



Student Advancement of Graduates' Employability (SAGE)

Executive Summary and Methodology

Executive Summary

Introduction

Employability was first mentioned in the Sorbonne Declaration in 1998, and it was one of the key ideas behind a harmonised European higher education system. Definition of employability, ever since then, kept on changing and gaining new forms and contexts. In the Bologna Declaration (19 June 1999), employability was referred to as “citizens’ employability”, while in the Prague Communiqué (19 May 2001) it was clarified as “graduate employability”. (Frederiksen, Vuksanović, 2013)

With Bologna Declaration, ministers and higher education institutions committed themselves to creating higher educational systems that will widely reflect societal needs, encourage critical thinking and help coherent development of the “citizens’ employability”. For these purposes, various action lines and tools have been created in the both parallel processes: the EU and the Bologna Process (European Higher Education Area since 2010), i.e. Qualifications frameworks, Cycles and ECTS, Recognition, Lifelong learning. In the European, national and disciplinary levels “learning outcomes”, “competences” and employability have been largely promoted in order to ensure similarity of curricular thrusts (Schomburg, Teichler, 2011). However, development of the educational system that will be based on societal needs and encourage “citizens’ employability” had scarcely forwarded from the initial plan. Moreover, higher education reforms have taken downturns in certain national contexts and jeopardized autonomy of higher education institutions, endangering further independent development of teaching, learning and research.

Employability With Student Eyes, as the main research study of the Student Advancement of Graduates Employability project, reflects opinions of the National Students’ Unions on the current higher education trends, focusing primarily on the buzz word “employability” and the ways this concept is being dealt with in various national contexts. It is also set to prove that employability is not a one-size-fits all concept and that its understanding and implementation highly depend on the national educational and economical policies.

The survey was developed in accordance to the Bologna With Student Eyes questionnaires, consulting the questionnaire of the Bologna Implementation Working Group of the BFUG¹.

Status quo of understanding, defining, implementing and developing employability

Employability has been put into focus of educational developments by governments, policymakers and other stakeholders since the beginning of Bologna process. This has often met with strong negative reaction coming from academics and students. Keeping academic values at the core of education is opposed to transforming HEIs purely into agents for economic development. Freezing of the public sector hiring and encouraging the private sector efforts to reduce the overhead costs have made obstacles for graduates to becoming autonomous members of society. This has been made even worse when after leaving higher education, graduates are burdened with debts, due to the increases of tuition fees in many countries.

There is even a higher concern that structural implementation of Bologna process has failed to strengthen the diverse roles of higher education, due to the lack of actual implementation of Bologna tools and action lines on the national and the institutional level. Low participation of students in structural reforms of higher education has also been one of the means to support consumerist approach and restrict autonomy of students and graduates. Many students are forced to work alongside their studies and they predominately continue to take up positions unrelated to their studies, and the Bologna bachelor degree is perceived to offer too few employment opportunities.

First meaningful employment

With the SAGE survey we investigated the possibility of gaining the first meaningful employment after studies and in 31.5% of answers the possibility was characterised as medium, in 17.8% low and in 9.6% high. In addition, 78.1% of respondents claim that employers are not aware of the value of bachelor's degree. Denmark (DSF) reports that the ordinary bachelor degree scarcely gets recognised by employers. In Check Republic (SKRVŠ) recognition exists in theory while in practice no, and in Switzerland there is no data on the matter.

In 19 countries there are initiatives facilitating graduates' entry to labour market, in seven countries (Belarus, Bulgaria, Estonia, Germany, Lithuania, Serbia and Sweden) there are none. The initiatives are for example subsidized employment after graduation, cooperation with third sector, career centres in employment offices and universities, firms collaborating with universities, career days, R&D projects and internships. Most often these initiatives have been started by the universities (14 countries). In eleven countries they have been initiated by

¹ Bologna Follow Up Group

students, and in twelve by the state. In many countries there are either initiatives that have been started by several parties together or several initiatives started by different parties. The initiatives have been fairly successful, in twelve countries at least some of them have been working as planned but in five at least some of them have failed in one way or another. Also here many answered that they don't know. In 13 countries the students are more prepared for the labour market due to the initiatives. Employers appreciate the initiatives in most of the countries. Only in Croatia they don't appreciate them.

