



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 20.09.1996
COM(96) 428 final

REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION

TO THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT,
THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE
AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS

EVALUATION OF THE FIRST PHASE
OF TEMPUS

1990/91 - 1993/94

Evaluation of the First Phase of TEMPUS 1990/91 - 1993/94

1. Research Design, Methods and Procedures

On May 7, 1990 the TEMPUS Programme was launched by the Council of European Communities. The aim of the Programme was to promote a reform of the higher education systems and to effectively support the adjustment of Central and Eastern European countries to the needs of a market economy. The collaboration between the CEE partner countries, the EU Member States, as well as other G24 countries in the field of higher education, based on co-operation, knowledge transfer, equipment aid, structural and curricular development, student and staff exchange, was supposed to provide the necessary prerequisites for an education and training system to fit the new requirements.

To comply with the goals of providing a comprehensive evaluation and an accurate overview, a description and analysis of the programme activities is necessary according to their structure, their administrative support and their actual realisation in the higher education institutions. The study presented here focusses on the following lines of inquiry:

- *The policy framework of the TEMPUS Programme:* What are the general rules of the TEMPUS Programme? Who are the major actors in policy formation on the national and the supra-national level? What role do they actually play? How are the national priorities in the CEE partner countries established and how do they function? etc.
- *The administration of the TEMPUS Programme on the national and the supra-national level:* What are the major tasks of the EC TEMPUS Office and the National TEMPUS Offices in the CEE partner countries? What is the quantity and quality of information about TEMPUS-related issues? What is the quality of advice and support for applicants? Do they organise the dissemination of results? Are the procedures established for TEMPUS administration functioning well? etc.
- *The participating institutions and institutional settings:* What kind of institutions participate in TEMPUS? In which countries are the institutions located? Which role is played by size and type of higher education institutions from CEE partner countries for participation in TEMPUS? What is the role of the central level of higher education institutions in fostering TEMPUS activities? What kind of support is provided to TEMPUS Joint European Projects by the institutions? etc.
- *The financial conditions of TEMPUS Joint European Projects (JEPs):* What is the proportion of the TEMPUS budget spent on JEPs? How is the overall budget assessed by partners in the JEPs? What are the major financial problems JEP partners and the central level of institutions have experienced? etc.
- *The cooperation within the JEPs:* What is the role played by partners from Western and CEE countries in initiating the establishment of JEPs? What kind of prior contacts did the JEP partners have among each other? What are the reasons for participation in JEPs? How many partners participate in JEPs? In which language(s) do the partners communicate? From whom do the partners receive information about the TEMPUS Programme? etc.
- *The administration of the JEPs:* In which countries are the JEP management functions, coordinator and contractor, located? How many hours per week do the partners spend on administrative work related to TEMPUS? What kind of information related to the overall

administration of the JEP is available to the partners? On what basis was the JEP grant administered? etc.

- *The educational activities:* What kind of educational activities (i.e., cooperation measures in the field of teaching and education, structural development, staff and student mobility) are undertaken within the JEPs? What are the objectives of the individual activities? With which subject areas are the JEPs concerned? What are the major difficulties which were encountered? etc.
- *Outcomes and impacts of TEMPUS:* To what extent are the envisaged goals of TEMPUS JEPs realized? How do the JEP partners assess the impact on the targeted department/institution? Are there synergy effects among the various educational activities? Are there spin-off activities from the activities of the JEPs? Do the JEP partners continue their cooperation after the end of TEMPUS support for their JEP? etc.

In order to cover the broad range of topics related to the main goals of the evaluation and to ensure a high validity and representativity of results, two different surveys were undertaken. In addition, available statistics were re-analysed, interviews were carried out with key actors for TEMPUS in all CEE partner countries and a broad range of official documents and written material was taken into consideration. In detail the evaluation study is based on the following approaches:

- *Surveys:* First, with the help of highly standardised written questionnaires, all participants (coordinators, contractors and partners) of TEMPUS Joint European Projects were asked to state their experiences and assessments. Second, all higher education institutions in the Central and Eastern European Countries involved in TEMPUS were sent a written questionnaire mainly concerned with the effects of the TEMPUS Programme on the restructuring and development of the institutions.
- *Interviews:* To become acquainted with the decision-making and administrative structure and processes above the institutional level, interviews in the Central and Eastern European partner countries were undertaken with the responsables for TEMPUS and Phare in the ministries, the representatives of the European Commission and the directors of the National TEMPUS Offices. Further interviews were undertaken with the main actors in selected higher education institutions and departments participating in TEMPUS. Last but not least, mobile students and staff members were asked about their experiences.
- *Analysis of databases:* as far as possible, the data bases of the European Training Foundation (ETF) in Torino were analysed in order to provide basic quantitative data about the various institutions and measures involved in TEMPUS.
- *Desk research:* in order to validate the own research results as well as to get the necessary background information about the TEMPUS Programme, existing documents and written material (guidelines, annual reports, country studies, evaluation studies, etc.) were analysed.

2. Basic Information on the TEMPUS Programme

In the aftermath of the political changes of 1989 in Central and Eastern Europe a comprehensive programme of financial assistance and expertise was agreed by the European Council to help the Central and Eastern European countries concerned in the restructuring of their economies and political systems. Thus, the Phare Programme was inaugurated in December 1989 providing a framework for Community assistance to support the economic and social reform processes in Central and Eastern Europe. Phare operations began in 1990.

In January 1990, the Commission submitted two proposals to the Council and the Parliament: the TEMPUS Scheme and the establishment of the European Training Foundation.

The *TEMPUS objectives are based on the objectives of the Phare Programme*. The main objectives of TEMPUS I are the following:

- to facilitate the coordination of the *provision of assistance* to the CEE partner countries in the field of exchange and mobility, particularly for university students and teachers, whether such assistance is provided by the Community, its Member States or the third countries of the G24 group;
- to contribute to the *improvement of training* in the CEE partner countries and to encourage their cooperation with partners in the European Community, taking into account the need to ensure the widest possible participation of all the regions of the Community in such actions;
- to increase opportunities for the *teaching and learning* in the CEE partner countries of those *languages* used in the Community and covered by the LINGUA Programme, and vice-versa;
- to enable students from the CEE partner countries to *spend a specific period of study* at university or to undertake industry placements *within the Member States* of the Community, while ensuring *equality of opportunity* for male and female students as regards participation in such mobility;
- to enable students from the Community to spend a similar type of *period of study or placement in a CEE partner country*;
- to promote increased exchanges and *mobility of teaching staff and trainers* as part of the cooperation process.

TEMPUS is funded by the CEE countries from within the allocation they receive under the Phare Programme. The Phare budget for each of the CEE partner countries is determined annually by the EU Commission on the basis of fixed criteria and after consultation with the national authorities of the partner countries. The disposition of funds within this national budget is determined by the national authorities on the basis of national indicative programmes which are developed according to the framework of objectives and aims to be achieved with the help of Phare. A certain *proportion of the Phare budget is allocated to TEMPUS on an annual base* by the national authorities in consultation with the Commission. The national authorities of the CEE partner countries involved in this process are the Education Ministries, the national Phare Coordinators, other Ministries involved in Phare activities and as a rule - to decide about the final version of the proposed allocations - the Council of Ministers.

The *administration of the TEMPUS Programme is a decentralised activity* involving key actors on various levels. Overall responsibility for the TEMPUS Programme was given to the EU Commission's Task Force Human Resources, Education, Training and Youth which is now the Directorate General XXII (DG XXII). There is a close liaison between the Task Force/DG XXII and the Phare Operational Service of DG I with regard to TEMPUS.

On the Community level the implementation of the TEMPUS Programme and all relevant programme decisions are assisted by the *TEMPUS Management Committee* consisting of two representatives of each EU Member State and being chaired by the TEMPUS representative of the EU Commission. The Committee also assists the Commission by commenting on and adopting the *general guidelines governing TEMPUS*, including the financial guidelines, all questions relating to the geographical and content related balance of TEMPUS activities and arrangements for monitoring and evaluation of the Programme. For the technical assistance in the management of the Programme an EC TEMPUS Office was established, first in Brussels and since 1995 a special Department of the European Training Foundation (ETF) in Torino has taken over the technical assistance for the Programme.

In each Member State of the European Union a National Contact Point was established to provide assistance, information and advice to all institutions and organisations interested in participating in the TEMPUS Programme. In each of the CEE partner countries a *National*

participating in the TEMPUS Programme. In each of the CEE partner countries a *National TEMPUS Office* (NTO) was established being *responsible for the administration of TEMPUS* in the country and providing all necessary help and support to participating institutions.

The TEMPUS Programme consists of three actions each of which covers a number of activities. Action 1 provides support for Joint European Projects (JEPs), Action 2 provides support for Individual Mobility Grants (IMGs), and Action 3 provides support for Complementary Activities and Measures (CMEs).

Joint European Projects (JEPs), which represent about 90 % of the total TEMPUS budget, are consortia of at least one institution of higher education from a CEE partner country and partner organisations from at least two different EU Member States, one of which must be a higher education institution. JEP grants are designed to promote the development and reform of higher education in the CEE countries and to encourage cooperation between higher education institutions of the CEE countries and higher education institutions, enterprises and other organisations of the EU Member States. Institutions, organisations and enterprises from G24 countries may participate as partners in a JEP consortium. There are four basic areas in which activities can take place: structural development, cooperative educational activities, staff and student exchange.

