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I. Executive Summary

Background

The present study was carried out by the Academic Cooperation Association (ACA) in the period between February and May 2000, for the Directorate General Education and Culture of the European Commission.

The terms of reference (TOR) required the contractor to provide the European Commission with recommendations concerning a coherent future European Union cooperation policy with non-Union countries ("third countries") in the field of education and training, which would contribute to enhance the quality of education and training inside the Union. In order to develop the recommendations, a three-step-methodology was proposed to and agreed with the European Commission. The three steps in question, which also guide the structure of this report, are

Component I: This initial part of the study is empirical and analytical in nature and consists of an inventory of the Union's third country cooperation programmes. Only programmes with non-European target regions and countries have been included in this overview. Furthermore, the definition of a "programme" applied in the study eliminated any schemes lacking a clear transnational cooperation element, such as "technical assistance projects" (cf. p. 17sq.). This way, a set of 25 programmes have been selected which form the basis of the ensuing analysis. It must be stressed that the criteria thus applied for inclusion in the inventory exclude vast programmes with Central and Eastern Europe (such as TEMPUS, and the wider Phare and Tacis framework schemes) and a wide range of "technical assistance" projects in developing countries1, which together make up the bulk of the EU's external engagement both in budgetary and in activity volume terms.

The analysis of the selected programmes was carried out with the help of standard indicators derived from the terms of reference, which are

- duration
- budget
- rationale and aims
- geographical focus
- sector of the overall education and training system
- beneficiaries
- cooperation activities
- subject area / thematic focus
- programme design

Component II: This part of the report depicts the state-of-the-art in international cooperation. Unlike component I, it focuses on higher education only. Its findings are based on a review of the most recent literature on internationalisation and

---

1 It must be stressed that this approach did not mean the elimination of developing countries from the scope of the inventory of programmes. The geographical coverage of the inventory does not exclude any countries. However, the definition of "programme" applied in the study, which is a standard one by any measure, does in fact entail as a consequence the exclusion of a host of education-related activities which the Union conducts with developing countries, particularly in the ACP region.
international cooperation. The state-of-the-art mainly serves the purpose of providing a qualitative "measure" against which to judge the Union's present third country programmes, and to develop criteria for the formulation of a future third country policy. The decision was made to take a wide perspective in this chapter. Its scope is not limited to cooperation programmes. It also looks at the major trends in international cooperation outside of funding programmes, and it likewise encompasses an analysis of structural traits of higher education and training systems which impact on international cooperation, such as various aspects of quality assurance and enhancement.

Component III: This chapter contains the actual recommendations for a future European Union cooperation policy with non-member countries outside of Europe. It concerns higher education only, and it concentrates, in line with the terms of reference, on cooperation and other measures which can improve the quality of education and training inside the Union. Methodologically speaking, the recommendations are the result of a critical comparison between the findings of the empirical component I and the normative component II, or, differently put, of present practice and future needs.

Component I:  
Overview and Analysis of EU Third Country Cooperation Programmes

The history of the European Union's engagement in cooperation with third countries as defined in this report is a relatively young one. With one single exception, all of the 25 programmes included in the inventory were started in the last decade, and most of them in its second half.

In terms of budgets and activity volume, EU cooperation with non-member states outside of Europe is still a modest undertaking, when compared to Union expenditure for intra-EU cooperation (SOCRATES, LEONARDO) or to activities of the member states. The total expenditure since the beginning of the 1990s for the programmes included in the inventory amounts to less than 300 million EUR. Activity volumes (such as, for example, mobility flows) are likewise modest when compared to the "turnover" of the Union's internal education and training programmes or those of the member states in the same field. Within this general scope, there are important differences: the smallest programme has a budget of a mere 240,000 EUR per annum, and an activity volume consisting of the mobility of 24 persons only, while the largest one has a budget of 38.4 MEUR over five years and an impressive range of activities. It must also be stressed that programmes under preparation tend to be larger-scale than most of those operating at present.

In terms of geographical reach, EU third country cooperation now covers most regions and countries of the world. However, in many cases, individual target countries or regions are "serviced" by one or two rather small programmes only. The

---

2 The authors which to make it clear that the focus on quality-enhancing cooperation in this study does not signify that they regard a European Union engagement in collaboration motivated by other aims, such as development, as of no or a lesser importance. It is their conviction that the Union has the obligation to continue its substantial efforts in development, also and in particular in the field of education and training.
latter can also be the case with a whole continent, such as the Americas. Overall, Asia is the clear focal region of EU efforts, with China and Japan leading the table. Looking at the EU’s choice of partner countries with regard to their economic power, EU cooperation concerns developed, emerging, and developing countries alike.

In terms of sectoral priorities, the picture is that the majority of programmes caters for the higher education sector (about two thirds). Continuing training, mainly in the field of management, comes second. A third, but very small category, is made up of all sorts of "other" organisations, schools and cultural or media institutions. This picture is mirrored by the beneficiaries of the programmes, both at an institutional and individual level. The group of institutional beneficiaries is led by universities (and occasionally other types of higher education institutions). Companies come a distant second. Individual beneficiaries benefiting from EU cooperation with non-Union countries are, in that order, higher education students, academic staff and company personnel.

Overall, the mobility of persons is by far the preferred activity in EU cooperation, although there are obviously notable exceptions with regard to individual programmes. The creation of institutions (mostly European Studies centres in Asia), which also serve as a "carrier" of cooperative activity with the EU, is another recurring activity form (referred to later as "institution-cum-programme"). Further frequent cooperation activities are the development of curricula and the creation of teaching materials, as well as the organisation of conferences and seminars. When compared to intra-EU cooperation (SOCRATES and LEONARDO, and their predecessor schemes, for example ERASMUS or COMETT), activity types such as recognition and credit transfer and "virtual cooperation" using new information and communication technologies are quite rare.

Between them, EU third country cooperation programmes cover the whole range of subject areas and a wide array of thematic orientations. About one third of all programmes are entirely subject-unspecific or include a very wide range subjects and themes. The remaining two thirds of programmes either limit participation to a restricted set of disciplines or themes, or, mostly, are devoted to one single discipline. Priority disciplines in this second category are business and management studies, as well as European studies.

The design of the majority of EU third country programmes is remarkably traditional and makes little use of the experiences made and the stage of development reached in intra-EU education and training cooperation. The majority of programmes focuses on the participation of individuals rather than institutions. Likewise, third country cooperation displays a preference for bilateral cooperation, as distinct from cooperation in the type of multilateral networks on which SOCRATES and LEONARDO and their predecessor schemes are based. Obviously, there are exceptions to this general trend, such as the EC-US and EC Canada programmes, which are outstanding in many other respects too, or the ALFA Programme. Also, some programmes under preparation in Asian target regions (for example Asia-Link and the ASEAN-EU University Network Programme) deviate from the general

3 The concept behind the distinction into "bilateral" and "multilateral" programmes is explained in Chapter III, 3.7). In essence, a "bilateral" programme is understood to be one which does not require, on the European side, the participation of more than one partner from more than one EU country.
trend, indicating that a paradigm shift might be under way. A minority of programmes are structured on a model beyond the above distinction, in that they primarily serve to create and run a "centre", "school" or even a whole institution.

In their predominantly bilateral and individual approach, the majority of EU third country cooperation programmes differ surprisingly little from the schemes run by member states. This raises questions about the extent of their "European value added" and their innovative potential. Given scarce financial resources, the Union would be well-advised to develop and adopt a Community-specific programme formula along the lines of institutional involvement and multilateral network structures, as it has done in intra-EU cooperation.

Component II: The State of the Art in International Cooperation in Higher Education and Training

With respect to the "state of the art" of internationalisation, five main trends can be identified which will be of immediate relevance for the design of EU cooperation policies with non-member States:

With respect to the still most dominant form of international cooperation, student mobility, one should note that student mobility from other continents into the European Union is well developed, but not competitive enough on the international market. The imbalance of student mobility flows from outside of Europe, which increasingly favour the already over-demanded US, but also Canada and Australia, over European destinations (with the exception of the UK), point to several obstacles with respect to incoming students in Europe: here one should point to immigration laws which still inhibit academic flows into Europe, lack of marketing and professionally designed information on higher education institutions and systems for non-European potential applicants, lack of systematic quality assurance or publicised quality labels of higher education providers, lack of attention paid to the learner, and less consumer-friendly service cultures. Competitive advantages such as the wealth of experience which has been gained in Europe - more than elsewhere - in questions of recognition of study abroad periods and mutual transparency of widely differing systems of education is predominantly used internally but does not seem to be exploited in the wider international cooperation market. The European Union has either failed to fully address these mobility obstacles for students from out of Europe, or has failed to sell the advantages of studying in the European Union. Instead many higher education institutions and some governmental agencies in Europe have perhaps concentrated too exclusively on the European internal market of exchange students.

In recent years, other forms of cooperation have gained in visibility and emphasis. Teaching staff mobility and joint curriculum development, both activities which presuppose dense communication and exchange between partner institutions, involve academics in addition to requiring institutional decisions at other levels (e.g. to allow for the adoption of new courses and integration of incoming teaching staff). European institutions of higher education have gained ample experience in this field, more so than institutions elsewhere in the world. Nevertheless, what could be a competitive edge is not always exploited as such. With regard to curriculum development, it is particularly surprising to note that the dense cooperation in Europe in this field has
not resulted in greater presence of European products on the rapidly expanding global market of educational products, which is strongly dominated by American providers. Such market advantages of US providers can only be attributed to their more widespread use of ICT, the availability of such course material in English, the will to reach a wider audience and to better marketing of these products.

The rate at which contacts are being established inside and outside Europe is steadily increasing. With the use of ICT, communication and exchange across borders has become even easier so that multilateral forms of cooperation are transforming from being a communicational challenge into relative normality. European higher education institutions are characterised by a well-developed density of such networks of contacts which have in some cases expanded into inter-institutional networks. Only rarely, however, are such networks used strategically to position the ingredient institutions in a more advantageous manner on the international market, for example by being able to offer pooled expertise in a network of different but complementary specialisation.

With restricted budgets and reduced state intervention, quality management and the efficient use of public funds have become the topic of the nineties. While most individual European countries do not have a tradition of quality assurance agencies overseeing quality enhancement, such agencies have recently been established with the input of already existing systems of quality assurance of other EU members. Different agents involved in quality improvement of higher education are increasingly exchanging information and experience across borders. As yet, such progress has not yet resulted in a qualitatively more transparent European space of higher education, however. Moreover, only recently have quality assurance procedures like the "Internationalisation Quality Review" been used to cover issues of internationalisation. Quality is clearly becoming the central focus of cooperation in higher education as more and more inter-university contacts accumulate and greater selectivity becomes necessary. With quality enhancement in mind, cooperation activities all over the world are being institutionalised and integrated into the profile or even the strategic development of higher education institutions. Helped by national regulations or such cooperation frameworks as ERASMUS/SOCRATES, the systematic integration of cooperation activities into a wider institutional framework, enhancing efficiency as well as the potential for synergies, is taking root in Europe. However, only if the attention paid to issues of quality were to become more visible and effects of quality improvement in Europe were to become noticed even outside of Europe, would European higher education retrieve its former reputation of offering top-level educational services and research.

As world-wide communication becomes easier with the help of ICT, the idea of conquering the world market of educational products and services is increasingly attracting business-minded established institutions and profit-based new providers in a race in which most traditional higher education institutions have as yet been left far behind. Hence new demands are being made on the presentation and marketing of any institution which tries to enter the world-wide competition in higher education. The emerging market of educational products and services, which most European higher education institutions are not sufficiently aware of, is generally regarded as a gold mine, not only because of its prospects (due to the value attributed to knowledge
for economic survival in developed countries), but also because of its risks (due to the relative lack of consumer protection).

Component II: Recommendations

The following recommendations concern two types of related, but separate measures. The first set focuses on cooperation programmes as such, i.e. programmes of the type contained in the inventory. The second group of recommendations concern a wider range of measures, which relate to systemic aspects of higher education systems and institutions in Europe, and which are meant to improve the framework conditions for third country cooperation of European higher education institutions.

Regarding cooperation programmes as such, the conclusions of the study are

♦ that, given that resources for EU third country cooperation must be expected to remain scarce, rather than spreading resources widely, the Union should concentrate its efforts and set clear priorities, particularly with regard to preferential target regions and countries; and that one of the criteria for setting country/regional priorities should be the strength and innovative power of the partners' education and training systems;
♦ that the Union should continue in its emphasis on the higher education sector (the latter understood as including non-university tertiary institutions);
♦ that the Union should balance out its present mobility-of-persons focus by the use of a wider spectrum of cooperation activities, and notably by enhancing ICT-based forms of cooperation and by curriculum development measures;
♦ that the Union should make better use than has been the case so far of the experiences gained in its successful intra-EU programmes. In this regard, the programme design developed in intra-European education and training cooperation, with its emphasis on the participation of institutions rather than individuals, and on multilateral networks rather than bilateral cooperation, should become the role model for EU third country cooperation. Likewise, heightened efforts in the field of recognition and credit transfer are recommended.

Regarding "systemic measures", which are aimed at improving the general framework conditions for the third country cooperation of European higher education institutions, the recommendations are that the Union

♦ help to facilitate "access" to European higher education for students from third countries (and scholars) by removing bureaucratic obstacles and by improving the provision of services by the institutions;
♦ help to improve the "readability" of Europe's higher education systems for non-Europeans by further supporting the objectives of the Bologna Declaration and, in particular, support tendencies towards a more unified degree structure in Europe;
♦ encourage Europe's higher education institutions to better promote themselves and their services globally through a variety of measures, amongst them the marketing of genuinely European "flagship products" (joint/double degrees developed through SOCRATES/ERASMUS) and the creation of "good practice guides" for marketing, in respect of which many countries of continental Europe are lagging behind their main competitors (US, Australia);
support the creation of European labels for quality assurance and accreditation, in order to safeguard quality standards at a European level and to communicate them to the world outside Europe;

encourage higher education institutions to provide, on top of their "domestic" courses normally taught in the national language(s), degree and other courses taught in major world languages mastered by potential students;

face the challenge of "transnational education" by supporting the creation and development of European educational alliances and their products which would be competitive on a global scale, inclusive of the effective use of advanced ICT, and by supporting the creation of joint European offshore campuses in third countries.
II. Background

1. Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the present study "The Globalisation of Education and Training: Recommendations for a Coherent Response of the European Union" (Tender No. 21/99 DG Education and Culture) basically set two main aims to be fulfilled by the contractor:

- to create an overview and, more important still, to provide an analysis of the European Union's cooperation programmes in education and training with third countries, and;
- second, to contribute, by way of recommendations, to the formulation of a future EU third country cooperation policy which would respond in a coherent and meaningful way to the challenges posed by the ongoing process of economic globalisation and the need for an enhancement of the quality of education and training inside the Union.

The TOR provide a broad categorisation of EU third country cooperation by different policy interests. They differentiate between programmes which support the process of the Union's enlargement (mainly in Central and Eastern Europe) and are thus part of a pre-accession strategy; programmes which are part of the Union's development cooperation policies (mainly, but not exclusively, with ACP countries); programmes which promote the "visibility of the EU as a global player"; programmes geared to promote commerce and trade with third countries; and, last but not least, programmes which are driven by an essentially educational rationale and which, in line with articles 149 and 150 of the Amsterdam Treaty aim, *inter alia*, at an enhancement of the quality of education and training inside the Union.

Analysis

The TOR specify that one important measuring rod to be used in the analysis of present programmes ("analysis of status quo") should be the latter of these policy objectives, i.e. the enhancement of the quality of education and training inside the Union. In other words, the analysis should answer the question to which extent the present arsenal of programmes complies with the objectives of educationally-motivated cooperation and to which extent it is likely to promote the objectives stated in articles 149 and 150 of the Amsterdam Treaty. It is further specified that an important aspect of the analysis is to explore to which extent these programmes reflect and put to optimum use the experience made over the last 15 years with the "internal" EU programmes in education and training (SOCRATES and LEONARDO and their predecessors). As to more concrete criteria for the analysis, the TOR suggest:

- geographical spread and coverage (countries and regions targeted);

---

4 The term "third country" is not to be confused with "third world country". The term "third country" simply denotes any country which is not a member of the European Union, and thus falls into the remit of the European Union's external relations. In this study, the terms "third country" and "non-member state" are therefore used synonymously.
• thematic focus (themes and disciplines covered);
• activities supported (mobility, curriculum development….);
• the target groups (beneficiaries), and, particularly;
• the "structure" of the programmes, i.e. their "format" or design.

Recommendations

Based on the above analysis, the TOR further require the contractor to "provide the basis for the formulation of a comprehensive EU strategy on education and training". The recommendations expected in this regard should reflect the aims and objectives of articles 149, 150 and 300 of the Amsterdam Treaty. In other words, the recommendations are to concentrate on the question how EU cooperation with third countries can contribute to the development high-quality education and training inside the Union and for its citizens.

In respect of the concept of high-quality education and training, the TOR contain an important specification or interpretation. "High-quality of education and training" is understood in terms of providing a convincing answer to the challenge of economic globalisation. The question posed is therefore which internationalisation strategy the Union should adopt as a response to the growing interdependence of the world's economies. More concretely, the expectation is voiced that recommendations will be given on how to increase links between national education and training systems, on how to provide increased opportunities for the citizens to acquire "international knowledge and experience", on how to promote "individual mobility", on how to internationalise curricula and "innovative methods in teaching and learning", and how to best secure the influx of innovation from other advanced systems of education.

As a consequence of the demand to respond to the globalisation challenge, the TOR limit the geographic catchment area of the recommendations (but not of the inventory and analysis of programmes) to "cooperation with countries and regions which have the highest standards of education and training, including in particular the OECD countries, Latin America and South-East Asia."

Beyond this, the contractor is expected to provide recommendations on such items as mentioned already above, such as the major activity types, thematic and disciplinary foci, target groups and structures (formulas) of EU third country programmes. With regard to the latter, the TOR also make it clear (at any rate implicitly) that the contractor is expected to comment on the relative benefits or otherwise of the use to be made in third country cooperation of the main programme features developed in intra-European education and training cooperation (networking, multilaterality, etc.). Additionally, the TOR require the contractor to make recommendations on the way the new information and communication technologies (ICT) could be used.

2. The ACA Proposal

In response to the above TOR, ACA submitted to the European Commission a project proposal, the main lines of which are reflected in the structure and content of the
present study. ACA proposed a methodology which results in three main components of the study, namely

- an inventory and analysis of past, present and planned EU third country programmes (component I);
- a review of the state of the art in international cooperation and internationalisation, with a view both to current best practice as well as to the scholarly debate of the subject (literature review) (component II);
- a set of recommendations for future EU third country cooperation, as a result of a comparison of present EU practice in third country cooperation with the international state of the art (component III);

Component I

Component I of the study, its empirical and analytical part, consists of an overview of all EU cooperation programmes in education and training with third countries, as well as an analysis of the entirety of these programmes. This analysis serves the aim of identifying the underlying policy pattern (if any) of EU third country cooperation as a whole.

The proposal for the inventory, and ensuing analysis, largely excludes research programmes. The definition of a third country as excluding any country on the continent of Europe, which the inventory is based on, emerged out of a later agreement with DG EAC and was not yet part of the original proposal. Other specifications relating to the concept and definition of an "EU education and training programme", and leading to an exclusion of certain programme types (technical assistance measures, measures without a transnational element) are likewise the result of a later understanding brought about with DG Education and Training. It must be noted that these latter specifications, while not excluding in any way cooperation programmes with developing countries, do in fact eliminate from the scope of the inventory sizeable activity which the Union conducts in the field of education and training with developing countries (and ACP countries in particular), but which are not "programmes" in the sense of this study.

The proposal makes it clear beyond doubt that the identification and documentation of the programmes in question (inventory) is not to be an end in itself, but rather a necessary first step for an analysis of the main trends governing EU third country cooperation. It was therefore stressed that, while by no means disregarding demands on comprehensiveness, the degree of detail to be covered in the inventory would be governed (i.e. limited) by the needs of the ensuing analysis.

Component II

In contrast to component I, which is empirical, component II is normative. This part of the study is to provide DG Education and Culture with a state-of-the-art report on internationalisation, both in terms of current best practice, and with regard to the present expert debate on internationalisation and international cooperation. It is essentially a review of up-to-date research literature and policy documents. As
outlined in the proposal, the overriding concern in this state-of-the-art report will be the concept of quality, and the various ways in which international cooperation can enhance the quality of the education and training systems inside the EU.

The proposal already indicated different quality concepts that could be followed in international cooperation. The basic differentiation used was that between "quality in cooperation" and "quality through cooperation". Broadly speaking, the first approach looks at what constitutes a quality programme. The second one addresses the question how cooperation can be used to "import" quality and innovation from other countries, i.e. it looks at cooperation basically as a "channel" or "carrier" for system innovation and enhancement.

In order to do justice to both concepts of quality, the issue of cooperation will be addressed with a wide approach. The state-of-the-art report not only covers cooperation programmes as such, but also addresses a wider set of measures and framework conditions which contribute to the internationalisation of education and training, and which take place outside of what is classically understood to be a cooperation programme.

Unlike component one, which addresses the whole spectrum of education and training sectors, this chapter focuses on higher education. This specification, which was not yet made in the proposal, emerged from later discussions with DG Education and Culture.

Component III

As already stated in the proposal, component III of the present study consist of the recommendations, which should support the European Commission in formulating future policy priorities in third country cooperation. The recommendations are obviously the key element of the study, for which the two previous chapters provide the necessary groundwork. Methodologically speaking, the recommendations are a result of the comparison of the results of the analysis of the status quo (component I) with the (normative) needs emerging from state-of-the-art report (component II). The recommendations concern the field of higher education only.
III. Component I: EU Third Country Cooperation Programmes: Overview and Analysis

1. Introduction

1.1. Identification of Programmes

The identification of EU third country cooperation programmes was facilitated by the fact that ACA, as an expert organisation in the field of international cooperation in (higher) education, knew of the existence of a large number of these programmes already prior to commencing work on this study.

To identify any further programmes, ACA used the following approach:

♦ it collected and reviewed internal documentation (overview tables) of third country programmes which had been produced during the last three years by DG Education and Culture and by DG External Relations;
♦ it made contact with DG Education and Culture, DG External Relations, DG Research and DG Development, asking these services to identify programmes not known to ACA. In this vein, it particularly used Commission desk officers responsible for programmes known to ACA as "multipliers", enquiring with them about the existence of further programmes in their region, or beyond;
♦ it conducted a systematic search of the websites of the above-named services, with a view to identifying further programmes;
♦ it reviewed Commission overview publications with a bearing on education and training of the above-named services;
♦ it sent a letter to all EU Delegations in Austral-Asia, the Americas, North Africa and the Arabic countries, asking to name any EU education and training cooperation programme involving "their" country. About half of the Delegations answered, often with detailed information.

1.2. Collection of Information on Individual Programmes

Based on the programmes identified through the above-named measures, more in-depth information on each of these programmes was collected in basically two ways.

