Sandra Bürger and Ute Lanzendorf

(eds.)

# Higher Education Institutions in Europe: Mobilized by Mobility?

## The Impact of the ERASMUS Programme on Quality, Openness, and Internationalisation

**Reihe WERKSTATTBERICHTE**

Sandra Bürger and Ute Lanzendorf

(eds.)

# Higher Education Institutions in Europe: Mobilized by Mobility?

## The Impact of the ERASMUS Programme on Quality, Openness, and Internationalisation

# WERKSTATTBERICHTE

Access is provided to the electronic version of this publication at:
http://www.uni-kassel.de/incher/v_pub/

# Contents

# PREFACE

## INCHER-Kassel and the ERASMUS Programme –
## a Continuous Dialogue through Evaluation Studies

### Ulrich Teichler

Evaluation research has been a regular companion of the ERASMUS programme (European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students) from its beginning. For each pluri-annual funding period, evaluation studies were commissioned in order to have programme implementation checked and to establish if the intended programme impact materialized. This reflects the general policy behind European programmes: they are expected to actively promote sector development rather than to fund 'routine' services. Their primary objective is to contribute to the achievement of medium-term strategic goals at the European level. Most programmes of the European Union are established under the condition that they have to be discontinued should there be evidence that they fail to bring about the expected change. Certainly, in the case of the ERASMUS programme, also its enormous potentials and risks led to the conclusion that frequent and thorough studies ought to be undertaken. Evaluation results regularly informed strategic re-orientation and also adaptations in the way the ERASMUS programme was implemented.

Over the last decades, scholars of the International Centre for Higher Education Research of the University of Kassel in Germany (INCHER-Kassel), previously named Centre for Research on Higher Education and Work, have continuously played a major role in evaluating the ERASMUS programme. They took responsibility for transferring the evaluation requests by the European Commission – and occasionally re-undertaken by other sponsors – into credible research projects which surpassed the scope and political interest of the funders, drew from the state of systematic knowledge on mobility as well as from own, credible data surveys, and at the same time did not compete with politicians in making recommendations by limiting their advice to aspects immediately plausible from empirical findings.

Most recently, in 2008 – i.e. at the time when the former SOCRATES Programme was enlarged and named Lifelong Learning Programme, whereby ERASMUS was continued as a sub-programme –, scholars from the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS) of the University of Twente in the Netherlands

took the lead in analyzing the role of ERASMUS for the quality of higher educa-
tion institutions in Europe (CHEPS, INCHER-Kassel and ECOTEC, 2008). In the
study "Quality, Openness and Internationalisation: The Impact of ERASMUS on
European Higher Education" – coordinated by Hans Vossensteyn – teams of
CHEPS, INCHER-Kassel as well as of ECOTEC Research and Consulting Ltd.
cooperated. In this framework, Sandra Bürger and Ute Lanzendorf from INCHER-
Kassel undertook questionnaire surveys of university leaders, central ERASMUS
coordinators and departmental ERASMUS coordinators within the individual
institutions of higher education participating in ERASMUS. Whereas the format
and approach of these three surveys resembled those of previous studies, the gen-
eral project design differed in some respects from the design of earlier studies
under participation of INCHER-Kassel: the various parts of data collection were
only loosely intertwined, the questionnaire surveys were not in the centre of the
project, and it was an objective to provide detailed policy advice.

This book presents the findings from the study "Quality, Openness and Interna-
tionalisation: The Impact of ERASMUS on European Higher Education". After
the final report had been published by the European Commission on the Internet
shortly after its submission, the description of the three surveys and their results
were revised and edited to become the central chapter of this book. Prior to the
chapter on the three surveys, the overall project approach and additional findings
will be summarized in an introductory article written by three key persons of the
overall project.

Whereas earlier ERASMUS evaluations had focussed on the specific results of
the different programme components, the study on the impact of ERASMUS on
quality, openness, and internationalisation took a different perspective. Hitherto,
evaluation studies took European-funded activities as a starting point and then
analysed their impact on individuals and on the higher education study pro-
grammes the individuals were involved in. The project the results of which are
presented in this book, however, for the first time endeavoured to establish links
between overall changes in higher education and ERASMUS activities. Starting
from recent advances in quality, openness and internationalisation in higher edu-
cation, the main question to be researched was if these had been substantially
supported or triggered by ERASMUS. In this context, the analysis of programme
impact considers the various ERASMUS activities as a whole and links them to
overall institutional development rather than to individual participants or study
programmes.