Mobility Grants serve to support mobility of university staff, staff of enterprises and students in both directions. In the second year of TEMPUS I the Individual Mobility Grants (IMGs) for students were discontinued. From that time on student mobility was only supported within the framework of a JEP.

Complementary Measures under TEMPUS I provide support for four, in the last year of TEMPUS I for five groups of activities. Complementary Measures projects in the first three groups comprise information, publication and research activities about TEMPUS matters as well as the integration of CEE associations into European ones and are called CMEs; activities in the fourth group are Youth Exchange Projects (YEX), and projects in the fifth group which was introduced in 1993/94, are carried out in the framework of Joint European Networks (JENs).

There are three groups of countries eligible for participation in the TEMPUS/Phare Programme:

- eleven Central and Eastern European Countries supported in the framework of Phare,
- originally twelve, meanwhile fifteen EU Member States,
- and the remaining G24 countries not being members of the European Union, namely Australia, Canada, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey and the U.S.A.

There are three groups of institutions or organisations which can participate in the TEMPUS/Phare Programme:

- "Universities": universities and other higher education institutions accredited in their respective country as well as consortia of higher education institutions, such as ERASMUS ICPs or COMETT UETPs.
- Enterprises: enterprises or companies in the strict sense.
- Organisations: other kinds of organisations, such as professional or scientific organisations, industrial federations, trade unions, employers organisations, chambers of commerce, etc.

Since the start of the TEMPUS Programme preference was given to project applications planning to develop and establish activities in so-called *priority areas which were identified by the Central and Eastern European countries*. Priority areas were supposed to be closely linked to the Phare priorities and then translated into fields and disciplines of university studies. Over time, the process of establishing these priorities did not only become more and more complex involving a consultative process with a number of policy makers in the CEE partner countries as well as in the EU Commission, but also the priorities themselves frequently became increasingly detailed

frequently became increasingly detailed and were given an increased importance for the selection of applications. In this process they became more detailed and refined and were formulated as a *mixture of structural or thematic and subject-related priorities*.

The selection procedure of JEP applications is a co-determination process involving the Commission and the CEE partner countries in several stages.

As a rule, *JEP applications are assessed in terms of four different aspects*. The technical assessment is concerned with completeness and correctness of all forms and a check whether all letters of endorsement are submitted. The initial quality grading is a first check on the consistency and academic level of the proposed activities as well as on the distribution of tasks, the level of cooperation among partners and the management of the proposed project. The third aspect concerns the assessment by academic experts in terms of correspondence with national needs and academic quality of the proposals. The last assessment is more concerned with the correspondence of applications with the overall TEMPUS and Phare objectives and national higher education policies and involves the NTOs, Phare responsables as well as the Ministers of Higher Education from the CEE countries and the EU Commission.

The selection of applications for Individual Mobility Grants (IMGs) also has a number of stages but is a less complex procedure. The NTOs receive and assess the applications from academic staff of their own country, the EC TEMPUS Office receives and assesses the applications from academic staff of the EU Member States. The EC TEMPUS Office then coordinates the submission of all IMG applications to the Commission for approval of those proposed for support. After the Commission has approved the selection of proposals the contracts are issued by the EC TEMPUS Office. Contracts for academic staff from the CEE countries are sent to the NTOs for distribution.

3. The Quantitative and Structural Development of Joint European Projects

During the first three years of TEMPUS the *number of Joint European Projects, the number of participating organisations and the number of partners increased continuously*. In the fourth year, however, only a few new activities were awarded grants. Altogether 749 Joint European Projects were awarded support. About 6,150 partners from 2,200 organisations were involved in the TEMPUS I JEPs.

Joint European Projects comprised *about 8 partners on average*. Between two and three of these partners were from Central or Eastern European countries while the majority was from Western countries. About 80 percent of the partners represented higher education institutions, 8 percent enterprises and 12 percent other organisations.

The proportion of Joint European Projects involving *partners from enterprises was more or less stable over the time* (about one quarter). However, the proportion of JEPs comprising only higher education institutions increased from 44 percent in the first year of TEMPUS to 62 percent in 1993/94. The proportion of JEPs involving other organisations decreased from 48 percent to 28 percent.

Higher education institutions participated on average in four Joint European Projects. In contrast to this, participation in more than one JEP was rather an exception for enterprises and other organisations.

Slightly more than one third of the JEPs involved one Central or Eastern European country and two Western countries, i.e. the minimal configuration required for TEMPUS support. A single CEE country and three or more partners from EU or other "G24" countries participated in 42 percent of JEPs (see Table 3.1). About one fifth of the JEPs were "multi-CEE JEPs", i.e. included organisations from two or more of CEE countries. The *proportion of*

multi-CEE JEPs was highest (37 percent) in 1990/91, and *decreased continuously* to only percent of those newly established in 1993/94.

Table 3.1
Country Configuration of TEMPUS Joint European Projects, by Year of Start (percent of JEPs*)

	Year of start				Total
	1990/91	1991/92	1992/93	1993/94	
1 CEE and 2 EU Member States	32	36	43	23	37
1 CEE and 3 or more EU or other Western countries	32	44	42	69	42
Multi-CEE	36	20	15	8	21
Total	100	100	100	100	100
(n)	(152)	(318)	(240)	(39)	(749)

* Configuration of JEPs in the first year of TEMPUS-support. Not including possible changes in the configuration during the second or third year of operation of the JEP.

Source: Database of the European Training Foundation

In absolute numbers, *Poland, Hungary and the former Czechoslovakia* were the most often represented Central and Eastern European countries in Joint European Projects whereas the Baltic States and Albania participated each in only about two percent of the JEPs.

Among the EU Member States, *the United Kingdom participated most often in TEMPUS* Joint European Projects (62 percent). Germany participated in 47 percent and France in 41 percent of TEMPUS JEPs. The Netherlands (31 percent) were strongly represented. Each of the non-EU G24 countries, which did not receive TEMPUS support for their activities, was represented in less than 5 percent of the JEPs (see Table 3.2).

Altogether, about *one quarter of the TEMPUS Joint European Projects were coordinated by partners from Central or Eastern European countries*. The respective proportion increased from 28 percent of the JEPs starting in the second year of TEMPUS, to 32 percent in the third year and 52 percent in the fourth year. Partners from Hungary (6 percent), Romania (5 percent) and Poland (4 percent) more often acted as coordinators of JEPs than partners from the other CEE countries. The 'contractor' function was only taken over in a few cases (4 percent) by partners from Central or Eastern Europe.

Partners from the United Kingdom were clearly dominant in taking the role of JEP coordinators and/or contractors. Many other coordinators and contractors were from France, Germany and the Netherlands, whereby the frequency of management functions by and large reflected the frequency of involvement on the part of EU Member States.

Two *subject areas were strongly supported* in Joint European Projects during the first phase of TEMPUS: *engineering/applied sciences* (20 percent) and *management/business administration* (18 percent). Undoubtedly these two areas were seen as most important for the economic development of the Central and Eastern European countries. All other subject areas were represented by less than 10 percent each: social sciences (9 percent), computer sciences (8 percent), medical sciences and environmental protection (7 percent each), while we note the humanities, art and design, architecture/urban planning and law at the end of the scale (1-2 percent each) (see Table 3.3).

Table 3.2
Number of TEMPUS Joint European Projects, Partners and Organisations 1990/91 - 1993/94 per CEE and Western Country (absolute number and percent*)

	Joint European Projects		Partner		Organisations	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
ALB	14	1.9	16	0.3	4	0.2
BG	89	11.9	177	2.9	60	2.9
CZ	81	10.8	168	2.7	56	2.6
CS ¹⁾	170	22.7	143	2.3	39	1.8
GDR ¹⁾	12	1.6	19	0.3	10	0.5
EE	18	2.4	24	0.4	9	0.4
H	211	28.2	512	8.3	130	6.0
LT	18	2.4	27	0.4	13	0.6
LV	20	2.2	32	0.5	12	0.6
PL	258	34.4	514	8.4	163	7.5
RO	109	14.6	209	3.4	77	3.5
SK	46	6.1	62	1.0	22	1.0
SLO	44	5.9	68	1.1	24	1.1
YU ¹⁾	71	9.5	62	1.0	27	1.1
B	203	27.1	317	5.2	100	4.6
D	349	46.6	634	10.3	228	10.5
DK	97	13.0	148	2.4	64	2.9
E	168	22.4	236	3.8	74	3.4
F	304	40.6	668	10.9	354	16.3
GR	117	15.6	164	2.7	60	2.8
I	85	11.3	379	6.2	131	6.0
IRL	219	29.2	98	1.6	24	1.1
L	2	0.3	2	0.0	2	0.1
NL	231	30.8	366	6.0	105	4.8
P	81	10.8	101	1.6	34	1.6
UK	467	62.3	798	13.0	243	11.2
AT	34	4.5	4	0.1	21	1.0
AUS	4	0.5	4	0.1	2	0.1
CDN	7	0.9	7	0.1	5	0.2
CH	11	1.5	12	0.2	8	0.3
FI	36	4.8	38	0.6	16	0.7
J	3	0.4	4	0.1	2	0.1
N	14	1.9	16	0.3	8	0.4
SE	32	4.3	36	0.6	16	0.7
TR	3	0.1	3	0.0	3	0.1
USA	29	3.9	35	0.6	30	1.4
Total	749	100.0	6146	100.0	2171	100.0

* All partners and organisations; including those not participating the whole period.