There are career centres in universities in 21 countries, in three (Belarus, Belgium, Macedonia) there are none. According to the answers to the survey they typically organise career fairs, facilitate contact between students and employers in different ways, give guidance and help students improve their job seeking skills. In addition to these they relay information on available jobs and internships, give lectures on getting employed, help the foreign students to find work and organize information campaigns. It seems that in most of the countries students are happy with the career centres, in some countries they seem to be not active or the support to graduates is not of good quality.

Cooperation of stakeholders

Cooperation of different stakeholders on the matter of employability still remains a challenge. Swedish (SFS) national student union doesn't initiate discussions with stakeholders however there is no lack of support and participation in discussions. In Lithuania (LSS), cooperation with stakeholders is a matter of each individual HEI and there is no common framework of cooperation on the national level. Swiss (VSS-UNES-USU) national union of students doesn't work on the matter and is not aware of any projects regarding the topic. In Romania (ANOSR) cooperation is mostly based on conducting research studies on the local level and creating policy recommendations that are, later on, presented to the stakeholders on the national level. French community student union in Belgium (FEF) doesn't work on the matter and it considers higher education exclusively a matter of academia. Icelandic student union (SHI) has been trying to cooperate with the government on the matter, unsuccessfully.

Responsibility of universities regarding long term employability

When asked to reflect their opinion on responsibility of universities regarding the long term employability of graduates, the National Unions of Students stated following:

- One of the Finish NUSes (SYL) states that universities should get financing according to employment of graduates. Quality higher education is crucial and it has to be developed and supported by universities primarily.

- In Denmark (DSF) students expect from universities to secure relevant field of studies and quality of education through cooperation with all stakeholders.
- In Norway (NSO) students view responsibility of universities in promoting education that is general and used by diverse society.
- In Ireland (USI) students expect from universities to be responsible for innovating teaching and learning, equipping students with key lifelong learning skills and up-to-date knowledge.
- In Germany (fzs) students think that universities should provide HE for self-consistent individuals instead of providing graduates for the labour market.
- In Serbia (SUS and SKONUS) students state that universities' crucial responsibility should be focusing on cooperation of stakeholders and teachers' training.
- In Sweden (SFS) students believe that universities should provide HE that accommodates student needs and not employers', while the active cooperation of stakeholders should be encouraged.
- In Lithuania (LSS) students strongly believe that HEIs are the ones responsible for the development of learning outcomes and shaping of the labour market, mobility and hard skills, not vice versa!
- Armenian students (ANSA) consider universities not responsible for employment of graduates.
- In Estonia (EUL) students believe that universities should be responsible for provision of skills and knowledge relevant for the labour market and that accommodates student needs.
- In Portugal (FAIRe) students state that universities are responsible for reflexive feedback and monitoring of graduates.
- In Hungary (HOOK) students believe that universities should be responsible for practical and theoretical knowledge that fits labour market's needs.
- In Ukraine (UASS) students believe that universities are responsible for development of lifelong learning and competitiveness on the labour market.

It is obvious that for all students and student representatives, the autonomy of higher education institutions is crucial in making decisions regarding structural implementation of Bologna process. Also, it is clear that students strive for prevention of academic values, leaving decisions regarding development of learning outcomes, knowledge, skills and competences in hands of the academia. Cooperation with stakeholders is expected and encouraged in most of cases however, students do not support development of learning outcomes in accordance to the labour market solely. There is a vast majority of students in Europe that sees the paradigm shift from teacher centred to student centred learning, as one of the key steps in further development of the concept of employability.

Skills and competences

Generally speaking, obtaining a higher education degree is to the benefit of the individual, society and labour market. Rather than looking at the exact numbers of graduates in each field, the focus should be on the type of skills, or competences, that seem to enhance the opportunities for finding work, regardless of the study background. Those graduating from generally oriented programmes have a lower likelihood of finding a good match in their first job and of staying in that job compared to vocationally educated (EU 2012e). However, it is possible that their education provides the kinds of transferable skills that towards getting better matched and higher-skilled jobs in the long term. This underlines the necessity for education and training systems that avoid developing curricula that are overly specific and which are useful in only a limited range of occupations.

The different stakeholders, or interest groups, each have their opinion on what the skills are that are most needed or important for graduates' to acquire during their studies.