Earlier evaluation studies on temporary student mobility in Europe led by
INCHER-Kassel or under participation of its scholars include the following:

– The ERASMUS programme was preceded by the pilot programme "Joint Study
  Programmes (JSP)" which provided support from 1976 to 1986 for networks of
  departments cooperating in student exchange. Scholars of the Centre in Kas-
  sel joined the "Study Abroad Evaluation Project" (SAEP) which – initiated

by Ladislav Cerych (European Institute of Education and Social Policy, Paris) – compared the provisions, processes and results of temporary student mobility in the framework of various programmes in France, Germany, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, among other student mobility in the framework of JSP (see Burn, Cerych and Smith, 1990; Opper, Teichler and Carlson, 1990). In addition, a study was undertaken on issues of recognition in the framework of JSP (Dalichow and Teichler, 1986).

− "The ERASMUS Experience", the biggest single study on the ERASMUS programme was undertaken in the early period: the first seven years of ERASMUS (Teichler and Maiworm, 1997). The statistical reporting system of ERASMUS was initiated in this context, and surveys were undertaken of ERASMUS students soon after the study abroad period, former ERASMUS students some years afterwards, ERASMUS coordinators and mobile teachers. This project turned out to be the standard-setting for various subsequent studies. This study was coordinated by Ulrich Teichler of the Centre in Kassel and was undertaken in cooperation with the Gesellschaft für empirische Studien (GES) in Kassel.

− In the late 1990s, a team of experts led by Andris Barblan (European Rectors' Conference, CRE) and with scholars from the Centre in Kassel undertook the project "European Policies". It analysed the "European Policy Statements" written by the individual institutions of higher education in their application for ERASMUS grants and aimed to assess the role strategic views played in the overall international activities of the institutions (Barblan et al., 1998; Barblan et al., 2000).

− Around 2000, an interim evaluation study of the SOCRATES Programme – the EU umbrella programme established in 1995 and continued until 2006 which included ERASMUS as a sub-programme – was coordinated by Jean Gordon (European Institute of Education and Social Policy, Paris). In this framework, scholars of the Centre in Kassel and the GES were in charge of the evaluation of ERASMUS and undertook in 1999 the study "ERASMUS in the SOCRATES Programme" with a similar set of surveys as they had undertaken in the preceding evaluation project (Teichler, 2002).

− Around 2005, scholars of the Centre in Kassel, coordinated by Ulrich Teichler, and again active in cooperation with colleagues at GES, analysed "The Professional Value of ERASMUS Mobility". They surveyed mobile students as well as mobile teachers about five years after their stay abroad, thereby addressing their retrospective views of the mobility period, their subsequent learning, employment and work as well as the perceived impact of the ERASMUS experience (Janson, Schomburg, and Teichler, 2009).

The results of the surveys undertaken from the 1980s until 2005 became well known. They certainly were steps on the way of gradual extension and improvement of research on internationalisation of higher education (cf. Teichler, 2004;

Kehm and Teichler, 2007; Kehm and Lanzendorf, 2010). The highlights of the findings can be viewed now as "conventional wisdom" about temporary student mobility in Europe:

1. While the "mainstream" of student mobility world-wide is study abroad for a whole study programmes in countries with higher quality standards than those of the students' origin, ERASMUS is a programme for temporary student mobility among institutional partners of more or less the same quality. The major effect of such "horizontal mobility" cannot be that of enhancing the quality level of learning in general, as it is expected to be in the case of "vertical mobility", but rather that of creative learning and widened understanding from contrasting experience.

2. ERASMUS has succeeded in making temporary study abroad for students in Europe from previously being an exceptional choice to be one of the normal options in the course of study. Its initial aim that – through ERASMUS or other means – at least ten percent of all students in the European Union spend at least one study period in another country has become a reality within twenty years, for quite a number, but not for all countries participating in Europe.