Source: Data base of the European Training Foundation

Table 3.3
Subject Area of TEMPUS Joint European Projects, by Year of Start (percent of JEPs)

	Year of start				Total
	1990/91	1991/92	1992/93	1993/94	
Agricultural sciences/agrobusiness	4	6	6	15	6
Humanities/philological sciences	1	2	1	3	1
Social sciences	7	9	10	8	9
Management and business	24	17	16	13	18
Natural sciences and mathematics	7	6	6	10	6
Medical sciences	6	7	9	10	7
Engineering studies/applied sciences	18	23	19	13	20
Computer sciences	8	8	8	10	8
Environmental protection	7	5	8	3	7
Architecture, urban/regional planning	1	2	3	3	2
Art and design	1	2	0	0	1
Language studies	7	7	4	3	6
Teacher training	3	3	5	8	4
Law	3	2	2	0	2
Other subjects	5	2	3	3	3
Total	100	100	100	100	100
(n)	(152)	(318)	(238)	(39)	(747)

Source: Data base of the European Training Foundation

The *proportion of Joint European Projects established in the various subject areas changed significantly over time*. The proportion of newly established JEPs in business administration decreased from 24 percent in 1990/91 to 13 percent in 1993/94. JEPs in engineering increased from 18 percent in the first year of TEMPUS to 23 percent in the second year and then decreased to 19 percent in the third year and to 13 percent in the fourth year. On the other hand the proportion of JEPs in agriculture, medical sciences and teacher training increased continuously.

Most of the JEPs were *concerned with activities in several areas of support*: 15 percent were awarded TEMPUS support for all three areas (cooperative educational measures, structural development of the CEE institutions and mobility of students and staff), and more than half for two areas each: 22 percent for cooperative educational measures and for structural development, 22 percent for cooperative educational measures and for mobility of students and staff, and 7 percent for structural development and for mobility of students and staff. The remaining 34 percent of the JEPs received TEMPUS support only for activities in a single area.

Activities differed according to subject areas. Joint European Projects in computer sciences (68 percent), engineering (55 percent) and natural sciences (48 percent) were concerned most frequently with upgrading of facilities whereas this activity only played a marginal role in teacher training (13 percent), art and design (14 percent), management sciences (16 percent) and social sciences (17 percent). Support for mobility of students and staff was awarded to all JEPs in arts and design and to 79 percent in language studies but only to 38 percent in law. Curriculum development was most common in architecture (83 percent) and

engineering (68 percent) and least frequent in art and design (43 percent) and teacher training (45 percent).

Altogether 16,891 students were awarded mobility grants in the framework of Joint European Projects. The vast majority of these grants (87 percent) were provided to students from Central and Eastern Europe to spend a period abroad in an EU Member State. TEMPUS was expected from the outset to serve primarily students from CEE countries. The number of mobility grants awarded to students increased from 1,218 in 1990/91 to 6,408 in 1992/93 and then decreased slightly to 6,166. Poland and Hungary clearly stood out in the number of students sent to the EU but also in the number of students received from Member States of the EU.

TEMPUS mobility grants for academic and administrative staff were provided for a broad range of activities. Altogether, about 26,000 staff members received grants during the first phase of TEMPUS. About 60 percent went from Central and Eastern European countries to EU Member States. West-East mobility was substantially more frequent for staff than for students. The number of mobility grants awarded to staff increased from 1,308 in 1990/91 to 9,870 in 1992/93 and then slightly decreased to 9,518 in 1993/94. Poland, Hungary and Romania were most active in the exchange of staff members.

Due to the full-funding approach of TEMPUS and the ambitious and expensive activities supported, Joint European Projects were awarded about 400 000 ECU on average over a period of three years. The average annual support increased from 100 000 ECU in the first year to 150 000 ECU in the second and 166 000 ECU in the third year of operation (see Table 3.4).

Table 3.4
Average Amount of TEMPUS-Support Allocated to Joint European Projects in Each Year of Operation, by Year of Start (mean in ECU)

Year of operation	Year of start				Total
	1990/91	1991/92	1992/93	1993/94	
First year	105,279 (152)	86,042 (315)	122,356 (237)	111,072 (39)	102,874 (743)
Second year	158,484 (134)	146,829 (275)	149,906 (220)	*	150,388 (629)
Third year	180,169 (126)	159,096 (242)	*	*	166,311 (368)

Source: Database of the European Training Foundation

* Information not available

TEMPUS funds allocated for administrative matters of the Joint European Projects increased on average slightly from about 44 000 ECU in the first year of operation to about 50 000 ECU in the third year, whereby its proportion of the overall annual budget decreased from 48 percent to 35 percent.

TEMPUS funds allocated for the provision of equipment remained more or less stable during the years of operation of the Joint European Projects (about 30 000 ECU per year). However, the proportion of TEMPUS funds allocated for equipment decreased from 30 percent in the first year of operation to 20 percent in the third year. Mobility funds increased substantially from 30 000 ECU on average in the first year of operation to 86 000 ECU in the third

year, i.e. from 22 percent to 45 percent of the overall annual budget. The *role of mobility increased* notably in Joint European Projects newly established in 1992/93 or 1993/94.

In each of the first three years of TEMPUS, *about 40 projects each were awarded support for Complementary Measures* (not including youth exchange). In 1993/94, the last year of TEMPUS I, the number of projects decreased to 19. Slightly less than half of complementary measures project were concerned with surveys and studies, about one third with publication and provision of information and about one quarter of the projects received support for establishment and fostering associations and consortia of higher education institutions.

During the first phase of TEMPUS grants were awarded for *Youth Exchange* between CEE partner and Western countries. Because this activity was generally considered as not much linked to the other activities supported by the TEMPUS Programme, *it was discontinued by the end of TEMPUS I*. The number of Youth Exchange projects was 65 in 1990/91, 66 in 1991/92, 106 in 1992/93 and 114 in 1993/94. On average, about 300 young people participated in one project. Information about the home country of participants and the directions of mobility is not available.

4. The Administration of the TEMPUS Programme in the CEE Partner Countries

The TEMPUS Programme is highly appreciated and can be considered as successful in the CEE partner countries. Nevertheless, the role of the EU is sometimes still somewhat too prescriptive and not living up to their own promotion of moving "from assistance to partnership". The *growing expertise* which was found in several CEE partner countries in terms of acquiring the knowledge and skills necessary for *successful participation* in and *local administration* of European education programmes is not always adequately recognized and taken into account by EU key actors.

Against the background of the key areas of national policy formation and the various interests of the actors involved in the respective processes and procedures, TEMPUS can be characterised as a programme needing *a continuous formal as well as informal dialogue* of all actors involved. The procedures which have been established in all CEE partner countries to arrive at the necessary policy decisions do not clearly separate actors and levels of decision-making power (e.g. supra-national, national, institutional level) but rather have intensified the efforts at coordination and cooperation.

In all CEE countries similar *models and procedures* have been developed to ensure the necessary coordination processes. In all countries bodies have been created - called TEMPUS advisory or supervisory boards or TEMPUS steering committees - in which all relevant actors are members and groups of actors are represented. The main functions of these boards are to balance the various interests coming into play in the steering of the TEMPUS Programme and to give legitimacy to TEMPUS policy decisions.

The National TEMPUS Offices play a major role for TEMPUS policy formation and decision-making which goes far beyond their official and primarily administrative tasks. They have frequently become a moderator in case of conflicts among key actors of TEMPUS. More important, however, the task of preparing all major policy decisions by drafting proposals or recommendations which are widely accepted by the other actors has been informally delegated to them in many of the CEE countries. This is due to an increasing proficiency and professionalisation.

Towards the end of the TEMPUS I period we found *a relatively smooth functioning of policy formation* including all relevant actors and a routinized steering and administration of the TEMPUS Programme in almost all CEE countries. Because of the increased professionalisation of the National TEMPUS Offices and the work of the national TEMPUS advisory

or supervisory boards there was a high degree of stability and continuity in the operation of the Programme on the national level.

The example of the EU Delegation in Romania shows that there is a certain role to play in TEMPUS for *EU Delegations* in the CEE partner countries which goes beyond support in legal matters, although help is needed and provided in this respect in several countries. As long as a visible commitment to and involvement in national TEMPUS policies is offered in the form of *expert advice* rather than programme control or administrative control it has possibly helped to improve links between Phare and TEMPUS and thus, impacts of TEMPUS Programme itself.

The role of the *Education Ministries* in TEMPUS related processes of policy formation and decision-making varies from country to country but is *generally not highly pro-active*. Many of the tasks involved in filling out these responsibilities are delegated to the TEMPUS advisory or supervisory boards which are usually chaired by a representative of the Ministry of Education. The lack of national higher education development plans in most CEE partner countries has contributed to the fact that there was no real basis for a focussed and overall strategy to provide a framework for TEMPUS activities. To a certain degree ministerial involvement in and procedural commitment to TEMPUS also seemed to be dependent on the proportion of TEMPUS support in the overall budget for higher education in any one of the CEE partner countries.