♦ review of any programme documentation available, such as websites of individual programmes, printed programme brochures, vademeca and users' guides, application packages, as well as programme evaluation reports;
♦ collection of further information, particularly on issues which the above documentation did not answer satisfactorily, through personal interviews (Brussels-based Commission and technical assistance staff), telephone interviews and, in case of questions of secondary importance, by e-mail contact.5

5 A list of all persons who provided information to this project is annexed to this report.
1.3. Definition of the Scope of the Inventory and Analysis

EU activity in the field of foreign policy with some sort of bearing on education and training is manifold. As one of our interlocutors remarked, "most EU measures in or in relation to third countries entail some sort of training components". It is clear that such a wide interpretation of the term "third country cooperation programme" was not intended by DG Education and Culture. However, the above statement also makes apparent the need to more closely delineate the type of measures to be included in the inventory and analysis. This will be done below, by specifying more closely the central elements of the definition of "third country cooperation programmes" as used in this study.

Geographic Scope

Generally, in a European Union context, a "third country" is simply one which is not a member of the European Union. If one applies this understanding, any country outside the Europe of 15 falls into the scope of this study.

There are good reasons not to apply such a wide interpretation. A number of non-Union countries in Europe, such as those forming part of the European Economic Area (EEA) as well as certain accession countries in Central and Eastern Europe, already participate in the intra-EU education and training programmes SOCRATES and LEONARDO and cannot, for this reason, be regarded under educational terms as third countries. Cooperation measures with further countries in Europe, particularly in Southeast Europe and in the CIS, are inspired mainly by such considerations as peace keeping, stability and democracy and are thus not or not primarily educationally motivated.

Beyond excluding Europe (in a geographical sense), the terms of reference would also justify the exclusion of developing countries in general, and of Sub-Saharan Africa in particular. They allow an interpretation which would restrict cooperation to countries of a relatively similar level of economic development, and thus exclude all ACP countries. If one applied this selection criterion of near-economic parity strictly, this would even lead to a radical reduction of "third countries" to such of an OECD-type.

The approach adopted is one between the two extremes. For the purposes of the inventory and analysis of EU cooperation programmes, a "third country" is any state outside of Europe (in a geographical sense). Readers should note, however, that the recommendations (component III) will be focussed on a more limited number of target countries, which exclude the developing world.

Education and Training

While the terms of reference for the study generally speak of education and training in a wide sense (and sometimes even include the area of collaboration geared towards young people outside the education and training sector), they also entail certain indications that might justify a focus on higher education and training. The authors
therefore had to choose whether to restrict the scope of the inventory and analysis to programmes focusing on higher education, or to apply a wide understanding which would also include other sectors of education and training, such as, for example, primary, basic, secondary and adult education and initial and continuing training.

Furthermore, irrespective of this decision and with particular regard to higher education, the choice had to be made whether to concentrate entirely on the education function of higher education institutions, or to also cover research.

*The inventory and analysis of EU third country cooperation programmes will include all areas of education and training. Readers should note, however, that the subsequent chapters of the study (state of the art in international cooperation and recommendations) will narrow down the focus to higher education. Throughout the whole study, the area of research is excluded, with the exception of programmes catering for postgraduate and doctoral students.*

Another decision item was whether to limit the inventory and analysis, as indeed the entire study, to such programmes which involve institutions of education and training, and/or individuals from such institutions, or to also include programmes which do not cater for these actors, but the content (product) of which is education and training. This differentiation is by no means of a hair-splitting sort. There is a large number of EU programmes (particularly with Asian countries in the field of management education) which target young company executives who spend an internship in an enterprise on the other continent. These programmes "deliver" education and training, but they do not involve institutions or persons from the education and training sector.

*The inventory and analysis will include both programmes which deliver an education and/or training product and programmes which involve persons and institutions from the education and training field.*

**Cooperation**

In the course of the identification of programmes, the authors met with widely diverging concepts of cooperation. It is therefore necessary to clarify the concept underlying the inventory.

First, as stated earlier, there is a certain tendency in the TOR for the selection of partner countries along the lines of economic prowess. In parallel to this tendency, we found an understanding of the term cooperation which presupposes that the cooperating states would be roughly equals.

*As far as the inventory and analysis is concerned, and in line with the earlier geographic decision, this narrow understanding will not be applied. Cooperation with developing countries forms part of the inventory and analysis. However, the later parts of the study (components II and III) will be guided by a concentration on relatively equal partners.*

Second, the term cooperation is almost invariably understood as presupposing a transnational nature of a programme. The question is, however, which are the
minimum demands on the extent of the involvement of both sides and, particularly, on that of the European partners. In a minimum understanding of transnationality, it suffices that the European Union acts as (co-)funder of a measure, that a small number of experts from EU countries are involved in its implementation, but that it is otherwise fully focused on the third country. Such schemes are many, and they generally serve to develop and enhance the capacity of the system of education and training in the third country, or parts thereof. They are particularly numerous in developing countries, and they anyway always aim at developing (in a wider sense) structures and institutions.

A more maximalist understanding of transnationality requires a more balanced involvement of both partners (EU and third countries). The demands on transnationality in this concept are that institutions or individuals from both sides participate in joint projects. In most cases, the transnational element is provided by the mobility of persons, but there could be other cooperation activities, such as joint development of curricula, to name only one.

The concept of cooperation underlying this study is based on the latter, more comprehensive understanding of transnationality. Readers should note that this decision reduces the number of programmes in the inventory very considerably. They should also be aware that the lion's share of EU funds goes into the programmes thus excluded.

Programme

A related, but slightly different problem is contained in the understanding of the term "programme".

The classical understanding of the term is based on the notion of open access to a defined type of eligible participants (institutions and/or individuals) through regular calls for proposals. As distinct from this concept, there are what the authors prefer to label as "projects". The latter enable one organisation (or a consortium of organisations), identified normally through a call for tender, to carry out one particular measure in a third country. This measure, or series of measures, often falls into the category excluded under "cooperation", i.e. system enhancement projects. The measures in question are often referred to as "technical assistance projects". Should the study include such measures?

This study, with regard to the inventory and analysis of programmes, as indeed throughout, is based on the classical understanding of a cooperation programme, and thus only includes programmes which are open through regular calls for proposals to a defined set of institutions and individuals on both sides. Again, it must be underlined that a substantial part of the EU's overall education and training engagement in third countries thus falls outside the scope of the study.

A second decision had to be made with regard to institutes, centres or schools that have been set up by the European Union together with one or a number of third countries. The Union has helped to establish a substantial number of such organisms, mainly, but not exclusively, in Asia. Most, but not all of these centres act as the
"carrier" of some sort of operational transnational activity. Should the creation, and running of such institutions be regarded as a programme or not?

The inventory of programmes, as well as the analysis, will include centres of the type described above only if they also organise some "operational" activity, such as mobility to and from the centre (which will be further referred to as "institutions-cum-programme"). Centres without any operational programme element (such as the "European Union Centres" in the United States) will be excluded.

**Time Frame**

A decision needed to be taken on whether to limit the inventory to such programmes which were operational at the time of completion of the study, or whether to also include programmes which had already come to an end (or had been temporarily interrupted), as well as programmes planned to start in the near future.

*It was decided to adopt a comprehensive approach, including past and present programmes, as well as such which are currently under preparation.*

**Definition**

To sum up, for the purposes of the inventory of programmes, EU-third country cooperation programmes

♦ are geographically confined to countries outside of Europe (as a continent);
♦ cover any area/sector of the education and training system (exclusive of research) or deliver an education and/or training product;
♦ contain a clear transnational element, i.e. involve institutions and/or persons from both EU and third countries;
♦ are organised in the form of regular calls for proposals open to a defined set of participants (institutions, persons);
♦ comprise past and present programmes and programmes under preparation.
2. Overview

Applying the above concept, a total of 25\(^{6}\) EU third country cooperation programmes were identified. The table below lists these programmes in alphabetical order, together with the Directorate General responsible for each. More information on each of these programmes is contained in the "programmed data sheets", in the annex to this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Acronym</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>DG Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADIA</td>
<td>ACADIA Internship Programme</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEMC</td>
<td>ASEAN-EC Management Centre</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALFA</td>
<td>Amérique Latine - Formation Académique</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEF</td>
<td>Asia Europe Foundation</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIA LINK (working title)</td>
<td></td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUNP</td>
<td>ASEAN-EU University Network Programme</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIBS</td>
<td>China-Europe International Business School</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EABIP</td>
<td>Euro-Asian Business Internship Programme</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAMS</td>
<td>EURO-Arab Business School</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECAN</td>
<td>EU-China Academic Network</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU-China Higher Education Cooperation Programme</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/CND Programme</td>
<td>Cooperation in Higher Education and Training between the European Community and Canada</td>
<td>Education and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/US Programme</td>
<td>Cooperation in Higher Education and Vocational Education and Training between the European Community and the United States of America</td>
<td>Education and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>European Studies Programmes in the Philippines, Malaysia, Vietnam, Thailand, Pakistan, India</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETP/Japan</td>
<td>Executive Training Programme / Japan</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETP/Korea</td>
<td>Executive Training Programme / Korea</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-CJMTP</td>
<td>EU-China Junior Managers Training Programme</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU-India Economic Cross-Cultural Programme</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCO</td>
<td>International Cooperation Programme within the 5(^{th}) Framework-Programme</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEM</td>
<td>Jean Monnet Scholarship Programme(^ {7})</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED CAMPUS</td>
<td>Junior EU-ASEAN Managers Programme</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS</td>
<td>Postgraduate Technological Studies Programme</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VULCANUS</td>
<td>VULCANUS in Japan / VULCANUS in Europe</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU-CHINA 2000 Scholarship Programme (working title)</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be repeated once again that the inventory of programmes is not an end in itself. Although systematic research has been conducted in order to identify all programmes fitting the definition in III.1.3., the authors cannot exclude the possibility that one or two escaped their attention. While this would indeed be deplorable, it would not substantially weaken the validity of the analysis undertaken, which aims at identifying the main patterns of EU third country programme policy.

\(^{6}\) counting the six European Studies Programmes (ESP) as one single programme.

\(^{7}\) not to be confused with the intra-European "Jean Monnet Project"
3. Analysis

The analysis below is based on the information contained in the "programme data sheets" (see annex). The structure roughly follows that of the individual information items of these data sheets.

3.1. History and Scope of Programmes

The history of the Union's involvement in educational collaboration with third countries outside of Europe is a relatively young one. The oldest programme identified, the Executive Training Programme with Japan, started already in 1979, but it remained the only one for a long time. Of the 25 programmes included in the inventory8, only five (ETP Japan plus the China-Europe Business School, the EC-US Scheme, Med Campus and INCO9) were launched in the first half of the last decade. This means that the overwhelming majority of programmes were set up only very recently or are in fact still under preparation (ASEAN-EU University Network Programme, Asia Link, EU-China 2000 Scholarship Programme, various European Studies Programmes). In other words, EU third country cooperation in education and training is, by and large, a very recent phenomenon. Although the overall volume of operations is still very modest, as will be seen below, the growth rate in recent years is not to be underestimated.

In terms of size, EU third country collaboration as defined above is a very small field of operation. The TOR for the present study estimate annual expenditure for third country collaboration at 650 MEUR per year. The lion's share of expenditure contained in this figure, however, is devoted to programmes with European non-member states (through TEMPUS, as well as the wider PHARE and TACIS budgets, and/or to "technical assistance projects", both of which were excluded from this study). Excluding INCO, as well as the programmes under preparation10, the total amount spent on the programmes contained in the inventory between 1992 and today was a mere 277 MEUR. Given that most programmes were started only in the second half of the 1990s (and some of those with more substantial budgets have not been launched yet), a good deal of the spending occurred in the very recent years. There are also important differences between programmes, though. Larger-scale operations, such as the ALFA Programme covering all of Latin and Central America, had a budget of 38.4 MEUR for its initial five-year phase. At the other end of the spectrum, the ACADIA internship scheme with Canada was budgeted at a mere 240,000 EUR per annum.

Still, whichever way it is viewed, spending on EU third country cooperation to date is close to a quantité négligeable. For comparison, the budgets for intra-EU education and training cooperation (SOCRATES and LEONARDO) in their present phase amount to an annual average of 264 MEUR and 164 MEUR respectively11. The spending of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), only one of the

8 counting the six European Studies Programmes as one single programme
9 INCO, though, had an earlier predecessor scheme under a different name
10 INCO was excluded because of its disproportionately high budget
11 The overall financial envelope for the two programmes between 2000 and 2006 are 1.85 BEUR and 1.15 BEUR respectively.
internationalisation agencies of one single (though the largest) member state, for cooperation programmes with Australasia, Latin America and North America amounts to over 80 MEUR per year\textsuperscript{12}.

In terms of the volume of activity, EU third country cooperation can also in no way compare with intra-European cooperation or with member state activity. Due to the lack of reliable data, and to the difficulty in quantifying activity other than the mobility of persons, exact figures cannot be provided. However, an example might illustrate orders of magnitude. The EU-China 2000 Scholarship Programme, one of the biggest EU third country schemes, is scheduled to fund the mobility of 2,000 persons over a five-year duration\textsuperscript{13}. One of the smallest programmes, ACADIA, will fund 24 persons per year only. The turnover of most programmes lies between these two extremes, though normally much closer to the ACADIA than the EU-China 2000 example. To put these figures into perspective again, the number of persons who received mobility grants from or to Australasian, and North, Central and Latin American destinations in 1998 by the before-mentioned German agency DAAD alone was over 14,000\textsuperscript{14}.

Given that, both in financial and activity-related terms, the turnover of EU third country cooperation in education and training is less than substantial, it is clear even before any more detailed analysis that a major impact of these measures cannot be expected unless efforts will be concentrated on particular targets.

3.2. Rationales and Objectives

The findings in this section are based on an analysis of the stated aims and purposes of the programmes. Therefore, the analysis reflects in the first place the self-perceptions and ambitions of the European Union (and Commission in particular).

Most programmes are guided by more than one purpose. A large number of the stated objectives are of a highly general sort. The relationship between the stated aim and the particular activity of many programmes is sometimes far from obvious. Some programme documentation differentiates between "wider" or "general" objectives and very practical aims, the latter of which are frequently stated in operational terms and often simply repeat the activities supported by the programmes.

The most common rationale of EU third country cooperation programmes is the most general of all, the creation of mutual understanding between the (countries and peoples of) the European Union and the respective partner country or region. In many cases, however, this aim is coupled with considerations of political influence and access to the economic markets of the target regions. In other words, this objective often has the status of some kind of preamble, followed by more palpable and interest-guided aims.

\textsuperscript{12} cf. DAAD Annual Report 1998
\textsuperscript{13} The overall duration of the programme is foreseen to be five years. The operational programme phase is scheduled to extend to four academic years.
\textsuperscript{14} dto.
The second most important cluster of rationales and objectives is of an outright economic nature. The logic is that EU-third country cooperation will lead to a better understanding of foreign markets and foreign business practices in the EU, and therefore improve Europe’s ability to trade and compete with the countries in question. Typically, programmes with Asian partners in the areas of management and business are justified in this way.

As stated before, only such programmes were selected which fulfilled the "education and training" requirement specified in III.1.2. It is therefore not surprising that each of the programmes included in the inventory is at least "implicitly" governed by an educational rationale. On the basis of stated aims, educational objectives are the third most common single category. This rationale is most frequent in higher education-focused schemes, but not restricted to it.

A fourth objective concerns the raising of the Union's visibility in third countries. This concern is most commonly stated in the context of European Studies-based initiatives. The concept of "European visibility" does not refer to the single countries of the Union, but to the Union as a whole. The aim is an expression of the Union's ambition to be perceived as a major player on the world stage.

In very few cases, the programme rationale also includes a development cooperation aspect.

3.3. Countries and Regions

As explained earlier, the geographic scope of the study excludes any European target countries. Therefore, no European countries appear in this analysis. The table below lists the target countries of each programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Country/Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADIA</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEMC</td>
<td>ASEAN countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALFA</td>
<td>Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEF</td>
<td>China, Korea, Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Taiwan, Vietnam, Burma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIA Link</td>
<td>all countries in South and Southeast Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUNP</td>
<td>ASEAN countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIBS</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EABIP</td>
<td>China, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAMS</td>
<td>Arab League countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECAN</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-China Higher Education</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC-Canada</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EU third country cooperation programmes do by now show a comprehensive geographic coverage. With the exception of the ACP countries in general, and (Sub-Saharan) Africa in particular, the Union is present on all continents (ACP countries are only included in the INCO Programme of DG Research). However, it must be borne in mind that the overall volume of programmes both in terms of budgets and activity is small, so that even priority countries and regions are not, in absolute terms, covered very densely. Any assessment below is therefore to be understood in relative terms.

In terms of world regions/continents, there is a very clear concentration on Asia. In comparison, all parts of the Americas are only thinly represented, i.e. served by few programmes only. The same goes for North Africa.

Within Asia, there is a clear focus on China, and a slightly lesser focus on Japan and the countries represented in ASEAN. The Asian priority appears to reflect the conviction of the European Union (widely shared by other actors) that this region will continue to grow in importance, with regard both to political weight and economic strength.

In terms of economic development, the countries represented in Asia, but also beyond, cover the whole range from developing to emerging and industrialised countries.

Cooperation with emerging and developing economy countries appears to signal the Union's determination to secure access to and mutually beneficial cooperation with countries which have not yet reached a stage of development comparable to OECD-
type countries, but which are expected to be the future "hothouses" of the world. The strong China focus perhaps best expresses this strategy. In this respect (expected economic and political weight) and compared to China, India is slightly underrepresented, and the emerging economies of Central and Latin America are substantially underrepresented.

Looking at industrialised countries, the geographic spread shows a clear focus on Japan. Of those countries outside Europe and the Gulf States with a per capita GNP of over 10,000 US$ 15 (Japan, Singapore, the US, Australia, Canada, Israel, New Zealand and South Korea), Japan is by far the preferential partner country. Given its economic weight, activity with North America (US and Canada) is clearly underdeveloped. Canada is served by two programmes, the small EC-Canada scheme in higher education and training, and the tiny ACADIA programme. Cooperation with the US is restricted to the EC-US scheme in higher education. Likewise, there is very little cooperation with New Zealand and Australia, and with Israel. Korea's economic potential might be said to be more closely mirrored by EU third country involvement.

Another parameter of relevance for the selection of target countries could be size (measured in terms of population). The country spread represents this indicator fairly well in terms of its concentration on China (largest population in the world) and its relative focus on Japan (8th outside Europe). India as the second-largest country is slightly underrepresented. The cooperation volume with the US certainly does not adequately express the importance of the no. 3 in the world. The same goes for Indonesia (no. 4), Brazil (no.5), Pakistan (no. 6), Bangladesh (no.7) and Mexico (no. 9).

3.4. Sectors and Beneficiaries

In terms of sectors, about two thirds of the programmes contained in the inventory cater for higher education. The remaining one third caters for continuing education and training. These latter schemes predominantly provide management training for young executives in companies. Their geographic focus is almost exclusively Asian.

This picture is mirrored by that of the beneficiaries of the programmes, both institutional and individual. In terms of institutional beneficiaries, higher education institutions are the leading category. In most cases, these are universities, but occasionally, as in the schemes with the US and Canada, the "non-university" sector of higher education is also eligible for participation, as are extra-university research institutions (INCO). The only other sizeable group of institutional beneficiaries consists of companies (predominantly in the management-centred continuing training programmes with Asian destinations, such as ETP/Korea and ETP/Japan, JEM or EU-CJMTP). A third, and distinctly smaller category, is made up of all sorts of "other" organisations, schools, and cultural and media institutions.

Expectedly, this pattern repeats itself in terms of individual beneficiaries. The biggest groups come from higher education. Students make up the largest single group (undergraduate, postgraduate and Ph.D.), closely followed by academic staff. A third

and much smaller cohort of beneficiaries from higher education come from the ranks of administrators. The only other type of individual beneficiaries of any numbers are (young) company executives and managers. As in the institutional category, there is also a small mixed-bag type of "other" individual beneficiaries (civil servants, "officials", policy makers).

3.5. Activities

Between them, the Union's cooperation programmes with third countries cover a comprehensive range of activity types. Activity types which occur more regularly are:

- mobility (of different target groups and for different purposes);
- conferences, seminars and courses;
- curriculum development and development of teaching and training materials;
- joint research and publications;
- creation and enhancement of centres and institutions.

Programmes which focus on one cooperation activity only are slightly more numerous (about 60 percent) than programmes which fund two or more different activity types. Multi-activity programmes can contain up to ten individual activity types, although such diversity (to be found for example in the schemes with Canada and the United States), is rather an exception. The single-activity programmes almost exclusively cater for the mobility of persons.

Given that funding for mobility is also part of almost every multi-activity programme, it is legitimate to say that EU third country cooperation in education and training displays a heavy concentration on measures geared to the mobility of persons. In line with the strong concentration on higher education cooperation (see III.3.5.), mobility programmes target students in the tertiary sector (predominantly, but not exclusively, postgraduate and Ph.D. students), and higher education teaching and research staff (occasionally also administrative staff). Another sizeable target group consists of young professionals and managers from the corporate sector, to be found predominantly in the management-centred continuing training programmes with Asian destinations. A smaller number of programmes also caters for civil servants and all kinds of "officials". While a narrow majority of mobility measures focus on academic purposes (study, teaching and research), training measures of a practical sort (traineeships or internships) are also relatively frequent. The latter concentrate on target groups from the corporate sector, and they mainly provide management training.

In comparison with mobility measures, any other activity types are of almost marginal importance in EU-third country cooperation. Amongst these remaining activities, the development of curricula and of teaching and learning materials and the organisation of events such as seminars, small conferences, workshops and summer-school type of courses play a visible role. The latter are frequently part of "programmes" which are essentially devoted to the creation and development of joint EU-third country centres and institutions (management schools in the main), but where the "centre" or "school" carries out certain operational measures as well, such as mobility or seminars and conferences (referred to in the annexed "programme data sheets" as "institutions-cum-
programme"). The development of curricula is more evenly spread across programme
types. However, it is clearly underrepresented in general, and in particular with a view
to the centrality of curriculum development measures in the present debate on
internationalisation. Joint research is another one of the lesser concentration areas.

With a view to the activity range to be found in intra-EU education and training
programmes, two cooperation activity types are conspicuously absent from third
country cooperation: measures of recognition and credit transfer, and the use of
"virtual" means (distance education, information and communication technologies).
Both, but especially the former, have been a clear priority in the Union's internal
education policies over the last decade. From the documentation available, the only
two existing schemes which could be identified as catering for such activity forms are
the small cooperation programmes with the US and Canada. Asia-Link, a programme
under preparation, is the first Asian programme designed to pay considerable attention
to recognition matters. With a view to the Union's heavy investment in recognition
and credit transfer matters, and its de facto role as a world market leader in the field
with such products as the European Union Course Credit Transfer System (ECTS) or
the Diploma Supplement, the relative absence of measures in this field is one of the
most surprising findings of the present analysis of EU third country cooperation. This
is not to say that there are not any exceptions, such as, above all, the EC-US and EC-
Canada programmes, in which the said activities are a conditio sine qua non for
participation.