3. Efforts to stimulate "organized study" abroad (in terms of alleviating the organisational conditions) and "curricular integration" (in terms of making content-related arrangements that a study abroad period can be viewed as equivalent to study at home) was successful insofar as the major problems faced by mobile students during the study period abroad are out or partly out of the control of these principles: problems of funding, problems of accommodation, problems of having too many contacts with home country nationals, etc.

4. The results of learning for a temporary period abroad might be analytically segmented as academic, cultural and linguistic achievements, but the majority of mobile students consider academic progress abroad higher than academic progress during a corresponding study period at home because of the reflective value of learning from contrast – a result which cannot be divided according to those categories.

5. The rate of recognition of study achievements abroad upon return turned out to be in all surveys higher than 70 percent. As many students go abroad still with sub-optimal language proficiency and as on average fewer courses are taken abroad than at home, this level of recognition cannot be viewed as low. But there was room for improvement in some countries and various institutions.

6. The introduction of credits (ECTS) turned out to be successful in the first about ten years by leading to a higher degree of recognition on average than in the case of other means of "book-keeping" of the results of study abroad.

7. Recognition of study abroad, however, is quite low, if a strict definition is applied: no prolongation of the overall period of study is needed due to the period of temporary study abroad. This shows that many students are given artificial recognition, i.e. recognition not ensuring that a corresponding period of the home curriculum will be foregone.

8. Temporary mobile students in Europe turned out to be clearly superior to non-mobile students in terms of their visible international competences, e.g. foreign language proficiency, knowledge on other countries and intercultural knowledge and understanding. They also see themselves and are seen by others as slightly superior in other professionally relevant competences.

9. Former mobile students far more often opt for advanced studies than formerly non-mobile students. This suggests that learning abroad raises the interest in learning.

10. Careers of former ERASMUS students, as a consequence, look on average only marginally superior to those of non-mobile students, but they are clearly different in leading to substantially more international labour mobility and in taking over job tasks which require visible international competences clearly more frequently.

11. Over the years, the above named differences between the careers of temporarily mobile students and non-mobile students became smaller. This might be primarily due to the fact that the overall trend towards internationalisation leads to an erosion of the exclusiveness of international competences acquired with the help of temporary study abroad.

12. Teaching staff exchange in the framework of ERASMUS is not only an element of support for student mobility, but it also has far-reaching impact on the subsequent life of the mobile teachers themselves. Although the periods of teaching abroad are relatively short as a rule and take place at a period in life, when many key orientations and decisions have already been made, they often have an enormous re-orientation effect for the mobile teachers.

In the following, the study on the ERASMUS contribution to quality, openness, and modernisation of higher education will describe additional dimensions of ERASMUS impact with a focus on the institutional level.

## References

Barblan, Andris; Kehm, Barbara M.; Reichert, Sybille and Teichler, Ulrich (eds.) (1998). *Emerging European Policy Profiles of Higher Education Institutions*. Kassel: Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung der Universität Gesamthochschule Kassel (Werkstattberichte, No. 55).

Barblan, Andris; Reichert, Sybille; Schotte-Kmoch, Martina and Teichler, Ulrich (eds.) (2000). *Implementing European Policies in Higher Education Institutions*. Kassel: Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung der Universität Gesamthochschule Kassel (Werkstattberichte, No. 57).

Burn, Barbara B.; Cerych, Ladislav, and Smith, Alan (eds.) (1990). *Study Abroad Programmes*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers 1990 (revised version in German: Teichler, Ulrich; Smith, Alan and Steube, Wolfgang (1988). *Auslandsstudienprogramme im Vergleich: Erfahrungen, Probleme, Erfolge*. Bad Honnef: K. H. Bock Verlag (Bundesminister für Bildung und Wissenschaft: Studien zu Bildung und Wissenschaft, Vol. 68).

CHEPS, INCHER-Kassel and ECOTEC (2008). *The Impact of ERASMUS on European Higher Education: Quality, Openness and Internationalisation*. Brussels: European Commission, Directorate-General for Education and Culture (DG EAC/33/2007).