With regard to the *actual influence of the Phare representatives* on the TEMPUS Programme three partly contradictory conclusions can be drawn:

- In some CEE countries conflicts between Phare and TEMPUS actors about the direction and the administration of the TEMPUS Programme are existing but the relatively *smooth cooperation as regards the establishment of the budget* for TEMPUS was on the whole remarkable. Compared to its other sub-programmes Phare has allocated considerable funds to TEMPUS which can be seen as an indicator for the high value assigned to the reform and renewal of higher education on the national level. During TEMPUS I the overall TEMPUS budget has increased in absolute figures as well as in percentage of the national Phare budget.
- Content related criteria or conditions had no major importance for budget negotiations. Although Phare preferences were taken into consideration to a certain extent in recommendations or decisions of the TEMPUS advisory boards, the allocation of the TEMPUS budget was done as a *lump sum determination* based on the TEMPUS budget of the previous year and the annual Phare indicative programme. The incompatibility of Phare and TEMPUS decision-making schedules and sequences contributed to the choice of lump sum budget negotiations rather than direct allocation to selected projects and activities as is the case in the other Phare sub-programmes.
- While the first overall objective of TEMPUS is to support higher education reforms and renewal in the CEE partner countries, its second overall objective is to contribute to economic restructuring of the CEE countries involved. During TEMPUS I the attention of some the Phare responsables increasingly focused on this second TEMPUS objective and *efforts have been undertaken to better define the links between TEMPUS and Phare*. Nevertheless, we still found quite frequently an avoidance of overlaps or complementarity between TEMPUS projects and other Phare activities. In none of the CEE countries a policy of matching TEMPUS and other Phare resources or initiating cooperation of projects (e.g. in fields like environmental protection, urban planning or transport) was visible. Phare representatives became involved mostly in the context of general educational policy discussions for TEMPUS. The possibility of sector or subject specific relations between Phare and TEMPUS activities was not seen as an important issue.

Representatives of the higher education institutions are usually involved in TEMPUS policy formation through their membership in the TEMPUS advisory or supervisory boards. On the institutional level a *certain amount of infrastructural support and services has been provided*

for the TEMPUS activities in the faculties and departments. However, apart from formal consent by signing the letters of endorsement strategic management which would integrate TEMPUS activities into an institutional development plan could be found only in exceptional cases. To a considerable degree this is due to the fact that faculties and departments have a high degree of autonomy and often prefer to organize TEMPUS related matters themselves.

TEMPUS support during TEMPUS I tended to concentrate and thus, to open a *gap between the haves and the have-nots* concerning institutions as well as faculties and departments, and even among individual academic staff members in terms of the accumulation of new knowledge and international contacts.

Striving for *sensible balances* is more often the result in those CEE countries in which academic experts are cooperating in the assessment and have to reach an agreement concerning their recommendations as a group. *Concentration on quality* regardless of possible imbalances in the chances for successful applications and distribution of funds is frequently a result in those CEE countries in which the names of the academic experts are kept secret and experts don't know each other.

Towards the end of TEMPUS I a *broader coverage of subject areas* had been achieved either through introduction of balancing mechanisms into the priorities (i.e. additional preferences and conditions) or by rotation.

The process of establishing national TEMPUS priorities has been refined in most of the CEE countries during the TEMPUS I period and *priorities are widely accepted and acknowledged*. Concern about the validity of published priorities for the selection of applications was only voiced in those two cases in which priorities were changed by the EU Commission and then published without feed-back to the national actors.

The *level of funding* of TEMPUS activities is *mostly sufficient and satisfying*. More problems are caused by *delays in the transfer of grants and funds*. A positive development has been the growing awareness to make arrangements for the time when TEMPUS support has ended so that achievements will not be lost.

The impacts of such *programme revisions* as introduction of new JEP types and their discontinuation after a short time can disrupt the structure and the logic of the Programme as such and *prevent the building up of a stable knowledge and routines* in terms of planning of applications.

Although the majority of applicants and JEP partners felt and still feel well informed about those TEMPUS aspects most relevant to them, *information about national TEMPUS priorities often comes a bit too late* to structure applications in such a way that they are fully complying with the priorities.

5. Educational Activities in the JEPs

5.1 Perceptions of the Policy Framework

The TEMPUS Programme was obviously perceived in most of the Central and Eastern European universities, notably during the first years of the Programme, as a *Manna falling from heaven*: one could not fully explain why and how it came, it was a lot (for those who were blessed), and it was available only for the chosen few.

The complex setting of the general rules of the TEMPUS Programme, their annual modifications and specifications by the European Commission, the national priorities possibly revised annually (both their distinct and their vague elements), a multitude of rumours about the "real" underlying political intentions and selection criteria *created initially a considerable degree of irritation*. First, complaints were frequent about lack of information, notably during

first years TEMPUS support was provided in the respective country. In the beginning there was a noteworthy proportion of proposals the writers of which obviously had not been aware of the target areas, the national priorities and the publicly stated selection criteria. Second, the harsh watersheds of support, the inclusion of subject area x and exclusion of subject area y, the rich support for activity a and the complete neglect of activity b, were and still are regarded as somewhat arbitrary.

Many potential participants from CEE countries perceived it as crucial to find smart, prestigious and powerful partners in the West, even if their insight regarding the needs of the partners in the CEE countries was limited. Many hoped that the right connections to the national government or to the various layers of the TEMPUS administration was essential.

The major *thrusts of TEMPUS support set by the Commission were largely seen as pre-conditions one could not challenge*. In some respects, the donor was perceived as being too almighty to be criticised. However, many of the beneficiaries and also of the losers in the competition for support considered the immediate needs in terms of equipment and the need for provision of opportunities for first encounters with higher education in the West as more urgent than the pursuit of heroic goals of curriculum development, than faculty restructuring or student exchange. This issue was more salient in countries in which TEMPUS was initially or even until today, more or less the only source of support for new equipment. Some bowed opportunistically, many eventually accepted the bundle of support as a reasonable strategy for their development. One area stood out where amazement and criticism continued to prevail even after the initial uncertainties vanished: the Commission's strict emphasis on support for teaching without support for research.

Most of those wishing to be awarded support by TEMPUS *did not initially share the view that TEMPUS had a "bottom up"-approach*. One rather felt very much at the mercy of a super-structure of conditions and constraints irrespective, whether they were seen as the outgrowth of targeted policies from above, coincidental barriers or constraints due to inertia. Over the years, however, the beneficiaries in the CEE countries noted that conditions for support were relatively open and allowed for specific thrusts of innovation.

There is hardly any generalisation possible about the ways the universities experienced and perceived *national TEMPUS policies* on the part of the eligible CEE governments. They were regarded as too diverse in the extent they were targeted or vague, or to the extent they met or questioned the views held by the various representatives of the higher education institutions and departments. However, altogether we note that frequent changes of governments and vagueness of national policies were more often criticised in the interviews than very targeted government policies, but we cannot exclude a bias of the interviews in this respect because the interviews addressed more beneficiaries of TEMPUS support than unsuccessful applicants.

The nervous debates and the frequent policy changes in some countries harmed the continuous support over three years for the JEPs to a much lesser extent than it was initially feared. As already shown before, the proportion of *PHARE support for TEMPUS was relatively stable* in most countries, and shifts of national priorities seldom led to a reduction or cancellation of support for already existing JEPs after the first or the second year of support.

Altogether, we note a *high level of trust* at the higher education institutions as far as information, advice and support of most of the *National TEMPUS Offices* are concerned. They were generally considered very supportive in their attitude to departments asking for advice, and the later the participants were awarded TEMPUS support for the first time, the more they underscored the role the National TEMPUS Office had played for the application. On top, they tend to be perceived as a rock in the various policy storms potentially affecting TEMPUS support.

5.2 The Institutional Setting

Most persons involved and most external observers seem to agree that TEMPUS supported activities during the first four years of the TEMPUS Programme were more or less *a matter of the respective faculties or departments* in the CEE partner countries. The university as an institution did not come into play very much in CEE countries:

- Here and there, the prestige and the political influence of the rector or another top executive of the university was regarded as instrumental in influencing national TEMPUS policies or as helpful in other ways of ensuring support for the decision to award grants to the respective JEP and department.
- Resources for administrative support were mostly provided through decisions in the respective departments, and funds to complement the TEMPUS supported activities were hardly made available at all.
- The university administration was not infrequently viewed as inexperienced in those matters and not very supportive in their attitude. In some countries, however, a change towards more active support of the departments involved in international cooperation seems to be underway.
- TEMPUS support addressed the cooperating departments in an institutional environment prevailing in most CEE countries which was shaped considerably by a traditional and strong formal competence and influence of the faculty.

At various institutions, a *strengthening of the international offices* was observed. This tended to be seen as helpful for information and for the improvement of some administrative processes. Few, however, considered this as becoming instrumental to major internationalisation policies of the respective university.

Views varied less about the respective facts than about the question whether a *more proactive role of the university administration* should be deplored or not, how important countermeasures were and in what direction they should head eventually.

5.3 Financial Conditions

In response to a respective question the majority of partners in Joint European Projects from Central and European countries rated the *funds provided to them* as "generous". However, the proportion of those rating the financial conditions positively was clearly smaller than the proportion of those praising the educational outcomes of JEP activities. Although the sums seem to be impressive, notably in those countries in which TEMPUS continues to be the major source of funding beyond funding of the basic institutional needs, limits always come into the picture as well: more would be helpful. This notwithstanding, the interviews confirm as well that the beneficiaries of TEMPUS tend to appreciate the amount provided rather than emphasizing the shortages which remain.

