions that offer half of the curricula courses as e-learning. Advanced courses use learning management systems, ie. specially tailored learning platforms. Also blended e-learning courses are becoming more common. The eHLEE e-learning project, developed by the CLIOHnet Task Force C and funded by European Commission, is setting up a code of best practices in e-learning for history and it is obvious that for some types of learning outcomes in history, e-learning platforms offer particularly interesting methods. eHLEE has prepared an international cooperative history course for 2nd cycle students, using Tuning competences and methodology in planning the course. International cooperation is particularly feasible in e-learning since the access to the course is not dependent on place and students from various countries can attend the same courses.

Finally, a relevant number of credits and hence workload for History students at all levels is normally reserved for the production of reports, theses and dissertations, based on personal study and research. Since such work is central to the subject area and involves learning, teaching and assessment, we discuss it briefly below under point 5.

In conclusion it must be remembered that each of these general typologies may have diverse specific characteristics in different systems; and are used for different purposes. In the course typologies mentioned above, different approaches – more or less input based or more or less student centred – are implemented according to national practice and tradition and staff awareness, individually and collectively.

3. Learning activities

The l/t activities listed above should more properly be considered teaching formats, which may be linked to or require different learning activities on the part of the student.

Although the learner is to be placed at the centre of the higher education process, most thinking and planning still centres on modes of ‘delivery’ rather than on the ‘learning’ activities themselves. The learning activities linked to the teaching formats described above are obvious in their general lines: to lectures corresponds ‘attending lectures’, ‘taking notes’, and, in most systems, ‘personal study’; in some cases ‘tutorials’ or ‘work groups’. 
In most systems, History students must dedicate a relevant part of their work time to ‘personal study’, including such activities as ‘formulating bibliographies’, ‘reading and personal study of general works’, ‘reading and personal study of monographs or scientific articles’, ‘making outlines and summaries’. Such activities are necessary building blocks for most other activities, such as: ‘participating in group discussions’, ‘participating in task or problem based learning teams’, ‘preparation and presentation of oral reports’; and ‘preparation and presentation of written reports’.

History students obtain ICT skills of different levels. Most learn to use basic ICT tools, for text elaboration and retrieval of information from Internet and on-line sources. Also useful for History graduates, but not always implemented, are more advanced ICT activities, forming the more sophisticated abilities necessary to find and use digitalised sources and images, to create maps, databases and websites, on-line inventories and so forth. Elearning is also developing an ever greater role among the tools used for History learning and teaching.

Particularly significant for the History Subject Area is ‘work in archives’ or similar (work where original sources are preserved or may be found or accessed). According to the period studied the specific characteristics of these activities varies, but in all cases they represents a necessary phase in formation of research competences. Preparation for individual research work may be carried out through ‘group reading and comment of texts or sources’, specialised tutorials or workshops or the like.

Placements, as mentioned above, in those systems where they are used, commonly take place in libraries, museums, publishing houses or in offices of local bodies or even in universities themselves; for future teachers, in schools as teachers or teaching assistants. In these contexts the work of history students can be useful to the employer or host of the placement period. The placements are clearly useful for the students themselves, as they will gain ‘real-life’ experience in such areas as organisation of activities, of source materials and library resources, creation and updating of information for the public, of shows and exhibits. An emerging area is that of private, city or company archives which second cycle students may be able to reorganise and catalogue or inventory.

Other forms of learning activities with which history students come into contact are language learning, and in general, learning linked to other disciplinary areas.

4. Assessment

In the History subject area, assessment methods are largely determined by national tradition or even by national legislation or by the organisation of studies. For example, in many countries examinations are written. The use of ‘external examiners’, as in UK, makes nearly inevitable the use of written exams which can be re-examined at different times by different persons. In some systems the oral examination before a board of at least two teachers is nearly universal (e.g. Italy) whereas in other countries it is not much practiced. At present, assessment criteria are not always stated (although good practice would require this). They are often considered to obvious or intuitive. For example, for all forms of assessment, it is very often considered self-evident that assessment of the student’s performance will take into account clarity of presentation, precision of contents and relevance of contents, good written – or spoken – style, and so forth.