Dalichow, Fritz and Teichler, Ulrich (1986). *Higher Education in the European Community: Recognition of Study Abroad in the European Community*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities (in French: *Enseignement supérieur dans la Communauté Européenne: Reconnaissance des périodes d'études à l'étranger dans la Communauté Européenne*. Luxembourg: Office des publications officielles des Communautés Européennes; revised version in German (1985): *Anerkennung des Auslandsstudiums in der Europäischen Gemeinschaft: Ergebnisse einer Umfrage bei "Gemeinsamen Studienprogrammen"*. Kassel: Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung der Gesamthochschule Kassel 1985 (Werkstattberichte, No. 14).

Janson, Kerstin; Schomburg, Harald, and Teichler, Ulrich (2009). *The Professional Value of ERASMUS Mobility: The Impact of International Experience on Former Students' and on Teachers' Careers*. Bonn: Lemmens.

Kehm, Barbara M. and Lanzendorf, Ute (2010). "Student and Faculty Transnational Mobility in Higher Education". In Petersen, Penelope; Baker, Eva and McGaw, Barry (eds.). *International Encyclopedia of Education*, Vol. 4. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 559-565.

Kehm, Barbara M. and Teichler, Ulrich (2007). "Research on Internationalisation in Higher Education", *Journal of Studies in International Education*, Vol. 11, Nos. 3-4, 260-273.

Opper, Susan; Teichler, Ulrich and Carlson, Jerrry (1990). *The Impact of Study Abroad Programmes on Students and Graduates*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers (revised version in German: Teichler, Ulrich und Opper, Susan (1988). *Erträge des Auslandsstudiums für Studierende und Absolventen*. Bad Honnef: K. H. Bock Verlag (Bundesminister für Bildung und Wissenschaft: Studien zu Bildung und Wissenschaft, Vol. 69).

Teichler, Ulrich (ed.) (2002). *ERASMUS in the SOCRATES Programme: Findings of an Evaluation Study*. Bonn: Lemmens (cf. the complete study in Teichler, Ulrich; Gordon, Jean and Maiworm, Friedhelm (eds.) (2001). SOCRATES 2000 Evaluation Study. Brussels: European Commission 2001 (http://europa.eu.int./comm/education/-evaluation/socrates_en.html); revised and shortened version in German: Teichler, Ulrich; Gordon, Jean; Maiworm, Friedhelm und Bradatsch, Christiane (2003). *Das SOKRATES Programm: Erfahrungen der ersten fünf Jahre*. Bonn: Nationale Agentur Bildung für Europa.

Teichler, Ulrich (2004). "The Changing Debate on Internationalisation in Higher Education", *Higher Education*, Vol. 48, No. 1, 5-26.

Teichler, Ulrich and Maiworm, Friedhelm (1997). *The ERASMUS Experience: Major Findings of the ERASMUS Evaluation Research Project*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities (shortened and revised version in German: Teichler, Ulrich; Maiworm, Friedhelm, and Schotte-Kmoch, Martina (1999). *Das ERASMUS-Programm: Ergebnisse der Begleitforschung*. Bonn: Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung).

# 1

## Contributing to Quality, Openness, and Internationalisation:
## The ERASMUS Impact Study 2008

Hans Vossensteyn, Ute Lanzendorf, and Manuel Souto

### 1.1 The Mandate of the Project

The study presented here was commissioned by the European Commission in 2007 to explore the contribution of the ERASMUS programme to "excellence" in higher education in Europe. Following the Terms of Reference, the overall objectives of the study were:

- to identify the extent and nature of the contribution of the ERASMUS programme and its action programmes to quality improvement in higher education in Europe;
- to verify whether and how ERASMUS has contributed to the modernisation of higher education institutions by organisational reforms, internationalisation and professionalisation in student services and institutional cooperation;
- to identify the contribution of the ERASMUS programme (formally a subprogramme of SOCRATES from 1995 to 2006 and of Life-Long Learning from 2007 onwards) to the development and innovation of teaching and research, for example, by improving the quality of teaching, creating a more stimulating learning environment for students and establishing academic cooperation and networks; and
- to further identify the contribution of ERASMUS actions to developing a stronger European dimension to higher education in all the 31 countries which participated in the ERASMUS programme, with particular attention to the partnership and network effects that have been triggered between higher education institutions and the added value this may have generated.