It is very clear that *concerns regarding financial issues* on the part of beneficiaries primarily were expressed as regards the *financial administration*. Five issues deserve attention:

- The *delay of the provision of funds by the European Commission* was viewed as the most serious drawback. Responses to the questionnaire show that the participants also note delays caused by the coordinators and contractors of JEPs, the banking problems, and the university administration in the CEE countries, but delays caused by the Commission were clearly viewed as the most deplorable aspect (see Table 5.1).
- The *problems of transfer of funds* to CEE countries were serious notably in the first years, but continued in some countries for an extended period. Frequently, money had to be carried as cash, equipment had to be delivered personally, tickets had to be purchased in the West and mailed, etc. This inflated the administrative burden and frequently led to a reduction of educational activities originally envisaged.

- A considerable number of participants from the CEE countries were amazed to note that a considerable proportion of the TEMPUS funds eventually ended up in the West. This issue will be addressed below (see 5.4).
- Some interview partners criticised the TEMPUS administration for *not allowing to use funds initially earmarked* for certain activities to be eventually used for other activities.
- An uncertainty was felt frequently as regards the *continuity of funding*. In practise, however, the JEPs established in TEMPUS I were provided support for an average period of 2.8 years. In addition, the uncertainty was redressed in the last year of TEMPUS I by the introduction of a pluri-annual funding system.

There is finally the issue of the three-year limit of support. This approach seems reasonable as a support device for reform "take-offs", but many beneficiaries mentioned *drawbacks of this approach*. A library support intended, for example, for the purchase of foreign periodicals is seen as a waste if the subscription has to be cancelled afterwards. Somewhat more than 10 percent of the respondents to the questionnaire from the CEE countries observed already deficiencies of the laboratory or office equipments. Those deficiencies were possibly gravest in the most ambitious reform projects. Staff exchange might bear fruit, if not limited to a short period. Last but not least, a substantial proportion of the participants in the CEE countries pointed out that the development of teaching material stopped short of its implementation because no funds were available for printing or other means of material reproduction, especially textbook production.

Table 5.1
Financial Problems Encountered by the Departments Participating in JEPs, by Status of Respondent (percent*)

	Coordinator and contractor	Coordinator	Contractor	Partner	Total
Delay in provision of the grant by the European Commission	31	27	19	23	24
Delay in provision of the grant by the bank	18	24	17	20	20
Delay in provision of the grant by the JEP Contractor	1	12	2	16	14
Delay in provision of the grant by your institution	7	6	18	5	6
Difficulties with the institutional administration of the grant	14	10	25	10	11
Difficulties with the administration of the grant within the JEP	8	8	12	7	8
Unbalanced distribution of funds among partners	4	4	5	8	7

* Rating 1 or 2 on a scale from 1 = "very considerable" to 5 = "not at all"

Question 4.14: Please state the extent to which your department encountered financial problems regarding the following aspects.

Source: Survey "Experiences of JEP Contractors/Coordinators/Partners in the First Phase of TEMPUS"

Altogether, we note that the *TEMPUS support by the end of TEMPUS I played a strikingly different role in the various CEE countries* in the total setting of financial support for higher education reforms. While it was one of the available sources of support of innovation and renewal in some countries, it was the key fund beyond bare subsistence in others.

5.4 Cooperation within the JEPs

Most TEMPUS funds were made available for educational activities undertaken in the framework of networks comprising partners from the CEE partner countries and the West. In most cases, the *cooperation within the Joint European Projects was positively assessed* by the persons in charge at the participating departments from Central and Eastern European countries.

The *initiative for cooperation came frequently from the Western partners*. Also, most participants from CEE countries interviewed emphasized that the Western partners dominated the scene initially. Many participants from the CEE countries were grateful for the initiative, inspiration and effort shown by their Western partners.

However, *reservations were expressed not infrequently*. There were many cases of high praise, but some cases of bitter criticism as well. Reservations were put forward notably in five directions:

- The *Western partners were often seen as having played a too dominant role*, notably at the beginning of the cooperation. Some of the CEE partners underscored that they accepted uncritically reform concepts or proposals for activities which they later regretted when their knowledge about possible options had expanded. Communication was frequently shaped by a *status imbalance*. If CEE partners noted a low academic quality of support from the West, they often did not dare to express their concerns or even to drop the respective partner.
- As already noted, a considerable number of partners from CEE countries were amazed to note that their *Western partners reserved substantial proportions of the TEMPUS support for themselves*, though dramatic shortages were evident on the part of the CEE partners. Obviously, they expected more solidarity as regards the problems of the universities in the CEE countries.
- On the other hand, most of the Western partners claimed that their *administrative efforts were reimbursed only in part* and the TEMPUS scheme was not financially attractive.
- In response to the questionnaire, about one third each of the CEE participants reported that they were *not fully informed about details of financial plans and accounts* and that they did not receive copies of the reports sent to the Commission. About one tenth expressed strong criticism about the imbalance of the budget allocation between partners.
- Finally, a considerable proportion of departments from CEE institutions faced *problems of attracting partners from the West*.

Obviously, there were general dynamics in the cooperation between the partners:

- The *minimum configuration* of two partners from the EC countries was *not infrequently on paper only*. In those cases, one partner from the West was in charge, while the other served as a "sleeping partner" to fulfil the official requirements.
- The more partners were officially part of the network, the lower was the *proportion* of partners the participants from Central and Eastern European countries *actively cooperated with*.
- In various CEE countries *more partners from the same country* were taken on board.
- The cooperation of departments from different CEE countries was stimulated by TEMPUS only to a limited extent. The *proportion of "regional" or multi-CEE JEPs* was small from

the beginning and was *further reduced*, although the survey suggests that "regional" JEPs were slightly more successful.

- Other partners, i.e. *enterprises or other organisations* (for example research institutions), were frequently official partners within JEPs, but obviously most of them *played neither a central role in the administration of the JEP nor in its major activities*.

These dynamics are so obvious that they call for a reconsideration. Should one Western partner be sufficient? Should cooperation with other partners be encouraged? What are the drawbacks and potentials of "regional" JEPs?

Overall, the *cooperation was frequently unbalanced* because many representatives of the West considered themselves not only as donors and carriers of information, but also as academically superior partners. Over the years, however, the latter attitude changed somewhat.

5.5 The Administration Functions of the JEP Participants

The *management of TEMPUS-related activities in general is viewed as a very important task* in the CEE countries. Rectors, deans, vice-deans, heads of departments, their deputies or influential professors tend to be in charge. Partners from CEE countries without coordinating function report that they spent more than six hours on average per week for administrative functions related to the TEMPUS Programme. Those in charge of coordination spent about twice as much time on average. Some of them saw this function as advancing their academic career whereas others viewed them as a drawback, i.e. a reduction of their opportunity to be academically active and productive. A gradual transfer of the coordination and contracting function from the Western to the CEE partners was viewed as a matter of course.

Many participants from CEE countries wanted *administrators of their department* to be in charge of the administration of TEMPUS rather than administrators from the central level of the university. They saw the need to train the administrators and to be closely in touch with them.

5.6 The Educational Activities

Most participants of Joint European Projects were officially *involved in all of the four major areas of educational activities* supported by TEMPUS I, i.e. educational reform measures, structural development, staff mobility and student mobility. Undoubtedly, some considered the concurrent involvement in the various activities as a convincing reform approach. Some had clear preferences for a few of these activities, but got involved in the others in reaction to the support scheme and eventually put an emphasis on the combination of all activities. There are some participants as well for whom preferences for a few activities remained and the others were pursued only nominally or, if more than nominally, merely for the sake of being awarded support for what they conceived to be the core activities.

Altogether, the extent to which ambitious reform goals were successfully pursued but not successfully implemented or rather pretended varied substantially. Most observers, however, seem to agree that the *proportion of real success stories is remarkable* and that useful changes could be observed in most cases. More than 90 percent of the JEP participants in the CEE countries expressed a high extent of satisfaction with the achievements eventually reached (see Table 5.2).

Table 5.2
Overall Assessment of the Achievements of the JEP, by Country Group (percent)

	Country group		Total
	CEE country	Western country	
Very satisfied	59	32	43
2	33	45	41
3	7	15	12
4	1	5	4
Very dissatisfied	0	2	1
Total	100	100	100
(n)	(685)	(963)	(1648)

Question 10.10: How satisfied are you overall with the achievements which were accomplished with this JEP?

Source: Survey "Experiences of JEP Contractors/Coordinators/Partners in the First Phase of TEMPUS"

Staff development activities and intensive courses were frequently regarded to be *useful as collective exercises* of getting to know partners in other countries, their activities and their ways of thinking. In general, they are regarded as being useful to a similar extent as staff mobility. The impacts of acquiring a basic knowledge and becoming part of international networks of scholars were often seen as more important and more likely to be achieved than the official purpose stated for the individual measures.

Curricular development and teaching material production *varied in their intensity*. More than half of the respondents to the questionnaire survey claimed that they *undertook substantial changes*. There was also quite a number of respondents who just modified individual courses or produced texts of minor relevance to the respective courses. In a few cases, it was not more than a franchising relationship: the Western partners just transferred their own modes and materials to the CEE partners.

New equipment was the *pride of the respective departments* in the CEE countries, often a cause of envy of the neighbours in the respective university and sometimes even of their partners in the West. While in some cases it was closely linked to the respective educational measures, it was in most cases seen as an improvement useful anyway, i.e. for the quality of educational activities in general, for easing future international cooperation, for supporting the research infrastructure, etc. Structural development met the highest consensus as being an important element of support.