3.6. Themes and Disciplines

Between them, EU third country cooperation programmes cover the whole range of
subject areas and a whole array of thematic orientations.

About one third of programmes are entirely subject-unspecific (i.e. open to any
discipline) or include a wide selection of subject areas. Some few programmes are
based on a narrow and very specific range of themes, such as ACADIA (which is
defined not in terms of academic disciplines, but industry sectors) or Med Campus,
which focuses on themes with a particular relevance for the Southern Mediterranean
region.

Amongst programmes focussing on single areas (over half of the total), business and
management studies on the one hand, and European Studies on the other hand,
provide the focal areas of EU third country programmes. Programmes in management
and business studies focus almost exclusively Asian target countries and regions, and
mostly fund (individual) mobility, or joint EU-foreign centres and institutes with a
mobility component. European Studies, a wide concept which, depending on the
individual cases, might be focused on European integration or entail a broad array of
subjects with a European relevance in the humanities and social sciences, are also
Asian-centred, but display less of a concentration on mobility only. Programmes
concerned include, amongst others, all six European Studies Programmes (ESP),
ECAN, the Jean Monnet Scholarship Programme and the EU-China Higher Education
Cooperation Programme.
3.7. Programme Design

In this section, an attempt will be made to classify EU-third country cooperation programmes by means of two ideal type programme designs. The chief indicators for classification are the "bilateral" vs. "multilateral" form of the cooperation, and the focus on either "individual" or "institutional" cooperation. As will be seen, programmes which focus on individuals also tend to be bilateral; and programmes based on a "multilateral" formula are predominantly of an "institutional" set-up. The two concepts will be briefly explained below.

The various Fulbright Scholarship Programmes (as well as the many bilateral scholarship programmes run by the member states) can be used as an example of the individual/bilateral design type. In this programme, US scholars or students individually apply for a period of teaching or study in a foreign country (and foreign students and scholars in the US). They themselves identify and select their host institution. The agency administering the programme will or will not accept the application. It will base its decision on the perceived quality of the applying candidate, and the proposed host institution. There is no involvement of the home institution, and the commitment of the receiving institution is limited to the individual case. The home and the host institutions do not figure as direct partners in the mobility measure.

At the other end of a range of possible programme formulas stands the "network" principle, best exemplified perhaps by the cooperation mechanisms put in place by the ERASMUS programme. There are two major differences with respect to the above example. First, the main actors here are not the mobile individuals, but the institutions themselves. Cooperation is institutionally-based in that it is the institutions themselves (or their respective sub-units, such as faculties, departments, etc) who jointly apply for a set of measures (amongst them mobility). Acceptance or otherwise of the application depends on the inter-institutional mechanisms set in place by the cooperating institutions with a view to satisfying a set of defined criteria which basically judge the quality of the cooperation (and not the individual applicant). The individual who intends to participate (to stay within the bounds of the above example: the scholar or student) then applies to his or her institution. Second, the "network" or ERASMUS formula requires the participation of more than two such institutions from different countries. In other words, consortia of a minimum of three partner institutions are set up (in many cases the minimum number is higher). An institutional network is created.

Both programme formulas have their advantages and disadvantages. Programmes favouring the "network" principle obviously limit the choice of the individual participant, who might not find his or her ideal host institution amongst the consortium partners. The most obvious disadvantage of the individual (and bilateral) principle is that it does not provide a basis for systematic and sustained cooperation amongst institutions. With regard to mobility measures, the institutional guarantee of certain minimum quality standards, such as the transfer of credits guaranteed by ERASMUS, or minimum service provision with regard to reception, counselling, housing, etc., is outside of the scope of the programme. Other activity types, such as

16 In the non-normative sense of the term as used by Max Weber, i.e. roughly equivalent with "prototypical".
the joint development of curricula, by definition require an institutional commitment and can thus not be implemented through programmes based on the "individual" formula. Endeavours such as the systematic internationalisation of a whole education institution (as is, for example, required of institutions applying for an "institutional contract" in the ERASMUS/SOCRATES programme) are obviously impossible to carry out in individual-focused programmes. Multilateral network-type programmes also offer the opportunity of multi-activity cooperation inside a network, which is obviously beyond the means of "individual" programmes.

In intra-EU education and training cooperation, the Union has clearly opted for the institutionally-based and multilateral network principle. The chief reason for this choice was the determination to create sustainable and systematic cooperation between Europe's education and training institutions. The Union was guided by the conviction that continued progress in cooperation, in terms of volume but more still in terms of quality, could only be established this way. In educational terms, the network principle became the *acquis communautaire*.

It is somewhat of a surprise to find that the experience of intra-EU cooperation in general, and the advantages of the institutional and multilateral programme formula, have been used by EU third country cooperation only to a limited extent.

First, however, it must be stated that there are a number of schemes which cannot be easily categorised by the above distinction. These "programmes" almost exclusively concern the creation of joint EU-third country institutions (management schools, foundations, etc.), which were included in this overview only because they often have an "added-on" component of operational cooperation, such as limited mobility to and from these centres ("institution-cum-programme"). About a fifth of the programmes contained in the inventory fall into this category, and thus outside the above classification.

Of the remaining programmes, about three fifths focus on individuals. They are predominantly or exclusively bilateral, and they do not create any systematic links between the home and the host institutions. The individual and bilateral principle finds its clearest expression in the continuing training programmes for young company staff with Asia, in the area of business and management education and training.

About two fifths of the remaining programmes can be said to follow, to a large extent or even fully, the network formula developed in intra-European cooperation. The ALFA programme is one example. The formula has rarely been applied in the Asian region, although the upcoming Asia-Link and ASEAN-EU University Network programmes appear to change this "tradition". The clearest, "prototypical", incarnation of the principle is encapsulated in the higher education cooperation schemes with the US and Canada. These latter have made full use of the advantages of this programme formula. They in fact require the formation of networks both on the European and North American side (often building on partnerships created through intra-EU cooperation), thus providing for a maximum of cross-fertilisation and transfer of innovation; they encourage broad institutional cooperation through a preference for multi-activity projects, and they require, in any mobility component, the use of state-of-the-art recognition tools to guarantee credit transfer.
It is also noteworthy that so far no use has been made of existing programmes of a "network formula" in third regions as an "anchor mechanism" for the Union's third country programmes. It is not known to the authors if there are many regional programmes of this type. However, the case of UMAP (University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific) is striking, even if it should turn out to be a less than representative example. UMAP is almost a replica of the ERASMUS programme, the appreciation of which was high in the Asia Pacific region almost right from its start. As a near-copy of ERASMUS, UMAP has all the features of a "networked" programme, inclusive of arrangements for credit transfer, and the UMAP network would therefore be an adequate structure for Union programmes to "tie into". It can only be hoped that, following an announcement of the Commission at the recent G8 education Ministers meeting in Kyoto, UMAP and EU third country programmes will in the future cooperate more closely.

3.8. Relationship to Member State Programmes

The relationship of third country cooperation programmes offered by the Union on the one hand, and by its member states, on the other, has been a key concern for some time, which also finds expression in the terms of reference for this study. The basic idea is that, in view of scarce resources, duplication of effort should be avoided and that activities of the Union should be guided by the principle of subsidiarity, i.e. that the Union engages only in such action which could not be better carried out at member state level.

The above idea is feasible in principle, but meets with considerable problems at implementation level. First, there is no comprehensive and up-to-date overview of member state education and training activities with third countries. Second, if there was, it is more than doubtful that this would yield a practical orientation for Union activity. Member states are guided in their own third country policies by (legitimate) national concerns, which are by no means the same across all fifteen countries and which, moreover, are subject to constant redefinition and change. It is therefore felt that a Union policy that was complementary to member state activity in terms of such main indicators as target countries or regions, disciplinary and thematic orientations, or activity types would be simply reactive, built on quicksand, and not likely to be very coherent. What is more, the concept of avoiding duplication of effort rests on the more than optimistic assumption that the combined efforts of member states and the European Union in third country cooperation can bring about a situation which would satisfy all demand. However, this is very far from being the case.

A meaningful demarcation line between member state and Union activity, however, could be established by more formal criteria, such as bilaterality and multilaterality. For it is clear that member states cannot and do not offer multilateral (i.e. multi-country) programmes (at the European end). This demarcation line would represent a very meaningful interpretation of the otherwise often vague principle of subsidiarity. Judged against this measuring rod, it must be stated that the Union has so far invested very heavily in a programme formula which one might consider as the privileged programme design of the member states.
IV. Component II:
The State of the Art in International Cooperation in Higher Education and Training

1. Introduction

1.1 Scope and Purpose of this "State of the Art" Description of International Cooperation

We have witnessed in the previous section that the EU supports a wide range of smaller education and training programmes which, while having been initiated on the grounds of geo-political and economic considerations, are at heart genuine educational cooperation activities. The question now poses itself how these relate to the accumulated experience of educational cooperation at large, to the state of the art in international cooperation. Given the fact that the majority of the previously mentioned programmes of cooperation with non-member states concern higher education and that it is also at the level of higher education that most experience in international educational cooperation has accrued, we decided that focussing on the higher education sector in our survey of the state of the art in international cooperation would be most constructive. By giving such an overview of the accumulated experience and progress in internationalisation at the level higher education we hope to be able to put existing schemes with non-member states into perspective. Once such a vista of the state of the art emerges, one will have to ask whether the definition, scope, target groups and organisational features of the current cooperation schemes are justified and offer the added value which one would want such schemes to achieve.

1.2 Globalisation, Internationalisation and Europeanisation

The rhetoric of higher education has always stressed internationalism. But, as Peter Scott rightly points out, after the decay of a 'universal' church and its notion of a supra-national authority in the Renaissance, most universities were in fact founded by states to serve national interests. With the beginning of the new millennium, however, such national definitions are increasingly under attack or simply dissolve under pressures of growing competition and globalisation. Suddenly, universities are supposed to serve not just as "custodians of the genius of nations" but also "active instruments of national competitiveness" (Scott, 1996). With the technological advances of transportation and information, scholarly and scientific contacts have multiplied and intensified. Students and information can travel quickly and cheaply between countries. Furthermore, after decades of efforts of internationalisation by idealistic individuals and progressive institutions, internationalisation has now become a key entrepreneurial arena in some countries, international student flows are being marketed, knowledge, in the form of skilled human resources, science, technology, research products, has become a vital resource for industrialised countries.
When talking about international cooperation, the term internationalisation often appears as a synonym for international cooperation. In light of the many different reflected and non-reflected uses of the terms internationalisation, globalisation and Europeanisation, our first step has to consist in some terminological clarifications. In the simplest sense, internationalisation refers to the sum of all those activities which aim to expand their reach over national borders (van Damme, 1999). According to Jane Knight (1993) internationalisation can be defined as "the process of integrating the international dimension into teaching, research and service functions of an institution of higher education", an international dimension referring to a perspective, activity or programme which introduces or integrates an international, intercultural or global outlook into the major functions of the institution". Another more selective understanding of the term emphasises "the process of systematic integration of an international dimension into the teaching, research and public service function of a higher education institution" (Wächter, 1999). In this sense, not many institutions which are active in international cooperation could be said to engage in internationalisation although, as we will point out later, a trend towards such systematic integration of an international dimension activities is clearly observable.

Globalisation refers to "forceful changes in the economic, social, political and cultural environment" brought about by global competition, the integration of markets, increasingly dense communication networks, information flows and mobility (van Damme, 1999). Reflecting processes of global competitiveness, for example between great regional blocs such as the United States, the European Union and the Pacific Rim, implies, as Peter Scott formulates, a radical re-ordering of the old world-order of Great Powers since "national boundaries are rendered obsolete by the transgressive tendencies of high technology and mass culture". Scott convincingly argues that globalisation should not be confused with or simply regarded as a higher form of internationalisation for three reasons: while internationalisation presupposes the notion of nation states and is often conditioned by geo-political concerns, globalisation ignores or transcends the order of nation states altogether. Secondly, internationalisation processes are often owned, initiated and expressed by the "'high' worlds of diplomacy and culture" while globalisation belongs to the "'low' worlds of mass consumerism and global capitalism". Thirdly, depending on the unequal pattern of nation states, internationalisation tends to reproduce hierarchy and hegemony while globalisation processes can bring up new agendas beyond existing hierarchies. In all of these respects, globalisation poses a fundamental challenge to tertiary education both with respect to the core functions of the university and to its institutional self-definition. For the purposes of our study, we see globalisation as the uncontrollable processes of dissolving national boundaries and hegemony brought about by world competition and the integration of markets both of which have been made possible by high technology. In contrast, internationalisation we regard as the active response of a given institution of higher education to the perceived insufficiencies of national definitions of the core functions of higher education. Since globalisation processes have often sharpened the perception of such insufficiencies among university representatives, internationalisation activities can in many cases even be regarded as institutional responses to globalisation processes. But while the latter ignore national boundaries, internationalisation works with them in order to transcend them.

Europeanisation, in the context of this study, we will simply regard as a geographical subset of internationalisation. In spite of the different political aims which are
associated with its funding and the complex processes of regional integration and redistribution of power implied in the term, it has been shown that in most cases, the aims and handling of European cooperation activities at institutional level do not differ significantly from the rest of international cooperation activities and can be seen to contribute to internationalisation at large (Teichler, 1998; Barblan et al., 1998). Ironically, as Teichler observes "the European Union, while talking about Europe, is a powerful actor of internationalisation, whereby Europe is actually predominantly a sub-category of less than systematic relevance".

2. **Key Themes and Trends in the Current Debate on International Cooperation in Higher Education**

2.1. **International Academic Mobility**

2.1.1 **Student Mobility**

The best known form of internationalisation certainly is the increasing mobility of students studying abroad. Travelling students are of course a very old phenomenon and certain regions of the world have a long experience with it. Most European countries have known the influx of students from their former colonies. Large numbers of Latin American students seek to obtain postgraduate degrees in Northern American universities. In the heights of the Cold War the higher education institutions of the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries attracted students from ideologically associated nations. Furthermore, educational exchange between the US and Western Europe after 1945 was developed to foster democracy and develop the Atlantic community. Generally, geopolitical considerations always have been influential in policies regarding student mobility. However, there is also a growing conviction that one of the most effective means to prepare future graduates for the needs of an increasingly international professional life in a global economy is simply to study and live abroad. The educational and social benefits, such as acquiring new and cross-cultural knowledge and competencies, improving foreign language proficiency (especially in English), establishing international personal and professional networks, becoming familiar with other countries and cultures, etc. are being stressed by international educators. In addition, broad cultural values such as internationalism in itself, the belief that cross-cultural educational and scientific exchange is a good in itself or that it promotes also the national understanding and cross-cultural sensitivity among home students and the wider community, go hand in hand with more economic considerations such as the broadening of educational markets and the generation of extra income.

Unlike the more marginal student mobility flows of earlier times, international student flows have now become a central feature of the global higher education system. Their quantitative development is impressive. Over the past forty years the world-wide growth rates in international student flows outweighed even the expansion rates of higher education in general, which underwent massification especially after the seventies (Throsby, 1998). Recently, it seems that the number of foreign students in relative terms, i.e. measured as a percentage of the entire world student population, is actually on the decrease. This appears less surprising if one takes into account the
massive expansion of higher education even on a global scale, which has now superseded the rise of foreign students. According to UNESCO statistics, there were some 1.5 million foreign students in the top 50 host countries in 1994-95. Over the last 25 years international student mobility has risen by more than 300% (Bruch & Barty, 1998; UNESCO, 1997). Most individual countries witness substantial growth rates of foreign student enrolment. Many observers expect its growth to continue for a while, even if the annual growth rates will diminish gradually. Some prognoses make mention of 2.8 million students studying abroad world-wide by 2010 and 4.9 million by 2025, with the by far biggest expansion rates occurring in Asia from where 2.9 million students studying abroad are estimated to proceed in 2025. The imbalance of receiving and sending students seems to increase. As receiving countries the Anglo-Saxon higher education systems attract by far the most significant shares. With respect to the mentioned exponentially increasing shares of students from Asia, for example, the USA alone receives nearly double as many students (291,000) as European countries do (170,500). In fact, Asian students constitute about well over half of all foreign students in the US. Of the share of Asian students hosted in the EU, about three fifths target the UK. Currently, about one third of the student mobility flows of the world are received by the US (nearly 500,000), a share which the president, secretary of state and the secretary of education of the United States are eager to augment. Australia has been greatly increasing its share of incoming students from abroad. In one decade (from 1984 to 1994) the number of foreign students enrolled at Australian universities has tripled. Europe occupies a rather unusual position as compared with other industrialised countries: While Europe hosts about half of all foreign students (51%), more than half of these students also originate from other European countries.

It is important to note that, while most discussions on internationalisation focus on organised student mobility in the framework of programmes, this in fact only represents about a fifth if not less of the overall student mobility flows. In Europe, where numbers in organised mobility are probably highest world-wide, the percentage of organised mobility probably does not exceed 20% (Wächter, 1999). When talking about conditions of student mobility programmes we should keep this fact in mind, especially as we turn to the possible future courses of action which should take account of these less controllable more market-oriented flows. If we turn now to the small but significant share of international student mobility which is supported and stimulated by various kinds of programmes and schemes, it should be noted that most countries have a variety of bilateral and multilateral agreements and programmes in this field. One of the best known programmes of international student mobility is the European ERASMUS and subsequent (since 1995) SOCRATES programme. Started in 1987 with a view towards the common market of 1992, ERASMUS (and other schemes such as COMMETT, LINGUA and TEMPUS, which specifically deals with Eastern Europe) had the ambition, among other goals, to increase significantly the mobility of students - 10% of the overall student population were targeted to have studied abroad at least once for a term, semester of year during their degree courses - in order to develop the European dimension of higher education and to strengthen a European social identity. Such immersion in other European contexts was seen to support the creation of an internal market of professionals and qualified workers. Since prior to Maastricht the European Commission had no explicit competencies in education and direct strategies at harmonisation of the structures of higher education were considered to be beyond its political competence, student mobility was the
vehicle of a strategy of Europeanisation of higher education. Within less than ten years it reached the level of more than 100,000 mobile European students a year and with this result it was considered to be one of the most successful European programmes in the field of education, even if the original target of giving 10% of all EC-students the opportunity to study abroad was not reached (Teichler, 1998). To some extent, the success of ERASMUS / SOCRATES is of course also due to supportive national policies of member states, providing additional funding. ERASMUS and SOCRATES are not the sole, perhaps not even the most important frameworks of international student mobility in the world. In the Asia/Pacific region the "University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific" programme (UMAP), established in 1991, is important although it has not yet resulted in some kind of funding scheme (Kameoka, 1996). Smaller student mobility programmes exist in most world regions.

International student mobility increasingly is a regional and not only an intercontinental phenomenon. Regional economic integration processes also instigate student mobility and international treaties such as NAFTA, ASEAN or APEC have proven to be stimulating in this respect. Changes in development aid policies also tend to stress more regional student mobility than South-North mobility. The ERASMUS / SOCRATES programme in Europe and the UMAP in the Asia-Pacific region are specifically designed to promote regional student mobility. Of regional nature is also the NORDPLUS-programme of student exchange in the Nordic countries with its original and attractive "money follows student"-imperative (Nyborg, 1996).

Besides this more or less organised mobility there is also an important "spontaneous" mobility of "free movers", taking place outside schemes and programmes. As Todd Davis has shown for the US and Gordon and Jallade (1996) for the European situation, this spontaneous mobility can be attributed to a mixture of "push" and "pull" factors, such as national differences in access (numerus clausus regulations in certain disciplines) on the one hand and language and cultural considerations and the perceived quality differentials on the other hand.

The most important global movement still is that towards the United States, which is the largest receiving country of foreign students with 34% of the OECD-total (OECD, 1997). The transatlantic mobility between Europe (and other world regions) and the US for example, implemented on a multilateral and reciprocal basis under the International Student Exchange Program (ISEP), is confronted with an increasing unbalance. American universities have a growing attraction on European students and the growth of intra-European programmes has not negatively affected this, while European universities seem to have lost some of their attractiveness for US-students (Haug, 1996). The world-famous top research universities of the US exert an enormous attraction on mobile students all over the world, but also the second rank American universities receive important numbers of foreign students. The dominance of English as the lingua franca in contemporary science and scientific training and the most commonly mastered second language contributes to the fact that besides the US also the UK, Canada and Australia are among the top host countries world-wide. From the point of view of the countries of origin of mobile students, it is clear that market-driven, economic factors put into the shade older, more traditional links such as (post)colonial relations. It is no wonder that the newly industrialising economies of the Asian and Pacific region (Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, China, Hong Kong)
are major sources of foreign students, who aspire to fill the ranks of the growing professional classes.

The example of Australia shows that the emergence of a more trade-oriented policy towards foreign students, whereby universities engaged in student recruitment and marketing strategies, was a fruitful enterprise at least from a mercantile point of view. Education is seen by the Australian state as the fastest growing export industry, which was expected to generate an export income of 3.5 billion US$ by the year 2000, hopes which were put on hold due to the Asian-Pacific economic crisis. The number of full-fee paying international student enrolment rose from 7,131 in 1987 to more than 143,000 full-fee-paying students in 1996 in Australia, including 54,000 at the higher education level (Mallea, 1998).

Indeed, international student flows have become "more trade than aid" in many host countries, since often international students are or have become full-fee-paying students. In many host institutions, especially in Anglo-Saxon countries, the income of fee-paying foreign students is a welcome addition to shrinking domestic funding, without which many departments would be threatened with closure. Revenue generation has become an important rationale in institutional policies promoting recruitment of foreign students. A growing part of international student mobility thus is becoming market-driven rather than state-driven or aid-oriented (Scott, 1998). The international market in education services is becoming a booming sector and the international marketing of domestic universities and the recruitment of students are central elements of it. Some countries are developing well-organised national policies in this field, such as France with its marketing initiative by *EduFrance* and its 1,058 associations in 132 countries of the *Alliance Française*, or Great Britain with the "Welcome to the UK" initiative and the British Council's 211 offices in 147 countries. Some countries, such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand and even South Africa after 1994, have developed ambitious strategic plans in order to strengthen their market position in the field (Mallea, 1998; Oettli, 1999; Kishun, 1998).

With the end of the strong expansion at universities, which, after decades of massive expansion, had seemed to most higher education representatives like a kind of "natural" growth, the opposite trend is already being observed in some fields and many countries, namely a growing trend to seek and actively compete for students, also for the sake of maintaining sufficient levels of public funding which is linked to student enrolment in most countries. In many higher education communities this is something new, which also induces many actors to try and discover new "markets" of potential students. Since one may expect students' choices to increase, institutions of higher education will have to and are beginning to pay more attention to their needs and satisfaction than was customary e.g. in continental Europe in the past.