To these ends the project aimed at the following:

- the identification and analysis of the different aspects of quality improvement of higher education institutions and the extent to which these have been influenced by ERASMUS;

- the identification and analysis of the ways in which the Europeanisation, internationalisation and modernisation of higher education institutions have been influenced by ERASMUS;
- the identification of indicators to be used to study the impact of the ERASMUS programme on quality improvement in European higher education over time;
- the formulation of recommendations on how the operation and impact of ERASMUS on quality improvement in higher education in Europe can be maximised in the future.

In the course of the study, these objectives and expected deliverables have been expanded with the notion that not only the success factors of ERASMUS for quality improvement in European higher education should be considered, but that the potential barriers that ERASMUS may raise for quality improvement in the core functions of higher education should also be taken into account.

## 1.2    Conceptualizing Excellence and Quality in European Higher Education

During the first decade of the 21$^{st}$ century, special attention was paid in the higher education policy debates to the diversity of higher education. In this context, many actors and experts advocated a widening of vertical diversification in order to enhance the conditions for „world-class" research in a limited number of top universities. "Excellence" became the key word in the public debate, when the strengths and the weaknesses of a high-quality sector within higher education were addressed, and it spread in the debate towards various concerns about the quality of higher education. Following this debate, the contribution of ERASMUS to excellence can be understood as contribution of ERASMUS to moving universities "to the top" in comparison to other universities in a competition towards becoming and remaining universities.

The European Commission and the authors of this study agreed that for the purpose of the study the term "excellence" should be understood in such a way. The concretisation of excellence as "quality, openness and internationalisation", first, takes into consideration that ERASMUS was established to mobilize large number of students, possibly representative to the average in terms of countries, fields and socio-biographic background and also not way above the academic average, i.e. notably students who would not have gone abroad for a temporary study period, if such a promotion programme had not existed. Second, this underscores the understanding that horizontally varied universities should strive for quality enhancement according to their specific profiles. Institutions of higher education all have their own unique characteristics; they have different missions, and different contexts and environments. Some universities aim for a breakthrough in academic knowledge, others are more oriented towards applied re-

search to respond to regional needs, while a third group of universities may have as their primary mission educating people whose competencies match well with specific labour market needs. All these activities are equally important in making Europe a leading knowledge economy and society. The diversity in higher education institutions and missions is regarded as a particular European strength in the global competition. Therefore, the aim of the study was to explore the role ERASMUS plays in enhancing quality in higher education according to diverse perspectives and correspondingly diverse criteria of quality. The project just started from one of the beliefs of the European Commission, according to which mobility was one valuable element in the modernisation and the quality enhancement of higher education in Europe (see European Commission, 2006). The European Commission formulated in the terms of reference for this project: "'Excellence 'in the context of this study is defined by "quality" and "the degree of openness and of internationalisation".

Given the diversity in missions and profiles of higher education institutions across Europe, the study took a rather broad and pragmatic approach.

First, this project accepts the notion of the European Commission that quality includes, in addition to the notion of academic standards, the successful modernisation in terms widely accepted by actors and experts. In the framework of this project this includes the notions of the European Commission that internationalisation and openness are elements of such a modernisation. In the scope of this study, openness to society includes contributions to the region, the economy and society.

Second, the project aims to explore the breadth of notions of quality and the contribution of ERASMUS to varied notions of quality. In open interviews, quality improvement can be explored in terms of contributions to "fitness for purpose". Quality is thus judged as the extent to which higher education institutions and systems broadly achieve their purposes and mission.

Third, the project methodologically was not in the position to consider "quality" as an "open sky", if it employs standardized questionnaires for measuring the perceived impact of ERASMUS. Therefore, a need was felt to develop a relatively broad list of aspects on which one could expect an impact of ERASMUS. Actually attention was paid notably to international mobility and cooperation, student services, teaching, learning and research, quality assurance, the professionalisation of staff as well as enhancing the missions and profiles of higher education institutions.