Student exchange tended to be regarded as very *helpful for those actually going abroad*, but altogether *less intertwined with the other reform activities*. Obviously, there were only few cases of close links between student exchange and the major thrusts of educational reform, notably because regular exchange of most students was not viewed as a feasible goal. In some cases, students or doctoral candidates were supported who were expected to serve as junior academic staff upon return. In this context it is worth noting that the "brain drain" effect of the TEMPUS Programme generally was seen as being small.

5.7 Outcomes and Impacts

The first and most significant outcome of the TEMPUS activities obviously was the *integration of the CEE partners into an international community of scholars* and in some cases of administrators. They became accustomed to and versatile in this framework, they were integrated into smaller and larger networks, and they received some training and generally improved their competences and their status.

Besides, the TEMPUS Programme had tremendous *socialising impacts*. The efforts undertaken for improvement became feasible and worthwhile. Working in the framework of international networks became a promising innovation strategy.

TEMPUS support ensured *significant provision of equipment* for most of the beneficiaries. In a substantial number of departments in CEE countries, far-reaching curricular innovations were achieved, and the development of new teaching material of a strategic nature was realised frequently. Curricular development and other educational activities, however, varied substantially in scope and achievement.

The outcomes in the CEE countries tend to depend on many factors. By and large, we note the *highest appreciation of results in countries, institutions and departments which neither were relatively rich and prestigious nor were very poor and of little attraction* to Western participants. Thus, if we compare according to country, it may not come as a surprise to note that our findings suggest the highest assessment of the outcomes of TEMPUS support in Bulgaria.

Compared to this, the *rationales for supporting certain subject areas* and not supporting others could be viewed nowadays as having been *somewhat arbitrary*. National policies shifted not infrequently, good reasons could be presented for almost all and against almost all subjects. The rating of achievements of the actual TEMPUS activities varied little according to subject area.

The successes are mostly seen as *achievements on select islands of innovation* privileged to be chosen in the framework of the TEMPUS Programme. Impacts on the institutional setting remained moderate or mostly marginal (see Table 5.3). There are no reasons to assume, however, that substantial impacts or spin-offs for the respective institution of higher education could be expected. If the major thrust is educational innovation within subject area networks, the spin-off within the institution tends to be limited as a matter of course.

Table 5.3

Accessibility of Equipment Acquired with TEMPUS Support (percentage of JEP partners from CEE countries purchasing respective equipment)

Accessibility	Computer	Literature	Lab eq.	Office eq.
Only for JEP department	44	21	46	59
Other departments	31	20	31	21
All depts. of institution	23	56	20	19
Accessibility not specified	2	3	3	1
Total	100	100	100	100
(n)	(537)	(491)	(287)	(278)

Question 7.3: What type of equipment was acquired and who has access to the equipment within the targeted institution?

Source: Survey "Experiences of JEP Contractors/Coordinators/Partners in the First Phase of TEMPUS"

A substantial proportion of participants being actively involved in *regional cooperation* within the Central and Eastern European countries considered this as a *worthwhile and promising experience*. Some interview partners criticised that little has been done to spread successful experiences within the subject areas in the respective CEE country. Regional cooperation also could be more easily taken into account a few years after the rapid political change, and could also lead to more promising results than it might have been possible in the early 1990s.

6. The Institutions of Higher Education Participating in TEMPUS

TEMPUS has supported institutions of higher education in Central and Eastern Europe which underwent *substantial change since 1990*. According to persons at the central level of the institutions responding to a respective questionnaire, about 40 percent of the degree programmes offered in 1995 had been newly established, almost 30 percent had changed substantially during that period, and only slightly more than 30 percent remained more or less unchanged.

According to those in charge at the central level of higher education institutions, TEMPUS has strongly helped to *establish international contacts* and substantially *contributed to staff exchange* (see Table 6.1). At many institutions, its contribution to the improvement of equipment and to its various educational targets is remarkable. There is a lesser impact, though, on staff development, reorganisation of course programmes and on university management. Also, the faculties and departments involved in JEPs are frequently viewed as more active than others in change-oriented educational activities, but not so much more active in administrative rearrangements and university-industry relationships. Altogether half of the respondents concluded that TEMPUS activities have had a strong impact on the changes that took place at their institution.

TEMPUS activities have *some impact beyond the respective institution* of higher education. As many as half of the respondents stated that teaching material developed at their institution in the context of TEMPUS cooperation became a standard in the respective country, and about one third reported a similar dissemination of course programme developments in JEPs (see Table 6.2).

The central level at higher education institutions in Central and Eastern Europe is not seen as weak by the respondents as far as contributions to change are concerned. Thus, it does not come as a surprise that many ways are stated in which the *central level encourages international activities*, supports project activities administratively and provides various related services. What remained an exception though, is financial support from the central level to the faculties involved in JEPs and facing the need for complementary funding.

Most of the institutions claim to undertake *strategic planning* in the framework of which some or all TEMPUS activities are strongly emphasized. However, the central level plays an active role in setting objectives for TEMPUS applications only at one seventh of the institutions. At one tenth of the institutions, applications were sometimes not confirmed by letters of endorsement.

The findings of the survey suggest that a strong involvement of the central level and strategic planning emphasizing TEMPUS might be helpful here and there. On average, however, the *perceived success of TEMPUS activities at the faculties and departments does not seem to differ strikingly according to the extent in which the central institutional level is involved*.

Table 6.1
Perceived Contribution of TEMPUS to the Change at Institutions of Higher Education
in Central and Eastern Europe, by Number of JEPs (percent of institutions)

	Substantial contribution of TEMPUS to change*					Substantial changes occurring**				
	Number of JEPs					Number of JEPs				
	1-2	3-5	6-10	11 and more	Total	1-2	3-5	6-10	11 and more	Total
Establishment of international academic contacts	56	64	71	82	70	76	76	88	86	83
Increase of staff exchange	63	52	68	90	69	67	44	82	72	68
Improvement of equipment e.g. computer centres, laboratories, libraries etc.	61	63	62	69	64	76	72	82	79	78
Introduction of new teaching methods	56	44	55	82	60	53	48	45	59	51
Establishment of new course programmes	50	43	70	64	59	75	68	76	67	71
Increase of student exchange	47	44	53	83	58	63	44	55	83	61
Introduction of new contents/paradigms	57	60	52	61	57	62	72	55	74	66
Establishment of international research cooperation	33	29	30	43	34	50	38	43	64	49
Reorganisation of staff development and continuous education programmes	38	26	27	42	33	38	42	23	35	33
Establishment of new faculties/departments	29	17	29	35	27	56	52	57	59	56
Changes of the degree structures	18	29	25	24	25	43	57	30	42	42
Reorganisation of higher education management	0	15	9	17	11	13	14	25	38	24
Establishment of cooperation between institution and industry/commerce	8	16	10	8	10	21	11	16	16	16
Establishment of technology transfer units or centres	9	0	11	14	9	29	5	29	13	19
Reorganisation of administrative structures and procedures	8	9	0	14	7	7	26	27	22	23

* Percentage of respondents stating 1 or 2 on a scale from 1 = "very substantial changes" to 5 = "no changes at all" among all responding to the respective area

** Percentage of respondents stating 1 or 2 on a scale from 1 = "very substantial contribution" to 5 = "no changes at all" among all responding to the respective area

Question 3.5: Please rate the extent to which changes occurred since about 1990 at your higher education institution in the following areas and the extent to which TEMPUS activities contributed to these changes.

Source: Survey on the development and restructuring of institutions participating in TEMPUS

Table 6.2
Spin-off Activities from the TEMPUS Activities at the Higher Education Institution, by
Number of Full Time Students (percent; multiple reply possible)

	Current full time students				Total
	Up to 1000	1001 - 2500	2501 - 5000	5001 and more	
Formal partnership agreements with the partner institution(s)	46	59	48	83	60
Teaching material developed in TEMPUS projects becomes a standard in the country	46	55	48	57	51
Establishment of special units/courses for language training	27	23	31	50	34
Courses/course programmes developed were adopted by other institution(s) in the country	38	32	38	27	34
Introduction of a system for recognition of study periods abroad	27	23	38	37	32
Provision of training courses for staff members from departments/institutions not involved in TEMPUS	23	36	28	33	30
Establishment of special unit/office responsible for international activities	8	23	21	43	24
Membership of department/institution in international networks	12	9	17	33	19
Establishment of inter-library loans services	12	14	14	7	11
Other	0	0	3	3	2
Not ticked	12	5	3	3	6
Total	250	277	290	377	302
(n)	(26)	(22)	(29)	(30)	(107)

Question 3.17: Are there any spin-off activities from the TEMPUS activities at your higher education institution?
 Source: Survey on the development and restructuring of institutions participating in TEMPUS

Most *internal problems* being named by those providing information from the perspective of the central institutional level concerned the *provision of resources*: notably covering the costs not borne by TEMPUS funds and pre-financing of activities because the receipt of TEMPUS funds was delayed.

Most institutions of higher education in Central and Eastern Europe tend to be more or less *satisfied with the communication with their National TEMPUS Offices and with the information flow in general*. If problems of information are expressed, they are likely to imply criticism as far as the acceptance of decisions and their transparency are concerned. On the other hand, about a third of the respondents believe that their institution has some influence on the priorities set and almost one quarter stated that it has some influence on the pre-selection of JEPs.