2.1.2 Academic Staff Mobility

Although not as extensively researched as student mobility, staff mobility can be considered the second most important form of internationalisation in higher education. The distinction line with student mobility is not always very clear due to the large numbers of mobile postgraduate and Ph.D. students. In many regions and specific areas of study, such as business administration, regional and international
training networks for young researchers and professionals have become well-established. Of course, there is a great deal of "natural" mobility in the academic profession, due to the international character of scientific research and training. Traditionally, international mobility among professors is most often motivated by research and scholarship and is stimulated by the growth of global and increasingly competitive research scenes with its abundant conferences, meetings and joint research projects, but also by the availability of cheap air travel. Education and teaching have become reasons for international mobility only recently.

As with student mobility there is a great deal of geographic inequality in the mobility flows. The International Survey of the Academic Profession (Welch, 1997) has shown a high polarisation between countries with high academic immigration, sometimes as a result of deliberate international recruitment of academic staff for expanding higher education systems (e.g. Hong Kong), and countries with low levels of internationalisation of faculty. The latter are mostly countries which are either more ethnically homogeneous, do not use English as a language of instruction or have a small range of countries to draw upon for academics speaking their own language. The US and the UK are the major important ex- and importers of academic labour, but compared to the domestic production of highly skilled academics the picture is much more diverse. Developing countries and Eastern European countries face the problem of emigration of researchers and academic staff to the global centres of research. A massive problem of brain drain therefore exists on a global scale at the expense of developing and "second world" regions. Especially Africa faces a huge problem of academic brain drain, caused by political instability and slow social-economic recovery (Matos, 1999). Mobility of professors and scientists seems to have encouraged the emergence of a global marketplace in scientists, rather than to have advanced the internationalisation of higher education at a global scale.

Programmes such as ERASMUS/SOCRATES and UMAP promote regional teaching staff mobility projects alongside student mobility. Some bilateral programmes, such as Fulbright, also focus on staff mobility. In ERASMUS/SOCRATES, staff exchanges are promoted as part of a more or less regular cooperation between European higher education institutions. Teichler rightly denotes that for the European Commission teaching staff mobility was not an end in itself but an instrument which formed part of the more general aim to de-nationalise curricula and to develop European courses by developing inter-institutional networks (Teichler, 1998). However, most of the mobility of academic staff within ERASMUS projects is for relatively short periods. Many travelling professors point to problems associated with the heavy teaching load in their home universities and with limited financial and administrative support for teaching abroad (Enders, 1998). It is clear that within ERASMUS before and with SOCRATES, where it gained a greater emphasis within the framework of the "institutional contract", teaching staff mobility has still not received a decisive push, neither from the funding agencies nor from the institutions of higher education.

2.2. Internationalising Curricula

The notion of a growing interdependence of national economies and labour markets has become established enough to spread the view that human resources should also
be qualified to act successfully on an international stage. Accordingly, more and more representatives of the labour markets and higher education institutions see the need to integrate foreign languages and courses on foreign cultures, politics and legal frameworks into existing curricula. Furthermore, the political integration process in the European Union has fostered the desire to support the construction of a European citizenship and social identity with European studies elements in relevant disciplines, in addition to the additional knowledge of the framework conditions of a European labour market.

However, the respect of the variety of national systems of higher education and the subsidiary powers of governments and institutions with regard to curricula has often dampened the aspiration to de-nationalise curricula. In Europe, the de-nationalisation of curricula was viewed with such mistrust - especially by member state authorities who feared that their competence was being encroached upon (Schink, 1993) - that the introduction of European elements into existing curricula could only be realised by means of mobility projects. According to Teichler (1998), this was one of the reasons why the management of mobility programmes was situated at the level of the departments and not, as in the American examples, at the level of the institutions and their central international offices. Nevertheless, ERASMUS cooperation and the Commission's support is seen by its most well-known evaluator, Teichler, to have contributed significantly to the de-nationalisation of higher education curricula, be it through the obligation to recognise study abroad for the home degrees and thereby the need to compare curricula, or through the support of actual joint curriculum development in the context of inter-departmental partnerships (ICPs). Teichler even states that "the Commission's contribution to internationalisation rests primarily on its successful challenge to national forces of curricular coordination. It is clear, however, that the new emphasis of the "Europeanisation" of curricula under ERASMUS/SOCRATES has been received with great restraint and caution, mainly due to the limited funding available" (Barblan et al., 1998).

Strategic attempts initiated "from above" and aimed at the internationalisation of curricula have not always been very successful, neither in Europe nor abroad. Mestenhauser calls the internationalisation of curricula the "sacred cow" and refers to Woodrow Wilson's saying as president of Princeton University that "it is easier to move cemeteries than to change the curriculum" (Mestenhauser, 1997). Nevertheless, there are some meaningful developments towards international curricula in various countries and regions. Van der Wende (1996) has researched several of these developments comparatively. She used the rather broad OECD-typology of international curricula ranging from curricula with some international content, over curricula that address cross-cultural skills, to curricula leading to internationally recognised professions and special curricula designed for foreign students. She witnessed a strong and recent increase in the number of internationalised curricula in several of the researched countries, although the picture is very diffuse in these countries. Most of these international curricula are found in the areas of economics and business studies, the humanities and social sciences (Van der Wende, 1996). Van der Wende also notes that the joint development, delivery and certification (joint or double/triple degrees) of programmes are more widely found in the European Union than in the Asian-Pacific region (Van der Wende, 1996). From her international comparative analysis some conditions for successful development and successful implementation emerged which were acknowledged across the various countries.
analysed and could therefore be considered as internationally valid. These conditions for success include sufficient institutional autonomy, sufficient flexibility in curriculum regulations within the institution, internationalising the curriculum being regarded as an academic challenge to staff, broad involvement and commitment of staff, a senior academic moderating the process, endorsement from top management, consistency with the institutional mission and policy, combined top-down and bottom-up strategy, administrative support infrastructure and services for the reception of foreign students and staff, and, last not least, extra budgets.

Internationalising curricula can also be seen as something more comprehensive than developing curricula with international components, namely the international harmonisation of curricula. The most powerful inducement to internationalise curricula has probably come from the growing impact of international professional associations. The rapid growth in international trade in professional services has provoked several professions to organise themselves at an international scale. These international professional associations started to deal with issues of education and training, such as quality assurance, international minimum standards, criteria of professionalism, accreditation, etc. and usually promote the greater convergence of curricula and quality criteria. Some professions have been very active in this matter, such as the engineering, the medical or the legal professions. Professional associations, organised at an international level, thus have exerted a harmonising influence on standards and curricula in view of the professional accreditation of programmes and the professional recognition of degrees in various countries (van Damme, 1999; Mallea, 1998). In some instances, these international professional standards are legally enforced by international organisations. The European Union for example increasingly deals with minimum standards of education and training in view of the mobility of labour and the recognition of entry into specific professions in the common market. Also organisations such as OECD and WTO are becoming increasingly interested in these matters and free trade agreements such as NAFTA or ASEAN often contain clauses on mutual recognition of licensing or certification procedures in view of the international mobility of professional services (van Damme, 1999).

But also from the point of view of removing mobility obstacles, the motivation to render curricular structures more homogeneous has grown significantly in many countries, especially in the EU in recent years. After years of member state resistance to curricular homogenisation, the impulse to at least obtain a comparable curricular structure in Europe has now come from the national governments. With the declarations of Sorbonne and Bologna, the signatory member state and other governments commit themselves to converging reforms in the curricular architecture which are likely to set off a major surge of new curriculum development motivated by the aim of international compatibility and accessibility (see also section 2.3 below).

2.3  Recognition and Transparency

The main thrust of the past decades of international cooperation in higher education has been on cooperation and exchanges within existing structures, made possible by efforts to create some degree of transparency between very different national systems.
The recognition of degrees or diplomas obtained in a foreign country back at the home institution or labour market has been a preoccupation of international organisations and the focus of a number of declarations, conventions and agreements between states for several decades. Information centres and electronic databases have been established in order to obtain some degree of transparency regarding foreign curricular, degree and grading structures. The most impressive development in this field has taken place in the European Union. Already in the fifties the Council of Europe has set up conventions and information centre networks in order to enhance mobility in Europe. Together with the UNESCO’s centre for higher education (CEPES) an important "Convention on the recognition of qualifications concerning higher education in the European region" was adopted in Lisbon in April 1997. Here it is no longer assumed that there are strict standards of equivalence. Instead the existing diversity of systems of education and ongoing diversification of higher education is acknowledged by the emphasis of the concept of recognition and the trust upon the effectiveness of the other countries’ systems of quality assurance and accreditation. An important information tool was also promoted through the convention, the so-called "Diploma Supplement", which was developed by UNESCO, the Council of Europe and the European Commission. While it had been on the political agenda since the mid-1980s, it was now adopted as an instrument to improve the possibilities for diploma recognition by describing given national diplomas in type, level, contents and status, thus allowing for a level of transparency which is supposed to lead to a de facto recognition of foreign degrees in European countries. The national information centres (ENIC) are also supposed to facilitate recognition procedures at national level. With a similar purpose but in a separate network of centres, the National Academic Recognition Information Centres (NARIC) were set up with the support of the European Union.

In this context, the ERASMUS programme should be mentioned again since it was the first funding instrument world-wide which obliged institutions to fully recognise periods studied and credits earned abroad. While this obligation was not always observed very diligently in the early years of ERASMUS, pressure has increased on institutions to implement this guideline. In order to support institutions in their efforts to grant recognition, the EU developed a separate instrument, the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS). This system, which constitutes another important tool to enhance transparency across borders, was developed and tested between 1989 and 1995 during a pilot project involving 145 European higher education institutions which refined and prepared the system for wider use. Consisting of a 'learning agreement' between student, host and home institution, an information package on the host institution describing the content and relative weight of each course in the curriculum, and a transcript of records, ECTS is an attempt to quantify periods and components of study and thus to facilitate their transferability. With the introduction of ECTS as an activity fundable under ERASMUS/SOCRATES which even received great rhetorical emphasis with the introduction of the institutional contract under SOCRATES, ECTS has quickly extended its scope and now is being introduced at the majority of institutions in the EU, with attempts to apply it in a modified form even for student mobility between Europe and non-European countries. Of course, ECTS lends itself more easily to higher education systems which are based on credit accumulation systems. But it now seems to have exerted considerable pressure on non-credit systems to adapt. In the framework of SOCRATES, with its emphasis on new cooperation activities and the introduction of the institutional contract, ECTS has
been given more scope at most institutions. However, ECTS is not intended as a solution to problems of equivalence of courses and credits as far as contents or quality goes, even though it is often misunderstood as such (Barblan et al, 2000). It is a quality-neutral translation tool, which is effective only if it is not over-rated in its use.

Beyond the simple translatability of diverse course offerings, there have been even some signs lately of growing acceptability of harmonisation of curricular structures because of numerous practical and logistic problems in international mobility programmes. Issues such as the structuring of the academic year or the size of credits and modules increasingly are seen as susceptible for international harmonisation which was formerly regarded as a taboo. Concerning the far more important issue of the structure of an academic programme in an undergraduate and a graduate cycle, there is a slow evolution towards general acceptance of some Anglo-Saxon model. Stimulated by advocates of internationalisation in international businesses and structured professions, academics and policy makers tend to recognise the advantages of gradual harmonisation of the basic characteristics of university education. The most ambitious developments in this respect are the Sorbonne and Bologna Declarations (1998 and 1999), which also focussed on the theme of the transparency and translatability of European systems of education. Both are inter-governmental declarations and are based on joint efforts of ministers of education and higher education representatives. They aim at setting up gradually a common European space for higher education which is supposed to designate a common structure of degrees rather than a gradual homogenisation of contents. While the first, the Sorbonne Declaration was followed by a somewhat confused and concerned debate about its alleged recommendation of a single pattern of degrees after three, five, and eight years in higher education, which was perceived as a threat to Europe's cherished diversity, the Bologna Declaration, which was prepared by an exhaustive survey of Europe's jungle of degree structures and areas of convergence and divergence, sets up a work schedule and programme to achieve a European space of readable and comparable degrees, undergraduate and postgraduate, with a first degree no shorter than 3 years and clearly relevant to the labour market, ECTS-compatible credit systems everywhere, a European dimension in quality assurance and an improvement of the free movement of students and teachers through structural reforms in all 29 signatory countries. Institutions of higher education are now challenged to introduce meaningful first degrees which are shorter, more flexible (through the adoption of credit systems), more relevant to professional life, more multidisciplinary, more European and international, as well as to create masters degrees in environments where there were no short, or separate, programmes at this level in order to meet the needs and expectations of the mobile students from the rest of Europe and the world. The main benefit one would expect from the development of such independent master's courses would be to have a much wider redistribution of students entering the postgraduate level than we currently have, which could also pave the way for a new type of mobility (Haug, 1999). Most remarkably perhaps, the Bologna Declaration signals a political turning point in the history of cooperation in higher education since it constitutes a pledge freely taken by the 29 signatory countries to reform their own systems in such a way that its structures may converge clearly and thus constitutes a dramatic shift away from the generally hesitant and reactive role which the member states of the EU used to play in a political scene of university cooperation which was most often fuelled by initiatives of the European Commission.
2.4. Institutional and Strategic Integration of International Cooperation Activities

Increasingly, international education moves higher in institutional priorities and becomes a major concern of the central administration, in Europe as well as in other industrialised countries (Barblan et al., 1998; de Wit, 1995). In the US, the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA), in cooperation with national academic associations, published very influential Guidelines for International Education at US Colleges and Universities already in 1983 which called for the establishment of one central institutional "lead point", a senior administrator with the responsibility "for developing strategy and managing activities tied to internationalising the institution." In Europe, the European Commission revised the managerial framework of its successful ERASMUS programme in 1994 in order to enhance institutional commitment and foster the central administration's involvement and support of European cooperation. Accordingly, ERASMUS/SOCRATES now requires that higher education institutions collect the whole array of European cooperation activities under the framework of one institutional application and formulate a "European Policy Statement" every three years explaining the status and context of their planned cooperation activities. Only in a few European countries, such internationalisation statements were already established practice. The majority of higher education institutions formulated such a policy statement for the first time and did not just adapt an already existing policy statement for the purpose. As recent studies have shown, these new requirements have indeed contributed to lending greater visibility and transparency to internationalisation issues and practice in the eyes of the central administration and decision-making bodies, leading in many cases to increased support and coordination of exchange services, institution-wide recognition guidelines and mobilisation of hitherto inactive areas (Barblan et al, 1998, Barblan et al., 2000).

It is generally agreed that it makes a great difference whether the initiative for internationalisation proceeds from a component of the institution, such as a department or research group, or whether the institution's internationalisation is also being initiated, coordinated, planned and systematically integrated by the institution's central leadership. Of course, institutional contexts in which international cooperation activities are being undertaken vary greatly. A seminal model describing the variation of institutional internationalisation processes has been developed by Davies (1992). He differentiates two dimensions: one proceeds from sporadic uncoordinated efforts of internationalisation to systematic and carefully planned ones; the other characterises the locus of international initiative in the institution as varying from marginal to central. Thus Davies presents a matrix according to which an institution can have

♦ a systematic-central organisation type where "there is a large volume of international work in many categories, which reinforce each other and have intellectual coherence. The international mission is explicit and followed through with specific policies and supporting procedures";
♦ an ad hoc-central organisation type where a high level of activity may take place throughout the institution but is not based on clear concepts, coordination, prioritisation and has therefore an ad hoc character;
♦ a systematic-marginal organisation type where the level of activities is limited but these are well-coordinated, prioritised and based on clear planning and decisions;
an ad hoc-marginal organisation type where little activity takes place and the activities are not based on clear decisions.

The above model of course suggests a certain normative progression from marginal to central and from ad hoc to systematic. The "institutionalisation" of the whole variety of international cooperation activities would thus signal progress as compared to the more anarchic state of many unrelated cooperation activities co-existing in an institution without awareness of each other. Interestingly, as van der Wende points out, innovation theory also regards institutionalisation as the last stage which decides the ultimate fate of an idea for change (van der Wende, 1999). Referring to Levine’s work on innovation in higher education, she highlights institutionalisation as the most critical phase for any innovation. Levine's own research shows that innovations are usually transformed or die during the "institutionalisation – termination phase". The most positive outcome of an innovation in this phase would be if its characteristics were allowed to spread through the host organisation ("diffusion"). Many higher education institutions are currently moving into this crucial phase of institutionalisation, often helped or propelled into it by support from funding schemes.

A good case in point is the ERASMUS programme and its new requirements under the SOCRATES framework. While the early phase of ERASMUS had been characterised by a pioneer spirit of persons who decided to devote time and energy to make the innovation a success, ERASMUS under SOCRATES tried to address questions about the need for continuity and reliability of cooperation activities independent of the coincidental strengths and weaknesses of the pioneers (Teichler, 1999).

According to Teichler, the move from initial ERASMUS to ERASMUS under SOCRATES - with its requirement to describe the institutional context and underlying policy motivating the planned activities and apply for all of the cooperation activities within one framework application - may be regarded as the most visible support measure accompanying the transition from casuistic to systematic treatment of the international dimension in higher education. The institutions were suddenly challenged not to consider their international activities anymore as marginal, non-coherent, decentralised activities of individuals but rather as important, costly activities which require a certain stability as well as a common infrastructural support if they were to lead to cross-fertilisation, activities which are supposed to be relevant to the quality and reputation of the institution as a whole. Interestingly, analyses of the 1,600 Policy Statements submitted to the European Commission as part of the Institutional Application and case studies of the processes of preparation and implementation of the policy statements revealed that institutions appreciated the occasion to gather an overview of all of their international cooperation activities and to mobilise hitherto inactive areas but, in a vast majority of cases, were reluctant to introduce highly interventionist strategic action (Barblan et al., 1998 and 2000) or to shift their emphases away from student mobility, which continued to be the core of most institutional European policies. Nevertheless, SOCRATES can be said to have pushed those institutions which had a very casuistic approach towards internationalisation to make the latter a regular topic of discussion and coordination, to have led to the creation of mechanisms for reflection, information and transparency regarding the level and content of the institution's cooperation activities, as well as to
have systematised decision-making regarding international issues from the pioneers' coincidental decisions to the general decision-maker to regular policy.

Teichler inserts his description of the institutional responses to the changes of the ERASMUS programme requirements into a general model which also implies a natural evolution from "casuistic" to "systematic" approaches as internationalisation activities expand:

"For all international activities, after a while, both the quantitative growth and continuity naturally raise the following questions:

♦ Does experience permit us to routinise the activities?
♦ Can the activities be undertaken more efficiently through coordination and economy of scale?
♦ Should individual activities be replaced by continuous responsibilities of the departments and the institution at large?
♦ Is there scope for cross-fertilisation between the various types of international activities?
♦ Is there a need for prioritisation because of the large number of activities and expectations?
♦ Does having a common profile of international activities at an institution of higher education – and a joint commitment to them – help individual activities?" (1999, p.14)?

Regarding strategic development, Teichler predicts that by virtue of the fact that internationalisation will tend to "more and more affect the whole life of the institution of higher education, the major consequence might not be so much the prioritisation of strategic options, but rather care that this dimension is taken seriously across the board in all major activities" (1999, p.17).

Teichler notes that many institutions opted for systematic approaches and have therefore changed in three respects. In matters of management, they have established regular responsibilities and regular modes of decision-making procedures regarding international issues. For example, vice-presidents or pro-rectors have been assigned the task of coordinating international issues. Committees for international affairs have been set up or existing committees entrusted with the task on a regular basis. At faculty and/or departmental level, deans or other staff have been appointed to coordinate and help the implementation of internationalisation. With respect to infrastructure and services, internationalisation clearly results in the expansion of services, be they related to foreign language training, accommodation for foreign students or scholars, information and administrative support, counselling or other functions. Accordingly, many institutions have extended their international offices or established such offices if they did not exist before. At most institutions, international offices play the double role of providing services for regular international activities and of preparing and administering the international policies of the institution (Teichler, 1999). The extension of the role and influence of the international relations administration and offices has been noted to lead to an increasing professionalisation of international education administrators in Europe (Callan, 1998, Barblan et al., 2000) as well as in the United States where national norms have even been developed with respect to professional administration of student mobility (Kuhlman, in: Klasek ed., 1992) and elsewhere (de Wit ed., 1995).
If institutionalisation of international cooperation activities is seen to be desirable mainly because of the sustainability and better synergies and cross-fertilisation between activities, it may be helpful at this point to recall the range of possible activities which serve to internationalise a given institution of higher education, in order to then think of the ways in which such activities can be institutionalised, i.e. integrated into the institution's mission, planning and review systems, policies and procedures, hiring and promotion systems. Knight presents two rather comprehensive lists of activities and mechanisms of institutionalisation under the labels "programme strategies" and "organisational strategies" (1999, p.23-26) which offer a useful overview over the realm of institutional options.

Explaining her first table, Knight observes that the first category of the first table is perhaps closest to what is generally considered internationalisation activities. The second category can touch upon the substantive nature of research, its methodology and the distribution of knowledge. The third category of external relations has traditionally been oriented to international development activities and bilateral cooperation agreements between institutions, it is gradually shifting to less of an "aid" and more of a "trade" focus, with commercial activities like the export of educational products and services increasing in scope. Networks between institutions also with the private sector are also increasing in importance so that this category may well be the one undergoing the swiftest change at the moment. The last category is often forgotten but should be remembered in view of bringing a comparative perspective to the campus and the classroom.
Table 1: *Programme strategies of internationalisation (activities)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic programmes</th>
<th>- Student exchange programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Foreign language study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Internationalised curricula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Area or thematic studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Work/study abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- International students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teaching/learning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Joint and double degree programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cross-cultural training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Faculty/staff mobility programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Visiting lecturers and scholars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Link between academic programmes and research, training and development assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and scholarly collaboration</td>
<td>- Area and theme centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Joint research projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- International conferences and seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Published articles and papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- International research agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Researcher and graduate student exchange programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- International research partners in academic and other sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Link between research, curriculum and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External relations and services (domestic and abroad)</td>
<td>- Community-based partnerships and projects with non-government groups or private sector companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Intercultural project work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- International development assistance projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Customised/contract training programmes offshore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Off-shore teaching sites and distance education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Link between development projects and training activities with teaching and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Participation in international networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alumni development programmes abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-curricular activities</td>
<td>- Student clubs and associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- International and intercultural campus events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Liaison with community-based cultural groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Peer groups and programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social, cultural and academic support systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Knight (1999, p.24)*

Knight's list of organisational strategies (table 2 below) includes initiatives which help to ensure that the international dimension is institutionalised through appropriate human resources, policies and administrative systems.
### Table 2: Organisation strategies to institutionalise internationalisation activities

| Governance | - Expressed commitment by senior leaders  
- Active involvement of faculty and staff  
- Articulated rationale and goals for internationalisation  
- Recognition of an international dimension in mission statement and other policy documents |
| Operations | - Integration of international dimension activities into institution-wide and department planning, budgeting and quality review systems  
- Appropriate organisational structures  
- Communication systems (formal and informal) for liaison and co-ordinator  
- Balance between centralised and decentralised promotion and management of internationalisation  
- Adequate financial support and resource allocation systems |
| Support services | - Support from institution-wide service units, i.e. student housing, registrariat, counselling, fund-raising, etc.  
- Involvement of academic support units i.e. language training, curriculum development, library  
- Student support services for international students studying on campus and domestic students going abroad, i.e. orientation programmes, counselling, cross-cultural training, student advisors, etc. |
| Human resource development | - Recruitment and selection procedures which reorganise international and intercultural expertise  
- Reward and promotion policies to reinforce faculty and staff contribution to internationalisation  
- Faculty and staff professional development activities  
- Support for international assignments and sabbaticals |

*Source: Knight (1999, p.26)*

The above lists - one may even call them checklists - of optional internationalisation activities and of ways of organising the international dimension so as to make it part of the "core" functioning of a given institution bear the advantage of being quite balanced with respect to the sources of internationalisation: they include multiple ways of ensuring that initiatives come from the entire constituency of a higher education institution, including academic staff, students and administrators, rather than just from the top decision-makers and chief strategists. The dangers of top-heavy strategic management, which have recently been brought to the fore in the study of the implementation of SOCRATES where growing de-motivation and loss of ownership among academics active in ERASMUS have been observed, are often emphasised by the EAIE. Wächter (1999) calls the individual commitment a *conditio sine qua non* of internationalisation and inter-institutional cooperation: "This is clearly underlined by many inter-institutional linkages established between heads of institutions, without appointment of a responsible academic, which lead their life largely on paper and are not followed by any cooperation activity" (1999, p.38).
2.5. Institutional Networking

Collaboration between universities is hardly new, but institutional forms of cooperation agreements dealing with various aspects of education and teaching constitute a rather recent phenomenon. They are often developed in the context of collaboration projects dealing with student and/or teaching staff exchange. For example, in the framework of ERASMUS-ICPs and even more formally in the case of the bilateral agreements which are supposed to underpin each "institutional contract" in SOCRATES, denser institutional relationships have been developing between European universities. In this context a deeper institutional engagement is implied in various forms of inter-institutional agreements which in one way or another seek to recognise the educational programmes of one institution to another.

