

# COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

SEC(89) 2051 final

Brussels, 13 December 1989

## ERASMUS PROGRAMME

Report on the Experience  
Acquired in the Application  
of the ERASMUS Programme  
1987-1989

(presented by the Commission)

## SUMMARY OF MAIN CONCLUSIONS

### 1. ERASMUS has already marked European universities

ERASMUS has received an exceptionally warm welcome in university circles. This enthusiasm has expressed itself in a massive demand to participate, a response way above the programme's resources. There has been a substantial increase in student mobility (4.000 students the first year, 28.000 in the third year). Most students consider that their stay abroad period has opened up wider professional possibilities especially with regard to their host Member State. Interuniversity cooperation has been strengthened. There are now over 1.500 ICPs, a very large majority of which would not have seen the light of day without ERASMUS. The transnational dimension of ICPs is now well established and has gone hand in hand with a very definite geographical rebalancing of the interuniversity network. Furthermore, the ICP network has now been supplemented by the ECTS pilot programme.

ERASMUS focuses on organised student mobility and it is in this area that the programme has been most successful and that demand has been strongest. The interuniversity network is however, still "fragile": the success of ERASMUS rests mainly on the personal commitment of its promoters and as a whole, ICPs are extremely dependent upon Community support, in both the short and medium term. ERASMUS support acts both as a symbol stimulating the commitment of programme directors and as a pump-priming financial resource.

ERASMUS has highlighted certain disfunctions at national and university level and has encouraged a process of contact and comparison between different systems of higher education. Many Member States have already taken important complementary measures.

### 2. The obstacles encountered

ERASMUS needs continuity in its financial support especially in the light of the qualitative and quantitative demand expected.

The ERASMUS Programme has suffered considerably from its incapacity to satisfy the demand it has created, owing to the budgetary limits imposed on it. This has given rise to numerous reactions of disappointment and frustration. In addition it has had a braking effect on the creation of new programmes and a particularly discriminatory effect on exchanges with countries for which linguistic preparation is long and expensive.

There have also been some inequalities and inflexibility which has given rise, for example, to disparities in the treatment of students from different Member States (national quotas for Action

2 allocations), to the exclusion of students undertaking complete study cycles in another Member State, to dissuasive selection rates for the development of joint curricula and intensive programmes. Growing difficulties with regard to the question of accommodation of ERASMUS students in the host institution have also become apparent.

3. Implementation of the programme

All the activities provided for by the programme have been implemented, with the exception of the ERASMUS prizes and the management structures and services responsible have carried out their tasks successfully. There has been a major and constant effort to arrive at an interuniversity network which is as balanced as possible and appreciable results have been achieved in the first 3 years of operation. For programme users, the main difficulties are the precarious nature of the annual subsidies and late notification of results to beneficiaries.

4. Factors governing the future development of ERASMUS

The future of the programme is also linked to the notion of what might be termed co-development: increased collaboration with the Member States and the NGAAs; overall coordination with other Community programmes in the field of higher education; assistance and counselling services aimed specifically and selectively at the weak areas, taking into consideration special needs and situations; reestablishment of a more direct and personal dialogue with those responsible for ERASMUS in the universities.

Both the results already achieved and the trends becoming apparent confirm that significant progress has been made in a very short-time and that the programme is developing along the lines envisaged. However, if the full potential of interuniversity cooperation is to be realised in the years to come, far wider developments will also have to take place not least at Member State level involving a profound change in the practices and outlook of the academic world.

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
A. SYNTHESIS REPORT	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
1. Aim of the Report	1
2. Monitoring Measures	1
3. Evaluation Measures	2
4. Extent to which Objectives have been realized	2
5. Future Prospects for Evaluation	3
II. ERASMUS HAS ALREADY PROFOUNDLY MARKED EUROPEAN UNIVERSITIES	5
1. Main objectives of the ERASMUS programme	5
2. Enthusiastic welcome, massive demand	5
3. Student mobility: successful start	6
4. European interuniversity cooperation strengthened	7
5. Focus on the ORGANIZED mobility of students	8
6. Impact on course content	9
7. Success of ERASMUS relies mainly on the personal commitment of its promoters	10
8. Growing institutional support	11
9. Support for ERASMUS through national policies	12
10. The impact of ERASMUS beyond the Community	12
III. THE OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED: THEIR NATURE AND IMPORTANCE	13
1. Adverse consequences of over-selectivity	13
2. Quotas and inequalities	14
3. Rigidities and exclusions	15
4. Language preparation and students accommodation	16
IV. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME: STRUCTURES, RESOURCES AND METHODS AVAILABLE FOR INFORMATION, ADMINISTRATION AND EVALUATION	18
1. The ERASMUS Advisory Committee	18
2. Allocation of resources	18
3. Selection of applications	19

	<u>Page</u>
4. Administration of student grants	20
5. Information and publications	22
6. Evaluation measures	24
V. FACTORS GOVERNING THE DEVELOPMENT OF ERASMUS AND GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	 26
1. Need for adequate resources	26
2. Strengthening of cooperation with the Member States	27
3. Consolidation of ERASMUS in its areas of weakness	27
4. Selective promotion by means of counselling	28
5. Reestablishment of a direct dialogue with the market	29
B. List and Summaries of the main evaluation documents	
C. Statistical Annex	

## I. INTRODUCTION

### 1. Aim of the Report

Article 7 of the Council Decision of 15 June 1987 the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS) requires that "Before 31 December 1989, the Commission shall submit a report to the European Parliament and the Council on the experience acquired in the application of the programme, as well as, if appropriate, by a proposal to adapt it".

The aim of the present document is to respond to this requirement. It comprises as concise and full a synthesis as possible of the various steps taken by the Commission to monitor and evaluate the programme during the first two years of its application. The proposals for amendments to the Decision which the Commission has presented with a view to the improving operation of the programme are based on the results of these measures.

The analyses contained in this report refer to the first two academic years of the programme's application, the first of which (1987-1988) mainly consisted of a transition stage involving the setting up of the necessary structures, on a fairly limited scale, while the second enabled the programme to reach more or less its "cruising speed".

It is therefore the numerical and analytical data from this period, together with the results of the selection of the programmes for the academic year 1989-90 (completed in June 1989) which has provided the basis upon which the Commission has been able to monitor the programme, to identify its problem areas, to reach a preliminary value judgement on the results and to lay the foundations for a medium- and long-term evaluation policy.

### 2. Monitoring Measures

In the context of internal monitoring,

- a computerized data base on ERASMUS students has been set up,
- the annual reports which every grantee must submit have been subjected to a first analysis,
- a series of twelve bilateral consultations between the Commission and the national authorities responsible for the programme in each Member State has been organized,
- meetings have brought together the main protagonists of the programme (university coordinators and students),
- a series of visits to a representative sample of participating universities has been started,

lastly, the Commission has taken part in numerous seminars and meetings dealing with problems linked to the implementation of the programme in the various Member States.

### 3. Evaluation Measures

Furthermore, analyses which are partly descriptive and partly analytical in character have been carried out on behalf of the Commission by external experts in relation to particular key-components of the programme and to certain problems of application:

- academic recognition of periods of study in another Member State,
- linguistic and cultural preparation for study abroad,
- under-representation in the programme of certain disciplines, such as fine art and medicine in relation to the number of students involved,
- problems of information and motivation in certain geographical areas.

These measures, which, taken as a whole, cover all the groups involved in the programme and all the main issues involved, have provided the basis for this first evaluation.

### 4. Extent to which Objectives have been realised

Any evaluation of the programme must be related to the main objectives fixed by the Council Decision (Article 2). This report makes it possible to assess for the first time the extent to which both the quantitative and the qualitative objectives have been achieved. It has led directly to the amendments to this Decision which the Commission has proposed (doc COM(89)392). The amendments aim basically to introduce greater flexibility in the management of the programme and to open it up to certain hitherto excluded categories of students.

In quantitative terms there is no doubt that very significant results have been achieved. Student mobility has shown strong growth (4000 students in the first year, 28000 in the third); the number of ICPs has risen from 400 in 1987/88 to 1500 in 1989/90, involving over 1000 institutions of higher education and 5000 teaching staff.

These figures, which speak for themselves, do not, however, represent more than a fraction of the potential for participation. Indeed, the applications submitted by universities and students are three times greater than the budget allows for.

The analysis has also revealed very positive initial trends in qualitative terms. Inter-university cooperation has grown to the point where it has become an integral part of the policies of the institutions involved. The creation of ICPs has led to the multiplication and diversification of partner networks and to the reorientation towards the Community of international development in certain sectors. The academic world as a whole has become aware of the opportunities provided by European cooperation; institutions are now engaged in setting up permanent structures which match the needs of this cooperation and take account of it in their strategy for development.

The spread of staff exchanges and the joint development of teaching programmes, which go hand in hand, promise an improvement of the quality of teaching in key-sectors of education.

The progress to date in the area of academic recognition and the enthusiasm shown by universities to become involved in the ECTS pilot programme of credit transfer should greatly facilitate student mobility.

The first surveys carried out among students signal the emergence of a new generation of graduates who possess an experience of living and working in several Community countries and have qualifications with European "added value" which is the gateway to a labour market of Community dimensions.

All in all, the impact of the programme has been considerable, and it has had repercussions even outside the university world. ERASMUS may be said to have opened the universities to Europe and to have allowed Europe to enter the universities.

At Member State level, the ERASMUS programme has shown up differences between national policies and has fostered a process of contact and comparison between systems and institutions which goes beyond the bounds of the Community itself. The complementary measures which ERASMUS has sparked off directly include regulations and even legislation to facilitate exchanges, provide supplementary grants to ERASMUS grantees, and new learning opportunities in less widely-taught Community languages.

The process of comparison which has stemmed from inter-university cooperation will assist national governments to introduce educational reforms which take account of the experience of other Member States; this in turn should eventually lead to a certain convergence of the various educational systems which, while respecting their diversity, should at the same time prove useful to their development.

##### 5. Future Prospects for Evaluation

It is clear from the report that the first results achieved correspond to, and have even gone beyond, the hopes entertained at the outset. A



more systematic medium- and long-term evaluation is at present being introduced.

Certain elements already mentioned, and in particular the creation of specific data bases, are already being integrated into the strategy being followed by the Commission to bring this about.

Medium- and long-term evaluation will be continuing and thorough, and will be carried out on a large scale. It will be based primarily on regular and detailed analysis of the reports submitted by institutions, teaching staff, and students who have taken part in the programme and also on the systematic analysis of statistical data, both in relation to the number of requests for information and grant applications, and to the activities actually carried out within the framework of the programme. The Commission enjoys the valuable support of the National Grant Awarding Authorities in the collection of these data. As a supplement to this, the findings of a detailed questionnaire sent to several thousand ERASMUS students will produce a mass of quantitative and qualitative data.

The problems identified during the first phase of evaluation will be followed up carefully.

Studies will be carried out covering all the modalities already established or contemplated in relation to the academic recognition of diplomas.

An in-depth enquiry has been started into the problem of student accommodation which emerged from the first consultations as a potential obstacle to mobility. Precise information on other determining factors will be collected as a basis for a consideration of the national conditions of application of the programme and of ways to improve the geographical balance of participation.

As a result of concern for administrative efficiency, the impact of the programme on institutions, and in particular their utilization of the grants received, will be reviewed.