Persons from the central level of the CEE higher education institutions confirm the problem also stated by JEP partners from CEE countries concerning the delays in the transfer of funds. *Delays of funds seem to be most frequently the source of problems* whereby delays

caused by the Commission are more frequently named (by more than one third) than those caused by the TEMPUS contractor at the partner institution (by about one quarter of the respondents).

The actors on the central level of higher education institutions notably advocated an *increased flexibility of the funding arrangements*, further a continuation and *increase of TEMPUS support* and a *decrease of bureaucracy*, as far as details of book-keeping and reporting are concerned. Some changes of the overall administrative procedures are called for, and some suggest a reconsideration of priorities whereby increased student mobility is favoured most often.

7. Final Assessment

- ⇒ (1) The TEMPUS Programme is characterised by a complex dynamic of decision-making and administration which has to (a) ensure a balance between the Western initiators and donors and the CEE partner countries; (b) establish a balance between the autonomous views of the higher education institutions and the economic and social demands of society; (c) involve a broad range of actors; (d) ensure a smooth coordination of the various stages of programme-related decision-making and the selection and award processes. In theory there is a clear model of stages of decisions in which a single key actor is defined for each stage. In practice, however, the inter-relationships of the various stages as well as the constant overlaps have created a centripetal pressure towards (a) a single major decision-making arena, and (b) a managerial unit serving as a moderator for most key administrative processes. The national TEMPUS advisory or supervisory boards serve the former and the National TEMPUS Offices serve the latter function. The establishment of national TEMPUS advisory or supervisory boards in all CEE countries to serve as an arena for dialogue and cooperation of all key actors involved in TEMPUS policy decisions has turned out to be a reasonable option for the necessary coordination processes. The functioning of these boards requires the willingness of all actors to cooperate with each other. If this is not the case, the decision-making and operation of the TEMPUS Programme becomes vulnerable on the national level.
- ⇒ (2) Although the dynamic conditions and aims of the TEMPUS Programme are frequently emphasized, actual changes in the structure and activities of the Programme were rather moderate during TEMPUS I. There are two reasons which might have contributed to this: (a) Because of existing regulations and arrangements for the financing of JEPs the leeway for changes became smaller each year. The necessity to provide funding for a growing number of JEPs in their second and third year of operation on the basis of annual renewal applications gradually decreased the available amount of funding for new JEPs. (b) The supra-institutional decisions with regard to the annual revision of priorities and re-definitions of measures and activities in the TEMPUS Programme did not disrupt the structure and logic of the Programme to such an extent that institutions were confronted with a discontinuation of existing project activities.
- ⇒ (3) The major areas of support in JEPs were constructed as a bundle of activities: structural development, cooperative educational measures, staff and student mobility. The majority of JEPs opted for carrying out all four of these activities, although preferences for the provision of equipment and for staff mobility were clearly visible. The combination of all four activities contributed considerably to the success of curricular reforms. In addition, the bundle of activities in its current combination is also a preferred option for the future. Two deficits stand out, however. First, it was often regretted that a contribution of TEMPUS to research was explicitly excluded. This exclusion

was difficult to understand because TEMPUS aims to contribute to structural reforms of higher education in countries in which there was previously an institutional separation of research and teaching and the integration and cross-fertilization of these tasks is considered to be one of the major targets of reform. Second, student mobility has been least integrated into the bundle of JEP activities. It was considered worthwhile for those who went abroad but less important in the context of the combined impact of the other three activities. Insofar, some open questions are left concerning the combination of activities eligible for support within JEPs.

- ⇒ (4) Although we can state a certain degree of continuity in national policies and budget allocation procedures, the annual re-definition and re-determination of TEMPUS resources and national priorities as well as their rather late announcement led to some disquiet among applicants and recipients of grants. Until the last moment they could not be sure whether their applications would match the priorities or whether their activities would still coincide with policy decisions and further support would be granted.
- ⇒ (5) The national TEMPUS priorities and their annual revision do not only reflect the divergence in the development of the various CEE partner countries but also determine the balance of participation as regards institutions and subject areas. During TEMPUS I a broader inclusion of various types and sizes of higher education institutions has been achieved. Approximately 70 percent of all higher education institutions in the CEE partner countries participated in TEMPUS. Vis-à-vis the pronounced dominance of business studies and engineering in the beginning of TEMPUS, a somewhat broader coverage of subjects can be stated for the second half of TEMPUS I. However, certain disciplines and subject areas are still rather underrepresented in TEMPUS which deserve stimulation for reform in the context of socio-economic transformation.
- ⇒ (6) The distribution of tasks in the management of the TEMPUS Programme has changed considerably in the second half of TEMPUS I. The gradual political consolidation and the continuing progress concerning the transformation in the CEE partner countries as well as the increasing professionalisation of the National TEMPUS Offices have led to a transfer of more and more responsibilities and tasks from the EC TEMPUS Office/TEMPUS Department in the ETF to the NTOs. This has not only influenced the relationship between the EC TEMPUS Office/TEMPUS Department in the ETF and the NTOs but the time seems to have come to reconsider the role and responsibilities of the EC TEMPUS Office/TEMPUS Department in the ETF. A higher degree of independence of the NTOs might be connected with a different set of tasks for the TEMPUS Department in the ETF.
- ⇒ (7) In general, the overall JEP grants were regarded as generous by most recipients from the CEE countries even though differences might exist among countries in what is considered as generous. Criticism concerning the amount of support awarded to JEPs was rather directed at issues of continuity in support. It was a typical feature in TEMPUS I that support came like "manna from heaven" and after three years it stopped without offering any solution to smooth the transition from the fat years to the meagre ones. With the introduction of JENs in the last year of TEMPUS I this problem has been somewhat redressed, but any radical take-off solution for TEMPUS award and support policies must be questioned.
- ⇒ (8) Overall, the administrative process concerning the transfer of TEMPUS support and the inflexibility in utilization of funds was criticized by the recipients. The most serious criticism was voiced in terms of the delays in the transfer of funds for JEPs and mobil-

ity grants. The causes for these delays were sometimes attributed to the banks and also to the JEP contractors. Most frequently, however, they were attributed to the transfer arrangements of the EU. Delays in the transfer of funds combined with typical project dynamics aggravate the problem of inflexibility in the utilization of funds, i.e. the impossibility to use funds for other than the ear-marked cost items even if there were delays in the transfer of specific funds (e.g. for mobility), if money could be saved because of spending less on certain activities than originally envisaged or if shifts in priorities for certain activities occurred due to the dynamics of a project.

- ⇒ (9) The higher education institutions are usually represented in the national TEMPUS advisory or supervisory boards. Thus, they participate in the annual establishment and revision of national TEMPUS priorities and can bring institutional interests and strategies into play. In general, the higher education institutions are quite satisfied with the communication and information activities of the NTOs. There was no serious concern voiced with regard to the functioning of communication structures among higher education institutions, JEP partners and actors on the national level. Furthermore, sufficient feed-back opportunities exist in both directions: from the institutional to the national level and vice versa.
- ⇒ (10) TEMPUS has contributed to substantial change at higher education institutions since 1990. Only slightly more than 30 percent of the degree programmes at institutions responding to a respective questionnaire remained unchanged. TEMPUS has also helped strongly to establish international contacts and to organise staff exchange. It has had less consequences, however, for strategic planning. Overall, the perceived success of TEMPUS activities at the faculties and departments does not differ strikingly according to the extent in which the central institutional level is involved.
- ⇒ (11) Concerning the cooperation within the networks four issues should be pointed out: the relationship between CEE and Western partners, the number of partners within JEPs, the number of institutions from one country and the role of enterprises.
- The relationship between CEE and Western partners is dominantly seen as friendly and cooperative. Many CEE partners are grateful for the tremendous amount of support and commitment they received from their Western partners. Cooperation has increased respect for each other. Nevertheless, complaints of CEE partners were not infrequent about a domineering attitude of some Western partners and the very high amount of administrative costs they sometimes claimed were necessary for their efforts. In contrast to this, Western partners frequently stated that TEMPUS support for their administrative costs would not by far cover all the direct and indirect costs incurred.
 - Problems concerning the configuration among partners within JEPs varied according to the size of the JEP. The more partners were officially part of the network, the lower was the proportion of partners with whom participants from CEE countries actively cooperated. Cooperation was more intensive in JEPs with a smaller number of partners.
 - In some CEE countries national governments stimulated the cooperation of several institutions from the same country within one JEP. This was done in order to reduce the imbalance of a few winners and many losers in the competition for TEMPUS support and provide an opportunity for less successful institutions to participate in TEMPUS and to acquire the necessary know-how for successful applications and JEP management.
 - On the whole, enterprises did not play a very strong role in JEP activities. The number of enterprises participating in JEPs decreased during the period of TEMPUS I. Frequently, enterprises were just "sleeping partners" or were merely involved by

offering places for internships. Higher education institutions did not comment much on the importance or influence of enterprise involvement in JEPs and did not state any preferences in this respect either.