In most cases, international links have started as people-to-people relationships which might but need not result in inter-departmental or inter-faculty links and even in a formalised inter-institutional agreement at a later stage. For many years, until the introduction of the "Institutional Contract" under SOCRATES, the structural backbone of ERASMUS constituted a formalised collaboration between departments or faculties, misleadingly called "inter-university cooperation programme" - an organisational principle which was later also adopted by the UMAP programme. While for any large-scale and systematised cooperation an enhanced degree of institutional commitment is a necessary complement to such departmental multi-lateral links, it has recently been quite clearly confirmed that no institution-based agreement and internationalisation strategy can live without the life-vein of these academic contacts. Recent studies of the implementation of SOCRATES showed that the programme's change of emphasis away from the multilateral transnational network structure to the institutional embedding of cooperation activities in central coordination and priority setting was only partly successful (Barblan et al., 2000). Numerous interviews with affected professors and administrators revealed that the down-side of the new managerial modus of the programme is widely regarded to be its lack of support to multilateral departmentally-based networks since these are felt to be the true motor and animator of academic cooperation. As it has been argued by programme representatives that, when it comes to concrete cooperation activity, multilaterality boils down to a sum of bilateralities, one may ask what it is about multilateral networking that can be regarded as vitally important. Typical answers by concerned academics point to several advantages of multilateral networking. They were seen to be:

- more efficient for solving problems with network partners than a series of bilateral meetings, especially regarding academic integration, comparison of teaching contents, not just because all network partners were present at one place at one time, but also because of the abundance of potential mediators;
- necessary for truly integrated teaching staff mobility, the preparation of which demands a lot of communication and which can be helped by other partners' experience;
- a good probing ground for possible joint curriculum development;
- an optimal opportunity to find new partners, helped by the mediation of established partners present (this was strongly voiced by newcomers to ERASMUS in the CEEC);
an excellent tool for building a European identity for all the partners involved. At multilateral meetings, national identities were seen to be feeding better into a common European group identity, better than any series of bilateral meetings could ever hope to achieve (Barblan et al., 2000).

Other observers point to the opportunities for more structured and more sustainable cooperation as well as economies of scale, due to multilateral communication. The pooling of expertise which such discipline-based or thematic multilateral networks bring about are also said to offer particularly fruitful soil for the growth of new ideas, new project plans, for innovation.

Some such inter-departmental partnerships have accumulated with such density between two institutions that true inter-university relationships may develop from them. If these in turn discover a common sense of purpose, context or institutional development, they may turn and have in a number of cases turned into inter-university networks. In such inter-institutional networks, institutions attempt to address each other as a whole and even as allied political actors in the European scene of higher education. Examples for such inter-institutional networks which try to form around a common sense of identity are the SANTANDER Group, the UTRECHT, UNICA or COIMBRA networks. In most cases, the actual competencies of such networks in the field of education and teaching are rather limited. Rather than being networks in which very specific common approaches to education are developed and implemented, these networks are to be seen as rather loose fora for discussion and exchange of experience. However, some networks are actually evolving into more ambitious cooperative entities with common self-definitions and self-presentations and common lines of strategic development, which is also seen to serve their status and competitive advantages on the international market of higher education services.

The closest form of inter-institutional cooperation is represented by the mutual recognition of the educational programmes of two institutions - agreements which may lead to the establishment of important international university networks at a global scale. The "Global Alliance for Transnational Education" (GATE), an important international organisation of businesses, higher education institutions and governmental agencies in the field of quality assurance, accreditation and certification in international education, distinguishes different forms of such inter-institutional arrangements, namely "franchising", "twinning" and "articulation". Under franchising agreements an institution grants a host institution in another country the permission to provide some of the courses and degrees of the first, under mutually agreed conditions; the education provided resorts completely under the degree-awarding capacity of the home institution while the host institution is responsible for the actual provision of the course offer. In twinning agreements, higher education institutions in different countries offer joint programmes where students follow exactly the same courses, have the same materials and pass the same examinations, although the academic staff is usually engaged locally. Contrary to twinning agreements, at "articulated" institutions students are enrolled in programmes or part of programmes in the host institution which lead to credits recognised by the other institution without the courses having been developed jointly.

The example of the networks mentioned above also shows how inter-university recognition agreements may sometimes be the first step toward the cooperating
partners transforming themselves into a real transnational network of institutions. Current trends suggest that such networks will trade in the global educational marketplace in the future while the constituent parts may want to maintain their respective national identities. Such transnational networks are in a better position to develop a more internationally marketable image, by pooling their respective expertise and by building on their experience with intercultural and international communication and cooperation.

Another interesting development is the prospect of transnational mergers of institutions. A European attempt has been made in Limburg, where the Belgian (Flemish) "Limburgs Universitair Centrum" (LUC) and the Dutch "Universiteit Maastricht" are planning close forms of cooperation in the field of academic education, which are eventually to lead to a transnational merger. Such a development could result in important institutional benefits, since the new university could integrate its statutory educational supply and degree-awarding capacities and thus transgress national limitations in planning and programming (van Damme, 1999). In many countries, national legislation in higher education is not prepared to deal effectively with real transnational institutions. Since all of the above-mentioned agreements and arrangements are made at an institutional level within the space of autonomy left to the educational market, they mostly remain unknown to the political authorities. Sometimes they may even transgress national procedures and frameworks of educational planning, recognition of diplomas, accreditation and quality assurance.

2.6. Internationalisation and Quality Assurance

In the past decade, the quality of educational provision has become an increasingly urgent concern in most countries. The growing urgency with which the issue of quality has been dealt with among higher education representatives but also among politicians and government officials and other stakeholders can be attributed to a number of factors. First of all, as van Damme points out (1999), the massification of higher education has exerted increasing pressure on infrastructures as well as on human and financial resources and has heightened the need for efficient expenditure. Secondly, key stakeholders, businesses, professional bodies and employer organisations have voiced their concern about the capacities of traditional academic management to guarantee adequate quality standards and to respond to the needs of modern workplaces and labour markets in an increasingly competitive and transformative economy. Thirdly, in most industrialised countries, budget restrictions and fiscal crises have led to a decrease in government funding per student and a pressure to increase efficiency in public expenditure. Fourthly, the deregulation of many national higher education system has not only increased institutional autonomy but also the demands of the "evaluative state" (Neave) and public accountability. The establishment of quality assurance policies and mechanisms in many countries took place in a political and governmental environment characterised by a changing relationship between the state and the institutional field. Especially in Western Europe, deregulation, increasing institutional autonomy, devolution of authority, a shifting balance between state- and market-oriented elements in the steering of higher education systems, and a growing weight of output-related, performance-based factors

17 This process has in the meantime met with obstacles, and it is presently not clear whether a merger will ultimately be achieved.
in steering and sometimes also financing, were the decisive features of that changing relationship. Governments converted their higher education policies from an input-oriented regulation into an output-oriented steering. In general, there was an exchange between deregulation and institutional autonomy on the one hand and quality assurance, accountability and output-control on the other hand (van Damme, 1999). Furthermore, increasing mobility of students who do not only want to study abroad but also want to have these studies recognised upon return, as well as the heightened opportunities of students to move to places and institutions which they perceive to best respond to their needs, have highlighted the importance of quality assurance and improvement. Finally, the growth of competition from private providers which respond to market needs more flexibly have raised concerns of consumer protection, minimum quality standards and the protection of fundamental academic values (see also section 2.7). In Eastern Europe, for example, the development of quality assurance and accreditation schemes can to a large extent be attributed to the increasingly complex situation caused by the establishment of numerous private higher education institutions.18

In the relationship between internationalisation and the quality of higher education three different dimensions can be distinguished (van der Wende, 1996):

- the contribution of internationalisation to the improvement of the quality of higher education;
- the quality of internationalisation as such;
- the international dimension of quality assurance systems and mechanisms in higher education.

As van der Wende (1996) points out, improving the quality of higher education forms the ultimate goal of many policies and programmes of internationalisation of individual higher education institutions, national governments, and the European Commission. However, that internationalisation should necessarily contribute to quality is by no means guaranteed. Van der Wende (1994) lists a number of opportunities and threats connected with internationalisation which can usefully be recalled here:

"Opportunities for quality improvement may be found in the broadening and deepening of subject areas by adding international elements (or by joint curriculum development), in staff development, in an enhanced foreign language acquisition and preparation for work in a global economy by study abroad, in the presence of foreign

---

18 While accreditation and quality assurance are based on overlapping concerns and have been observed to converge organisationally, the two terms should be distinguished here. Traditionally, accreditation is the result of an evaluation of whether an institution qualifies for a certain status which may have implications for the institution itself (e.g. permission to operate) and/or for its students (e.g. eligibility for grants). Accreditation implies a particular standard, asking whether the institution or one of its components or programmes is good enough to be approved where “approved” implies admission to some category (Woodhouse, 1999). In theory, the result of an accreditation procedures is a yes or no/ pass or fail decision, although gradations are possible. Unlike accreditation, quality assessment most often aims at the improvement of the institution or programme or the definition of some strategic perspective regarding its future so that different investigative and communicative methods are needed for it to be effective. While the expertise of an agency in accreditation may benefit the expertise in quality assurance, the two functions are still fundamentally different in purpose.
students (the international classroom) and in a greater awareness of the institution of its own quality as compared to international standards and partners.

Threats to quality may be related to a loss of control over activities (study and teaching abroad) which take place outside the institution, to teaching new groups of students coming from other countries with unknown learning styles and levels, to teaching and learning in a foreign language (insufficient fluency), and to an excessively external orientation of academics, administrators or managers within the institution."

To van der Wende's list of opportunities, one may add the quality enhancing potential of international cooperation and exposure regarding teaching methodology, new qualification and certification processes, intellectual resource sharing (contributions to the advancement of knowledge), the dissemination of information on a given institution, the improvement of an institution’s reputation as well as its management (Smith, 1994).

Many observers of internationalisation stress that the success of internationalisation increasingly depends on sound quality assurance systems. With mobility and exchange becoming a regular feature of research, teaching and learning, higher education institutions are increasingly forced to let go of their own quality control (to the extent that it existed) and have to trust the host institutions of their outgoing staff or students with respect to the services, infrastructure and expertise offered. If international student and staff mobility continues to increase and if institutions are confronted with more and more demands for credit transfer and recognition of foreign programmes and degrees, their quality assurance mechanisms will have to be extended to also cover the programmes and degrees in foreign partner institutions. Indeed, the growing emphasis on transparency, recognition and credit transfer has further contributed to bringing questions of quality to the foreground. Already a number of years ago, the then Higher Education Quality Council (HEQC) tried to respond to the growing concerns about the loss of quality control through internationalisation by offering advice and recommendations about quality assurance and standards for institutions of higher education in the UK that have established educational partnerships with other countries. This trend is widely seen to gain momentum. As DeWinter formulates: "In the international 'marriage market', suitors will look in your direction only if you are equipped with a handsome control system. Or, in still other words, the entrance ticket to international educational networks might very well, in the future, become explicitly a sound quality assurance system."

Of course, the Maastricht and Amsterdam treaties' articles dealing with higher education emphasise the improvement of the quality of education as the explicit goal of any EU support of higher education cooperation initiatives. This fact makes it all the more remarkable that the emergence of the quality assurance movement in higher education was only influenced to a very limited degree by factors relating to internationalisation and also, until very recently, took very little notice of international aspects of higher education provision. In many countries, the issues of international competitiveness and international mobility of labour were widely debated and perceived as urgent issues but were nevertheless only marginally (if at all) integrated into debates and development of quality assurance. However, international stimulants have contributed to raising quality awareness and even led to the establishment of
quality assurance agencies in some countries. One example of such stimulants is the Institutional Evaluation Programme of the "European Rectors Conference" (CRE, now officially called the Association of European Universities) which was launched in 1993 in order to help universities improve their quality management processes and assist in developing strategies of change. Over 50 universities have been audited, follow-up visits are being planned. Another important example were the European pilot projects launched in 1994/95 by the European Commission (DG XXII) with the aim of widening experiences of quality evaluation across western Europe. In the framework of these projects, subject evaluations in selected subjects were conducted in 17 countries. These resulted in the creation of several national evaluation agencies in Europe and, eventually, in the founding of a European network of quality assurance agencies which meets regularly to exchange experiences and best practices (1999). In Europe, 11 countries now have quality assurance agencies and more are added each year.

While networking of national agencies has intensified particularly in Europe during the last few years, there also seems to be an increasing interest in such exchanges of experiences and information internationally. The fact that international communication on quality assurance is developing rapidly is evidenced by the emergence of networks, scholarly journals, conferences, and organisations promoting international understanding and mutual exchange of ideas. Recently, to name a prominent example, representatives of quality assurance and accreditation agencies all over the world were hosted by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) in the USA (which is increasingly also pursuing quality assurance interests) with the explicit aim to internationalise quality assurance. The next steps will focus on exchange of information and good practice and on increasing transparency between the different systems of quality assurance. The same purpose is pursued by the International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education which was formed in the early nineties and holds annual meetings. At the moment, there is still an enormous degree of international variation in quality assurance. Most fundamentally, systems differ in the notions of quality on which they base their operations. Green (1994) distinguishes different concepts of quality: quality as distinctiveness, as conformance to specified standards, as fitness for purpose or effectiveness in achieving institutional goals, and as meeting customers' needs. Also the functions of the quality assurance systems vary greatly: from improving education and giving feed back to higher education staff on teaching, research and curricular design, to allowing for accountability in view of safeguarding the public interest and the efficient use of government funding, to offering public information and market transparency, and finally steering the higher education system through quality indicators in resources and planning. Such different functions of quality assurance naturally entail different emphases, methodologies and operations. Nevertheless, it is to be expected that some degree of convergence will result from the above-mentioned intensification of transnational exchanges of experience, expertise and good practice. Several expert observers see an increasing international convergence in approaches to higher education quality assurance (Van Vught & Westerheijden, 1994; El-Khawas, 1998; Woodhouse, 1996).

Like the internationalisation of quality assurance, the quality of international cooperation itself has also only recently become the subject of focussed networking and cooperative projects. Many obstacles, such as lack of funding, lack of national or
institutional commitment and of coherent policies, bureaucratic over-regulation on the part of funding agencies and all kinds of administrative problems (e.g. long application procedures) still hinder the smooth functioning of internationalisation efforts at institutional level, leading to many complaints from students and other participants. Moreover, the actual outcome of individual international cooperation activities is only rarely researched or monitored in detail. In general, widespread systematic evaluation is restricted to analyses of various aspects of student mobility. In spite of the many criticisms of various conditions of international cooperation activities and the generally observed tendency of increased efforts in establishing or expanding quality assurance in higher education, institutional internationalisation activities are as yet only rarely covered by quality assurance procedures since the latter still deal primarily with the "core functions" of education and research. Already in 1994, Smith stated that the assurance of quality should gradually cover the whole spectrum of international dimension activities of a given institution of which he gives an exhaustive and thus useful overview:

♦ Academic staff: teaching assignments and exchanges, sabbaticals abroad, joint curriculum development, intensive courses and summer schools;
♦ Students: arrangements for individual mobility, organised exchanges, study abroad, foreign student reception;
♦ Courses and curricula-comparative elements: international and European elements, area studies, foreign languages (as subjects of study and as medium of delivery), distance learning, use of new technologies;
♦ Certification, recognition and assessment: award of joint/ double degrees, credit transfer arrangements, academic recognition, assessment arrangements;
♦ Governance and management: decision-making structures, international offices, arrangements at faculty/departmental level, staff recruitment, promotion and development, participation in international networks, exchanges of administrative staff, resource management, advisory and information services, evaluation procedures and infrastructure.

Although the need for quality assurance of internationalisation initiatives is increasingly recognised, limited progress has been made towards developing workable systems at national level. Curiously, the above-mentioned EU pilot projects in quality assurance, which had helped the establishment of quality assurance systems in Europe, had also given only very cursory attention to the external relations of universities, as the EAIE remarked (1995). Only in a few countries, codes of practice and specific quality assurance procedures and instruments in the field of international education have been developed. In the UK, as already mentioned, the Higher Education Quality Council produced such an instrument which was later developed further by the Quality Assurance Agency (Bruch & Barty, 1998). In the Netherlands, institutions' internationalisation policies were reviewed in 1994 by the Inspectorate of Higher Education. The hogescholen have also developed an instrument for self-evaluation of internationalisation at these higher education institutions which is integrated into the general quality assurance system. In Finland, the Centre for International Mobility (CIMO) developed guidelines for evaluation including institutional self-evaluation of internationalisation, emphasising, like the Dutch, the consistency between the objectives of internationalisation and the institution's wider aims as well as the reflection of these internationalisation objectives in curriculum, organisation, policy development etc. In the US, two quite comprehensive instruments
for institutional self-evaluation of internationalisation aiming to estimate the degree of success achieved in internationalisation by a given institution (on a score from 0 to 5) were developed and disseminated a few years ago. Other countries, many of which have only just begun to establish quality assurance systems, are still far from including the international dimension of higher education in their procedures. Professional organisations, e.g. in business and engineering, have also developed various forms of quality control of education and training in their international networks.

Until recently, however, these and other initiatives in developing quality assurance procedures and instruments in international education have been rather dispersed and have remained uncoordinated. The Internationalisation Quality Review (IQR, formerly IQRP for Internationalisation Quality Review Process), jointly developed by the OECD and ACA from 1995 onwards, has tried to redress this dispersion. Since 1994, the Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE) of the OECD had had a programme focussing on quality assessment and assurance of institutional-level strategies for the internationalisation of higher education and on the contribution that internationalisation has made to enhancing the quality of higher education. This concern was now taken up by IQR, through the development (in a first phase) and the refinement (in a second phase) of guidelines for self-assessment and peer review, which assist higher education institutions to assess and enhance the quality of their internationalisation strategies against the background of their own aims and objectives, and thus also to strengthen the contribution that internationalisation makes to the quality of higher education overall.

It is to be expected that increasing differentiation among higher education institutions with respect to the quality dimension will result in more discriminating internationalisation policies. Hence, unless the quality issue is fully integrated in internationalisation policies of governments and institutions, the further progress of internalisation is likely to suffer greatly.

2.7. The Impact of New Technologies on Internationalisation: Competition with New Providers

Increasingly, new technologies are used to complement and support established cooperation activities, be it mobility or curriculum development. A number of "administrative" examples may serve to illustrate the use of satellites, the Internet, and the World Wide Web in higher education cooperation, such as statistical databases to track students and their progress; Web pages to introduce study abroad options, including detailed information on coursework and living situations; the use of e-mail to receive and submit assignments as well as communicate with individual tutors or remain in touch with home students and professors; and online applications to support classroom teaching, providing convenience and saving time. Two broad categories of usage seem to encompass the majority of applications: courses offered over the Internet and the World Wide Web, focusing primarily on students; and research collaboration, focusing on faculty (Philson, 1998).

The number of courses offered electronically is increasing rapidly. Many of these are prepared and delivered by individual faculty, but often entire units of an institution or
indeed entire institutions are being established to offer online alternatives. Especially in the US, the offer of complete degree programmes is available in a growing range of disciplines. One of the best-known providers is the University of Phoenix, an accredited institution in the US offering online undergraduate and graduate courses. In Canada, the Athabasca University is a well-established virtual campus serving thousands of students in Canada and overseas. Traditional universities are also beginning to offer complete degree programmes online. In this new environment, new organisations also emerge, e.g. brokerage organisations, such as the Globewide Network Academy and the Electronic University Network, which help link students with institutions offering courses online, as well as organisations which develop their own courses. Indeed, with the expansion of the new technologies, a considerable growth of new providers of higher education services can be noted, adding to the choice available to students and to the concerns about minimum quality standards. The upsurge of interest in accreditation in many countries can be linked to these concerns and to the desires of new institutions to receive marketable labels.

Indeed, more and more universities of the industrialised world, mostly in Anglo-Saxon countries which tend to adopt a more market-oriented, entrepreneurial approach to the recruitment of students, are not satisfied by the increasing numbers of mobile students coming to them. They combine recruitment of foreign students with extending their educational supply to promising markets in other countries by setting up local campuses under the full authority of the mother institution. Complete programmes from commencement through graduation are possible in this system, if the local state legally permits the granting of foreign diplomas and degrees on its territory. Here, the process of internationalisation does not only shift from the demand to the supply side but seems to dissolve into a new form of academic imperialism where national offers are simply transferred to another national setting without any guarantee of reflective attention to cultural divergences and intercultural communication. In some cases, such branch or "off-shore" campuses are indeed seen as an intrusion into the local educational culture and policies of the host country, by offering courses tailored to foreign conditions and needs in a strange environment, mostly in another language and targeted at the more affluent students. A growing number of examples of this form of "internationalisation", which is often misleadingly labelled "transnational education" but should perhaps more fittingly be called neo-imperialism, can be observed, especially but not only in the developing world.