Respondents themselves valued social skills (teamwork, social aspects) (14 mentions) and work and practical experiences (study jobs, internships) almost as equally important (13 mentions). These two categories ranked as the most important type of skills. These were followed by communication and presentation skills with 9 responses out of X, language skills with 7 mentions, hard skills with 5 mentions, mobility and autonomy, entrepreneur skills, learning from prior experiences were all given two mentions. IT skills, academic skills, skills gained from social and political activities, organization skills and having low financial demands were each ranked as least important.

The respondents thought higher education institutions value skills in the following way: hard skills (knowledge, good grades, degrees, short study time) was rated as the most important by 16 mentions, good theoretical knowledge as second most important with 10 mentions. Methodological skills, work experience/internships, academic skills, language skills, and hard work/effectiveness were all mentioned 4-5 times. Other types of skills mentioned include technical skills (2), critical thinking (2), independence (1), time management (1), competitiveness (1), entrepreneurship (1) and self-learning skills (1).

As for the labor market, the following skills are important in the opinion of the student representatives: work experience (13 mentions), social skills/networking (8), knowledge (6), communication/presentation skills (6), language skills (5), punctuality/availability (3), the right attitude (3), technical knowledge (IT) (3), independence (2), inter-cultural skills (2), academic skills (2), entrepreneur skills (2), creativity (2), organization skills (2), flexibility (1), critical thinking (1), extracurricular activities (1), driver's license (1) and proactivity (1).

As a general conclusion, it can be found that for students social skills and soft skills in general seem to play a bigger role than for higher education institutions and the labour market. For the latter two groups, hard skills and work experience are the most important, according to the student representatives opinions. Why it is important to explore the perceptions of students is because such beliefs may have an impact on the choice students' make concerning different study courses, optional

studies, whether they engage in volunteer activities, and what kind of topics and subjects they decide to focus on during their studies. Offerings ways to reach the skills that the students' value contribute to their motivation and successful completion of studies.

Student centeredness

The participants were asked whether they are aware of any mechanisms where students are asked about their expectations towards their degree. 41.1% said that there are mechanisms in place in their country but a larger portion, 58.9%, were not aware of any mechanisms. No gender differences or study status differences were found for this question. Also the duration of working at a student union had no influence on the question. When it comes to the type of mechanisms, mostly questionnaires that are assessed at the universities were used. Sometimes also discussions and interviews are done or personal study plans are made. Career consultations and student advisory services were mentioned only by two respondents.

A third (32,9%) of the respondents answered that they were aware of studies on both levels. 23% knew of studies on institutional level, and 16.4% were aware of studies only at national level. Almost a fifth, 17.8%, were not aware of any studies whatsoever.

According to the findings of study visits to 11 countries and 23 institutions conducted by EUA (2011:32), many institutions highlighted the importance of tracking not only their progression path but also the students' experience, through surveys, course evaluations or focus group interviews. Beyond support to individual students or groups of students, there was a focus on institutional development in various areas, such as the development of teaching and learning (courses and programmes), improvement of services and facilities, and the enhancement of quality assurance, governance and management approaches. In essence, this amounted to improving the quality of the overall student experience, as well as of teaching and learning. In many institutions, tracking of the progression path of students and of their experience were very closely interrelated and the distinction between the two activities was blurred.

If both the expectations of students' and later on, the satisfaction and how the expectations were met, were measured, the effective planning to answer to the needs of the students would be made easier. Both types of information are needed to understand the interrelatedness and cause-effect relationship of the factors that influence successful study completion.

Recognition of prior learning

The role the recognition of non-formal learning, including skills gained in extra-curricula activities in higher education could facilitate a significant shift in improving the flexibility of study paths and later on, the transition to working life.

The respondents were asked whether the competencies and skills gained through non-formal education are recognised by the labour market. 68.5 % of all respondents think that this is the case. 13.7 % do not think the skills are recognised by the labour market and almost a fifth, 17.8 % do not know.

The respondents were asked whether there is a student portfolio system existing in their national context. A portfolio refers to a way of displaying the competences one has gained prior to seeking admittance to higher education, or alternatively, to the working life. In other words, it is a system to have one's knowledge recognized as competences and learning outcomes systematically, so that the higher education institution can recognize the prior learning one has gained. The knowledge might have been obtained in previous work places, extra curricula activities or by having self-studied.

The majority of respondents, 56.2% say that there is no student portfolio system existing in their national context. Only 12.3% state that there such a system does exist. 31.5% of the participants do not know whether there is a student portfolio system in their national context.