- ⇒ (12) JEPs in which partners from different CEE countries cooperated, i.e. multi-CEE or "regional" JEPs, were quite successful and offered special opportunities for trans-border cooperation. The combination of decentralisation and nationalisation in TEMPUS promoted the influence of national priorities and did not only reduce the role of multi-CEE cooperation but also made successful applications considerably more difficult because they had to comply with the national priorities of two or more CEE partner countries. This development has reduced a certain potential and quality of cooperation which should be reconsidered.
- ⇒ (13) Issues of administrative cooperation within the JEP networks and among the partners as well as between the central level of the higher education institutions and the faculties and departments involved in JEP activities are frequently stated as a source of disagreement and differences in perception. However, a certain focal point in which these differences would concentrate is not visible and thus, a clear direction for change cannot be indicated.
- ⇒ (14) The opportunity to build up personal contacts and to become integrated into an international community of scholars was certainly one of the most visible as well as highly appreciated impacts of TEMPUS for CEE partners. However, once such contacts and cooperation are stabilized and have become normal the TEMPUS Programme will lose its importance as the only or main source of opportunities for international contacts and integration.
- ⇒ (15) Impacts of TEMPUS concerning the modernisation of equipment and the renewal of teaching and learning have been highly rated by faculties and departments involved in TEMPUS. They were also more direct and visible than impacts in other areas of structural development supported by TEMPUS. It is therefore not surprising that, for example, substantial changes in the structure of degree programmes were undertaken less frequently and regarded less as a direct impact of TEMPUS activities in those cases in which such changes had been introduced.
- ⇒ (16) Only towards the end of TEMPUS I has student mobility become more important in the perception of faculties and departments involved in TEMPUS activities. This is mainly due to the expectation that participation in SOCRATES will soon be possible for most of the CEE countries. In this context Mobility-JEPs are regarded as an appropriate preparation. It must, however, be noted that TEMPUS support for student mobility can not be compared to ERASMUS student mobility. TEMPUS supported student mobility is not characterized by a reciprocity of exchanges, it is not as highly organised as in ERASMUS and also still lacks frequently curricular integration and recognition arrangements. Student mobility in TEMPUS was, however, successfully used to a certain extent as an instrument in the selection of potential junior academic staff.
- ⇒ (17) Spin-offs of educational and curricular activities for the same subjects and departments at other higher education institutions in the country have been achieved within TEMPUS. A certain extent of dissemination of results and adoption of curricula and teaching material developed in the framework of JEPs can be noted, although it could be improved by increased support for dissemination, publication of material developed within JEPs and increased communication and exchange. The same kind of spin-offs were a potential of the multi-CEE JEPs and could have led to an exchange of

special curricular innovations or outstanding material and course programmes among CEE countries. Overall, the dissemination of results of JEP activities was not strongly promoted and supported during TEMPUS I. When TEMPUS support for JEPs ended after three years there was often no funding left over or no additional funding available to publish developed material or organize the dissemination of results. Spin-offs might also be increased if they were part the TEMPUS support system and if a more targeted approach towards dissemination of results were adopted.

- ⇒ (18) The island character of innovation achieved by JEPs was a frequent and widespread argument when JEP participants and actors on the central level of the institutions were asked about possible spin-offs for the institutional setting. This is insofar understandable as subject-related activities do not automatically lead to spin-offs for the governance and administrative structures of the institution as a whole. The island character may, however, also be due to resistance against change from other academic staff members in the same faculty or department and/or to an unwillingness of those involved in the JEP to share innovation and new resources because there is a high degree of competition.
- ⇒ (19) There are different perceptions of the JEP participants on the one hand and the central institutional level on the other about the service function of the central level for the JEP activities and the integration of JEP activities into an institutional development strategy. JEP participants perceive the support of activities through services offered by the central level of their institution as considerably lower than the central level itself. Various styles of institutional management do not seem to influence the success of JEP activities in any direct way. The validity of the different perceptions is hard to determine apart from the fact that both sides direct their attention rather to new developments (i.e. in the framework of TEMPUS II) and base it less on an assessment of previous developments.

In contrast to other European programmes, TEMPUS is bound to be unstable because of its logic. The reasons for this are:

- The more successful TEMPUS is the more diminishes the role of its support provided to the CEE partner countries.
- As a consequence of political and economic stabilisation as well as of growing professionalisation and self-confidence in international settings the role of the CEE countries vis-à-vis the European Union will be more determined and influential in the relevant decision-making processes.
- Similarly, the role of the National TEMPUS Offices seems to be growing vis-à-vis the TEMPUS Department in the ETF.

The instability inherent in the logic of the TEMPUS Programme is also reflected on the level of the JEPs. Most JEPs were active in all four major areas for which TEMPUS support was granted, although - as already stated - individual activities tended to be pursued to varying degrees. Nevertheless, the bundle of activities created an incentive to be more active in educational innovation than initially intended by the JEP partners in the CEE countries so that the creation of such a bundle can be considered as relatively successful. The time has come now to reconsider this bundle as emphases and targets of reform and renewal start to shift in CEE partner countries:

- After four to six years aims and objectives will have to take into account how the take-off and emergency character of TEMPUS has changed.

- The national dimension of the Programme is gradually complemented by a European dimension in the CEE partner countries.
- Individual areas might still need support without, however, being integrated into a bundle of activities.
- New tasks and activities might acquire new importance.

TEMPUS has successfully contributed to a considerable amount of development and change in the higher education institutions of the CEE partner countries. In the face of growing political consolidation and progress in social and economic transformation TEMPUS has lost its original character as an emergency aid programme for the majority of the CEE partner countries. This implies that the time has come for new basic decisions concerning the direction in which the TEMPUS Programme should develop. For these decisions the successes and achievements of the TEMPUS Programme up to now have to be taken into consideration just as much as the remaining problems and changed conditions in the CEE partner countries. As a result of our findings three major directions for TEMPUS emerge as possible issues for further considerations about the future of the Programme.

- The first direction can be characterized by "decentralisation and nationalisation". The trend towards a transfer of TEMPUS-related responsibilities and tasks to the CEE partner countries continues. This does not only suit the various degrees of stability and economic development which have been reached in the CEE countries but also the various foci in terms of TEMPUS activities. As a consequence, TEMPUS would be bound to become very heterogeneous. The potential for regional spin-offs and cooperation among CEE countries would be further reduced and the European dimension of activities would remain weak or become even weaker.
- The second direction can be characterized by "Socratization and residualisation". This means that some CEE countries would move towards participation in SOCRATES (and LEONARDO) as is currently already visible, and the remaining CEE countries would form the rest of CEE partner countries in TEMPUS. This scenario matches widespread ambitions of some CEE countries although many educational activities supported in TEMPUS are not strongly represented in SOCRATES. Those CEE countries with ambitions in this direction might not yet be able to provide the complementary resources required for participation in SOCRATES but it is frequently a matter of prestige and a feeling to be on a par with higher education institutions in the EU Member States which comes into play as a decisive factor.
- The third direction can be characterized by a "Europeanization" of the TEMPUS Programme combined with a restructuring of tasks and administration. The EU might take the lead in stimulating activities which have a strong European dimension and at least a medium-term life-cycle while allowing the individual CEE countries to take care of other remaining take-off support which is short-term in its orientation and national in its approach. This could lead to a higher degree of permanence in the TEMPUS Programme although it would probably require additional financial support not made available by national Phare funds and not yet taken into account in the national decision-making processes established for the allocation of Phare funds for the TEMPUS Programme.

8. General Conclusions

The TEMPUS Programme is highly appreciated and well accepted in the CEE partner countries. Although the overall quality of applications has continuously increased the majority of applications could not be supported because of the limited TEMPUS budget.

The projects supported by TEMPUS I can be considered by and large as successful and important for the development of higher education in the CEE partner countries. Nevertheless, not all potentials and possibilities were used to foster dissemination of results and spin-offs of project activities beyond the "islands" of innovation in individual departments or faculties supported.

The policy formation for the TEMPUS Programme in the CEE partner countries has gradually become more targeted to the needs of the individual countries. This development underlines the increasing awareness of all actors concerned with higher education on the national level in terms of the potentials of the TEMPUS Programme.

The administration of the TEMPUS Programme in the CEE partner countries can be considered as efficient and appropriate in the face of the complexity and necessity for continuous adaptation of the Programme, the number of institutions and subject areas included and the range of measures of support within the Programme.

Although a substantial contribution of TEMPUS I to the development of higher education in the CEE partner countries can be observed, further efforts will be necessary at least in some of the CEE partner countries to reach a level of achievement and progress in higher education renewal and restructuring which utilizes the potentials of the TEMPUS Programme to a fuller extent in order to reach the aims and objectives of the Programme.

TEMPUS BUDGET (MECU)					
	1990	1991	1992	1993	total
Albania			1.20	4.90	6.10
Bulgaria		5.00	8.00	15.00	28.00
Czech Republic	2.46	6.00	10.00	8.00	26.46
Estonia			1.00	3.60	4.60
Hungary	6.18	12.00	16.00	16.00	50.18
Latvia			1.50	4.70	6.20
Lithuania			1.50	5.20	6.70
Poland	12.35	13.50	26.00	35.00	86.85
Romania		10.00	13.00	18.00	41.00
Slovenia			2.30	3.50	5.80
Slovakia	1.23	3.00	5.00	5.00	14.23
Sub-total	22.23	49.50	85.50	118.90	276.13
Regional funds		15.00	12.50	10.25	37.75
former DDR	0.93				0.93
Yugoslavia		6.00			6.00
Grand total	23.16	70.50	98.00	129.15	320.81