Of course, the most avant-garde development in new forms of higher education provision is the delivery of degree courses by a provider institution situated in one part of the world to other parts of the globe through forms of technologically supported distance education, which is regarded as another form of "transnational education". Information and communication technologies through the Internet and satellite transmission open up avenues of developments in educational delivery modes in which geographical limitations are eliminated. As van Damme observes, "some see the future of global higher education in the emergence of a limited number of global virtual universities, designed by powerful corporations; others think of most current universities providing higher education as well through traditional delivery modes as through virtual modes or, which is highly probable, various intermediate modes." In fact, in most existing forms of distance education there is also face-to-face contact in seminars and workshops in regional support centres in addition to independent learning through electronic delivery of education.
In this respect the various "open universities" have done pioneering work, not only in the developed world but also in countries such as Turkey, India, Indonesia, Brazil, etc. Currently, the eleven most important open universities in the world together enrol about three million students. Also the corporate sector is becoming very active in this field, with multinational corporations such as Microsoft, News Corporation and numerous others. The clearest example of this virtual internationalisation of course is the establishment of real cyber-universities. The International University, "The University of the Web", established in 1993, is the first example of this kind (Pease, 1998), but others are following. These new institutions offer courses and degree programmes using multiple communication technologies on a global scale. In 1997, the International University has been awarded accreditation in the United States after having obtained GATE-certification.

Another usage of IT for international links, which is more often overlooked or underrated, is the use of IT for the purpose of facilitating collaboration among researchers. We should recall at this point that the World Wide Web itself was actually created in 1989 by Tim Berners-Lee of CERN to facilitate communication between high energy physicists at various distant locations. These collaborations usually occur within a given discipline or thematic area. Secondly and more surprisingly, the organisations which support such collaboration often occur on a regional basis (such as mainly in Europe, or North America, or the Pacific Rim). In order to illustrate the functioning of such IT-based research collaboration, we should briefly describe a single case, the "Upper Atmospheric Research Collaboratory" funded by the National Science Foundation since its beginning in 1992. This highly developed network fosters distance collaboration between space physicists working together to analyse data from instruments in Greenland. A half-dozen instruments send data on the Internet to scientists at 10 different locations in Michigan, Massachusetts, Maryland, Greenland and Norway. The system allows access to archival and real-time data. The scientist can build multiple "windows" on their individual computers with separate areas for viewing real-time data, archival data and for real-time communication with colleagues using a "chat" function. The studies of the development of this "collaboratory" have confirmed many of the earlier findings regarding computer-mediated communication: the increased opportunities scientist have to exchange ideas and information with colleagues worldwide and to share scarce expensive resources go hand in hand with the recognition that such long-distance communication requires more structured dialogues, including conscious efforts to establish common understandings about the data being discussed (Philson, 1998).

Listservs are another interesting more informal example of such long distance communication fora among researchers. A listserv is essentially a group of people using e-mail who have joined together to discuss issues of common concern, without any particular goal or task and few constraints on topics which can be raised by members of the list. According to Philson, over 15,000 individual public listservs exist, ranging in membership from a few to over 10,000 individuals, the majority of whom tend to be US participants. Many listservs use a moderator to manage the list and screen messages before broadcasting them to all members of the list.
Given the range and exponentially growing scope of all of these IT-based forms of international collaboration it is curious to note that, at the level of policy-making, the link between ICT and distance education on the one hand and internationalisation on the other is often lacking (Van der Wende, 1997). Moreover, many observers of higher education exchange and politics fear that the challenge from providers of transnational education, distance education, off-shore campuses under the control of another European or overseas institution remains under-estimated, and that neither governments nor higher education institutions are ready to address it as a common issue.
3. **Trends**

Of the above described "state of the art" of internationalisation we should highlight five main trends which will be of immediate relevance for the design of EU cooperation with non-member States:

a) **The EU’s student mobility is well developed but not competitive enough on the international market**

In 1997, 45,531 Japanese students studied in the US while only 7,708 ended up at European higher education institutions (UNESCO Statistical Yearbook 1998). Although the Japanese example is not representative regarding the size of the gap between Europe and its main competitors, we have shown that such data are in principle not singular exceptions but exemplary of a trend which has now firmly established itself and should make any European higher education representative aware of the fact that the Union, more than ever before, has either failed to address mobility obstacles for students from outside of Europe, and failed to sell the advantages of studying in the European Union, or has concentrated too exclusively on its internal market of exchange students.

The imbalance of student mobility flows which increasingly favour the already over-demanded US, but also Canada and Australia over European destinations (with the exception of the UK) point to several obstacles with respect to incoming students in Europe:

Unlike the US, where regulations were revised in 1990 and now encourage the talented and highly skilled to stay in the US (Kuhlman, 1992), EU immigration laws still reflect a hostile mistrusting attitude to non-EU students which seem to be regarded as potential immigrants who could take away jobs from locals. The imminent shortage of highly qualified labour and already dawning shortage of postgraduate students in natural sciences and engineering is not yet taken into account by immigration laws. In this respect, the US, Canada and Australia are a decade ahead in recognising the need for most students from abroad to be able to work part-time, gain professional as well as academic experience during their training and to have some hope of finding a job which responds to their qualifications after their studies. American observers of their own market position mention, for example, the opportunities for US-educated international Ph.D.s on the faculties of American institutions as a competitive advantage. While European higher education remains far from being widely open to incomers from other countries as far as academic positions are concerned, the pressure from other professional fields is already growing enough to warrant action.

- Professionally designed, concise and widely distributed information in English on European higher education systems as well as on individual higher education institutions and their profiles and strengths is available only to a limited extent. The quality of higher education provision is either not assured systematically or not publicised widely enough wherever it is systematically assured and monitored. Hence, the general inclination of most students from abroad to prefer
high-profile destinations and institutions remains unanswered by most European institutions.

- Some of the reputation of the Anglo-Saxon systems of higher education derives from the perception that more attention is paid to the learning process of each student and to the targeted training of his or her competencies. "Learner-centred teaching" and "competence-based learning" have become not only qualitative but also marketable assets of Anglo-Saxon higher education institutions. Continental Europe clearly has something to learn from the attention paid to the learner but also from the more consumer-friendly service culture which developed successfully in the Anglo-Saxon educational (and other) environment. While many services concerning the reception of incoming students have greatly improved in Europe with the quality requirements of such exchange programmes as ERASMUS, much remains to be done, especially with respect to the consumer-friendliness of the "normal" student services and administration.

- The wealth of experience which has been gained in Europe - more than elsewhere - in questions of recognition of study abroad periods and mutual transparency in spite of widely differing systems of education is predominantly used internally but does not seem to be exploited in the wider international cooperation market.

b) Beyond mobility, other forms of cooperation gain in importance

In recent years, other forms of cooperation have gained in visibility and emphasis. Teaching staff mobility and joint curriculum development, both activities which presuppose dense communication and exchange between partner institutions, involve academics but also institutional decisions at other levels in order to allow for the adoption of new courses and integration of incoming teaching staff. European institutions of higher education have gained ample experience in this field, more so than institutions elsewhere in the world. Nevertheless, what could be a competitive edge is not exploited as such.

With regard to curriculum development, it would seem all the more surprising that the aggressively expanding market of education products is dominated so strongly by American providers. Such market advantages can only be attributed to the more wide-spread use of ICT, the availability of such course material in English, the will to reach a wider audience and attention paid to doing it justice, and to better marketing of these products. However, it seems that some European countries, such as the UK, which are more advanced in marketing education products, have not been used to the extent possible and desirable, or at any rate not early enough, as an example for others to follow.

c) The advance of networking

The rate at which contacts are being established inside and outside Europe is steadily increasing. With the use of ICT, communication and exchange across borders has become even easier so that even multilateral forms of cooperation are transforming from being a communicational challenge into relative normality. European higher education institutions are characterised by a well developed density of such networks
of contacts which have often even expanded into inter-institutional networks. Only rarely, however, are such networks used strategically to position the ingredient institutions in a more advantageous manner on the international market, for example by being able to offer pooled expertise in a network of different but complementary specialisation.

d) The quality of cooperation is increasingly regarded as the essential point or stumbling block for sustainable cooperation

The international dimension of higher education provision has only recently begun to be subjected to quality assurance. At the same time, quality has become the central focus of European cooperation as more and more contacts accumulate and greater selectivity becomes necessary. With quality enhancement in mind, cooperation activities all over the world are being institutionalised and more frequently integrated into the profile and strategic development of higher education institutions. Helped by national regulations or such cooperation frameworks as SOCRATES, the systematic integration of casuistic cooperation activities into the wider institutional framework, enhancing efficiency as well as the potential for synergies, is taking root in Europe too. It fosters hope that clear strategic targeting and central level attention and prioritisation will push the cause of internationalisation further by greater mobilisation and awareness of the importance of internationalisation for the survival of higher education institutions as well as for better quality assurance and enforceable guidelines of good practice.

Quality management has become the topic of the nineties. Restricted budgets and reduced state interventions have emphasised the role of monitoring and efficient use of public funds. While most individual European countries do not have a tradition of quality assurance agencies overseeing quality enhancement, such agencies have recently been established with the input of already existing systems of quality assurance from other EU member states. The exchange of information between different agents involved in quality improvement of higher education are increasingly exchanging information and experience. As yet, such progress has not resulted in a qualitatively more transparent European space of higher education, however. Only if the attention paid to issues of quality were to become more visible and effects of quality improvement were to become visible even outside of Europe, would European higher education retrieve its former reputation of offering top-level educational services and research.

e) New technologies and new providers of higher education are challenging the market of international education with new service demands

As world-wide communication becomes easier with the help of ICT, the idea of conquering the world market with educational products and services is gaining ground. Business-minded established institutions and profit-based new providers are exploiting these markets aggressively enough to have left more traditional higher education institutions behind. The quality of such offers is by no means better but new demands are being made on the presentation and marketing of any institution which tries to enter the world-wide competition in higher education. The market is
generally regarded as a rapidly expanding one with enormous future prospects due to the value attributed to knowledge for economic survival in developed countries. The gold-rush has only started. This time who finds real gold is less a matter of luck but entirely up to the players.
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V. Component III: Recommendations for Key Elements of a Future EU Third Country Cooperation Policy

Cooperation programmes of the type the European Union currently runs with third countries are an important means of the internationalisation of European education and training institutions in general, and for raising the quality of education in the Union in particular. However, as became apparent in the preceding state-of-the-art report on internationalisation, they are clearly neither the only, nor a sufficient instrument to internationalise European education. What is equally necessary is the creation of framework conditions which are conducive to internationalisation, in that they improve the attractiveness and competitive standing of Europe's education on a world-wide scale. Therefore, the following recommendations will touch on both cooperation programmes as such and on a wider set of measures ("systemic measures") geared to enhance the framework conditions for international cooperation.

1. Cooperation Programmes

Concentration of Effort

The European Union's budgets for third country cooperation in education and training are modest. Even if budgets were to be increased very significantly, the Union would still not have the means to be everything to everybody. In order to achieve any impact, the Union needs to concentrate and focus its programmes, according to policy priorities to be worked out.

Priority on Higher Education

One obvious way to prioritise is by sectors of the education and training system. Given the Union's accumulated experience in higher education cooperation and the level of advancement reached in this sector, it is recommended that the Union continues and reinforces its concentration on higher education, inclusive of the tertiary non-university sector. This does not, and in fact must not mean, that non-academic partners, such as companies, are not to be integrated into higher education collaboration.

Selection of Priority Countries and Regions

Present EU third country cooperation targets a wide range of countries and regions, in the developing, emerging and industrialised world. Especially in view of budgetary limitations, a continuation of the relatively unfocused geographic policy is not advisable. The EU needs to identify a more limited number of priority areas and regions. The two key criteria for selecting target countries and regions should be the strength of their higher education systems, and the importance and potential of their higher education markets. In this
It is clear that activities with North American partners will need to be stepped up, and that countries so far not (adequately) represented in EU third country cooperation, such as Australia, will need to be integrated.

**Strengthen Curriculum Development and the Use of ICT**

The Union's prime focus in third country cooperation is so far on (individual) mobility of persons. Mobility is an important element of any cooperation policy. But, as was shown in the previous chapter, increased mobility can also and often even better be achieved by the reduction of mobility obstacles in Europe's higher education systems and institutions than by cooperation programmes. In programme cooperation, the Union needs to make better use than is so far the case of joint curriculum development, to create a sustainable internationalisation base, and of the new information and communication technologies (ICT). In the field of curriculum development, a programme supporting the introduction of "European Modules" (cf. ERASMUS/SOCRATES) into non-European Studies degree courses could be an adequate measure. ICT will help to use more effectively scarce resources.

Generally, curriculum development and ICT in cooperation programmes should be complemented by other activity forms and vice versa, for maximum mutual enhancement (see also remarks on "multi-activity designs" below).

**Make Use of the Experience Gained in Intra-European Cooperation**

The Union has an experience of 15 years in organising intra-European cooperation, through SOCRATES, LEONARDO and their predecessor programmes. The lessons learned and the quality levels attained through intra-European cooperation must become the measuring rod for EU third country cooperation. This practically means:

- the need for the introduction of recognition and credit transfer procedures in any programmes entailing the mobility of persons (particularly of students), such as equivalents of the ECTS and the Diploma Supplement
- the need for a much more systematic and widespread use of the "network-type" programme formula, as it is used, for example, by the EC-US and EC-Canada schemes. This formula entails a concentration on multilaterality (rather than bilaterality), an institutional approach (rather than one geared towards individuals), a multi-activity design (rather than a focus on one single activity) as well as pluri-annual funding.

Also, the Union should, to the degree possible, aim to systematically cooperate with programmes in the target countries and regions which have been designed along the lines of the above model (such as UMAP).

2. **System Enhancement Measures**

The authors are aware that a fair number of the measures elaborated below do not fall into the direct competence of the European Union. It is therefore clear that the
following recommendations can only be implemented in collaboration with the member states and the higher education institutions themselves. Nevertheless, it was felt that the following issues were far too vital not to be emphasised in the recommendations.

*Improve Practical Conditions for Access to Europe’s Higher Education*

There are a number of very practical hindrances which act as an impediment when it comes to increasing the number of foreign students (and also scientists) in European higher education institutions, and which have been (partly) abolished by Europe’s main competitors, thus putting Europe at a disadvantage. **European higher education is in need of framework conditions which are perceived as welcoming and caring by potential students.** Obstacles to be tackled include:

- difficulties in obtaining study visas;
- relative impossibility to obtain work permits after completion of studies (even for limited periods);
- the lack of a service culture in most European institutions of higher education, and particularly, of information and support services before and after arrival (one measure could be *stages* for European higher education administrators in universities of countries with a more developed service culture).

*Improve the “Readability” of European Higher Education Systems*

One of Europe’s strengths is the diversity of its education and training systems. However, this diversity is often perceived as confusing by potential students from third countries. At the level of formal aspects of the education system (not concerning the content of education), Europe needs more commonality, in order for its education systems to be "readable" from the outside. **The Union is therefore encouraged to continue to support the "Bologna Process"**, which is hoped to finally bring about a unified European degree structure based on internationally accepted models.

*Marketing of European Higher Education*

Europe has one of the highest levels of education in the world. But this is not often perceived outside of our continent. There is ample evidence that potential students and academic staff consider the quality of higher education in the United States of America, but also in such countries as Australia or Canada, as superior to that of Europe (with the possible exception of the United Kingdom). **Europe therefore needs forceful marketing to adequately communicate the quality of its education to the outside world.**

- Europe’s higher education institutions need to present themselves in a professional way on the world stage. First measures will entail the creation of English-language websites (possibly also in further world languages) of a professional standard and of superior-quality written material for every higher education institution.
The European Union will need to encourage member states and institutions to actively promote their higher education systems and institutions. In order to help especially those European countries which have not yet entered (in any major way) into marketing, an overview of measures already successfully undertaken in Europe and beyond would need to be created (The Good Practice Guide for Marketing).

There is a need for the marketing of genuinely European "flagship products" on the world educational market. Europe has developed many joint degrees offered by institutions in two or more member states of a model sort (through the SOCRATES/ERASMUS Programme, inter alia). More and more European networks of higher education institutions provide jointly developed and jointly delivered teaching products. A high-quality selection of such courses, delivered in English (and possibly other world languages), should be compiled and marketed in third countries. The same goes for high-quality education offers of a specialised kind at individual universities.

There is also a need for more background information on the European concept of higher education. Compared to the United States and other leading higher education providers, Europe's higher education landscape is less stratified. The relative absence of outstanding "star institutions" is often misunderstood as an indicator of a generally mediocre quality of European higher education. It must be communicated to third countries that the quality of European higher education is generally high.

In this respect, it will be important to stress that the absence of (high) tuition fees in (continental) Europe does not mean that there is no substantial investment in European higher education, and thus no quality. The fact that higher education in the Union is often free and at any rate rarely expensive for the users needs to be explained and communicated as an asset.

Safeguard and Display Quality of European Education

From the outside world, Europe is often, if not mostly, perceived as one. In terms of its measures to safeguard a high level of education and training, i.e. in quality assurance and accreditation, European solutions are only just now emerging. The "Bologna Declaration" proposes a joint European approach to European quality assurance agencies and accreditation, and the European Commission itself has championed an ever closer cooperation of national quality assurance agencies. These forms of cooperation need to be reinforced and should ultimately result in the development of "European labels" for accreditation and quality assurance, which would be usable as complementary top-up procedures to national quality assurance mechanisms, where they exist, and should cover a wider range of issues in such countries where quality assurance systems do not yet exist. In its approach to quality assurance, the Union should regard it as its task to integrate into national quality assurance systems the element of European and international cooperation, or, alternatively, to support the further development and use of separate instruments for quality assurance in internationalisation such as the Internationalisation Quality Review (IQR).
Develop "External" Language Policies

For good reasons, Europe is making every attempt to protect its rich linguistic diversity. This is a wise internal policy. However, most European languages are not frequently spoken outside of Europe, and they thus present a barrier when it comes to attracting the best foreign students and scientists. This is why the Union should support developments already underway in many member states to provide education in major foreign languages (English above all). This recommendation is not meant to replace national languages as modes of instruction across the board. But each institution should offer a selection of degree and other courses which it regards as particularly appropriate to attract an international target audience in one or more world languages.

Face the Challenge of Transnational Education

"Transnational education", i.e. the delivery of education and training products in countries other than the one of origin (and mostly through international consortia of universities and corporate bodies), is rapidly increasing. So is electronic teaching and learning. Again, in comparison with the United States and other countries, in this process Europe seems to be led by others rather than being a leader itself. This can develop into a major problem: rather than using the means of transnational education to be present on foreign markets, Europe could become infiltrated by providers from third countries. The European Union should counteract such developments, *inter alia* through the following measures:

- support the formation and development of European transnational education alliances (inclusive of company partners) which are present with technically and educationally up-to-date products in third countries;
- in this process, make maximum use of advanced information and communication technology;
- through, amongst other measures, top-up grants for European SOCRATES partnerships who act as carriers of European educational offers on third markets;
- and support the creation and development of joint European offshore campuses in third countries (supported by modern ICT and e-learning modules).
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Programme Data Sheets

♦ ACADIA Internship Programme
♦ ASEAN-EC Management Centre (AEMC)
♦ Amérique Latine - Formation Académique (ALFA)
♦ Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF)
♦ Asia-Link
♦ ASEAN-EU University Network Programme (AUNP)
♦ China-Europe International Business School (CEIBS)
♦ Euro-Asian Business Internship Programme (EABIP)
♦ Euro-Arab Management School (EAMS)
♦ EU-China Academic Network (ECAN)
♦ EU-China Higher Education Cooperation Programme
♦ Cooperation in Higher Education and Training between the European Community and Canada (EC/Canada Programme)
♦ Cooperation in Higher Education and Vocational Education and Training between the European Community and the United States of America (EC/US Programme)
♦ European Studies Programme, India (ESP India)
♦ ESP Philippines
♦ ESP Thailand
♦ University of Malaya European Studies Programme (UMESP)
♦ ESP Vietnam
♦ ESP Pakistan
♦ Executive Training Programme (ETP/Japan)
♦ Executive Training Programme (ETP/Korea)
♦ EU-China 2000 Scholarship Programme
♦ EU-China Junior Managers Training Programme (EU-CJMTP)
♦ EU-India Economic Cross-Cultural Programme
♦ International Cooperation in Research (INCO)
♦ Jean Monnet Scholarship Programme
♦ Junior EU-ASEAN Managers Exchange Programme (JEM)
♦ MED CAMPUS
♦ Postgraduate Technological Studies Programme (PTS)
♦ VULCANUS
ACADIA Internship Programme

Duration
1998 - 2000 (extension to 2001 foreseen)

Budget
240,000 EUR (annual)

Third countries involved
Canada

Sectors involved
Higher education

Themes and Disciplines
telecommunications, building, electronics, motorised equipment, banking, accounting, fisheries, forestry, health, community services.

Beneficiaries
♦ higher education students (first degree obtained)
♦ companies (providing placements)

Purpose
general aim: objectives of the EU-Canada Action Plan

specific aims: "to enhance the understanding of the Canadian market by offering sector-oriented experience to young Europeans; to contribute to the development of increased trade and investment links with Canada" (call for tender for a management contract of ACADIA, 9 June 1999)

Programme Activities

mobility (five-month internships of European graduates in Canadian businesses/SMEs).

Total number of internships per year: 24
Programme Design

individual, bilateral, single-activity

Organiser

Formaper – special agency of the Milan Chamber of Commerce, Via Camperio, 1 – 20123 Milano – Italy, Tel. 0039 02 8515 4555 - Fax 0039 02 8515 4556, E-mail: info@eu-acadia.org, website: www.eu-acadia.org

Short description of the programme

This very small mobility scheme provides internships for a total of 24 graduates from European higher education institutions in Canadian companies. Its formula is of the “classical” sort, i.e. focused on individuals (no institutional involvement), bilateral (no networks) and single-activity (mobility).
ASEAN-EC Management Centre (AEMC)

Third countries involved
ASEAN countries

Sectors involved
Continuing education and training

Themes and Disciplines
Management training

Beneficiaries
- private companies
- public institutions
- higher education institutions (management schools)
- private and public-sector managers

Purpose
- to create an ASEAN centre of excellence for human resource development
- to enhance management efficiency and effectiveness in the private and public sectors of ASEAN and to help develop the capacities of management training throughout the region
- to facilitate the development and evolution of new ideas, concepts, strategies and policies relevant to ASEAN's long-term needs
- to develop public administration and business management skills existing within institutions and corporations in ASEAN and the EC
- to strengthen cooperation links between ASEAN and the EC, through instruments of management, and to establish links with other areas covered by ASEAN-EC cooperation, such as industry, trade, tourism, science and technology with a view to enhancing such cooperation.

Programme Activities
- seminars and conferences
- lecture tours (of "distinguished speakers" from the other continent)
- research fellowships
- "case study" grants
- exchange of junior managers and/or post-experience MBA graduates
- "ASEAN-Europe immersion programme"
Programme Design

AEMC has a unique design, best described perhaps by the formula "institution-cum-programme". The Centre itself, located in Brunei Darussalam, has the function of a "hub", to which "spikes" (networks of institutions in ASEAN and EU countries, in the EU mainly the member institutions of CEMS) are attached. AEMC is therefore a predominantly institutional, networked and multi-activity programme.