Clearly, though, if an output- competence-based approach is properly implemented, the competences emphasized in programmes as a whole and each course unit must be stated and provided for in designing the relevant approaches to learning/teaching and assessment. Assessment must be designed to ascertain whether or not the announced competences have been formed to the level required by the minimum learning outcomes; moreover the assessment criteria must allow the learner to demonstrate higher levels of achievement. The more usual forms of assessment used in the subject area are:

*Written exams*, which may be more or less elaborate and challenging. Written exams may be used at midterm, at the end of term or even more frequently. Usually the student is asked either to answer questions, to comment texts or to write themes. Written examinations may be quite brief or last up to several hours. They are usually distinguished from quizzes, which are simpler, but also quicker and more ‘objective’ means of ascertaining whether the student possesses certain factual information. Quizzes
are ‘short-answer’ or ‘multiple choice’ and are not much used in history studies except as a tool for understanding the initial level of student knowledge at the beginning of a course unit or study programme.

In some systems oral exams are used more commonly than written ones, or even exclusively. Students may be asked or required to present written or oral reports based on specific reading assignments or circumscribed research tasks. The reports are assessed and the assessment usually is taken into consideration in the final grade or mark for the course unit. In some cases the entire course work may consist of one or more oral or written reports and the assessment hence constitutes the final result in its entirety. In some traditions reports have a codified scheme according to which the argument must be treated (France); in other countries the form is freer (usually the approximate length is specified), although general indications about form may be given. The reports are judged by the interest and accuracy of the contents and usually on the basis of clarity, efficacy and correctness of expression, although these criteria may not be stated.

Classroom discussion/participation: in many of the ‘teaching formats’ identified under point 2, students are encouraged, asked or expected to enter into discussion, asking questions, formulating comments or giving information. The discussion styles in different countries (and even with different teachers) are markedly varied. In some instances, performance in discussion is taken into account in a precise way; in others assessment of discussion is only used as a general indicator of the interest and preparation of the student, to integrate the results of exams or reports; in still others, assessment based on performance in classroom discussion is specifically avoided, in order to encourage students to express themselves freely and to use the discussion in a non-prescriptive, unstilted, brain-storming style.

As mentioned above, a very significant method of both learning/teaching and assessment is based on theses, dissertations or research papers. As this method is central to the subject area, we examine it briefly as a separate point, here below.

5. Theses, dissertations and research papers

For some first cycle students, most second and, particularly, all third cycle students in the field of History, the written research thesis or dissertation has a fundamental role both in learning/teaching and in assessment. The production of such a piece of work constitutes an important phase for the learner, who must develop to a higher degree and use ‘in the field’ the competences which have been initially formed in other contexts. The object of producing such a work is both to demonstrate that the learner possesses the competences to carrying out professional historical research, and to enhance or perfect the formation of those competences.

Equally important, those competences, both subject specific and generic, must be integrated and coordinated so that the resulting piece of work is original, well structured, scientifically founded, written in correct narrative and linguistic form and organised according to the canons of the discipline. Although the length of the text and the degree of difficulty of the research undertaken varies greatly, according to the level of studies and the national or institutional tradition, assessment always takes into account, more or less explicitly, all the above criteria.

In the case of theses and dissertations, the mechanics of assessment varies considerably in the different national contexts. There may be a specific commission or a single advisor who directs or advises on the preparation of the work; this same or another advisor or commission may be responsible for evaluating the final result. The dissertation may be presented and discussed publicly or not; the public presentation and discussion may be a pure formality, or it may influence or determine the final outcome. In some countries qualifications are awarded with a numerical indication of achievement, based on course work and/or on the dissertation; whereas in others this is not the case.