## 1.3    Data Collection

The research team lead by Hans Vossensteyn – Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS), University of Twente, the Netherlands – agreed to undertake three studies in the framework of the project:
− a literature review,

−  questionnaire surveys, and
−  interviews at individual institutional cases.

The research work was divided accordingly between the three institutions partici-pating in the project.

The CHEPS team undertook a literature review. This review considered publica-tions on the ERASMUS programme since its inauguration in 1987 with a focus on systematic studies aiming to take stock of the ERASMUS activities and results achieved. Hans Vossensteyn, Maarja Soo, Leon Cremonini, Dominique Antono-witsch and Elisabeth Epping were involved in this activity as well as in the overall synthesis of the three studies.

The questionnaire surveys of the university leaders, the central ERASMUS co-ordinators and the departmental ERASMUS coordinators at all institutions of higher education participating in ERASMUS as well as the analysis of their find-ings were undertaken by the team of the International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER-Kassel) of the University of Kassel, Germany. These surveys undertaken between March and May 2008 were coordinated by Ute Lanzendorf and Ulrich Teichler and actually carried out and analysed by Sandra Bürger, Ute Lanzendorf and Ahmed Tubail.

The case study analysis was under the responsibility of ECOTEC Research and Consulting Ltd. Members of the team were Manuel Souto (coordinator), Andrew McCoshan, Sonja Vega, Kerry Allen, Javier Fernández, Begona Soriozano and Christina Torrecillas. 20 institutions of higher education in 16 European countries were addressed in the case study analysis. Actually 12 case studies were under-taken by the ECOTEC team and four each by CHEPS and the INCHER-Kassel teams.

Based on the survey results, 15 institutions that reported very high and five in-stitutions that reported very low ERASMUS impact on quality improvement were selected. Among the case studies, institutions from different geographical regions and with different missions are represented. Available documents were analysed, before on-site visits were undertaken with interviews of ERASMUS coordinators, academic, administrative staff, students, and – as far as possible – also external stakeholders. The aim of the study was to map the national and institutional con-text, to gather detailed information on the ERASMUS experience and to explore the varied views as regards the impact of ERASMUS on quality improvement in a broad range of areas.

In this chapter, select findings of the literature review and the case studies will be summarized. The findings of the questionnaire surveys will be presented sepa-rately in the following chapter. The policy recommendations can be consulted in the online publication of project results (CHEPS, INCHER-Kassel and ECOTEC, 2008).

## 1.4    The Results of the Literature Review

Several studies have examined the effect of the ERASMUS programme on students and staff, as well as on higher education institutions and national systems. At the individual level, ERASMUS students are more likely to have international careers; the programme has demonstrated an effect on their career related attitudes, personal values, interpersonal skills and confidence. Although the academic contribution of the programme is usually less emphasised, around half of the students still report positive effects on their academic progress, and especially on foreign language skills. Mobile staff reports better career opportunities, positive effects on teaching activities, and a particular effect on research cooperation and academic competencies in general.

ERASMUS has also demonstrated a considerable effect at the institutional level. These effects can be identified primarily in two areas: internationalisation and teaching and research. Since its inception ERASMUS has had a positive impact on establishing international offices and language centres in universities. It has increased the awareness of European and international activities, and improved international cooperation. The programme has also encouraged universities to develop structured internationalisation policies to replace ad hoc international activities. The European Policy Statement (EPS) is one way to increase the awareness of this.

The effect on teaching and research seems to be more indirect. Teacher exchange programmes contribute primarily to international contacts and joint activities, and to a lesser extent to teaching practices. Curriculum development projects have contributed to teaching in the form of curriculum improvement, but the evidence on the impact of the projects is not conclusive. International contacts that come out of teaching activities had a spill-over effect on research networks. Next to international networks, cooperation and other indirect benefits, the direct effect of ERASMUS on the quality of teaching and learning is estimated as quite low.

The effect of ERASMUS on national and international policies is most difficult to show empirically. In general terms, the growing number of mobile staff and students has made internationalisation a part of general higher education policy and the programme has thus helped to influence domestic internationalisation policies. There are also examples of specific international initiatives that have grown out from ERASMUS activities.