Evaluation will also be directed to student mobility flows outside the programme, with reference to the prospects for attaining by 1992 the 10% student mobility originally aimed at by the Commission supported by the European Parliament.

Finally, the Commission will have recourse to the judgement of eminent European personalities from the academic world whom it will approach for their assessment of the whole evaluation process.

## II. ERASMUS HAS ALREADY PROFOUNDLY MARKED EUROPEAN UNIVERSITIES

The purpose of this part of the report is to evaluate the overall impact of the ERASMUS programme on the different groups involved, in relation to the objectives it sets out to promote.

### 1. Main objectives of the ERASMUS programme

When the ERASMUS programme was adopted in June 1987, its main objectives were defined in article 2 of the Council Decision; there were a number of them but some stand out particularly:

- the main objective is quantitative: to achieve a "substantial" increase in student mobility within the Community;
- the increase in mobility should, in particular, serve to create human resources adapted to the future needs of the Community, and also contribute to a "Citizens' Europe";
- interuniversity cooperation should be promoted between all Member States (which assumes that an acceptable balance should be sought within the cooperation network) and should make the best use of the intellectual potential of the Community.

ERASMUS thus aims at a quantitative objective, directed towards the labour market, accompanied by qualitative considerations (utilization of human resources, balance of cooperation).

### 2. Enthusiastic welcome, massive demand

All the reports have underlined this: ERASMUS has received an exceptionally warm welcome in university circles. Both students and university teaching staff have expressed themselves wholeheartedly in favour of its objectives and methods, and various recent consultations have shown that this fund of confidence remains one of the programme's most solid advantages. Even in areas where participation is lower (Fine Art, Medecine), commitment is real and is manifested by substantial confidence that resolving the difficulties is only a matter of a little extra time.

In concrete terms, this enthusiasm has expressed itself in a massive demand to participate in the various ERASMUS activities. ERASMUS has provoked a response way beyond its resources, for every part of the programme, not only the interuniversity cooperation programmes (ICPs) and the student mobility grants, but also for Short Study Visits, the European Community Course Credit Transfer System (ECTS), the organisation of fora and information meetings, and university association and publication projects.

One of the most evident conclusions from this evaluation of ERASMUS is that the programme has been limited by financial resources which are considerably smaller than what the European "market" for inter-university mobility and cooperation would have allowed (see Annex III); in each of the three years, the applications for grants has been three times greater than the available budget (see Statistical Annex).

### 3. Student mobility: successful start!

The objective of a "substantial" growth in intra-Community student mobility is at the heart of the ERASMUS programme. This is a quantitative objective, though there is also a need to maintain a certain balance in the flows of mobility along with certain criteria of academic quality.

Both in terms of the number of students and the number of study years spent in other Member States, mobility within the framework of Commission-assisted programmes has greatly increased compared to the last year before ERASMUS: in 1989-90, 28,000 students will travel to another Member State, compared with about 2,500 the year before ERASMUS. Growth during ERASMUS' three years of existence is also very evident: from around 4,000 students involved in 1987/88, to 15,000 in 1988/89, and to 28,000 in 1989/90 (see Statistical Annex).

Such a large numerical increase would not have been possible without a certain "democratization" of international student mobility, which ERASMUS has extended well beyond the limited social circles in which such mobility was concentrated until then.

Considerable progress has also been made in involving Member States, a feature underrated by observers. Whereas in 1987-88 exchanges within the France- F.R.G.-U.K. triangle represented 62% of total stays abroad within ERASMUS, the same triangle represents only 42% in 1989-90 (see Statistical Annex)). Of course, many of the new exchanges involving other Member States also include these three countries, but the data clearly demonstrate the existence of a flow of ERASMUS students between each Member State and each of the others (except understandably in the case of Luxembourg). Certainly the situation is not perfect, but one can state unequivocally: things are moving in the right direction.

Upon their return, the great majority of ERASMUS students are excellent ambassadors of the programme, highlighting their improved language skills and the experience of living and working in another Member State (more than the purely academic benefits emphasized by ERASMUS promoters and ICP directors). These new skills and experiences constitute very important professional qualifications as 1992 approaches, and students are in no doubt: the majority believe that their study periods in other Community countries open up wider professional possibilities and that they have acquired privileged links with their host Member States. All Member States, and the Community as a whole, have reason to believe

that, thanks to ERASMUS, they will have men and women better equipped to work in post-1992 Europe.

The effect of this student mobility on the perception of the European dimension by the public at large should not be neglected: friends, family and relations of ERASMUS students are confronted with a new and manifestly Community reality, from which one can expect a multiplier effect as we look towards a Citizens' Europe.

#### 4. A strengthening of inter-university cooperation

ERASMUS has given rise to more than 1,500 inter-university cooperation programmes (ICPs) of various types, involving more than 1,000 higher education establishments within the Community.

Without ERASMUS, a very large majority of these programmes would not have seen the light of day. It is worth remembering that in 1986-87, the last year of the pilot programme which preceded ERASMUS, there were only 250 Commission-supported inter-university programmes in existence.

Of course, a lot of applications for financial support in the first ERASMUS academic year involved exchanges which already existed, or at least were based on pre-existing contacts between teaching staff, who found in ERASMUS a new and convenient source of financial resources. ERASMUS allowed these types of ICPs to speed up their development (in particular opening them up towards other partners in other Member States) and to give back a European direction to certain areas already largely open to the international dimension, but as yet more attracted by trans-Atlantic cooperation (in particular in the technological disciplines and business management).

In a second period, going beyond the basis of existing contacts, universities started to look for new links, with the specific intention of creating or enlarging ERASMUS partnerships: this is the case in particular of the vast majority of ICPs between countries which until then were little involved in bilateral cooperation, started a little behind the others, and have had, during this initial phase, to cross more ground at greater speed.

Thanks to these developments, the transnational dimension of ICPs is now well established, and the expansion of the University Network has gone hand-in-hand with a very definite geographical rebalancing (see Statistical Annex): the participation of universities in countries under-represented until now has increased proportionally even more rapidly than the number of ICPs. Italy is now participating in 437 ICPs (compared with 85 in year 1), Portugal in 155 (compared with 20), Greece in 120 (compared with 31), Denmark in 128 (compared with 26). This also means that Italy is now present in more ICPs than there were ICPs existing within ERASMUS two years ago. Here too, the situation is not perfect, but the conclusion is clear: things are going in the right direction.

It would appear that the Network is less developed in certain disciplines than in others. Languages, Engineering and Business Studies are particularly well-represented, while Fine Art, Medicine and Teacher Training are much less so. Experts who have analyzed this point have found, in each case of low participation, precise and specific reasons for this, linked to the structure and deep culture of the discipline or profession involved. If certain Member States are particularly sought after as countries of destination in certain areas, this can also be due to the fact that they offer particularly attractive possibilities in the particular area or discipline. The reports on under-represented disciplines also emphasized that in every case there was scope for change in the future, but that a little more time would be needed for good intentions to become fact.

The ICP network has since been supplemented by the ECTS pilot programme, which will start effectively in 1989-90 for a six year experimental phase, after a period of preparation involving the active participation of the universities.

The universities have given ECTS a very positive welcome: 464 applications for participation were received from 254 higher education institutions. These permitted the constitution of an "inner circle" (85 universities selected in such a way as to ensure a balanced participation of all Member States in the five selected disciplines) and an "outer circle" open to the other interested universities. In 1989-90 it is expected that almost 600 students will be exchanged within the framework of ECTS, most of them supported by an ERASMUS mobility grant.

It is obviously too early to judge the impact of ECTS, but the future appears promising. Universities are manifestly interested, and ECTS has paid due attention to their prerogatives in the areas of student admission and the award of degrees. This is a major asset for the development of the pilot programme and a progressive increase in the number of exchange students.

##### 5. A focus on ORGANISED student mobility

As regards organised student mobility, ERASMUS has been able to put to good use the ten years accumulated experience of the pilot programme which preceded its adoption. ERASMUS was launched and implemented as a programme for the organised mobility of students, with the other actions being more or less accessory to this principal objective. This option appears well-fonded given the objectives of the programme and the severe budgetary constraints which have led those responsible for the programme to concentrate on essentials. It also explains why it is in this area that ERASMUS has been most successful:

- taking the 4 categories of ICPs as a whole, those aimed at student mobility very largely predominate: demand has been stronger, and the Commission has been able to apply less unfavourable selection

rates (see Statistical Annex) than for other types of ICPs, in particular those aimed at teaching staff mobility;

- applications for preparatory visits for new ICPs (and hence in particular for developing student mobility) have been much stronger than for other types of visits, in particular teaching visits. Grants for preparatory visits have in this way played a double role in both inciting the creation of new student flows, and balancing of the Network;
- among the other activities (Actions 3 and 4), it is that which is most directly connected to organised student mobility which stands out: strongly supported by the academic world, the Commission has chosen to speed up the development of the ECTS pilot programme, rather than, for example, the NARIC network (National Information Centres on Academic Recognition) whose planned strengthening has had to be postponed and should take place in the next period;
- finally, during its' first phase, ERASMUS only gave a very marginal place to students who do not move within the framework of an ICP or ECTS ("free movers"). Giving priority to network students in awarding grants was provided for in the Council Decision, and lack of budgetary resources (together with certain difficulties in managing this less organised mobility) have transformed this priority into de facto exclusivity in most Member States. Nonetheless, "free movers" present a particular interest for certain Member States, where universities do not as yet have a large number of ICPs. It remains to evaluate more exactly the potential of this "free" mobility during the coming years.

#### 6. Impact on course content

ERASMUS does not impose a "model" of academic cooperation. It has permitted the emergence of cooperation schemes which are very diverse from all points of view: the motivation of their promoters, internal organisation, role of languages and language preparation, forms of academic recognition, etc. Most experts have underlined this key point and insisted on the need for the programme to be flexible in order to respond to situations which vary considerably according to region, discipline, type of establishment and the objectives of ICP organizers.

ERASMUS leaves universities considerable freedom in defining their relations within an ICP, but it is interesting to note that this freedom has frequently been under-utilised. Programme users regularly ask for the programme to be improved to allow them to carry out activities which are already perfectly possible. In this way, ERASMUS has suffered not only from certain very real inflexibility (see Section III) but also from inflexibility which users wrongly attribute to it.

Compared with other forms of university cooperation, particularly in America, ICPs are characterised by the importance given to the concept

of academic recognition of study abroad. The experts see in this a fundamental element of credibility, and an indispensable factor of academic quality, which also corresponds to the wishes of ICP directors.

Given the importance of course content in the implementation of ICPs, it is paradoxical to note, as several analysts have done, that so far ERASMUS has only had a fairly modest effect on the renewal of pedagogical methods and study programmes. So far only a minority of universities have carried through the complex process needed to bring about an in-depth restructuring of their teaching to adapt it to that of their partners, or to create, together with them new and totally integrated courses, with a really "European" content. It should, however, be stressed that the modification of university courses is bound to be a long-term process and that ERASMUS was launched only two years ago. The influence of the budgetary structure of the programme has also had an effect since there is a ceiling on the sums allocated to Action 3, which is intended particularly to support the setting up of new or adapted programmes of study.