The third cycle has been considered by the History group, and the results are to be published separately in the Tuning Journal. Here we may stress simply that research papers, first and second cycle theses and dissertations represent in most systems an important means of forming competences and assessing
them in action, and that doctoral dissertations are the fruit of the same kind of activity on a larger scale.

6. Linking L/T and Assessment methods to specific competences

As explained above, in order to investigate the ways in which today the subject specific (and generic) competences are formed or in which they could be formed, the members of the Subject Area Group chose a certain number of competences from the list established already. These were chosen on the basis of their perceived relevance (using the results of the Tuning 1 consultation) for the first two cycles and in such a way as to include a variety of different kinds of competences. Members of the subject area (two for each competence) were asked to describe each competence and discuss the ways it is perceived, taught and assessed or if this does not happen today, how it could be best taught and assessed in the national context in the future. The results of this analysis showed many interesting aspects: first of all it was striking to see how the various competences were interpreted differently in different countries, and second (partly as a consequence) how learning teaching strategies designed to form seemingly identical competences may actually be quite different.

Both observations suggest that, to ensure transparency, an agreed series of terms and definitions will be needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence 1</th>
<th>Critical awareness of relationship between present and past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Method</strong></td>
<td>Confronting students with the fact that current events and issues have historical roots, precedents and/or analogies; showing how historiographical debate is formed and is related to current events and issues; sometimes course units are designed specifically to do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Activities</strong></td>
<td>Attending lectures or course, reading assigned bibliography, participating in discussion groups, using e-learning materials, writing papers or making presentations; in some cases by comparing specific historical events or processes to comparable present events or processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Way of Assessment</strong></td>
<td>This competence, or awareness, permeates the l/t activities and is not necessarily assessed separately; however when specific course units or activities address this issue it is explicitly taken into account.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence 2</th>
<th>Awareness of the differences in historiographical outlooks in various periods and contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Method</strong></td>
<td>Lectures, and group work discussing, presenting examples of historical texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Activities</strong></td>
<td>Attending lectures or course, reading assigned bibliography, participating in discussion groups, using e-learning materials, writing papers or making presentations, comparing and contextualising historiographical texts relative to different periods and orientations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Way of Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Written and/or oral examinations; assessment of presentation, and participation in discussion groups or exercise course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence 5</th>
<th>Knowledge of the general diachronic framework of the past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Method</strong></td>
<td>Lectures, exercise courses and/or tutorials on different periods of history or diachronic themes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Activities</strong></td>
<td>Attending lectures or course, reading assigned bibliography, participating in discussion groups, using e-learning materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Way of Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Written and/or oral examinations; assessment of participation in discussion groups or exercise course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence 7</td>
<td>Detailed knowledge of one or more specific periods of the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Method</strong></td>
<td>Lectures, group work, site visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Activities</strong></td>
<td>Attending lectures or course, reading assigned bibliography, participating in discussion groups, using e-learning materials, writing papers or making presentations, reading and contextualising texts relative to the period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Way of Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Written and/or oral examinations; assessment of presentations, and participation in discussion groups or exercise course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence 12</th>
<th>Ability to write in one’s own language using correctly the various types of historiographical writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Method</strong></td>
<td>Reading and commenting historiographical texts either in class assisted by the teacher or autonomously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Activities</strong></td>
<td>Writing assignments to practise producing different kinds of texts such as essays, reviews and summaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Way of Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Correction of text and written and oral feed-back to the student, including comparison of their own products with expected results. Notes A particular problem to be considered is that of countries in which historiographical texts are largely read and studied in languages other than the local one, creating difficulties in finding appropriate translations for historical concepts and terms, leading to problems of conceptual clarity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence 14</th>
<th>Knowledge of and ability to use information retrieval tools, such as bibliographical repertoires, archival inventories and e-references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Method</strong></td>
<td>Presenting the most important tools, explaining the different citation criteria, providing with lists of reviews, reference books, visiting libraries and archives, showing how to find materials or repertories preserved electronically, teaching not to trust references without checking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Activities</strong></td>
<td>Learning by doing, carrying out tasks, finding and using books and other materials, catalogues and inventories, finding electronic materials and so forth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Way of Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Checking result of the exercise and giving feedback and advice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence 23</th>
<th>Awareness of and ability to use tools of other human sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Method</strong></td>
<td>Some institutions allow or require students to take courses in other disciplines. In others, students acquire knowledge of other human sciences from lectures and reading books or articles from related fields. For some directions of study, tools from other disciplines are necessary, such as quantitative methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Activities</strong></td>
<td>In addition to the coursework, sharing experiences with students studying in related fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Way of Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Assessment according to the methods used in the related field, such as examinations and field work or anthropology and archaeology, tests for statistics and so forth. When the specific tools are required in history courses the ability to use them appropriately and correctly is assessed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence 1</th>
<th>Critical awareness of relationship between present and past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Method</strong></td>
<td>Confronting students with the fact that current events and issues have historical roots, precedents and/or analogies; showing how historiographical debate is formed and is related to current events and issues; sometimes course units are designed specifically to do this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Learning Activities
- Attending lectures or course, reading assigned bibliography, participating in discussion groups, using e-learning materials, writing papers or making presentations; in some cases by comparing specific historical events or processes to comparable present events or processes.