Undoubtedly, ERASMUS has triggered a series of important developments in higher education. Especially, ERASMUS had a considerable impact on the Bologna process in terms of agenda setting, infrastructure and content. Action lines in the Bologna declaration have a clear overlap with the ERASMUS programme (e.g. ECTS, diploma supplement most visibly, but also quality assurance, student mobility and joint degrees). In addition the ERASMUS grants have supported numerous stocktaking exercises and facilitated other overview reports and conventions. ERASMUS' impact has been particularly noticeable in the quality assurance

activities. Since the early 1990s ERASMUS has initiated quality review exercises and facilitated the sharing of 'best practices', which culminated in establishing the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) in 2000. Most recently ERASMUS has supported the establishment of the European Quality Assurance Register and supports the annual forum on quality assurance issues in higher education.

The European Qualifications Framework (EQF) is also closely linked to ERASMUS. ERASMUS projects shared experiences with national qualifications frameworks in the early stage, leading to the inclusion of qualifications frameworks in the Bologna agenda. This process was further stimulated by the ERASMUS supported project "Tuning Educational Structures in Europe".

ERASMUS has also inspired the higher education part of the Lisbon Strategy for Growth and Jobs, as the (Bologna) curricular reforms are an integral part of the modernisation agenda for universities, defined in the Commission Communication of May 2006. Some national and interregional initiatives take over the ideas and procedures of the ERASMUS programme, such as the ERASMUS Belgica programme. Outside Europe ERASMUS has also gained attention and influence. The Japanese government launched a policy to establish an Asian equivalent of the ERASMUS programme including an academic credit transfer and accumulation system from 2009 onwards. In addition, the ECTS model is regarded as an example for higher education systems throughout the world that are in the process of developing a credit transfer system.

## 1.5 The Results of the Case Studies

The case studies examined in greater detail the findings that emerged from the survey (see the following chapter). They showed that the motivations for getting involved in the ERASMUS programme vary. One group of universities sees ERASMUS as an opportunity to improve the quality of the institution and to support its modernisation efforts. Others see ERASMUS as an important tool to offer students international study opportunities that may be required in their course programmes. Yet, some universities see ERASMUS as a way to contribute to their profiling at international level, and in some countries universities face pressure from national policy-makers to get involved. Others indicate their ERASMUS involvement is related to national expectations to get involved in the programme.

In spite of the varied motivations to take part in the programme, the case study visits found evidence that higher education institutions have clearly benefited from their participation in the ERASMUS programme in terms of teaching, learning and student services. ERASMUS has provided universities with an opportunity to improve their institutional structures, internationalisation strategies and modernisation efforts. Key impacts were reported in respect of improvements in teaching and learning. Interesting developments were found primarily in terms of curricu-

lum development. Specifically, new modules and study programmes were set up in collaboration with other international partners and curricular modernisation and internationalisation have occurred. The ways in which education is delivered has also evolved as a result of ERASMUS participation, leading to the use of new methods and techniques. The introduction, development and harmonisation of ECTS, although varied in its degree of implementation was also reported as a positive impact. Thematic networks, joint degrees and ERASMUS-supported ECTS have triggered modernisation and internationalisation of the curricula. As a result of ERASMUS participation, institutional strategies to internationalise curricula in different subject fields have also been developed. ERASMUS and ECTS are regarded as quality marks by many higher education institutions as they are associated with certain forms of accountability and transparency.

The presence of international students in particular seems to have an effect on teaching methods and quality. Several universities noted that international students require the institution to review their teaching practices. Often the changes made are related to shifting from a lecture format to more interactive teaching approaches, with some higher education institutions increasingly using case studies and student presentations and discussions. In some cases, the use of ICT and e-learning has been greatly developed. In addition, ERASMUS has also contributed to improvements in the language skills of students and staff, which has encouraged international cooperation further.