7. The success of ERASMUS rests mainly on the personal commitment of its promoters

Another characteristic of ICPs within the European Community is that they are, in most cases, established at faculty or department level. The key role of the initiators and directors of programmes at university department level has been highlighted by several experts. These experts conclude that ERASMUS is first and foremost the work of individuals (at all levels of the university hierarchy), who often receive only limited or fragile support (political and financial) from their institutions, but whose personal commitment is the essential pre-condition for the lasting success of ERASMUS as a whole.

It is the mobilisation of these thousands of people and their good will which has permitted ERASMUS to develop so far and which will remain essential in the future. In many cases the universities as such take the initiative, or firmly support ERASMUS projects which come up from their faculties and departments. But this is not always the case: frequently ICP directors are of the opinion that the central authorities of their universities are less interested in ERASMUS than in programmes that are more gratifying as regards research and the advancement of academic careers. They feel fairly isolated, both within their universities and in relation to the central administration of the Programme.

Of course, institutional commitment cannot be achieved everywhere in the space of two years. Particular attention must be paid to this area in coming years. The maintenance of close contacts with those in charge of ICPs will remain essential, to avoid people becoming discouraged in the course of time, a discouragement which would be all the more damaging as institutions as such are not always ready to take over, and ERASMUS

still needs to attract a large number of new ICP promoters in order to ensure its development.

The fragility of the ICPs is also visible on the financial level: as a whole, ICPs are extremely dependent upon Community support, in both the short and medium term. For this reason, the value of this support for the continuity of the Network should not be underestimated: it acts both as a symbol (support for ICP promoters) which stimulates the commitment of programme directors, and as a pump-priming financial resource: were it to disappear the ICP promoters would in many cases lose both their "status" and their means for taking action.

For this reason, if ERASMUS just provided finance for individual ICPs for a limited period, there would be a serious risk of jeopardizing the European University Network, and the relative geographical balance which it implies. And, of course, it is the less "spontaneous" cooperations (ie: those which ERASMUS makes its greatest effort to promote) which would be the first to suffer. Community aid must therefore be kept up until the institutions are in a position to take over. It is necessary for the Member States to take the steps needed to ensure the continuity of the actions which the Commission has initiated.

#### 8. Growing institutional support

Even if certain ICPs are not getting all the institutional assistance which might be desirable, it is none the less clear that ERASMUS has allowed universities to be directly involved in building the Community. A large number of personalities from the university world have given their support to the programme, and many universities have appointed coordinators for all their ERASMUS-related activities. The European dimension has become a strategic variable in universities' development plans (as shown by the colloquium on "Higher Education and Europe after 1992", held in Leuven on June 21-23, 1989), and ERASMUS is already an integral part of the European higher education landscape. Progressively, participation in the programme even becomes a matter of emulation between universities, and is prominent in information brochures they publish for prospective students.

In addition, various European associations of university administrators have been formed since the creation of ERASMUS. Particularly worthy of mention here are EUPRIO (public relations officers), FEDORA (academic orientation counsellors) and EAIEA (officers of international relations) all of which are likely to facilitate the development of inter-university relations. It should however be noted that no such association yet exists for universities' accounting and financial officers, a fact which we can deplore, given their importance in administering the ERASMUS funds destined for establishments and students.



9. Support for ERASMUS through national policies

In several Member States complementary measures, sometimes even involving changes in legislation, have been introduced.

ERASMUS has highlighted certain disfunctions (accommodation, social security, language training, absence or insufficiency of national grants, obstacles to academic recognition) at the same time as giving rise to a certain pressure to resolve them at Member State or Community level. Examples of complementary measures in various Member States which ERASMUS has been directly responsible for stimulating include the creation or strengthening of systems of grants for study abroad, legislative measures to facilitate exchanges and academic recognition, grants to supplement ERASMUS support (often at the initiative of regional authorities), new facilities for learning less frequently taught Community languages etc.

One of the most important consequences of ERASMUS is probably to have started a process of contact and comparison between the different national systems of higher education. Witness here the debate in France on the position of shorter courses, the Portuguese project for national subsistence grants, reflexion about student social security and student accommodation policy in several Member States. Information now circulates more intensively between Member States and this facilitates exchanges of ideas and comparisons. Those in charge of education systems at national level should take account of the opportunity when formulating their policies.

10. The impact of ERASMUS beyond the Community

ERASMUS is exerting a certain attraction for universities in non-community Europe (EFTA, but also Eastern Europe) and elsewhere (USA, Canada, but also Latin America etc.).

The most manifest demonstration of the influence of ERASMUS outside the Community is no doubt the recent adoption of a very similar programme by the Nordic Council countries under the name of NORDPLUS. Denmark of course participates in both programmes.

### III. OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED : THEIR NATURE AND IMPORTANCE

A significant part of the evaluation exercise has been devoted to the study of the wide range of hindrances or obstacles which have appeared during the application of the programme.

#### 1. The adverse consequences of over-selectivity

During each of the three years, the funds available have amounted to between only one quarter and one third of the sums applied for, leading to a very high degree of selectivity (in particular for ICPs other than for student mobility). The support allocated has also been very much below the amounts requested (see Statistical Annex). For 1989-90, the average support for student mobility ICPs is only 8,100 ECU, or around 3,000 ECU per participating university (compared with the maximum of 25,000 ECU per university announced by the Decision). For students themselves, whilst the Decision mentions an average grant of 2,000 ECU per year, the real average is considerably lower, and also conceals enormous disparities between Member States (see Statistical Annex).

This situation has had worrying and probably long term effects on the development of the programme. Of course, it has given rise to numerous reactions of disappointment and frustration from students (every study mentions very insufficient grants) and programme directors, and it has damaged the image of ERASMUS. But, beyond this obvious fact, this budgetary insufficiency has had other adverse effects:

- A braking effect on the creation of new programmes: for example, in 1989 a large drop in the number of applications for the two ICP categories which have been the most affected by the budgetary limits (intensive programmes and curriculum development) could be observed in response to the over-rigorous selection rates of the preceding year. It can also be said that, despite an increase in the quality of projects submitted by universities, a large number of "good" applications meeting all the conditions required for assistance, continue to have to be rejected.

- Effects on the quality of ICPs accepted: the analyses carried out have shown that if a programme receives only a small portion of the funds it needs, but its promoters do not want to abandon it, the quality of the organisation and follow up suffer. It is in particular the efforts regarding the infrastructure (language preparation, adaptation of curricula, long-term commitments) which fall by the way in this situation (the precarious nature of assistance granted on an annual basis should be added to this). Exchange programmes can also be badly disrupted when an ICP loses one of its components, which is the case in particular for programmes including both student and teacher mobility within an integrated course but where only one of the activities is supported (in general student mobility).
- A braking effect on the geographic balancing of the Network: the evaluation reports have shown that language preparation is a determining factor in the choice of host country and that ERASMUS support was considered totally insufficient for the training of students in less widely-taught languages. Thus, the inadequacy of the budget has had a particularly discriminatory effect on exchanges with the countries concerned in this respect.

## 2. Quotas and inequalities

The system of national quotas for Action 2 activities has given rise to major disparities in the treatment of students from different Member States (see Statistical Annex).

The amount allocated to each Member State, based exclusively on the two criteria defined by the Decision, does not in fact take into account:

- either the considerable differences in cost of living between Member States, which particularly affects students from certain countries, at the same time disadvantaged by the peripheral geographic situation;
- or the real demand for mobility expressed in each Member State, thereby penalising countries which have shown the greatest enthusiasm for ERASMUS (in particular the case for Irish students) - though this has made it possible to offer more attractive grants in countries where there has been greater need to stimulate demand.

A corrective mechanism could reduce the disparities inherent in the current system, at least in the most worrying cases!

### 3. Inflexibility and exclusions

It was emphasized above that ERASMUS leaves a considerable degree of freedom to ICP directors in organising exchanges. Nonetheless, the development of the programme has suffered from certain over rigid operating rules:

- the financial ceiling imposed on Actions 3 and 4 has led to dissuasive selection rates for the 2 ICP categories involved (intensive programmes, development of joint curricula). This situation is particularly regrettable in the latter case, as this development could have played a key role in the qualitative development of the Network, by stimulating the development of new and ambitious "European" curricula. It has been pointed out that delay in this area is one of ERASMUS's weak points at present. Removing the financial ceiling from this part of the programme has become even more essential since the launch of ECTS which is also included in Action 3;
- the analyses carried out show that the absolute separation between the budgets of Actions 1 and 2 has at times created unfortunate situations: certain ICP directors finding themselves seriously short of funds for their students (Action 2) would have liked to use part of the financial aid received under Action 1 to provide their students with larger grants;
- the exclusion of students who are not citizens of Community Member States, even if they are resident there and are entitled to national grants or student loans. Greater flexibility in the application of the current rule should be considered here;
- the condition that academic recognition be given by students' home university, which closes the ERASMUS programme to all students undertaking complete study cycles in another Member State in order to obtain more advanced qualifications ( in which case it is the host university which recognises the student's earlier studies). There is a demand for greater mobility emanating from these numerous and highly motivated students, in particular in southern Community countries. In this area ERASMUS has left a major demand unsatisfied (in terms of both quantity and quality, in particular in the move towards a European labour market);
- several experts have emphasized that the absolute requirement of a minimum stay of one month is acting as a brake on a greater mobility of teachers within the ICP framework and that shorter teaching exchanges may be more productive in certain cases.

#### 4. Language preparation and student accommodation

The obstacles mentioned above are of an internal nature and result from the programme itself. Of the various external obstacles, two have already significantly slowed down ERASMUS' development: insufficient linguistic preparation in the ICPs and the question of accommodation for students studying in other Member States.

The evaluation reports have shown language preparation of students to be an essential factor, not only for the success of the study periods, but also in the balanced development of the Network. For those languages which are less widely taught in the Community, students studying abroad under the ERASMUS programme frequently have to start learning the language from ab initio, whilst possibilities for learning such languages are limited and expensive (small groups, a lack of teaching material compared with more commonly taught languages, lack of teacher availability, etc.).

This enormous difference in the availability and cost of language preparation has so far been only partially reflected in the amount of support granted to ICPs. It is to be expected that considerable attention will have to be given to this area in the second phase of the programme in view of the importance of languages in post-1992 Europe.. To a large extent, ERASMUS has been able to develop to date by taking advantage of available potential mobility. At least in less widely-taught languages, this source will turn out to be more and more insufficient to maintain a balanced numeric growth in mobility. Hence the need for a specific investment in the teaching of these languages. The concerted action planned by the Commission and the Member States through the ERASMUS and LINGUA programmes should bring a marked improvement in the situation of these languages, especially thanks to a better contribution to costs and by the encouragement of collective initiatives at national and regional levels. The Commission is confident that modern distance teaching techniques will play an important role in this area at European level.

The attention which the linguistic question merits within ERASMUS should not however lead to extremist positions, which would add additional obstacles for certain countries. If Greek, Danish and Dutch universities wish to teach in English (as is reported in several experts' reports) this should not in any way penalise the assessment of their ERASMUS applications. The important point is that those institutions wishing to teach in their national languages can train the students they wish to host, and receive adequate support from ERASMUS for so doing.

The question of accommodation for students during their stay in other Member States appears as another major brake to the development of mobility. Accommodation is frequently scarce, uncomfortable and expensive. The situation is critical in many regions, due to the increase in Member States' student populations, and difficulties are further exacerbated for ERASMUS students owing to poorer knowledge of

local availability, restrictive regulations, special needs (need to find immediate accommodation, but often only for limited periods), etc.