### Way of Assessment
- This competence, or awareness, permeates the l/t activities and is not necessarily assessed separately; however when specific course units or activities address this issue it is explicitly taken into account.

### Competence 28
**Ability to give narrative form to research results according to the canons of the discipline**

#### Teaching Method
- Assigned papers, workshops, specific activities for guidance in writing and giving references, individual tutoring.

#### Learning Activities
- Writing (drafting, correcting).

#### Way of Assessment
- Papers prepared for courses are corrected and feedback given, final year dissertation or thesis is discussed and corrected before final presentation.

### Second Cycle

### Competence 9
**Ability to communicate orally in foreign languages using the terminology and techniques accepted in the historiographical profession**

#### Teaching Method
- Language courses and laboratories, history courses in foreign language, reading history texts in other languages, Erasmus mobility experience or similar (including virtual mobility).

#### Learning Activities
- Grammatical and lexical study and practice, practice in speaking, oral presentation and discussion in the language, working with foreign students of the required language, video conferencing.

#### Way of Assessment
- Oral exams, assessment of presentations and participation in discussions.

#### Note
- This competence has a different weight in different countries.

### Competence 15
**Knowledge of and ability to use the specific tools necessary to study documents of particular periods**

#### Teaching Method
- Generally, exercise courses using original documents, also study of appropriate languages, and other tools, courses in text analysis, image analysis and so forth.

#### Learning Activities
- Reading, observing analysing documents and other sources and objects, studying how they have been produced and preserved; evaluating and contextualising the information they provide.

#### Way of Assessment
- Assessment is based on accuracy of transcription and quality of interpretation.

### Competence 22
**Knowledge of world history**

#### Teaching Method
- Lectures, workshops

#### Learning Activities
- Attending lectures and reading assigned bibliography on histories of peoples of other continents and of global processes; workshops.