Recognition of prior learning on any level, whether institutional or working life, improves the chances of non-traditional learners and immigrants. These groups are the most vulnerable when it comes to accessing education and work. As the goal of EU2020 is to widen access to education, all possible means are needed: *"Broadening access to higher education means attracting more students from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds or geographical locations, from ethnic groups and from among people with a disability."* However, quantity should never be prioritised over quality.

Bologna tools that influence employability

Cycles and ECTS

In order to well develop student-centred system, it is of crucial importance to look into the development of ECTS, estimation of workload and formulation of learning outcomes. Student representatives were asked if the allocation of ECTS is being conducted based on both measures mentioned above. 12.3% of respondents said that allocation of ECTS bases completely on estimation of workload and formulation of LOs, while 20.5% said this happens in majority cases, 12.3% at all levels of HE, hardly at all in 28.8% and not at all in 16.4%.

Also, the room for improvement exists in participation of students in curriculum design, where only 6.8% of students fully take part, 57.5% to a certain extent and 35.6% doesn't participate at all.

When asked to reflect progress between cycles majority of respondents stated that if the 2nd cycle is compatible with the 1st cycle, students get automatically admitted. Problems were detected in Lithuania where it is difficult to automatically progress from the 1st cycle in UAS to the 2nd cycle in University and usually students need to obtain additional 60 ECTS. In Czech Republic flexibility is reduced as well, while in Iceland enrollment to the 2nd cycle greatly depends on the individual success made during the 1st cycle.

Recognition

When asked to reflect whether the Diploma Supplement is free of charge or not, 53.4% of respondents stated that it is free of charge, while in 20.5% it is not.

Diploma Supplement is compulsory and regulated by the law and ordinances, in most cases, while in Ukraine it is guaranteed by the Act of the cabinet of Ministers, in Switzerland it exists only in the form of recommendation of the RC to use the DS at UAS and Universities while in Romania it is regulated by the Student Statute which states that the DS is free of charge.

When asked to reflect whether there were changes in credit and degree mobility since in the period between 2011 and 2013, in most cases student representatives replied with no, while Netherlands stated that the HEIs strive for more mobility; in Romania external mobility is in development while internal mobility faces too many obstacles.

Automatic recognition

Automatic recognition refers to a process where students' certificates would not need to go through an assessment of equivalence with national qualifications, but which could be checked for authenticity and award by a recognised institution within the EHEA, to ensure authenticity of the degree and its award by a recognised higher education institution.

Although the legislative provision for automatic recognition is very poor, 44% of respondents are supportive towards the idea of AR implementation. 16.7% percent of respondents has no knowledge on legislative provision for AR in their countries. However, in:

Denmark: "There is Nordic cooperation on automatic recognition of qualifications (the Reykjavik Declaration)."

Norway: "For certain vocations regulated by the EEA-legislation (EU law governing recognition of professional qualifications), but otherwise there is no automatic recognition."

Only 23.6% respondents stated that students ask NUSes for help regarding AR and the issues they usually need help with are long administrative procedures, high costs, the degree doesn't meet all the conditions required for access.

When asked to state if there are other mechanisms that are used by the institutions for recognition of foreign degrees, unions said following:

Denmark: "It is the study boards with a 50 pct. student representation that are responsible for the recognition".

Norway: "Recognition of foreign degrees is a part of the mandate for the national quality assurance agency, 2KUT. There are vocations that are automatically recognised in connection with the EU-/EEA-regulations, however all other applications for recognition are processed individually and paper-based. This means that the combinations of subjects and programmes are taken into account on an individual basis. There is no database, but only a general set of rules for each individual country and the most common levels and types of study. The insitutions do the recognition of courses in degrees, for example when a student is halfway through their studies in another country and wants to complete their degree in Norway, or credit mobility. There are new systems being formed where there will be a national register for the universities to use to complete this credit recognition."

Ireland: "European and National Qualifications Frameworks"

Netherlands: "Nuffic and DUO (two Dutch organisations) are arranging these things."

Germany: "It's almost always handled on an individual basis."

Sweden: "A student turns to an institution to get credited. To get recognition of qualification a student applies to the Swedish Council for Higher Education. Decisions can be appealed."