In a very large number of cases, host universities and ICP directors have exerted considerable efforts to resolve this very difficult question and to facilitate the integration of ERASMUS students with local students. But it is clear that this question will pose itself even more acutely in coming years. Within ERASMUS, care should be taken to avoid three potential pitfalls in this area:

- the "ghetto" effect (ERASMUS students isolated in university residences reserved for them);
- the risk of reactions of rejection if ERASMUS students are given too obvious priority over local students in the allocation of accommodation;
- the temptation to make the accommodation question a criterion when selecting ICPs (which would have the effect of penalising less well equipped institutions and countries often those already labouring under other handicaps).

#### IV. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME : STRUCTURES, RESOURCES AND METHODS TO INFORM, ADMINISTER AND EVALUATE

All the activities provided for by the programme have been implemented, with the exception of the ERASMUS Prizes provided for by the Decision and not attributed so far, which is regrettable. In this regard the Commission proposes taking into consideration the results of the first three years of operation of the programme as a basis upon which to make the first awards.

Taken globally, the management structures and administrative services which have been set up have carried out their tasks successfully, despite the ever-increasing number and complexity of applications they have to handle (ICPs, Study Visits, etc.), and the setting out of completely new activities (such as the ECTS pilot programme).

##### 1. The ERASMUS Advisory Committee

The composition of the Committee (one high official and one representative of the university world per Member State) presents definite advantages as regards the representative nature of the Committee and its openness to the realities of the university world.

During the second phase of ERASMUS, it will be important for the Committee to be closely associated with the development of other Community programmes, (COMETT, LINGUA, SCIENCE, etc.), with a view to overall cohesion which will be one of the big challenges of the coming years.

##### 2. Allocation of resources

The splitting up of the budget into progressively larger tranches over the three years, and its allocation between the different activities appears globally justified. The absolute but non-exclusive priority given to those activities most directly involving student mobility is in line with the spirit and the interest of the programme. The consideration problems related to the system of national quotas for Action 2 and the financial ceiling on Actions 3 and 4 have already been mentioned as weaknesses of the programme in its first phase.

The evaluation reports have shown that the political choice of reducing the amount of support, in order to multiply the number of beneficiaries, also appears to be in conformity with programme goals which required a large number of beneficiaries in order to have a noticeable impact, and so avoid disappointing too many people of good will. In so doing, too little has however been done to promote the formation of networks with ambitious programmes which can generate numerically substantial mobility, and which act as an example to the rest of the university community.

The costs of administering and managing the programme have remained very reasonable, given the fact that, in this first phase, all the infrastructure and procedures had to be created for a new and complex programme covering the nine Community languages.

### 3. Selection of applications

The evaluation procedure is carried out systematically, with reference to a set of explicit criteria, by qualified and experienced administrators.

All the experts' reports have insisted on the very great diversity of ICPs and on the particular problems posed by one or other of the criteria to certain establishments, disciplines, categories of students and Member States : in particular, the reciprocity requirements, the non-prolongation of study periods, integral recognition, and the minimum duration of stay.

Taking these views into consideration, the Commission will continue to apply the greatest possible flexibility in the application of selection criteria. Ideally each ICP should be assessed globally, taking account of :

- particular difficulties which exist in certain areas, and which can explain weaknesses in one or another parameter;
- the complementarity between parts of one and the same educational project, even if, taken in isolation, one of these activities does not fulfil all the criteria (case of the mobility of teachers for short periods, when complementary to student mobility).

The Commission will also consider whether it is opportune to apply criteria differently when dealing with a new ICP programme or one which is already operating, and which has had a chance to correct any initial weaknesses.

Search for an acceptable balance : the managers of the ERASMUS programme have, wherever they could, made a major and constant effort to arrive at a European university network which is as balanced as possible, and appreciable results have been obtained in phase 1 (see Section II).

The evaluation reports show that a distinct policy of searching for an acceptable balance has indeed been implemented, within a market still clearly directed towards certain countries and disciplines. This policy has been supported by intensive information campaigns, and the systematic use of preparatory visit grants in order to stimulate demand in underrepresented areas and countries. But, equally, spontaneous demand has remained very strong elsewhere, and it is in particular by a very careful selection of applications that it has been possible to effectively rebalance the network. At the same time this rebalancing,



though genuine, remains fragile, because it does not yet correspond to an indepth redirection of the market.

Procedures : many ICP directors express a desire for a simpler and faster procedure for examining applications. Their principal concern is to obtain timely information from the Commission in order to be able to organise the exchanges in good condition. The same question poses itself, even more acutely, when it comes to the attribution of student grants. The Commission has responded to these comments and has taken the following steps to meet them :

- the progressive bringing forward of the various stages in the annual selection process;
- the staggering of applications for Visits and Action 4;
- the prospect of pluriannual funding for ICPs.

These various measures have been warmly welcomed in university circles, and in particular the prospect of pluriannual funding will give universities the continuity without which one cannot expect either the lasting consolidation of ERASMUS on the ground, or a major improvement of language preparation in less widely taught languages.

#### 4. Administration of student grants

The NGAAs (National Grant Awarding Authorities); set up by all Member States to administer mobility grants for students under Action 2 of ERASMUS form an essential part of the ERASMUS administrative infrastructure. Following initial criticism by ICP directors in a number of Member States these national agencies are now beginning to master the administrative procedures and to contribute to the dissemination of information and are playing a major role in the process of comparison which has come into being between system of higher education within the Community. Nonetheless, it remains difficult to be precise about their development and functioning, as the NGAAs have not yet been included in the evaluation of the ERASMUS programme.

The administrative interface between the Commission and the NGAAs and the complementarity between ERASMUS and national grants (where this complementarity exists), do not appear to pose major problems. In a number of Member States, the principal difficulty appears to be the delay in informing ICP directors and students about the amounts granted.

Those agencies which pay a global amount to ICP directors, leaving them with the task of distributing grants to students, certainly take the risk of differences in treatment from one ICP to the other. At the same time, they also frequently confront ICP directors with difficult choices, given the insufficiency of the amounts available. But the ERASMUS evaluation meetings have shown that students, whilst recognizing

the imperfection of the system, were of the opinion that the ICP directors are the best placed authorities to carry out the distribution.

The differences noted between the modes of distribution of funds by NGAAs in the different Member States, and which have at times been criticised, are inevitable if one wants to leave these agencies with the freedom to adapt to local conditions. In the same way, the space left to 'free movers' in each Member State is a function of the mobility requirements expressed in each country, and this diversity of situations ought to continue to be taken into account.

Nonetheless, the criteria for, and the control of, the distribution of grants to students by the NGAAs, ought to be the subject of further consideration. Indeed, various methods have already been proposed : the allocation of a minimum support grant to everybody, plus a supplement allocated by the ICP directors, the granting of a travel subsidy to everybody, with a variable supplement for other expenses, or setting up a grant system with amounts fixed according to country of destination.

The importance of the NGAAs in the good management of Action 2 of ERASMUS should further increase with the quantitative development of the programme, the arrival of the LINGUA grants, and the hoped for development of national grants systems to supplement ERASMUS grants. The strengthening of each NGAA and coordination both between them and with the Commission are essential for the continued good functioning of the ERASMUS programme.

The level of ERASMUS support and grants at the level of higher education establishments is not yet satisfactorily organised everywhere : a large number of ICP directors complain of administrative malfunctions or of operational inflexibility in their establishments; in certain cases the financial management of funds coming from the Commission or the NGAAs poses real difficulties, whilst covering the administrative costs relating to the functioning of the ICP presents a problem for a number of institutions.

The question is complicated by three important factors :

- the internal organisation system of the institutions involved, their staffing and administrative resources and the control exercised by tutelary authorities vary considerably, with the most serious problems seeming to be concentrated in certain countries and in certain types of institutions;
- at the level of the individual institutions, it is the same administrative and financial personnel who manage funds from ERASMUS and other European, international and national programmes, and the administrative rules frequently differ considerably from one programme to the next, and at times are plainly contradictory;
- the division of roles between central university authorities and ICP directors also differs substantially from one institution to

the next. ERASMUS cannot develop without the individual commitment of the ICP directors, but the fact of entrusting responsibility for a given ICP to a single person can also weaken the commitment of the institution as such, and contribute to the isolation of ICP director vis-à-vis the university administrative and financial authorities. On the other hand, an overly centralized control could reduce the individual commitment of ICP promoters, in particular in large universities, and ERASMUS would suffer greatly.

Generally, one can say that university administrators ought to be better informed - and better trained about ERASMUS. Investment will be necessary in the future here in order to strengthen the programme's administrative infrastructure. Concerted action in this direction, involving ERASMUS and a number of other Community programmes e.g. COMETT, LINGUA and SCIENCE could be considered.

#### 5. Information and publications

The ERASMUS programme has been the subject of a major, concerted information campaign which has been generally effective, and has generated considerably greater demand than the financial resources available. The evaluation reports have shown that ERASMUS is well known as a programme in most universities, even in areas which have participated least, but that students and university staff are often not familiar with details of content and procedures.

The image of the programme is generally very positive: its very evocative name is a major "commercial asset", and those involved are showing a clear commitment to the objectives laid down.

However, this basically positive image is marred by three factors:

- insufficient financial support which is harmful to the programme's attraction
- the complexity of the programme, which with its multiple objectives and numerous actions may appear heterogenous. ERASMUS is best known as a student mobility programme, and one should capitalise on this image and fine-tune it rather than try to "sell" a multi-functional and less intelligible image to the public. In view of this, the other parts of the programme, particularly those directly affecting teachers (ICP, Visits, Action 4) should be presented as actions contributing to student mobility.
- the virtual exclusion of students who do not belong to an ICP ("free-movers"): ERASMUS has aroused great hopes in a large number of students including those who, at the moment, have only very slight chances of being able to obtain a grant. However, these hopes are frustrated when the students obtain more information and find

out that they are not in the running since they do not belong to an ICP.

Dissemination of information: information policy so far has been systematic (mailings to all the higher education institutions in the Community), undifferentiated (the same information is sent to different audiences), and concentrated more on universities than on students (a cautious policy to avoid arousing too many hopes which cannot be satisfied).

The positive results obtained so far do not indicate a need for a general policy revision. However, the Commission will consider the possibility of introducing the following changes, importance of which is likely to increase in future:

- introduction of a better structure for replying to individual requests for information from students and universities in order to tap the potential demand these represent. The national information networks which the NGAAs represent, are beginning to function properly in several Member States, and could play a valuable role in this operation;
- special publicity campaigns for certain sections of the programme using specific information material: that is, material specific to one particular professional discipline or sector (requested by most of the experts studying the under-represented disciplines);
- improved information on the interface between ERASMUS and the other European programmes (especially COMETT, LINGUA, SCIENCE, SPES). This is particularly necessary with regard to support for language preparation: the current repartition of this support between ERASMUS Actions 1 and 2 is still causing problems for a number of beneficiaries, and the interface with LINGUA will make the situation more difficult.

The main obstacle to the comprehensive dissemination of information on ERASMUS in universities (teachers and students) seems to have its roots in the compartmentalisation within universities: information arrives (central departments, ICP directors) but does not circulate. To avoid this pitfall, some big universities have nominated a contact-person for ERASMUS, but this is not possible for all the institutions, particularly the smaller and less well-equipped ones.