#### Way of Assessment
- Written and oral exams, assessment of reports, presentations and participation in discussions.
### Competence 25
**Defining research topics suitable to contribute to historiographical knowledge and debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Method</th>
<th>Research seminars and individual supervision.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Activities</td>
<td>Participation in seminars and scientific conferences; preparation and choice of topic, compilation of bibliography, survey of sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way of Assessment</td>
<td>Evaluation of project by tutor/supervisor and by fellow students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Competence 26
**Ability to identify and utilise appropriately sources or information for research project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Method</th>
<th>Research seminars and individual supervision, workgroups, and small exercise courses on specific source typologies and methodologies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Activities</td>
<td>Critical examination of specific sources by individuals or in small groups, comment and criticism of sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way of Assessment</td>
<td>Evaluation of performance in above activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Competence 29
**Ability to comment, annotate or edit texts and documents correctly according to the critical canons of the discipline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Method</th>
<th>Presenting and explaining to students good examples of editions of different kinds documents and texts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Activities</td>
<td>Learning by doing: preparation of text or documents for edition with proper apparatus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way of Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment according to scholarly standards, feedback to the students and comparison of the work done by fellow students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Competence 30
**Knowledge of didactics of history**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Method</th>
<th>Lectures, workshops, placements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Activities</td>
<td>Study of theoretical and practical aspects of educational sciences as they pertain to history; planning courses (cognitive maps), teaching materials, including multimedial materials; taking part in practical exercises in class and in schools; exercises in didactics for museums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way of Assessment</td>
<td>Oral exams, assessment of presentations and performance in placement, self evaluation journal or log, joint assessment with secondary school teachers acting as supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td>This competence has a different weight in different countries: in some countries pedagogy or didactics is taught separately from disciplinary courses; in others teaching aspects are part of the history curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conclusions

Many of the findings indicated or hypothesised in Phase 1 of Tuning have found confirmation in Phase 2. Here it is useful to restate, schematically, the following:

1. Each national system can and must be seen as a coherent whole, in which the order, the contents, the teaching/learning and assessment methods are related to each other.
2. All the systems are in agreement as to the general ethical and heuristic reasons for studying-learning-teaching History, and aim to encourage critical historical perspective in their students. This aspect of the subject area is summarised in the ‘overarching’ competences or attitudes which we indicated in the Cycle level descriptors given in Tuning 1 (pages XXX in this
3. Contents (factual knowledge) and the order in which study of contents is organised in each national system vary very widely. Nonetheless comparability and transparency are possible using a competence-based approach.

4. History studies can form a basis for a variety of professions, not all of them explicitly linked to the subject area. Some subject specific competences are of interest and benefit for all citizens; and some key generic competences are formed effectively through History studies.

5. Other disciplines and competences (relative to the learner's own language, other languages, such related fields as philology, geography, archaeology, social sciences etc.) are essential for the formation of a historian or more generally for the formation of a critical historical mentality and hence must be included in history study programmes.

6. The subject specific competences and the valuable generic competences which history studies form can only be fully developed if the learner is exposed constantly to original sources and to professional historical research. Textbook level teaching of contents does not encourage or even allow the formation of the desired competences.

Above and beyond the general findings listed above, the analysis carried out in Tuning 2 of the ways in which history higher education endeavours – or could endeavour – to form the subject specific and generic competences defined has yielded important and significant results. It is true that the main methods of teaching learning and assessment can be described as variants of certain nearly universally used typologies (e.g. lecture, seminar, written exam, paper, oral exam). However it is in the highly variable details of each that there is most to learn.

Traditions and practices specific to one or a few national systems may be completely absent in other systems. Sharing knowledge and insight about learning, teaching and assessment methods can yield important benefits. Overall, with respect to the other subject areas, the History subject area offers particular experience in forming not only its own competences such as ‘placing processes and events in a chronological framework’, but also competences that are generally relevant, such as ‘ability to gather and integrate information from a variety of sources’, ‘appreciation and respect for diversity and multiculturality’. This knowledge can be shared, and in any case all those students who take some course units in History, although their degree programme may be in another subject area, will benefit by making explicit efforts to form the key history competences.

On the other hand, History studies are not always organised in such a way as to encourage the formation of some other generic competences which would be of use to History graduates, both in their profession and in particularly those regarding interpersonal skills. For example, whereas ‘teamwork’, ‘decision-making’, ‘ability to communicate with experts in other fields’ etc. maybe considered very important in other subject areas, they are often ignored or not specifically provided for in History studies.

Consequently, History graduates and historical studies will have much to gain if innovative approaches to learning, teaching and assessment are taken into consideration explicitly and implemented. Sharing the knowledge and experience available in the subject area and, particularly, adapting and utilising that existing in other subject areas, will be important tasks for the future.
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