Lithuania: "Sometimes there are bilateral agreements existing with non-EHEA countries on one hand, and with some separate universities, while holding a joint-degree programme with non-EHEA HEI."

Armenia: "Not a large number of incoming students, therefore we as a union don't deal with the issue of automatic recognition."

Romania: "Sometimes there are partnerships between universities from Romania and other universities abroad and based on these partnerships the process of recognition is facilitated between the two universities. This also happens at national level when the Ministry of Education makes some agreements with other countries and they look into specific aspects to HE system from the both countries and build a mechanism who makes the recognition more easy."

Portugal: "institutions protocols, national technical areas agreements, and in specific cases teachers good will. International cooperation: international programs that promote student mobility in undergraduate programs or postgraduate courses or research projects, such as networks CLUSTER CESAER, TIME, ATHENS and MAGALHÃES-SMILE. Joint PhD programs with international universities, such as, MIT, CMU, UT Austin, EPFL, etc."

Hungary: "The Hungarian Accreditation Committee established in 1993 is responsible for accrediting and evaluating the quality of teaching and research at higher education institutions. It assesses the standard of education and research in each higher education institution at least in every eight years (institutional

accreditation) based on a detailed self-assessment of the institution and the report of a visiting committee. The Hungarian Accreditation Committee also examines the curricula, the qualification requirements as well as the quality of the academic staff and the teaching facilities (programme accreditation). Degrees and qualifications Hungarian universities and colleges grant degrees following a binary pattern. Colleges and universities grant "Főiskolai oklevél" (college-level degree) and universities award "Egyetemi oklevél" (university-level degree). The duration of training at college level requires minimum 3 years and maximum 4 years of studies, while the length of study at university level is minimum 4 years, maximum 5 years (one of the few exceptions is the medical course where the duration of education is 6 years). Students complete their education with a final examination consisting of the preparation and defence of a dissertation, oral and/or written examinations prescribed in the qualification requirements and – in certain programmes – the performance of practical work. (source: Ministry of National Resources - nefmi.gov.hu"

Belarus: "Bilateral agreements with other HEIs."

Latvia: LRC

Switzerland: "These are made differently by every single institution - it is furthermore common, to have different rules who apply only to one country. E.g. students from Germany must have a high school degree with the mark of 2.5 to enter the University of Basel. For the University of Bern they need a 2. If you are from Austria, you just need a high school degree. If you are from Germany and want to enter a Master in Switzerland, where you need a minimal mark, there are still discussions, which German mark has the same value as the Swiss mark and so on. Students from several countries (but not all!) need to prove, that they have been accepted to study something similar at a university in their country in order to study in Switzerland."

Iceland: "Each university has an international office that goes carefully through any applications that come from outside of Europe and cooperate with certain foreign universities."

Countries that participated in the survey are following: Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, Ireland, Germany, Portugal, Serbia, Lithuania, Armenia, Romania, Estonia, Macedonia, Hungary, Spain, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Ukraine, Latvia, Belarus, Azerbaijan, Slovenia, Switzerland, Belgium, Croatia, Iceland, Cyprus.

Qualifications Frameworks

Regarding qualifications framework, there is still a big lack of knowledge on the side of NUS representatives and students in general. Students are fully consulted on development of NQF, self-certification and referencing in only 12.3%. However, respondents share the opinion that NQFs help transparency, facilitate recognition and enhance Lifelong learning. Also, they are aware of the importance of NQFs for an easier access from VET and other forms of education to Higher Education. 24.7% of respondents believe that LOs are transparency tools while 26.0% of respondents believe that LOs are a common language for achieving transparency.

The most important conclusion to draw out of the Bologna section is that there is a vast lack of the SCL implementation and student participation in structural reforms of higher education on the national level. In the view of ESU, this should be improved as soon as possible and students shouldn't be kept aside as observers of the process, but should rather be treated as equal partners and given the opportunity to equally contribute to the structural development of HE.

Methodology

Participants

From 47 European Student unions in 39 countries, 35 unions from 28 countries filled in the questionnaire between June and beginning of September 2013. As unions were asked to find up to five persons from their organization to fill in the questionnaire, a total of 73 questionnaires were filled in. In table 1 an overview of the participating countries and the number of collected questionnaire from that country are given. Nine persons did not fill in a country.