Some of the publications prepared in the context of ERASMUS are mines of information, but deserve better commercial promotion. This is true in particular of the Student's Handbook in the European Community, the ICP Directory, and the ERASMUS Newsletter, but also of NARIC publications and those prepared with financial support received under Action 4. Systematic follow-up and exploitation of all the publication projects which have received support under Action 4 could lead to a considerable increase in the impact of this part of the ERASMUS programme on the European university world.

In general, European universities do not have enough reference books on particular subjects (careers, students' rights, entrance conditions, conditions for obtaining scholarships from other Member States, teaching systems, social security), or on particular disciplines or professions at European level. Publication activities and the support available under Action 4 might be more resolutely aimed in this direction.

#### 6. Evaluation measures

The ERASMUS programme has been evaluated in a number and variety of ways. There is a wealth of statistical information available (perhaps too much!) enabling one to study the trends revealed by the most important figures despite their preliminary nature. The majority of areas of concern have been dealt with in specific studies (academic recognition, language preparation, disciplines which are lagging behind), and all the main sources of reaction have been consulted: Advisory Committee, NGAAs, higher education authorities in Member States, students, ICP directors, independent experts working on specific studies.

Evaluation, together with the general direction of the programme, should be the main point of cooperation between the Commission and the ERASMUS Advisory Committee; bilateral consultations, also involving the NGAAs, should be held regularly and systematically; assessment should not concern only the Commission's services but should also cover the actions and contributions made by Member States, particularly by the NGAAs.

The evaluation work carried out to date has laid a firm foundation for on-going evaluation, particularly through the creation of a data-base on the students participating in the programme.

Site visits should be organised more regularly to establish more direct contact between the administrators of the ERASMUS programme and the ICP students and directors in the universities. Apart from their role in evaluating ERASMUS, these visits also constitute:

- a motivating factor for ICP directors who are very sensitive to the interest shown in their programmes;
- an element of training for the administrators of the ERASMUS programme in specific features of certain cooperation schemes and areas of higher education;
- and a powerful driving force in developing the ICPs (because of the personal advice ICP directors can receive).

In the same spirit, the Commission intends to organise evaluation and promotion seminars at regional or national level, or by discipline or subject.

The scope of the evaluation of ERASMUS should be widened to include the following themes in particular:

- all the individual requests for information received by the ERASMUS Bureau and the NGAAs, so that the development of spontaneous demand from universities and students can be examined;
- a comparison of the cost of one year's study in the various regions of the Community for different types of courses, as a guide for those responsible for allocating grants to students;
- the "productivity" of the support granted: certain forms of cooperation or certain types of ICP will probably generate more mobility than others, for the same investment and in comparable conditions. If this factor were taken into account (along with some others), the budget could be geared towards the more dynamic models of cooperation;
- the development of projects which do not, or no longer, receive support;
- the flow of students within ERASMUS compared with total mobility within the Community.

## V. FACTORS GOVERNING THE DEVELOPMENT OF ERASMUS AND GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

From all the observations emerging from the evaluation of the first phase of ERASMUS, it is possible to reach a number of conclusions about those factors which will be decisive in ensuring the success of the programme in the coming years.

To this end, the objectives for the totality of community and national mobility programmes, announced when the ERASMUS programme was launched, must be recalled: that 10% of Community students should spend a study period in another Member State. Out of a population of 6,500,000 students, and taking 4-year courses as an average, this means 160,000 students per year. Of course, ERASMUS is not the only programme likely to be contributing to the achievement of this target: there are also COMETT and LINGUA, as well as a whole series of national and bilateral programmes, and students studying outside their own countries anyway, with or without scholarships.

Given the potential of the other programmes, it seems reasonable to expect ERASMUS to achieve two-thirds of the target, or about 100,000 students per year. In 1989-90, some 28,000 will be involved in exchanges; this gives some idea of what remains to be done. As for the number of higher education institutions involved, only 1.000 out 3.500 are currently taking part in ERASMUS, and much remains to be done in this respect as well.

### 1. The need for adequate resources

The existing ICPs need continued financing; many are still very fragile, and there are very few sources of finance that could take over were ERASMUS to stop providing support. It is vital to ensure continuity in Community financing, otherwise the whole programme will be jeopardised.

Moreover, demand will certainly continue to increase, in quantity and quality, as demonstrated by the ICP selection for 1989-90 (see Statistical Annex). The quantitative development of mobility will most probably result more from an increase in the number of ICPs than from an increase in the number of students involved in existing ICPs. However, in practice the two developments will be combined: numerous ICPs will extend and become multilateral (as shown by recent developments), while others will be created, stimulated in particular by preparatory visits. In addition, the effects of the ECTS will gradually start appearing, involving a greater number of students (and universities, if they are not to be held back for too long in the ECTS "outer circle").

Considering the extent to which the market has matured during the first phase of ERASMUS, a steep increase in the demand for mobility and cooperation during the second phase is expected. The approach of 1992

Massive investment should also be made in language preparation to prevent the expected growth from endangering the efforts made so far to find an acceptable balance between the Member States.

## 2. Strengthening of cooperation with Member States

This is another condition governing the lasting success of ERASMUS, which will be unable to achieve its objectives unless accompanying measures are taken by the Member States.

A number of measures would facilitate this cooperation:

- regular bilateral contacts with the Member States and reinforcement of the NGAAs in their administrative and information role in Action 2 of the programme;
- acceptance of national definitions for the eligibility of universities (revised, if necessary, to avoid undesirable exclusions) and students, particularly in respect of permanent residents who are not Community citizens and who are eligible for national grants and loans. This last point would meet a constant demand from several Member States since the programme was launched, and would be consistent with the Commission's statements that the integration of ethnic minorities into educational systems is one of the major challenges of the future.
- the clear and effective opening up of the programme to categories of beneficiaries of particular interest to certain countries. This is the case especially for students who have already acquired an initial diplom and wish to obtain further qualifications in another Member State.

## 3. Consolidation of ERASMUS in its "areas of weakness"

ERASMUS still has some "weak areas", in certain regions, disciplines and categories of universities. Imbalances in the Network have been limited so far by paying special attention to these areas (Section II). However, this is not enough to ensure the genuine integration of these zones as ERASMUS develops in the coming years. Specific stimulation measures will be necessary.

Some sections of the potential ERASMUS "market" suffer from almost all handicaps: geography, language, social structure (socio-cultural level of students), university structure (size, shorter courses, lack of previous experience in European cooperation, sometimes very close control by supervisory authorities), finance, etc.



The gradual disappearance of the weak areas will be brought about by means of two measures already mentioned in Section IV: the need for specific information (ad hoc documents, information seminars, meetings in small groups, etc.) and the application of corresponding selection criteria for ICPs.

This amounts to saying that consideration of special needs and situations should become customary. Here are some examples given by experts to illustrate this point:

- a study abroad period of six months does not mean the same thing for a two-year programme (either at undergraduate or at postgraduate level) as for a five year study course;
- mobility outside ICPs is still of real importance to some Member States;
- "integral" recognition is not easy in artistic fields where there are special assessment procedures for students;
- reciprocity is unattainable in some types of exchange;
- extension of studies is sometimes an excellent thing;
- even quite short periods of staff exchange to teach abroad can be very profitable if they form an integral part of an appropriate teaching method.

Experts' reports have also shown that if users have the impression that some criteria are sine qua non conditions for the acceptance of their projects, there is, for example, a risk of symbolic academic recognition at the expense of quality.

#### 4. Selective promotion by means of counselling

To go even further and specifically promote good exchanges where this is particularly necessary, an assistance and counselling service should be established aimed specifically and selectively at the "weak areas".

This new role could supplement and enrich the administrative tasks of the ERASMUS Bureau and Commission experts.

For instance, it might consist of giving advice on continuing basis to some of the ICP promoters in under-represented regions (or disciplines), and possibly in establishing some "demonstration programmes" likely to result in imitation or emulation by others.

In the same way, help could be provided for those wishing to start interesting projects in "weak areas" in the context of ERASMUS, and who do not have the necessary experience to do this without special counselling.

5. Reestablishment of a direct dialogue with the market

The mass of administrative tasks faced has had the effect of partially inhibiting direct and personal relations between the managers of the ERASMUS programme and ICP directors and other on-site ERASMUS promoters.

In Section II, it was already stressed that the strength of ERASMUS dependson the personal commitment of the thousands of enthusiasts in universities, and in their departments or faculties. The pursuance of existing exchanges and the multiplication of ICPs, vital for mobility growth, depend on their confidence and trust.

The restoration of a more direct dialogue with these active forces in ERASMUS is necessary for the coming years. There are numerous possibilities: strengthening of information and reception functions, visits to selected ICPs or universities, small seminars with ERASMUS promoters covering specific regions, disciplines, categories of institution, or special problems inherent to the programme, etc.

\* \* \*

At the time of writing of this report, ERASMUS has had only two years to show results, but already the programme has affected higher education in Europe, not just by the development of university cooperation and mobility, but also by contributing to the movement of Member States' policies towards meeting the needs of post-1992 Europe.

The impact of the programme is thus already very marked, but it still has not got fully into its stride. In order to realize its potential to the full during the coming years, ERASMUS will have to rely upon what might be termed "co-development":

- collaboration with the Member States and the NGAAs
- dialogue with the academic "market"
- coordination with the other Community programmes
- cooperation to eliminate the "weak areas".

But as well as needing this common effort, the success of ERASMUS will depend even more fundamentally on two other variables:

- the availability of adequate resources, the lack of which cannot always be made up for by the dedicated enthusiasm of those who operate the programme;

- the time needed for the results already apparent to be consolidated, in an academic environment in which the most rapid changes are not always those which last longest.

\*

\*

\*

Both the results already achieved and the trends becoming apparent confirm beyond any doubt that significant progress has been made in a very short-time and that the programme is developing along the lines envisaged. However, if the full potential of interuniversity cooperation is to be realised in the years to come far wider developments will also have to take place not least at Member State level involving a profound change in the practices and outlook of the academic world.

B. List of the main evaluation documents

Official Reports of the Commission of the European Communities

- Annual Report ERASMUS 1987, COM(88)192
- Annual Report ERASMUS 1988, COM(89)119
- Education and training in the European Community: Guidelines for the medium term (1989-1992), COM(89)236

Other Commission documents

- Information Notes and Statistics on ERASMUS 1989-90
- Minutes of the meetings of the ERASMUS Advisory Committee
- Minutes of the preparatory meetings for the ECTS pilot programme

Minutes of evaluation meetings organised by the Commission

- ERASMUS Students Meeting, Ghent (B), 16-17 January 1989
- Meeting of ERASMUS programme directors, Alden Biesen (B), 19-20 January 1989
- Synthesis note on the ERASMUS bilateral consultations (May 1989)
- Minutes of "Site Visits" carried out to various higher education establishments participating in the ERASMUS programme
- Minutes of an internal meeting on an information policy for ERASMUS held on 10 July 1989.