Organiser


European Director at: Lovanium International Management Center, Chaussée de Bruxelles 135, B-1310 La Hulpe, Belgium, Tel: 32 2 655 5983, Fax: 32 2 655 5836, e-mail: lovanium@pophost.eunet.be, website: 130.104.8.103/iag/mark/limc3.

Short description of the programme

AEMC is the combination of an institution (AEMC in Brunei Darussalam itself), two institutional networks (one in the EU, one in the ASEAN countries) built around it, and a broad variety of programme activities (mobility, conferences, etc.), in the area of continuing education and training in management.
Amérique Latine - Formation Académique (ALFA)

**Duration**

1995-1999  (ALFA I)  
2000-2005  (ALFA II)

**Budget**

38.4  MEUR  (ALFA I)  
42 MEUR  (ALFA II, inclusive of 11 MEUR cofinancing by participating institutions)

**Third countries involved**

Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela

**Sectors involved**

Higher education

**Themes and Disciplines**

Priority for medicine and health sciences; engineering; social sciences and economics; other subjects in principle possible.

**Beneficiaries**

♦ Higher education institution  
♦ Students, academic and administrative staff from higher education institutions

**Purpose**

"to create/strengthen links between higher education institutions by enhancing the dialogue between the academic communities of both continents; to create systematic and sustainable mechanisms of cooperation between those involved in higher education in Europe and Latin America, in order to encourage the establishment of mechanisms for mobility between the two continents and at regional level in Latin America" (ALFA website)

Documents: Council Regulation no. 443/92 of 25 February 1992 on financial and technical assistance to, and economic cooperation with, the countries of Asia and Latin America (ALFA website)

"Approval" of 10 March 1994/first phase  
"Approval" of 4 December 1998/second phase
Programme Activities

Sub Programme A: Institutional Management
♦ Meetings and conferences
♦ Study visits/short-term stays

Sub Programme B:
♦ Mobility of students (postgraduate, doctoral) in both directions, and within Latin America
  (exceptionally: preparation of student mobility)

Programme Design

♦ institutional
♦ multilateral network structure (six institutions minimum, three from each continent, all from different countries)
♦ multi-activity

Organiser

CEEETA, 36 rue Joseph II, B-1000 Bruxelles, Tel: 32 2 219 04 53, Fax: 32 2 219 63 84; e-mail: infoalfa@ceeeta.pt, website: www.alfa-program.com

Short description of the programme

A multilateral programme, fully networked, institutionally focused and multi-activity, between higher education institutions in all Latin American countries and in the EU. Main activities are mobility (for postgraduate students) and seminars and visits for cooperation in institutional management.
Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF)

Duration

since 1997

Budget

Total: 21 Mio. US $
EC Contribution: 3.5 MEUR

Third countries involved

Japan, China, Korea, Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Vietnam

Sectors involved

various actors from civil society

Themes and Disciplines

Wide range of “themes of interest and relevance to all ASEM countries”

Beneficiaries

♦ higher education institutions
♦ schools
♦ cultural institutions

Purpose

"to promote better mutual understanding between Europe and Asia through greater intellectual, cultural and people-to-people exchanges"

Programme Activities

♦ "Intellectual exchange" (=high-level conferences)
♦ "People-to-People exchange" (focussing on young people = youth, students, etc, including summer schools and, in the future, student exchanges)
♦ "Cultural exchange"

Programme Design

♦ at present: basically single institution (ASEF)
♦ future: student exchange included

Organiser
Short description of the programme

ASEF is an "institution cum programme". The institution focuses on the intellectual exchange between high-level personalities and limited people-to-people exchanges, but it plans for the future to broaden its exchange activities. The foundation is mainly financed by the participating Asian states, with the EU contribution making up only a fraction of the total budget.

Comment

The inclusion of this programme in the inventory might be contested, since it mainly focusses on non-educational target groups and activities ("intellectual", "people-to-people" and "cultural" exchanges). The decision to include it was based on the projected start of a student mobility component of ASEF.
ASIA-LINK

Duration
expected to start in 2001 (not yet approved), with an overall duration of six years (3+3)

Budget
Overall budget  45 MEUR  
EC contribution  40 MEUR

Third countries involved
India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Bhutan, Indonesia, Brunei, Malaysia, Philippines, Vietnam, Thailand, Singapore, Laos, Cambodia and China.

Sectors involved
Higher education

Themes and Disciplines
focus on subject areas such as technology, business/management and economics (but no disciplines explicitly excluded)

Beneficiaries
♦ Higher education institutions
♦ students
♦ academic staff

Purpose
♦ To facilitate better understanding and closer linkages between the peoples of the EU and South and South-East Asia.
♦ To foster closer linkages between Europe and South-East Asia in key fields of study and sectors of industry and technology
♦ To enable institutes of higher education in the developing countries of South and South-East Asia to offer improved services to students and the community

Programme Activities
♦ Mobility
  ♦ of postgraduate and (possibly) undergraduate students, as well as lecturers
  ♦ establishment of an EU-Asia Credit Transfer System, an EU-Asia System of Academic Recognition and an EU-Asia Higher Education Information System
Inter-institutional cooperation

- networking of European and Asian institutions of higher education
- upgrading management, curricula, and academic capacity of higher education institutions in South and Southeast Asia through co-operation
- Increase of access to European Studies in Asia and to Asian Studies in Europe
- Establishment of a central information dissemination point for improved access to information on EU and member state initiatives in higher education cooperation between Asian and Europe
- Conferences, seminars, to improve networking and promote links

Programme Design

not yet fully clear, but apparently

- institutional
- multilateral
- multi-activity

Organiser

Mr. Johan Cauwenbergh, DG External Relations, Tel: 32 2 29 68 022, e-mail: johan.cauwenbergh@cec.eu.int

Short description of the programme

Asia–Link is a programme under preparation (not yet adopted by the ALA Committee and not yet any financing agreement) the formula of which, if and when realised, will incorporate many of the experiences made in intra-EU collaboration. The programme's backbone is to be a network of higher education institutions on both continents, which will be the "carrier" for operational activities such as mobility and curriculum development. Recognition and credit transfer are to play a major role, too. In other words, a fully networked, institutionally-based and multi-activity scheme.
ASEAN-EU University Network Programme (AUNP)

Duration
Five years from launch (programme is under preparation)

Budget
Total Budget: 7.767.5 MEUR
EC Contribution: 7 MEUR

Third countries involved
ASEAN (= Thailand, Vietnam, Malaysia, Singapore, Philippines, Brunei, Indonesia, Laos, Myanmar, Cambodia)

Sectors involved
Higher education

Themes and Disciplines
human and natural sciences (priorities determined by programme steering committee on an annual basis)

Beneficiaries
♦ higher education institutions
♦ Ph.D. students, lecturers, institutional leaders (rectors), administrative staff (international officers)

Purpose

General:
"to contribute to the improvement of mutual understanding between EU and ASEAN, to facilitate human links as an instrument to promote further co-operation and to favour the transfer of expertise and knowledge".

Specific:
♦ to create and reinforce networks between ASEAN and EU higher education institutions
♦ to gradually build networks between the universities of the two regions
♦ to contribute to the reflection on matters of mutual interest and to the dissemination and implementation of the results of the reflection
♦ to exchange experiences and the building-up of common activities.
Documents:

◆ Commission Communication “Creating a new Dynamic in EU-ASEAN Relations”

Programme Activities

◆ "Networking"
  ◆ biannual rectors' meeting
  ◆ annual "short technical assistance programme" (on issues of European strengths, such as credit transfer)
  ◆ annual round table (heads of international relations departments of the universities involved)

◆ "Projects" (in the area of human or natural sciences)
  ◆ project preparation visits
  ◆ joint research and publications
  ◆ mobility of Ph.D. students and faculty
  ◆ curriculum development and development of course material
  ◆ "joint academic activities"

Programme Design

◆ multilateral (projects involve minimally two European and two Asian institutions from different countries)
◆ institutional
◆ multi-activity

Organiser

to be contracted

Short description of the programme

The ASEAN-EU University Network Programme (AUNP) is a scheme under preparation which will, like the planned Asia-Link Programme, constitute a new departure in the Asia region through its concept to base operational activity (mobility, joint research, curriculum development) on a network of Asian and European universities, which is to be created. It appears likely that AUNP, if and when it is launched, will be a fully networked, multilateral and institution-based scheme.
China-Europe International Business School (CEIBS)

**Duration**

Since 1994

**Budget**


**Third countries involved**

China

**Sectors involved**

Higher education

**Themes and Disciplines**

Business studies

**Beneficiaries**

higher education institutions
students and faculty

**Purpose**

overall
to contribute to the economic development of China and its business communities

specific

♦ to offer MBA students, managers and senior executives of companies operating in or planning to enter China, the latest knowledge and a thorough understanding of current practices in international management
♦ to help participants to adapt successfully to their own business environment.

**Documents:** ALA 443/92 (25.2.92)

**Programme Activities**

mobility (of European teachers and administrative staff to China and of Chinese students to Europe)
Programme Design

♦ single institution
♦ individual
♦ bilateral

Short description of the programme

The China-Europe International Business School (CEIBS) is an “institution-cum programme”-type of exercise. The school operates a mobility programme for European academic and administrative staff (incoming) and for Chinese students (outgoing, to European destinations).
Euro-Asian Business Internship Programme (EABIP)

Duration

1998 –1999 (Pilot Phase with Japan and China)

Budget

1.9 MEUR

Third countries involved

Japan, People's Republic of China

Sectors involved

Higher education

Themes and Disciplines

Priority: Business studies, related subject areas possible

Beneficiaries

♦ higher education institutions
♦ companies
♦ students (advanced phase of first degree)

Purpose

"to increase people-to-people contacts between Europe and Asia by providing young university students with the opportunity to experience the professional and cultural environment of the other region through short-term work placements in enterprises" (EABIP Programme Office)

Programme Activities

Mobility of students for company internships (both ways, 100 in each direction) (inclusive of preparatory and debriefing seminar)

Programme Design

♦ individual
♦ bilateral
♦ single-activity

Organiser
Short description of the programme

A "classical" bilateral student mobility programme for company internships (duration of 8 weeks) between China and Japan on the one hand, and the European Union, on the other. No institutional involvement (individual). In its pilot phase in 1999, the programme funded 100 Japanese and Chinese students in Europe, and 100 European students in Japan and China.
Euro-Arab Management School (EAMS)

Duration

established in 1995

Budget

8.3 MEUR

Third countries involved

Countries of the Arab League

Sectors involved

Continuing education and training, higher education

Themes and Disciplines

Management studies

Beneficiaries

♦ Managers
♦ Higher education teachers and trainers
♦ Policy makers

Purpose

EAMS was born out of a process originally started by the "Euro-Arab dialogue" as a way to further develop economic relations between Europe and the Arab World. The school is mentioned in the Action Programme of the 1995 Barcelona Declaration for its contribution to the development of human resources, especially in the fields of professional training and educational technologies. "It aims at achieving, ...., a better understanding of socio-economic and managerial issues that are central to Euro-Arab relations." (programme website)

Programme Activities

the school offers a
♦ Master in Management Development Programme (MMDP)
♦ Euro-Arab Management Diploma (EAMD)
♦ Euro-Arab Master in Business Administration
♦ Executive Education Seminars

It also runs conferences and seminars, and issues publications.
Programme Design

EAMS is essentially a single institution, linked to an (apparently loose) network of "partner institutions" in Europe and the Arab countries. Teaching takes place through a combination of "presence" phases on the school's premises in Granada and distance education components.

Organiser
EAMS, Calle Carcel Baja3, 18001 Granada, Spain, Tel:: 34 9588050, Fax: +34 958800152, e-mail: info@eams.fundea.es, website: www.eams.fundea.es.

Short description of the programme

The Euro-Arab Business School (EAMS) in Granada is essentially a single management school, with a certain amount of mobility towards it by students from the Arab and EU countries ("institution-cum-programme"). The school is linked to a "network of partner institutions" in the EU and the Arab World, but the exact relationship between the Granada centre and these "satellites" remains somewhat unclear.
EU-China Academic Network (ECAN)
(EU-China Research Fellowship Fund)

Duration
1997-2000 (extension)

Budget
500,000 EUR (for 1997-2000)

Third countries involved
People's Republic of China

Sectors involved
Higher education

Themes and Disciplines
European Studies

Beneficiaries
Universities
Academic staff

Purpose
"ECAN seeks to promote knowledge about China within the EU. ...designed to encourage collaboration among EU specialists on contemporary China".

documents
"new EU strategy for the development of relations with China" (ECAN website)

Programme Activities

ECAN:
♦ "private policy workshops" (for researchers on China from EU universities and for policy makers (government)
♦ ECAN Annual Conference

ECRFF:
Mobility fellowships for fieldwork and visits to archives in China to young (postgraduate, early postdoc) European researchers (3,250 EUR for China/Taiwan; 5,000 EUR for Hongkong for whole stay; no time limit)
Programme Design

multilateral
institutional (institute level)

Organiser

School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, Thornhaugh Street, Russell Square, London, United Kingdom, Tel: 44 171 637 6130; Fax: 44 171 323 6277, e-mail: ecan@soas.ac.uk; www.soas.ac.uk/Centres/ECAN.HOME.

Short description of the programme

A programme designed to strengthen cooperation and joint research among China specialists in Europe. Main activities are workshops and an annual conference. The programme has its own mobility component, the EU-China Research Fellowship Fund (ECRFF). A network-type of programme.
EU-China Higher Education Cooperation Programme

Duration
1996-2001

Budget
9.75 MEUR

Third countries involved
People's Republic of China

Sectors involved
Higher education

Themes and Disciplines
A comprehensive range of disciplines from the humanities and social sciences falling under a wide concept of "European Studies".

Beneficiaries
Higher education institutions
Individual academics and students
"officials" and "policy makers" (Chinese national and provincial government staff)

Purpose

overall objective:
"to promote greater interest in and understanding of the European Union in China"
(programme website)

specific objectives:
1. "build up institutional capacity in European Studies teaching, degree programmes and thereby enlarging the corpus of European specialist in China".
2. "adding European Studies elements to existing language courses run by the EU member states".
3. A transfer of European practice and experience to China in governance (in training workshops)

Documents:
- ALA/CH/95/19
Council Regulation No. 443/92 of 25 02 1992;
"European Commission's Communication on a long-term strategy for EU-China Relations / COM (95) 29"

Programme Activities

A. Mobility
B. Collaborative Projects (joint research; curriculum development; workshops)

A.1 (for European participants):
a) Robert Schuman Professorships (at selected "centres" in China, about 6 per year, duration 1 month))
b) European Visiting Professors (about 7 per year, 3 months' duration)

A.2 (for Chinese Participants):
a) Guest Professorships (professors and senior researchers, about 4 per year, 1 or 3 months' duration)
b) Fellowships ("scholars", one or six months)
c) Internships (academics, "officials" and "policy makers", 1 month or 6 months' duration), in European Union institutions (total no. of b) and c) per year: 105)
d) Studentships (postgraduates, one year duration)

C. Collaborative Projects
a) Collaborative Research (between at least one EU and one Chinese institution)
b) Curriculum Development (at Chinese universities, with the help of EU academics)
c) Workshops (in China, approximately 5 per annum, inclusive of business sector)

Programme Design

mainly bilateral. Multilaterality partially possible (collaborative research, workshops), but rarely used
institutional (individuals apply only through institution)
concentration on "centres" in some parts of the programme.
multi-activity (applications using various programme parts preferred)

Organiser

Project Management Office Europe: EU-China Higher Education Cooperation Programme, Lund University, Box 117, S-22100 Lund, Jenny Hällen, Tel: 46 46 222 12 93, e-mail: jenny.hallen@eu-china.lu.se; website: www.lu.se/eu-china.

Short description of the programme

A multi-activity, basically bilateral, comprehensive higher education cooperation programme in a range of subjects making up "European Studies". A large variety of mobility measures, in both directions, complemented by more structural forms of "collaborative activity", such as joint research, curriculum development and workshops.
Cooperation in Higher Education and Training between the European Community and Canada (EC/Canada Programme)

**Duration**

1996-2000
extension being negotiated

**Budget**

1996-2000: 3.24 MEUR (plus top up for 2000)

**Third countries involved**

Canada

**Sectors involved**

- Higher education
- Vocational education and training
- "relevant organisations" (businesses, NGOs, publishers, government departments, chambers of commerce, research institutes)

**Themes and Disciplines**

All subject areas

**Beneficiaries**

- Universities
- Non-university higher education institutions
- Vocational education and training institutions
- "Organisations" (see above)
- Students
- Higher education teaching staff

**Purpose**

- to promote better understanding between the peoples of Canada and the EU countries
- to improve the quality of human resources in the EU and Canada
- to improve the quality of transatlantic student mobility, particularly through appropriate recognition (credit transfer) measures
- to encourage exchange of expertise with regard to innovations, such as tele-teaching and use of new technologies
- to create new and consolidate existing partnerships
- to bring "added value" to transatlantic cooperation, by complementing existing bilateral cooperation measures of the member states
**Documents**
Council Decision of 27 November 1995 (95/523/EC), based on articles 126, 127 and 228 (2) and (3) of the Maastricht Treaty (149,150 and 300 of the Amsterdam Treaty)

**Programme Activities**

Transatlantic co-operative activities eligible for support are:
- Development of networks, providing the structural backbone for "operational" activity
- Mobility of students, teaching staff, trainers and administrators from higher education institutions and vocational training establishments
- Joint development of curricula, teaching materials, modules and methods, with particular focus on use of ICT
- Intensive programmes of a minimum of three weeks
- Teaching assignments forming an integral part of the curriculum in a partner institution
- Other innovative projects, including the use of new technologies and distance learning, which aim to improve the quality and cost-effectiveness of transatlantic co-operation in education and training

**Programme Design**

- multilateral (six partner institutions, three on each side, of which two from higher education and training)
- institutional
- multi-activity

**Organiser**

European Commission, DG EAC, Mr. Brendan Cardiff, 200 rue de la Loi, B-1049 Bruxelles, Tel: 32 2 2956083, e-mail: brendan.cardiff@cec.eu.int, website: www.europa.eu.int/comm/education

**Short description of the programme**

A small higher education cooperation programme which makes full use of the experience gained in the inner-EU education and training programmes (ERASMUS, COMETT and successors). Good value for money rate. Fully institutional, networked, multiactivity. Parallel programme exists with the US.
Cooperation in Higher Education and Vocational Education and Training between the European Community and the United States of America (EC/US Programme)

Duration

1993/94 - 1994/95 (pilot phase)
1996- 2000
extension being negotiated

Budget

pilot phase: 2 MEUR
1996 - 2000: 6.5 MEUR (plus top up for 2000)

Third countries involved

United States of America

Sectors involved

Higher education
Vocational education and training

Themes and Disciplines

All subject areas

Beneficiaries

Universities, non-university higher education institutions, vocational education and training institutions, enterprises, students, higher education teaching staff

Purpose

The programme "aims to add a new European Community/United States Dimension to student-centred cooperation and to bring balanced benefits to both the European Community and the United States." (DG Education and Culture website). Its more detailed objectives are identical with those of the EC-Canada cooperation programme.

Documents (concerning the first programme phase):
Council Decision of 23 October 1995 (95/487/EC), based on articles 126 and 127 as well as 228 (2) and (3) of the Maastricht Treaty (149,150 and 300 of the Amsterdam Treaty)

Programme Activities

♦ creation of a consortium of partner institutions as the precondition for structured cooperation
♦ mobility of students (for study and internships), teachers, trainers (teaching assignments) and administrators;
♦ Joint development of curricula, teaching materials, teaching methods and modules;
♦ Intensive programmes (minimum duration: three weeks)
♦ Support for projects in new technologies and distance education
♦ Recognition of periods studied abroad

Programme Design

multilateral (five partner institutions), institutional, multi-activity

One of the few programmes which has made full use of the experience from the intra-EU cooperation programmes:
♦ EC/US networks are preferably built on existing consortia from EU-programmes (on EU side)
♦ Exchanges in a structured environment (networks)
♦ Student mobility with credit transfer
♦ Teaching assignments must form an integral part of the host institution's curriculum
♦ Very wide activity range (with preference for multi-activity projects)
♦ High value for money rate
♦ Open to a multiplicity of institutional actors, inclusive of non-university higher education institutions.
♦ Based on a "subsidiarity" concept: intended to complement the member states' bilateral cooperation activities

Organiser

European Commission, DG EAC, Brendan Cardiff, 200 rue de la Loi, B-1049 Bruxelles, Tel: 32 2 2956083, e-mail: brendan.cardiff@cec.eu.int, website: www.europa.eu.int/comm/education

Short description of the programme

A small higher education cooperation programme which makes full use of the experience gained in the inner-EU education and training programmes (ERASMUS, COMETT and successors). Good value for money rate. Fully institutional, networked, multiactivity. Parallel programme exists with Canada.
European Studies Programme, India (ESP India)

Duration

4 years, not yet started

Budget

Total Budget: 8.12 MEUR
EC Contribution: 6 MEUR

Third countries involved

India

Sectors involved

Higher education

Themes and Disciplines

European Studies

Beneficiaries

Universities, academic staff, students (postgraduate)

Purpose

♦ to raise the profile of the EU in India;
♦ to promote better understanding of the EU among academics, and public and private sector decision-makers, to lead to stronger economic ties

Documents

♦ The Co-operation Agreement between the EC and the Republic of India on Partnership and Development, signed on 20 December 1993, names as one main focus of co-operation the "facilitation of better mutual understanding and strengthening of ties between the two regions in respect of technical, economic and cultural matters". Article 18, covering human resource development, states "In their mutual interest, particular attention should be paid to promoting co-operation between Community and Indian higher education and training institutes".
♦ The Commission Communication of June 1996 "EU-India Enhanced Partnership" states (article 2.2.3) that "the Commission encourages all forms of links between civil society, educational establishments and the media, precisely to build up a pool of mutual understanding".
Programme Activities

Each of the four Centres for European Studies (still to be created) will offer the following activities:
- European Fellow-in-Residence
- EU Professors' Visits to India
- European Union Studies Chairs
- Postgraduate scholarships
- Faculty Fellowships
- Training Programmes (both for academics and out-reach)
- European Documentation Centre

Programme Design

"Institution-cum-Programme"

Organiser

Mr. Carlos Pita, DG External Relations, Tel: 32 2 29 94 057, e-mail: Carlos.Pita@cec.eu.int.