Table 1:

Country	Frequency	Percentage
No country selected	9	12,3
Armenia	1	1,4
Azerbaijan	1	1,4
Belarus	1	1,4
Belgium	1	1,4
Bulgaria	1	1,4
Croatia	1	1,4
Cyprus	1	1,4
Czech Republic	1	1,4
Denmark	1	1,4
Estonia	3	4,1
Finland	7	9,6
Germany	3	4,1
Hungary	4	5,5
Iceland	1	1,4
Ireland	1	1,4
Latvia	1	1,4
Lithuania	4	5,5
Macedonia	1	1,4

Netherlands	3	4,1
Norway	1	1,4
Portugal	5	6,8
Romania	6	8,2
Serbia	5	6,8
Slovenia	1	1,4
Spain	1	1,4
Sweden	2	2,7
Switzerland	1	1,4
Ukraine	4	5,5
Total answers	73	100,0

Participants were born between 1976 and 1993 (mean = 1988.6; SD = 3.00), mean age was 25years of age. A little bit more than half of the participants were female (n = 39), compared to 34 male participants. Of all participants, 36% were studying in their first three years of tertiary education (Bachelor cycle), 40% already finished their Bachelor degree and 19% already finished their Master degree. 6% did not answer this question.

Participants were also asked how long they are already been active in the student movement. The frequencies and percentages of this question can be found in table 2.

Table 2: Duration of active student movement

	Frequency	Percentage
1 year	4	5,5
2 years	8	11,0
3 years	9	12,3
4 years	21	28,8
5 years	11	15,1
Other period	10	13,7
No answer	10	13,7
Total answers	73	100,0

15 respondents indicated that they are the Student Bologna Expert (SBE) of their country, 58 respondents said they were not the SBE for their country. Participants could also note down their field of expertise in the student movement in an open answer format. 18 respondents did not fill in a field of expertise, whereas 55 did. Some of them filled in more than one field. Main answers were: Social dimension (15 answers), quality assurance (14 answers), mobility (14 answers), financial issues (13 answers), internationalization (11 answers), employability (11 answers), education policies (5 answers), Bologna issues (4 answers), national higher education (2 answers) and 15 fields which were only

mentioned once (for example: research, interest representation, project management, entrepreneurship).

Measures

A questionnaire with 85 questions was developed. Questionnaires were divided into different chapters:

Demographic questions, expectations of students towards employment, skills(labor market and skills, quality of internship, skills gained in extra-curricular activities), employability of graduates and students, cycles and ECTS, Recognition, automatic recognition, qualification frameworks, cooperation with the third sector/companies/stakeholders and case studies (good practices on strategies, initiatives, plans, policies).

25 questions were compulsory to fill in, 60 questions were not. As some questions could only be answered from the NSU view or by the Student Bologna Expert of the student union. In total 10 of the questions were open question, the other questions were single- or multiple choice questions. However, most single- or multiple -choice questions had options for additional open answers.

Procedure

All student unions in Europe received invitation e-mails and reminders about the survey. They received a short description of the study and a link to the survey page.

The survey was created with lime survey, an online survey tool. The survey started with an introduction about the survey purpose, deadlines and rules to fill it in correctly. Also contact addresses were named, if persons had problems with filling in the survey.

After the 5th of September, the survey was closed and data was exported to an excel document. Qualitative questions were exported to MAXQDA, a content analysis program and quantitative data was exported to IMB SPSS statistics for further analysis. Data was analyzed by chapter; per chapter different teams were responsible for analysis and results description. All questionnaires with more than half of the questions filled in correctly were included into the survey data.

Closing remarks

Currently steered by the consumerist trends, higher education is being turned into a tool for producing the outcome-based knowledge relevant for the economy development. It is being price tagged, traded with and standardised. It is becoming fragile, less and less resistant to the political instability and elitism. Students, the biggest potential of the society, are also being turned into consumers or sometimes even a product.

Students are not users of the system, nor are they consumers. They are active partners who contribute to the reform and development of higher education with their knowledge, experience and expertise. Moreover, together with other partners they create the common ground for discussions and encourage an objective approach to higher education as a tool for social development (Frederiksen, Vuksanović, 2013).

No amount of charters, direct primaries, or short ballots will make a democracy out of an illiterate people (Walter Lippmann), therefore, this publication will revive the concept of the „citizens' employability“, suggesting the socially responsible pathway of education and employability and stressing the importance of active citizenship, critical thinking and independent development of teaching, learning and research