Experts' reports on a number of aspects of the implementation of ERASMUS, carried out at the request of the Commission:

- Student mobility within ERASMUS 1987-88, Teichler/Maiworm/Steube, WZBH Gesamthochschule Kassel, May 1989
- L'amélioration de la préparation linguistique et socio-culturelle des étudiants ERASMUS Baumgratz-Gangl/Deyson/Kloss, Unité Langues pour la Coopération en Europe, CIRAC, Paris, July 1989
- Recognition: a typological overview on recognition issues (within ERASMUS), U. Teichler, WZBH, Gesamthochschule Kassel, July 1989

Experts' reports on underrepresented disciplines, carried out at the request of the Commission:

- Medicine: H.I.S. (Hochschule-Information-System, Hannover), intermediate report 31.7.89
- Teacher Education and the ERASMUS programme, ATEE (Association for Teacher Education in Europe, Brussels), August 1989 (M. Bruce)
- Les obstacles à la participation au programme ERASMUS dans le domaine de l'Art et du Design, Pierre Kuentz, Strasbourg, July 1989
- ERASMUS et les arts du Spectacle (musique, théâtre, danse), EUROCREATION, Paris, July 1989.

Reports on the modalities for academic recognition in four ECTS disciplines:

- Business Management, Chemistry, History: Prof. Attilio Monasta, Università di Firenze, July 1989
- Mechanical Engineering: SEFI (Société Européenne pour la Formation des Ingénieurs, Bruxelles), August 1989 (M. H. Risvig Henriksen)

External Reports on information policy

- Investigation of means of improving flows of information on ERASMUS, Liaison Committee of Rectors' Conferences, Bruxelles, 1988 and 1989
- Study of best marketing strategy for ERASMUS vis-à-vis students and staff members based on a case study of the situation in Belgium, ICHEC, Bruxelles, 1988.

SUMMARY OF EXPERTS' REPORTS DRAWN UP AT THE REQUEST OF THE COMMISSION OF  
THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

- Student mobility within ERASMUS 1987-88, Teichler/Maiworm/Steube  
WZBH Gesamthochschule Kassel, May 1989
- Improvement of the linguistic and socio-cultural preparation of  
ERASMUS students  
Baumgratz-Gangl/Deyson/Kloss, Unité Langues pour la Coopération en  
Europe, CIRAC, Paris, July 1989
- Recognition: a typological overview on recognition issues (within  
ERASMUS), U Teichler, WZBH, Gesamthochschule Kassel, July 1989
- Teacher Education and the ERASMUS programme, ATEE (Association for  
Teacher Education in Europe, Brussels), provisional report, June  
1989 (M. Bruce)
- Obstacles to participation in the ERASMUS programme in the field of  
Art and Design, Pierre Kuentz, Strasbourg, July 1989
- ERASMUS and the performing arts (music, theatre, dance),  
EUROCREATION, Paris, July 1989
- Business Administration, Chemistry, History: Prof. Attilio Monasta,  
Università di Firenze, July 1989
- Training of (mechanical) engineers: SEFI (Société Européenne pour la  
Formation des Ingénieurs - European Society for the Training of  
Engineers, Brussels), August 1989 (M. H. Risvig Henriksen)
- Investigation of means of improving flows of information on ERASMUS  
to the Southern European Member States / the universities, Liaison  
Committee of Rectors' Conferences, Brussels, 1988 and 1989
- Study of best marketing strategy for ERASMUS vis-à-vis students and  
staff members based on a case study of the situation in Belgium,  
ICHEC, Brussels, 1988.

STUDENT MOBILITY WITHIN ERASMUS 1987/8 - ULRICH TEICHLER - JUNE 1989

1. This study of nearly all 1987/88 Interuniversity Cooperation Programmes (ICPs) with a student mobility component is the first systematic analysis of the reports from the first year of the ERASMUS scheme. It concentrates exclusively on providing an essentially statistical profile of 293 student mobility related ICPs and of 3,244 students supported by ERASMUS mobility grants.
2. Nearly 2/3 of all ICPs were bilateral although nearly a tenth involved five or more partners. 823 separate departments (from 416 university institutions) were involved in ERASMUS-supported student exchange although less than half both sent and received students. There were major differences in the level of involvement by subject area; Business/Management, Science, Art and Geography tended to have 3-5 participating partners while Agriculture, Humanities, Social Science and Medicine were usually bilateral. Each ICP involved 11 students on average although nearly half actually involved five students or less. Three programmes involved 100 students or more.
3. In 1987/8 76% of participating students were from Britain (28%), France (28%) and Germany (20%). Inward student flows significantly exceeded outgoing ones in Spain and the UK while the converse was true in Belgium, Denmark, Greece and the Netherlands. Students from all member States showed distinct preferences by destination, notably in the cases of Denmark to Italy (65%), France to the UK (64%), and the UK to France (48%). There was also a substantial concentration of student exchange between the UK, France and Germany. Numbers of students by subject area varied considerably with 42% in Business Studies and 20% in Language, well above the equivalent percentages of all students enrolled in those fields. The numbers in Medicine and Education were correspondingly low. There were clear linkages between subject area and member State. British, French, German and Italian students were most frequently involved in Business/Management programmes while Spanish, Irish and Belgian students often opted for languages. The UK was the most notable destination for students in Science, Engineering and Social Science; law students tended to go to France and architecture students to Italy.
4. The timing of study abroad varied considerably by programme and by nationality. British students typically travelled in their second year; Irish, French and German students in their third year; and others in their fourth year or later. The primary influence on timing was the member State course structure although some disciplines (e.g. Business studies, Languages) favoured relatively early study abroad periods and students from countries (e.g. Greece) with a relatively large number of postgraduate students funded from ERASMUS tended to travel late in their studies.

5. Although over 40% of all ERASMUS students in 1987/8 went abroad for a full academic year or more nearly 60% went for six months or less and the minimum short study period (three months) was the dominant pattern for all member States except Germany, France, the UK and Ireland. It was also the dominant pattern in graduate studies and in Architecture, Art, Education, the Humanities, Mathematics and Medical Science.
6. 54% of ERASMUS students were women and this proportion was especially high in Ireland, Portugal and the UK and in Humanities; women were poorly represented in Engineering/Science. The average age of an ERASMUS student was 22 years old although Irish, French and British students tended to be younger and Danish and Portuguese students were often considerably older. Nearly all fell within the 13-25 year old target group.
7. Nearly all ERASMUS students received a grant covering travel costs and most students also received subsistence support; support for language preparation was far less common except for students going to Portugal, the Netherlands and Denmark. The average student grant from ERASMUS was 677 ECU although there were very notable variations reflecting the different rates of demand for grants in each member State. Students from Portugal, Italy and Greece received, on average, around four times as much as Irish students.



Improvement of the linguistic and socio-cultural preparation and  
guidance for students participating in ERASMUS Interuniversity  
Cooperation Programmes

A study carried out between January and June 1989 by the Language Unit for European Cooperation at CIRAC (the Centre for Information and Research on Contemporary Germany), Paris, under the supervision of Dr Gisela Baumgratz-Gangl, Nathalie Deyston, Günter Kloss. The study is based on a questionnaire sent to the coordinators of 22 ICPs of particular interest distributed throughout all Member States with the exception of Luxembourg. The questionnaire was followed up by direct contacts..

Conditions for linguistic preparation

At national level, the influencing factors are the degree of integration within the EC, their role and use of languages in the secondary education system, and the distribution of the national language.

Individual institutions have extremely varied practices, which are a function of :

- their status and their means : the contrast between traditional university courses and training directly tuned to the realities of professional demands
- the extent of development and entrenchment of interuniversity cooperation
- the extent of degree course integration
- the languages concerned. The least taught languages (P, G, DK, NL and even D) call for special pedagogical solutions. Resorting to English as the teaching language is practised too often (DK, P, G).

The methods of linguistic preparation were examined in detail.

Each have their uses but none of them suffice in themselves. They must be complemented by :

- better planning of inter-university cooperation, leading to detailed agreements and genuinely integrated degree courses where the linguistic element is taken into account, including in examinations,
- improvements in the cultural preparation of the students, the quality of whose stay abroad suffers from the absence of this dimension.

In conclusion, the report makes some large-scale recommendations:

- the necessity for the Commission to initiate a linguistic policy at European level, offering institutions new perspectives, and accompanied by a systematic, high level information policy,
- more widespread availability of degree courses comprising a linguistic element and a more general overhaul of disciplines as a function of the demands of transnational communication,
- more solid structuring of the European inter-university network.

The LINGUA Programme should follow up on these aims, by developing new methods, improving teacher training and incorporating new technologies.

Ulrich Teichler

"'Recognition': A Typological Overview on Recognition Issues Arising in Study for a Limited Period in Other Member States of the European Community"

#### Summary

1. After a brief introductory section various popular uses of the term 'recognition' are identified and discussed, namely recognition as:
  - a principle (the readiness to accept or 'give recognition to' study abroad)
  - a set of mechanisms for implementing such acceptance
  - approval of course programmes comprising a study abroad component
  - certification of study abroad.

The author feels that 'recognition' should only be used for the first two of these, 'approval' and 'certification' being more appropriate concepts for the third and fourth respectively.

2. Six groups of factors which can in practice constitute obstacles to recognition are underlined:
  - problems of living and learning in a foreign country
  - differences in the modes of teaching, learning and assessment between home and host institution
  - discrepancies between the study abroad period on the one hand and the normal cycles of learning and examination periods at the host institution
  - discrepancies in terms of course content between topics studied during the study abroad period and topics which the student would have been required to learn at the home institution
  - discrepancies in the quality of education offered by the home and host institution
  - administrative and organizational matters.
3. 23% of the 1987/88 reports from ICP directors mention problems concerning academic recognition, the main difficulties being disparities of content and structure between the home and host university courses, differences in modes of assessment and examinations, problems in receiving approval from authorities outside the institutions themselves, discrepancies between the duration and timing of study components (e.g. terms, examination periods), failure of individual students to meet the required standards. Some of the problems raised refer more to general characteristics of the higher education systems in the respective countries than to particularities of the individual participating universities.

4. The study also discusses the extent to which - and the manner in which - a programme is organized can have a substantial effect on the arrangements for recognition as well as the links between curricular arrangements (the way in which the study abroad period is built into the students' overall course) and recognition.
- 5.. With respect to the mechanics of assessment and recognition procedures, following types of arrangements are identified:
  - formal agreements between home and host universities
  - comprehensive assessment of academic progress by host university
  - overall certification of courses and examinations taken abroad
  - initiation of recognition procedures on return (automatic or on request)
  - assessment of performance during study abroad by the home university
  - provision for the repetition of courses and examinations failed while abroad
  - award of formal equivalence
  - reference to study abroad in final examinations and final assessment.
6. In conclusion the author considers some practical implications of his findings, and states that these "support the current practice of the ERASMUS scheme in giving some priority to well-arranged and highly integrated programmes which appropriately grant complete recognition as a rule, while alongside this granting support intentionally as well, to a broad range of programmes usually leading to a lesser degree of recognition."

As a working rule in selecting the programmes for support, the author recommends the Commission "to consider complete recognition as realized, if academic work usually done successfully in the study abroad period is formally accepted by the home institution as being equivalent to the amount of academic work usually successfully done in a corresponding period of study at the home institution."

Finally, the study also advocates caution with regard to giving fixed recipes for recognition. Though in many cases a high degree of recognition has been achieved within the framework of highly formalized and integrated programmes, excellent recognition arrangements are also demonstrated by programmes with much looser structures. Furthermore, the precise mechanisms used for delivering recognition also vary widely, and it is not possible to say that one method alone should be favoured. Rather the specific circumstances of the countries and institutions/departments concerned should be taken into account.