Short description of the programme

The European Studies Programme for India aims at raising the profile of the EU in India and promoting better understanding of the EU among decision-makers, in order to lead to stronger economic ties. The programme pursues its aims by the establishment of European Studies entities at several Indian universities.
ESP Philippines

Duration

started 1998
continuation under preparation

Third countries involved

Philippines

Sectors involved

Higher education

Themes and Disciplines

European Studies

Organiser

Mr. Carlos Pita, European Commission, DG External Relations, Tel: 32 2 29 94 057, e-mail: carlos.pita@cec.eu.int
ESP Thailand

Duration

1995-1999 (2nd phase)

Budget

Total: 3.1 MEUR
EC Contribution: 2.9 MEUR

Third countries involved

Thailand

Sectors involved

Higher education

Themes and Disciplines

European Studies

Beneficiaries

Universities, academic staff, students (postgraduate)

Purpose

to raise the profile of the EU in Thailand

Programme Activities

♦ mobility of academic staff and researchers (including of Thai Ph.D. students and postgraduates) in both directions
♦ joint research projects
♦ conferences and training seminars on EU affairs
♦ creation of an interdisciplinary one-year master's programme in European Studies at Chulalongkorn University
♦ creation of a European Union Documentation Centre

Programme Design

"Institution-cum-Programme"

Organiser

Mr. Carlos Pita, European Commission, DG External Relations, Tel: 32 2 29 94 057, e-mail: carlos.pita@cec.eu.int
Short description of the programme

The European Studies Programme Thailand essentially concerns the creation of an institution ("centre"), which will act as the "carrier" for operational activity ("institution-cum-programme"). It aims at raising the profile of the EU in Thailand and promoting better understanding of the EU among decision-makers, in order to lead to stronger economic ties. Programme activities include mobility (academic staff and advanced students), the creation of a European Union Documentation Centre, the setting up of an interdisciplinary one-year Master's programme in European Studies, as well as conferences and training seminars on EU affairs.
University of Malaya European Studies Programme (UMESP)

Duration

1997-2001

Budget

Total: 997,000 EUR
EC Contribution: 927,000 EUR

Third countries involved

Malaysia

Sectors involved

Higher education

Themes and Disciplines

European Studies

Beneficiaries

University of Malaya, students (postgraduate), academic staff, public and private sector decision-makers

Purpose

♦ to establish a stand-alone postgraduate European Studies course
♦ to integrate European Studies components into existing postgraduate courses in order to raise the profile of the EU in Malaysia.

Programme Activities

♦ creation of a European Studies degree course
♦ integration of European Studies components into existing postgraduate curricula
♦ mobility of academic staff (in both directions)
♦ seminars and workshops on EU affairs (for public and private sector decision makers and academics)
♦ creation of a European Documentation Centre

Programme Design

"Institution-cum-Programme"

Organiser
Mr. Carlos Pita, European Commission, DG External Relations, Tel: 32 2 29 94 057, e-mail: carlos.pita@cec.eu.int
ESP Vietnam

Third countries involved
Vietnam

Sectors involved
Higher education

Themes and Disciplines
European Studies

Beneficiaries
♦ Universities (National Centre for Social Sciences and Humanities, Hanoi)
♦ teaching and research staff

Purpose
♦ to raise the profile of the EU in Vietnam by promoting a better understanding of the EU among Vietnamese academics, as well as political and business decision-makers.

Programme Activities
♦ Creation of an EU Studies Department (EUSD) within the Centre for European Studies (CES) of the National Centre for Social Sciences and Humanities, Hanoi
♦ Short-term mobility to Vietnam of European academics, to train teach and advise
♦ European Fellow-in-Residence
♦ Faculty Fellowships, enabling Vietnamese teaching and research staff to train for short periods in Europe
♦ Senior Research Grants
♦ European Studies Programme Research Projects
♦ seminars and workshops
♦ creation of a European Documentation Centre

Programme Design
"Institution-cum-Programme"

Organiser
Mr. Carlos Pita, European Commission, DG External Relations, Tel: 32 2 29 94 057, e-mail: carlos.pita@cec.eu.int
ESP Pakistan

**Duration**

1998-2002

**Budget**

Total Budget: 590,000 EUR

**Third countries involved**

Pakistan

**Sectors involved**

Higher education

**Themes and Disciplines**

European Studies

**Beneficiaries**

- Universities (University of Karachi)
- Teaching and research staff

**Purpose**

- to raise the profile of the EU in Pakistan;
- to promote better understanding of the EU among academics and public and private sector decision makers, to lead to stronger economic ties

**Programme Activities**

- European Fellow-in-Residence
- EU professors' teaching visits to Pakistan
- faculty fellowships in Europe for University of Karachi teaching and research staff
- enhancement of ASCE library
- seminars and workshops targeting public and private sector decision makers as well as academics

**Programme Design**

"Institution-cum-Programme"
Organiser

Mr. Carlos Pita, European Commission, DG External Relations, Tel: 32 2 29 94 057, e-mail: carlos.pita@cec.eu.int
Executive Training Programme (ETP/Japan)

**Duration**
Since 1979 (ongoing)

**Budget**
On average 6 MEUR per year (EC contribution)

**Third countries involved**
Japan

**Sectors involved**
Continuing training (in the business/management field)

**Themes and Disciplines**
Management training (foreign language learning, intercultural learning)

**Beneficiaries**
enterprises
young executives

**Purpose**

overall aim:
"to improve access of European goods and cross-border services to Japan" (Council Regulation 1035/1999).

Specific aim:
"to create a pool of EU executives equipped with the Japan-specific linguistic, cultural and business skills and knowledge necessary to operate in and with the Japanese market. The executives trained through the ETP programme should be able to give effective assistance to their organisations in penetrating the Japanese market." (Terms of Reference for the evaluation of ETP of 21 October 1999).

**Documents:**
Council Regulation no. 1035/1999 on "implementation by the Commission of a programme of specific measures and actions to improve access of European goods and cross-border services to Japan".

**Programme Activities**
Mobility of young executives (for 18 months) to Japan. One way (Europe-Japan).
Months 1 to 12: intensive language tuition, supplemented with series of seminars and company visits.

Months 13 to 18: training and work experience in Japanese companies.

700 executives funded since start in 1979.

Programme Design

bilateral
individual
single-activity

Organiser

SHL Group, Rue Maurice Charlent, 53, B - 1160 Bruxelles, Tel: 32 2 663 48 20, Fax: 32 2 663 48 28, e-mail: etp@shlgroup.com, website: www.etp.org

Short description of the programme

An 18-month mobility programme for young European company executives, consisting of a 12-months Japanese-language course (inclusive of company visits and seminars), followed by 6 months of company internship/work experience. Aimed at increasing competence on the European market of businesspeople knowledgeable about Japan. A bilateral, individual-type and single-activity programme.
Executive Training Programme (ETP/Korea)

Duration
January 1999 – December 2000 (pilot project)

Budget
Total: 700,000 EUR

Third countries involved
Korea

Sectors involved
Continuing training (in the business field)

Themes and Disciplines
Management training (foreign language learning, intercultural learning)

Beneficiaries
enterprises
young executives

Purpose
ETP Korea aims to provide European managers with the business knowledge, cultural understanding and basic linguistic skills needed to cooperate successfully in Korea's business environment.

Programme Activities
Mobility of young executives (6 months) to Korea, through companies involved. One way (Europe-Korea). Months 1 to 3: intensive language tuition, supplemented with series of seminars and company visits. Months 3 to 6: training and work experience in Korean companies.

Small numbers (12 per call)

Programme Design
bilateral
individual
single-activity

Organiser
Short description of the programme

A 6-month mobility programme for young company executives, consisting of a 3-months Korean-language course (cum company visits and seminars), followed by 3 months of company internship/work experience. Aimed at increasing competence on the European market of businesspeople knowledgeable about Korea. A shorter-duration version of ETP Japan, and like the latter, bilateral, individual-type and single-activity.
EU-China 2000 Scholarship Programme

Duration

5 years, scheduled to start in 2000

Budget

31.2 MEUR (to be confirmed)

Third countries involved

People's Republic of China

Sectors involved

Higher education

Themes and Disciplines

Natural sciences, technology, business administration and law, social sciences, humanities and European Studies.

Beneficiaries

Universities

Academic (research) staff and postgraduate students

Purpose

Overall objectives:
"create stronger links between China and Europe in the field of higher education and research; contribute to the development of human resources in China as a key element for economic progress and social reform; reinforce links and mutual understanding between China and the member states of the European Union" (draft proposal for a financing decision)

Programme Activities

♦ Mobility (one way: China-Europe) of 1,000 postgraduate students and 1,000 senior researchers for stays of 10 months and 3 months respectively;
♦ Complementary activities: academic seminars, publications, alumni association

Programme Design

individual
bilateral
single activity
Organiser

Ms. Ana Gonzalo-Castellanos, DG External Relations, 200, rue de la Loi, B-1049 Bruxelles, Tel: 32 2 29 90 946, e-mail: Ana.GONZALO-CASTELLANOS@cec.eu.int

Short description of the programme

A classical scholarship programme, of an individual and bilateral nature, the EU-China Scholarship 2000 Programme will fund the mobility of a total of 2,000 Chinese junior and senior scientists to European universities, for periods of 10 months (junior) and 3 months (senior) respectively. This mobility core of the programme will be complemented by academic seminars in China, and funding for publications and an alumni association.
EU-China Junior Managers Training Programme (EU-CJMTP)

Duration
1998 - 2003

Budget
9.935 MEUR

Third countries involved
People's Republic of China

Sectors involved
Continuing Training

Themes and Disciplines
Management
Chinese language and culture

Beneficiaries
♦ 45 young managers per year (25 - 37 years of age, minimum 2 years work experience)
♦ Companies (sending and receiving)

Purpose

Overall objective:
"to contribute to EU-China trade and economic cooperation" (EU Delegation Beijing, programme sheet)

Specific objective:
"train a pool of young and promising European managers in the Chinese language and business culture" (EU Delegation Beijing, programme sheet)

Documents
♦ Council Regulation No. 443/92 of 25 February 1992
♦ ALA/CHN/96/2

Programme Activities
♦ Mobility (Course A: 11 months, Course B: 15 months)
♦ Chinese language course
♦ Internships in companies
♦ Additional seminars, workshops, company visits

Programme Design

individual
bilateral (one way only)
single-activity

Organiser

EU-China European Coordination Office, Hame Polytechnic, Jaakonkatu 28, 13100 Hameelinna, Finland, Tel: 358 3 646 49 20, Fax: 358 3 646 22 30, e-mail: euchina@hamkk.fi, website: www.hamkk.fi

Short description of the programme

An individual mobility programme for young managers (45 per year, age 25-37) in a business context, consisting of a Chinese language component and a company internship period.
EU-INDIA Economic Cross-Cultural Programme

Duration

1997 - 2000 (first phase)
2000 - 2001 (2003 = extension(s))

The programme has been temporarily interrupted

Budget

27.6 MEUR (EU contribution)

Third countries involved

India

Sectors involved

higher education
media
enterprises

Themes and Disciplines

There is no particular subject focus. However, priority is given to applications that propose activity in more than one target sector

Beneficiaries

♦ Universities, enterprises, media
♦ academic and other staff
♦ students

Purpose

Aims:
♦ to create a constructive dialogue between two different cultural environments
♦ to develop links between European and Indian organisations in order to
♦ "increase the visibility of the EU in India, and that of India in Europe, through a two-way approach"; and to
♦ "help strengthen a two-way, dynamic economic cultural presence in the two continents"

Documents:
EU Commission Communication "Towards a New Asia Strategy" (1994) and "EU& India Enhanced Partnership" (1996)
Programme Activities

♦ mobility of academic staff, postgraduate and Ph.D. students
♦ network of EU and Asian Studies Centres = joint curriculum development, exchange and development of materials, library links, etc.
♦ joint research and development projects (production of learned "papers" on issues of mutual interest)
♦ seminars (in higher education "dimension" on issues of common concern such as training and education needs analyses, technology transfer, deregulation and autonomy, recognition and credit transfer, new teaching methods and technologies /ICT/ and multimedia)
♦ Libraries and databases
♦ "Project Preparation Fund"

Programme Design

multilateral (minimum one Indian, two European partners), institutional (universities, media organisations, enterprises), individuals cannot apply. Multi-activity

Organiser

Until February 2000: CIRPS Consortium, Avenue Marie José 44b, B-1200 Bruxelles, Tel.: 32 2 738 10 12, Fax: 32 2 732 01 04, e-mail: euforindia@inforboard.be, website: www.epms.nl/euforindia

Short description of the programme

A programme linking institutions from the three "dimensions" of universities, media and enterprises, aimed at creating a "dialogue" between the EU and India and enhancing each other's visibility. Multilateral and institutional, multi-activity. Priority given to applications covering more than one single "dimension". Particular activities in the university "dimension" inter alia cover exchanges (staff, postgraduate and Ph.D. students), "networks", cooperation in R&D, and seminars.
International Cooperation in Research (INCO)

Duration

1998-2002

Budget

Total Budget (including third country contribution): 503.3 MEUR

A. Cooperation with third countries
   • States in the phase of pre-accession (25.0 MEUR)
   • NIS and CEECs not in the pre-accession phase (107.5 MEUR)
   • Mediterranean partner countries (52.8 MEUR)
   • Developing Countries (201.5 MEUR)
   • Emerging economies and industrialised countries (4.8 MEUR)

B. Training of researchers
   • Bursaries for researchers from developing countries, including Mediterranean partner and emerging economy countries (7.7 MEUR)
   • Fellowships for EU researchers to Japan (6.7 MEUR)

C. Coordination: within FP5 and with other Community programmes; with COST, EUREKA and international organisations; and with member states (49.9 MEUR)

Third countries involved

1. States in the phase of pre-accession: Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia.
2. NIS and CEECs not in the pre-accession phase: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Mongolia, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan.
4. Mediterranean Partner Countries: Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Malta, Morocco, Palestine Authority, Syria, Tunisia and Turkey
   Other Mediterranean Countries: Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen
4. Developing Countries: ACP, ALA (Asian, Latin American) and MC (Mediterranean countries)
5. Emerging Economy and Industrialised Countries: Australia, Canada, China, Israel, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, South Africa, USA and emerging economies in Asia and Latin America

Sectors involved

Higher education, continuing education and training
Themes and Disciplines

Natural and applied sciences, medical sciences and socio-economic sciences

Beneficiaries

♦ individual researchers
♦ higher education institutions
♦ research institutions
♦ companies

Purpose

Aims:
♦ to confirm the international role of Community research and to attract the best researchers from all over the world to European laboratories
♦ in the case of developing countries, to guarantee the development of local research potential

Documents:
Co-operation with third countries and international organisations in Community RTD is explicitly mentioned in the EC Treaty as one of the activities to be promoted when pursuing the objectives of Community research policy. (see 130f of the Treaty). It is also mentioned as one of the instruments for implementing the Framework Programme, in which it is now, as the "second activity" of FP5, fully integrated.

Programme Activities

♦ mobility of young researchers

Programme Design

institutional
single-activity
bilateral/multilateral

Organiser

European Commission, DG Research, Unit INCO-DEV, Mr. Jaak Sinnaeve, Tel: 32 2 29 54045, e-mail: Jaak.SINNAEVE@cec.eu.int.

Short description of the programme

The INCO Programme is the "international arm" of the Fifth Framework Programme. It promotes cooperation with non-member countries in the field of research, through the provision of fellowship for young researchers in the framework of research projects. The programme targets a very wide range of countries.
Jean Monnet Scholarship Programme

Duration
1998 - 2003

Budget
Total Budget: 5 MEUR (entirely EU funded)

Third countries involved
Turkey

Sectors involved
Higher education

Themes and Disciplines
European integration studies
Themes linked to EU-Turkey relations

Beneficiaries
♦ Universities
♦ Graduates from Turkish universities
♦ Young civil servants and private sector staff

Purpose
Though originally started in a different policy framework, the Jean Monnet Scholarship Programme has recently been integrated into the pre-accession strategy.

Documents:
Financing agreement between the European Commission and Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs of 25 July 1997

Programme Activities
mobility (of Turkish) postgraduate students to EU universities

Programme Design
♦ individual
♦ bilateral
♦ single activity

Organiser
Short description of the programme

A small programme placing a total of 225 Turkish graduates over a period of five years at EU universities for postgraduate studies in European integration. Individual, bilateral. Part of the EU's pre-accession strategy with Turkey.
Junior EU-ASEAN Managers Exchange Programme (JEM)

Duration

1996 - 1998 (first phase)
Continuation under discussion

Budget

18.76 MECU (EU = 70%, private sector = 30%)

Third countries involved

ASEAN countries (= Thailand, Vietnam, Malaysia, Singapore, Philippines, Brunei, Indonesia)

Sectors involved

Continuing training (enterprises)

Themes and Disciplines

Management training (and language)

Beneficiaries

Enterprises
Young professionals from the private sector

Purpose

to raise the image and the profile, of the European Union, its member states, and European companies within ASEAN and vice versa.

Programme Activities

Mobility of young professionals (25 - 35 years, 2 - 3 years of professional experience, university degree) from any private-sector company;
♦ both ways;
♦ 8-month stays (language, cultural and professional training, company work placement)
♦ 675 to Europe, 300 to Asia

Programme Design

added-on bilateral principle
individual
single-activity
Organiser

EU JEM office, rue du Trone 51, B - 1050 Bruxelles, Tel: 32 2 551 07 70, Fax: 32 2 512 01 97, e-mail: info@jemasean.org, website: www.jemasean.org

Short description of the programme

A mobility programme in the field of management training programme of the formula “company experience plus language training in…”. Based on a bilateral (no networks) and basically individual (but involvement of company) programme structure. Interesting in terms of co-financing (private sector).
MED CAMPUS

Duration

1992 – 1993 (pilot phase)
1993 – 1995 (consolidation phase)
"relaunch" 1998, "interruption" 2000

Budget

In the period 1992 – 1995, Community funds allocated to Med Campus projects amounted to 23.5 MEUR.

Third countries involved

Algeria, Cyprus, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Malta, Morocco, Palestinian Authority, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey.

Sectors involved

♦ Continuing training (for civil servants)
♦ Training of trainers (teaching staff) in public higher education establishments.

Themes and Disciplines

Themes between 1992 and 1995 included: environmental technologies and legislation; energy conservation; new technologies (IT, biotechnology); management; language teaching and translation; mass media and communication; consumer protection; financial markets and banking.

Beneficiaries

♦ Universities
♦ Other public higher education and training institutions
♦ Research institutes
♦ public and private sector companies (SMEs)
♦ civil servants
♦ trainers (teaching staff) from public higher education institutions
Purpose

The stated aim of the "Renovated Mediterranean Policy" is to contribute to a reduction in economic and social imbalances in the Mediterranean Partner countries, by supporting economic and social adjustment – which implies deep-reaching reforms in public administrations and in the organisation of the public and private sectors in these countries. Within this framework, "decentralised cooperation programmes" such as Med Campus are to encourage multilateral regional cooperation through the participation of the main groups in civil society (local authorities, universities, the media and SMEs) in networks.


Programme Activities

The programme consists of two types of training activities:

- Continuing training courses for higher education teaching staff to develop their technical and practical teaching skills;
- Courses to improve the management skills of civil servants (in tourism; higher education institutions; social and health services; local administrations and SMEs).

A total of 150 projects were funded during the period 1992 - 1995.

Programme Design

- multilateral (involving at least two partners from EU Member States and two from Mediterranean Partner countries);
- institutional (applications are accepted exclusively from institutions cooperating in networks, not from individuals).

Contact

MED Secretariat, 63 rue Montoyer, B-1000 Brussels, Tel: 32 2 237 09 60, Fax: 32 2 237 09 70, e-mail: info@med.ibf.be

Short description of the programme

The Med Campus programme supports "decentralised" cooperation between universities and other higher education establishments. Its main aim is to encourage university cooperation between the European Union and the non-Union Mediterranean basin countries in order to strengthen economic and social development in the latter, through a development of human resources. The programme also provides training for those working in public administrations and private companies (SMEs).
Postgraduate Technological Studies Programme (PTS)

Duration
1998 - 2002

Budget
2.650 MEUR

Third countries involved
"All countries in South, South-East and South Asia, with the exception of China, Taiwan, Japan, Korea (North and South), Afghanistan and the CIS Republics."

Sectors involved
Higher education

Themes and Disciplines
- Engineering (Civil).
- Technology;
- Management;
- Environment, resources, development.

Beneficiaries
Universities, (enterprises in case of additional placements)

Purpose
Stated objectives: "to mutually enhance knowledge and understanding of salient economic, social and cultural features of Asia and Europe and to strengthen their technological ties" (programme flyer).

Programme Activities
- mobility of students (postgraduate, Ph.D.) to and from the Asian Institute of Technology

Programme Design
- "Institution-cum-Programme"
- Individual mobility, (AIT as fixed partner).
  - European students: 20 months, to conclude master's degree (includes short period at another Asian university, enterprise or public sector
organisation); 8 - 12 months for doctoral students already enrolled at European university

Asian students: four-month period in Europe (university, enterprise or public sector), integrated into AIT master's or Ph.D. programme.

Organiser

Professor Thierry Lefevre, PTS Programme Coordinator, AIT, P.O. Box 4, Long Luang, Pathumthani 12120, Thailand, Tel: 66 2 524 63 18, Fax: 66 2 524 63 19, e-mail: pts@ait.ac.th, website: www.pts.ait.ac.th;
Mr. Philippe Bouix, Rue Ravenstein 40, B-1000 Brussels, Tel: 32 2 513 93 19; Fax: 32 2 513 22 92.

Short description of the programme

This is a small student mobility programme for 90 students moving from Asia (AIT) to Europe and vice versa, linked to the Asian Institute of Technology (Bangkok, Thailand), and its master (and Ph.D.) programmes in Engineering, Technology, Management and Environment. One of the numerous "institution-cum-programme"-type measures to be found in EU-Asian cooperation.
VULCANUS (IN JAPAN and IN EUROPE)

Duration
1997 - open end (according to the EU-Japan Centre for Industrial Cooperation)

Budget
In 1999: 287,585 EUR

Third countries involved
Japan

Sectors involved
♦ Higher education (sending)
♦ Enterprises (receiving)

Themes and Disciplines
Computer Science, science engineering, mechanical engineering, chemical engineering, electronics, biotechnology, electrical engineering, physics, telecommunications, information, nuclear engineering, civil engineering, architecture, metal materials, production systems (not exhaustive)

Beneficiaries
♦ Universities
♦ Enterprises
♦ Students (undergraduate and postgraduate)

Purpose
Overall aim:
"to contribute to the improvement and stimulation of industrial cooperation and to better mutual understanding between Japan and the EU."

Specific purposes:
♦ to familiarise future management personnel in EU industry and administration with Japan's business culture, its economic structure and its institutions;
♦ to create the personal networks deemed essential for setting up successful industrial cooperation projects;
♦ to build a pool of specially trained graduates who will be well placed to help their future European employers in their business relations with Japan.
Programme Activities

mobility of (undergraduate and postgraduate) students for company internship of 8 months, plus a 4 months’ intensive Japanese course, in both directions

Programme Design

♦ individual (no discernible institutional involvement)
♦ bilateral
♦ single-activity

Organiser

EU-Japan Centre for Industrial Cooperation, rue Marie de Bourgogne 52, B-1000 Bruxelles, Tel: 32 2 282 00 40, Fax: 32 2 282 00 45, e-mail: office@eujapan.com, website: www.eujapan.com

Short description of the programme

A one-year programme for students in engineering and technology disciplines, comprised of an 8-month company placement, preceded by 4 months’ of language training and introductory seminar. No institutional involvement, purely individual mobility.
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EU Delegations in "Third Countries"

The EU Delegations in all non-European non-member states were asked to report on relevant programmes in their countries. Half of them answered, too many to list here individually.
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