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT ON TEACHER EDUCATION AND THE  
ERASMUS PROGRAMME

prepared by Mike Bruce on behalf of ATEE  
for the ERASMUS Bureau and the Commission of the European  
Communities

It has been a matter of concern to the Commission of the European Communities that, of all the disciplines covered within the ERASMUS Programme, teacher education is the one field which seems to take little or no part in it. Accordingly, the Association for Teacher Education in Europe was invited to produce a report on the participation of teacher training institutions in Interuniversity Cooperation Programmes (ICPs) with a view to identifying the obstacles and problems encountered by those teachers and teacher trainers interested in setting up cooperation programmes and formulating recommendations upon which the Commission could act in order to encourage more participation of this important part of higher education.

The report submitted analyses the evaluation reports sent in by those (very few) programme directors who have managed to set up ICPs in the first two years of ERASMUS - 34 in all - as well as giving an overview of the national situation in each Member State.

The author identifies a number of significant factors which, he feels, may be obstacles to European cooperation in the field of teacher education : the particular national culture of the teaching profession (some countries will not allow foreign students into the classroom); the legal status of teachers which can be a closed "public function"; the attitudes of university faculty based on those legal considerations; the status of some teacher training institutions (secondary education rather than higher education); course structure and assessment requirements; languages; lack of information.

On the basis of the report evaluations and the above factors, a series of recommendations are made. Some of these are more general : the author advocates cultural, political and administrative changes which are less dependent on the Commission, although it too has a part to play, and more on the "European awareness" of the target population. Others are more Commission-oriented : better and wider publicity; more flexible criteria especially in respect of the number of months students should stay abroad - three months out of a 2-year teacher training course is a very large chunk especially if part of that time should be dedicated to practice and not just theory.

Obstacles to participation in the ERASMUS programme in the field of Art and Design

Study conducted by Mr Pierre Kuentz, Art Accord Strasbourg in the relevant institutions in all the Member States.

A survey was conducted in 500 schools in all the Member States in order to establish the obstacles to the participation of these subject areas in the ERASMUS Programme. This survey showed that the main obstacles to participation in the ERASMUS Programme are the following:

1. Obstacles attributable to ERASMUS which are practically all indirectly linked to the singular nature of the institutions differing from universities in that their small size entails a weakness relating to their administrative capacity and also by virtue of the specific nature of their teaching and the "assessment of experience".
  - insufficient information to schools about the possibilities offered by the ERASMUS Programme and on correct procedure for applying;
  - administrative formalities, considered to be too complicated and sluggish for schools, are sometimes demotivating;
  - certain eligibility requirements (minimum duration, complete academic recognition of studies) cannot always be followed to the letter;
  - the long delays between the "application" and the departure of the students... and the payment of "grants".

The author of the study indicates that all these obstacles could easily be removed by special dispensations for art schools, i.e. by trimming formalities and relaxing some criteria.

2. Other obstacles which are more serious because they are linked to the wide variety of courses, infrastructures and statutes related to national traditions.
  - the absence of reliable information on institutions which teach art and design in Europe is keenly felt by everybody, since it makes the search for partner schools which can respond to the needs of all "sections" or "departments" of an institution extremely difficult.
  - the great discrepancy in the classification of these institutions means that schools of the same level, depending on the country, are not always considered as institutions of Higher Education. This results in injustices against young people in various countries as far as financial support from the European Community is concerned.

Recommendations: The author believes that the implementation of a single recommendation would suffice to improve the participation of art schools in the ERASMUS programme:

"recognizing the special character of art education and drawing all the consequences of this at every level".

1. In order to suit the programme better to schools' requirements:
  - draw up documents and forms which are clearer and more user-friendly.
  - simplify administrative procedures and dispense with intermediaries which depersonalise relations.
  - for some art schools, relax certain criteria, such as the minimum duration and complete recognition of the study period; in parallel, pursue the consideration of a system to "transfer credits which is suited to our courses" which is the only way of reintroducing more rigorous demands.
  - shorten the timespan between the submitting of applications and the students' departure.
  - organise special annual meetings for art schools in each country, or support associations to take up this task.
2. In order to promote the teaching of art in higher education, and thus give indirect but indispensable support to international cooperation:
  - provide financial aid for studies, specifically dealing with art schools, concerning the "transfer of credits", "post-graduate courses", and their corollary "relations between companies and schools",
  - help remove the obstacle posed by the unequal classification of institutions involved in higher education.

Obstacles to participation in the ERASMUS programme in the fields of music, theatre and dance

Study conducted by EUROCREATION, Paris, at the relevant institutions in all Member States.

The main obstacles to participation of the performing arts in the ERASMUS programme can be summarized as follows :

- the network of different teaching departments is heterogeneous and unequal : the circle of potential partners is thus reduced. University and company procedures are different and there are huge differences between national organisations as well as between disciplines.
- cultural factors (role of national languages and traditions - for the theatre in particular) restrict the opening up of systems.
- the teaching of languages is often non-existent in these procedures.
- potential partners do not know each other.

Nevertheless, there is a certain motivation and both teacher and student mobility had started to develop even before ERASMUS.

The survey recommends :

- collaboration between the supervisory authorities with a view to agreeing on a standard definition of "higher education in the performing arts", especially in a professional sense.
- an information drive on ERASMUS in the institutions concerned.
- the possibility for institutions to give precedence within the programme to the systems which suit them best: "free-movers" for students, intensive programmes (co-production of shows, theoretical seminars) for institutions.



EVALUATION OF INTERUNIVERSITY COOPERATION PROGRAMMES IN  
BUSINESS/MANAGEMENT, CHEMISTRY AND HISTORY : ATTILIO MONASTA, JULY 1989

1. The evaluator investigated progress made in evolving systems of interinstitutional academic recognition, and in adapting curricula and teaching methods on the basis of a study of 75 JSP and ERASMUS Programmes (in Business/Management, Chemistry and History) supplemented by visits, written contacts and a questionnaire.

2. The major findings were grouped as follows :

2.1 Academic recognition and/or credit transfer typified by :

- agreements between individual academics whereby the student's professor in his home institution recognizes the study abroad programme on the basis of information provided by the host professor;
- agreements at faculty or institutional level covering the recognition of exams taken during the study abroad period;
- agreements between institutions covering the formal recognition of all or part of the curriculum in the host institution.

Very few programmes had in fact reached the stage of formal recognition based on curriculum and cases of double degrees are equally rare. Nor was there evidence of real credit transfer although it was planned in one programme. Significantly one fully integrated programme felt no need to adopt a credit transfer system.

2.2 Changes in curriculum reflecting the requirements of interuniversity cooperation tend to be :

- quantitative. There was a general increase in the duration of studies to accommodate the sum of the curriculum requirements of each of the partners;
- qualitative. This frequently took the form of incorporating a language component into the main field of study, especially in business studies. Typically students studied abroad options not available in their home institution and many participants saw the educational experience of study-abroad itself as being qualitatively valuable.
- innovative. Only two examples of new curricula were noted, one involving a genuine collaborative effort by all the partners, and the other involving one partner creating a new curriculum for the rest.

In general curriculum was still very member State dependent and significant changes were mainly apparent in Business/Management.

2.3 Changes in teaching methods were noted, but infrequently, and the general attitude to teaching appeared conservative although the study found examples of the growing use of case studies, new technology, mixed learning groups and external visits. Assessment of students was not perceived as being part of teaching methodology although the study itself provoked some debate on the matter among respondents.

3. Conclusions and Recommendations

The study highlights that there is little linkage between participation in ECTS and experience of extensive recognition arrangements under JSPs and ICPs; such experience tended to be most apparent in Business/Management programmes. Changes in curriculum and in teaching methods were relatively modest, especially in History and Chemistry.

The evaluator notes that the individuals involved in programmes often felt isolated and unsupported by their institutions and he therefore recommends involving them more in study meetings and evaluation sessions.

The study also notes that systems of academic recognition can become rigid and dependent on increased bureaucratic intervention. Also the increase in course length was not always consistent with an improvement in the quality of studies offered. Consequently the evaluator suggests that far greater attention be given to curriculum development.

Apart from the impact of language learning and the experience of studying abroad there were few innovations in teaching methods. The traditional concept of the student remains unchanged, and there is little impact from such innovations as distance learning and little thinking on new forms of assessment. The evaluator suggests priority be given to remedying this situation.

Finally the evaluator considers that the subject-area approach to teaching in the universities is a major obstacle to interuniversity cooperation. He suggest that subject-area led study programmes assessed by exams be replaced by curricula based on "learning issues" and "training needs". Since university staff seldom have the skills to define such learning issues he recommends that the Commission should launch a research/action project to identify them.

Issues related to academic recognition  
within the framework of ICPs  
in the field of Mechanical Engineering

This analysis is one of a series carried out with a view to gaining a better insight into arrangements on academic recognition existing in ICPs in subjects selected for the ECTS pilot scheme.

The study was carried out by SEFI (European Society for Engineering Education, Brussels) and concentrated in particular on the following aspects:

- the main patterns of academic recognition emerging so far;
- the extent to which academic recognition is based on formal agreements;
- the interpretation of "full academic recognition" in practice.

To achieve these objectives, an in-depth analysis was undertaken on all 1987-88 interuniversity cooperation programmes (ICPs) in Mechanical Engineering and on a selection of others in related areas such as Materials Science and Civil Engineering. Personal interviews were also carried out (in Denmark, France, F.R. Germany and the United Kingdom) with the coordinators of ICPs found to be of particular interest in the light of the objectives of the study. Summary sheets for the various programmes which were investigated are included in the report.

The study underlines the considerable diversity in the existing schemes for academic recognition in the relevant field(s). Several "models" were identified and are described with examples; they include:

- basic recognition of freely chosen courses (waiving of courses, acceptance of grades achieved or laboratory work) abroad,
- fully integrated programmes (in parallel or in stages),
- courses jointly developed by the participating universities for inclusion in their degree programmes,
- double degree or joint-degree arrangements.

A significant number of existing programmes were found to concentrate on the advanced level of first degree programmes, especially for the

preparation of the final year thesis or dissertation at the host institution (either under dual supervision from home and host institution, or simply with full recognition of thesis after return from abroad).

Most programmes were developed and are implemented at the departmental/faculty level, but the majority have been formally endorsed by the institutions involved, mainly in the form of a written agreement.

However, these agreements seldom contain full details about academic recognition, which in general is arranged directly between the teachers involved.

Full recognition (with or without checking by the home university) was found to apply in the vast majority of cases. In only slightly more than one half of the ICPs was the recognition reciprocal (i.e. given for similar activities) amongst the participating universities.

The study also identified a need among ICP coordinators for information about alternative models for academic recognition, and a lack of communication between ICP directors in a given university or a given area of specialization in Engineering.

Training is the Message: Information Strategy Project of the Liaison Committee

Summary

The Liaison Committee was invited to assist the Commission in finding ways to improve existing information flows on ERASMUS to the individual institutions of higher education in the Member States of the Community. Following an initial investigation in 1987, it was decided to concentrate in the present report on the higher education sector in the Southern Member States. The present report presents the major outcomes of this enquiry.

Between 1987 and 1989 considerable progress has been made in all Member States in terms of shaping an information structure and improving the information flows. These recent developments are briefly spelled out. In general, institutions of higher education have realized increasingly that improving information flows on Community programmes in higher education is a necessary condition for their participation in these Community programmes.

Recommendations are made in the present report for structuring information flows from the Commission to the individual institutions of higher education via national bodies in higher education in the Community, for both the university sector and the non-university sector of higher education. Via these national bodies (vertical dissemination) and via European Associations in higher education (horizontal dissemination) it is hoped that almost the whole higher education sector in the Community will be covered. These recommendations also take the EFTA countries into account.

The Commission is strongly recommended to associate itself with the Liaison Committee's endeavours to implement information flows to the individual institutions of higher education via the proposed dissemination structures.

Particular emphasis is laid on two elements considered crucial in this undertaking, namely the introduction of a special Newsletter ("EUROFLASH"), strongly advocated by the higher education sector, and the taking into consideration of the training needs of information multipliers at both national level and at the level of the individual institutions.

Again, the Commission is strongly recommended to associate itself with the Liaison Committee's endeavours to produce a regular Newsletter tailored to the information needs of the higher education sector in the Community and to sponsor the organisation of regular information seminars for those persons who are responsible for the dissemination of information at both national level and in the individual institutions.

preparation of the final year thesis or dissertation at the host institution (either under dual supervision from home and host institution, or simply with full recognition of thesis after return from abroad).

Most programmes were developed and are implemented at the departmental/faculty level, but the majority have been formally endorsed by the institutions involved, mainly in the form of a written agreement.

However, these agreements seldom contain full details about academic recognition, which in general is arranged directly between the teachers involved.

Full recognition (with or without checking by the home university) was found to apply in the vast majority of cases. In only slightly more than one half of the ICPs was the recognition reciprocal (i.e. given for similar activities) amongst the participating universities.

The study also identified a need among ICP coordinators for information about alternative models for academic recognition, and a lack of communication between ICP directors in a given university or a given area of specialization in Engineering.

The ERASMUS programme - a study of prominence and profile -  
Perfection of a communication strategy

Study conducted in February 1989 by about 50 students from ICHEC (the Catholic Institute of Higher Studies in Business Administration), Brussels, with a representative sample of students, teachers and ERASMUS coordinators in all the Belgian institutions participating in the programme.

An in-depth study of prominence produced the following conclusions :

1. Information on the programme is still not widespread enough in institutions, especially as far as the students are concerned. A more systematic approach, better suited to existing structures, is required.
2. The vast majority of students are in full agreement with the objectives of the programme. Intentions to participate were expressed by 2/3 of those asked. Personal development is their main motivation. Their causes for concern involve financial support, the problems of academic recognition and linguistic preparation (especially for the less well-known languages).
3. The teachers are sensitive to the European aspect of the programme and are convinced of the necessity for inter-university cooperation. One teacher in three would be prepared to go to another Member State. Problems of domestic and professional organisation are the main limitations on mobility. The benefits gained by participating in the programme are essentially intellectual and educational.

The main recommendations proposed by the authors of the report are the following :

1. Improvements to the programme in terms of its administration :
  - concrete support to be given to actions involving linguistic preparation
  - better reception and information for students, as far as the latter is concerned particularly as regards academic recognition
  - simplification of the application procedure
  - ICP financing over a number of years.
2. The report proposes launching a systematic communication campaign on 4 fronts :
  - secondary school pupils

- students
- teaching bodies
- the general public.

Apart from the classic methods (using the media, poster campaigns) measures suited to the university and school environment are suggested: establishing ERASMUS delegates in universities, European days in schools, preparation of a brochure specially adapted for students.



C. Statistical AnnexA SELECTION OF USEFUL FIGURES

	<u>Page</u>
1. Summary of key figures from ERASMUS phase 1	2
2. Development of participation of Member States in accepted ICPs over 3 years	3
3. Development of flows of student mobility in the context of ERASMUS ICPs over 3 years	4
4. Example of the use of Visit Grants in order to arrive at a better balance within the Network (distribution by discipline, 1988-89)	5
5. Comparative development of amounts requested and granted by ICP category	6
6. Comparative development of proportion of "good" applications received and percentage acceptance rate for mobility ICPs	7
7. Action 2 funds available per student in Member States in 1988-1989	8

The normal statistics prepared by the Commission and the ERASMUS Bureau are not repeated here. The various figures and tables enclosed were prepared for the purpose of this report on the basis of raw data available on the Programme.

1. SUMMARY OF KEY FIGURES FROM ERASMUS PHASE 1

	<u>1987-88</u>	<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1989-90</u>
<u>ICP support (1)</u>			
Support requested : number of applications	868	2041	2223
MECU	12	52	56
ECU per application	13800	25400	25200
Support granted : number	398	1091	1507
% acceptance	46 %	53 %	68 %
MECU	3.85	10.2	16
ECU per ICP	9673	9455	10584
ECU/student year	882	993	960
<u>Mobility grants (2)</u>			
Grants requested : student years	?	12160	19580
number of students	?	19500	31200
MECU requested	15	39	60 (3)
MECU requested	?	25	40
Mobility in accepted ICPs :			
student years	4364	10271	17609
No. of students	5000(3)	15000(3)	27452
Becas concedidas : MECU	3.1	13	26
ECU/student years	711	1265	1477
<u>Visit Grants</u>			
Support requested : Number of applications	2377	3510	3777
MECU	6.36	8.5	9.7
Support granted : Number of applications	1138	1267	1913
% acceptance	48 %	36 %	53 %
MECU	2.03	2.1	3.2
ECU/Visit	1783	1657	1673
<u>ECTS grants:</u>			
to universities (MECU)	-	-	1
to students (MECU)	-	-	0.8
<u>Support for associations and publications</u>			
Support requested : Number of applications	30	125	157
MECU	0.64	3.6	3.1
Support awarded : Number of grants	12	35	51
MECU	0.13	0.52	0.47
<u>Totals</u>			
Support and grants requested (MECU)	34	103	129
Total budget (MECU)	11.2	30	52.5
Support and grants awarded (MECU)	9.1	25.8	47.5
	33 %	29 %	41 %
MECU granted/MECU requested	27 %	25 %	37 %

- 
- (1) See table 5 for detail by type of ICP  
(2) Not including ECTS student grants  
(3) Estimated  
(4) Based on 2,000 ECU per year (1 academic year = 10 months)

**2. DEVELOPMENT OF PARTICIPATION**  
**OF MEMBER STATES IN ACCEPTED ICPS OVER 3 YEARS**

	in the 398 ICPs accepted in 1987-88		in the 1091 ICPs accepted in 1988-89		in the 1507 ICPs accepted in 1989-90	
	number (1) of participants	%	number (1) of participants	%	number (1) of participants	%
B	43	10.8	191	17.5	273	18.1
D	172	43.2	449	41.1	600	39.8
DK	26	6.5	73	6.7	128	8.5
E	91	22.9	314	28.8	446	29.6
F	214	53.8	578	53.0	725	48.1
GR	31	7.8	74	6.8	120	8.0
I	85	21.4	291	26.7	437	29.0
IRL	29	7.3	95	8.8	144	9.6
L	1	0.3	4	0.4	7	0.5
NL	66	16.6	260	23.8	321	21.3
P	20	5.0	101	9.0	155	10.8
UK	238	59.8	571	52.3	737	48.9

(1) Each country is counted once only in each accepted ICP even if more than one university from that country participates.

**3. DEVELOPMENT OF FLOWS OF STUDENT MOBILITY IN THE  
CONTEXT OF ERASMUS ICPS OVER 3 YEARS**

	1987-88		1988-89		1989-90	
	duration (1)	%	duration (1)	%	duration (1)	%
Flow <u>between</u> F,UK,D	2707	62	4994	48.5	7381	42.0
Flow <u>between</u> F, UK, D and the 9 other Member States	1305	30	4207	41.0	8013	45.5
Flow <u>between</u> the 9 Member States (except D, F, UK)	352	8	1071	10.5	2215	12.5
Total Flows	4364	100	10272	100	17609	100

---

(1) Total number of academic years spent in another Member State by the students involved (1 academic year = 10 months).

4. EXAMPLE OF THE USE OF VISIT GRANTS IN ORDER TO ARRIVE  
AT A BETTER BALANCE WITHIN THE NETWORK (A DISTRIBUTION BY DISCIPLINE, 1988-1989)

DISCIPLINES ALREADY WELL REPRESENTED IN THE ICPS

Languages/Literature	18.9 % de PIC pero	11.3 % de Visitas
Engineering	14.5 %	9.9 %
Business Management	9.3 %	4.7 %

UNDER-REPRESENTED DISCIPLINES

Fine Arts/Music	2.8 %	4.7 %
Teacher Training	2.1 %	6.1 %
Medical/Para-medical	5.8 %	8.6 %

5. COMPARATIVE DEVELOPMENT OF  
AMOUNTS REQUESTED AND GRANTED BY ICP CATEGORY

Type of ICP	1987-88 (2)	1988-89	1989-90
SM:	ECU requested per application		13600
	Accepted applications	60 %	72 %
	ECU granted per ICP (SM) (4)	7200	8100
TM:	ECU requested per application	17200	18600
	Accepted applications	29 %	32 %
	ECU granted per ICP (SM) (4)	10000	11200
CD:	ECU requested per application	151000	12600
	Accepted applications	13 %	23 %
	ECU granted per ICP (SM) (4)	7200	7500
IP:	ECU requested per application	22700	19300
	Accepted applications	13 %	22 %
	ECU granted per ICP (SM) (4)	10300	12500
<u>All categories together</u>			
	ECU requested per application	13800	25200
	Accepted applications	46 %	68 %
	ECU granted per ICP (SM) (4)	9673	10584

- 
- (1) SM = Student Mobility  
 TM = Teacher Mobiltiy  
 CD = Curriculum Development  
 IP = Intensive Programmes

(2) In 1987-88, it was not yet possible to distinguish between the different types of ICP.

(3) A large number of applications involve 2 or more categories of ICPS simultaneously.

(4) ECU granted by institution:  
 1988-89 : 2,769  
 1989-90 : 2,892

6. COMPARATIVE DEVELOPMENT OF PROPORTION OF "GOOD" (1) APPLICATIONS  
RECEIVED AND PERCENTAGE ACCEPTANCE RATE (2)

	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90
<u>Student mobility ICPs</u>			
% of "good" applications	71 %	78 %	89 %
% acceptance rate	46 %	60 %	72 %
<u>Teaching staff mobility ICPs</u>			
% of "good" applications	(3)	53 %	74 %
% acceptance rate	(3)	29 %	33 %

- 
- (1) A "good" application is defined here as a project application having all the qualities required to eventually benefit from support under Action 1.
- (2) Calculated on the total of applications received.
- (3) In 1987-88, no distinction was made between the 2 types of ICPs, but, as during the other years, applications were mostly for student mobility ICPs.

**7. ACTION2 FUND AVAILABLE PER STUDENT (1)**  
**IN MEMBER STATES 1988-89**

Member States	ECU/year
B	1225
D	1314
DK (2)	1768
E	1556
F	876
GR (2)	2038
I (2)	3168
IRL	458
LUX (3)	-
NL	1260
P	2328
UK	879
EG	1265

- 
- (1) Mobility within the framework of ICPs only (1 academic year = 10 months)
- (2) This figure should be corrected downwards to take account of the fact that these countries have been granted a fairly large number of grants to "free movers", who are not included here
- (3) Not significant, given Luxembourg's special situation.