ERASMUS has impacted not only on teaching, but also on research activities. Staff mobility programmes as well as other ERASMUS activities that help to create international contacts contribute to this. Firstly, ERASMUS contacts have helped universities to benchmark themselves against international institutions and to benefit from becoming acquainted with quality standards from elsewhere. Secondly, the contacts that academics establish through their international colleagues have often led to joint research projects and publication activities – some higher education institutions reported outcomes from research collaboration that began with their participation in the programme. Other higher education institutions reported that the programme had an impact on shaping the research agenda of the ERASMUS coordinators and had also contributed to identifying new research areas for other staff. As many universities aim to become globally renowned centres of research, international collaboration is seen as vital to achieve this. As a result, ERASMUS seems to have had an effect on other international activities. It provides international experience and skills which allow the institutions to enter other international networks. ERASMUS procedures have also often been extended to other international mobility programmes, for the benefit of students and staff.

A significant contribution of the ERASMUS programme was identified in all case study reports in relation to improvement in student services. Universities have set up and expanded international offices, provided language training for outgoing

and incoming students, and identified key contact at international support offices. Higher education institution infrastructure has also improved in most cases, partly as a result of increasing inflows of international students and concerns with the image of the higher education institution abroad. Higher education institutions have also introduced a range of student support activities, such as international weeks, ERASMUS days and introduction to host cities. Information provision has also improved, for example through enhanced websites for international students and expanded provision of information on health and issues. Additional services for students, such as accommodation support, have also often been created.

Besides creating and strengthening these services and structures, it is worth highlighting that the ERASMUS programme has had an interesting side effect in terms of enhanced joint work within the higher education institution. For example, faculty members who are responsible for academic supervision of incoming ERASMUS students report increased contacts and collaboration with the Student Union and various other student support services. Strengthening these relations has associated benefits for not only ERASMUS students, but also home and other international students.

Several higher education institutions reported that the ERASMUS experience contributed to providing new opportunities for individuals from local, national and international communities and other partners. ERASMUS has led to international confidence and experience and by opening up the university to international visitors and networks.

Although some marginal negative side effects of ERASMUS have been identified, these were far out-weighted by the positive impacts evidenced by the case studies. The administrative burden of the programme, difficulties in achieving recognition of periods abroad and low levels of language proficiency are the key difficulties identified in the case study visits.

Overall, the study on the impact of the ERASMUS programme on quality improvement has shown that ERASMUS has been very valuable to the development of higher education in Europe, not only in terms of its primary processes in teaching, learning and research, but also in areas such as institutional and organisational development (modernisation), profiling through internationalisation and the development of student services. However, all activities require additional efforts in terms of administrative, financial and human resources.

## Reference

European Commission (2006). Final Communication from the European Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on "Delivering on the Modernisation Agenda for Universities: Education, Research and Innovation" on 10 May 2006. Brussels: European Commission, COM(2006)208.

# 2

## ERASMUS Impact from an Institutional Perspective – Findings from Three Questionnaire Surveys

### Sandra Bürger and Ute Lanzendorf

### 2.1 Introduction

In the recent decade, higher education institutions in Europe have lived enormous change. Implementing the European Higher Education Area, responding to the Lisbon strategy as well as adapting to new governance and funding mechanisms have made institutions reorganize themselves thoroughly. That process is widely understood as a general modernisation of higher education which has brought about important quality improvements with respect to teaching, research and institutional openness to society. This chapter presents the findings of an international survey on the role which the ERASMUS programme played in that context. The survey had the objective of collecting large scale standardized information on the extent and nature of the contribution of ERASMUS and its different action programmes to institutional development and quality improvement in higher education in Europe during the SOCRATES II period, i.e. between the academic years 2000/01 and 2006/07. It was part of a larger study and complemented other data analyses as outlined in the preceding chapter.

In the following, operational details of the survey as well as characteristics of the participating institutions and institutional actors will be outlined first. After that, the major findings – i.e. the perspective of institutional actors on the degree of change realised by higher education institutions and the contribution of the SOCRATES/ERASMUS programme to that change – will be presented. General findings will be broken down by institutional size and countries where institutions are located to provide a differentiated picture on the institutional impact of the SOCRATES/ERASMUS programme.

### 2.2 Survey Implementation

The survey addressed all ERASMUS institutions in the 30 countries operating the programme (Luxembourg was excluded) and was carried out in the first months of 2008. In order to study the institutional impact of the ERASMUS programme, the

three groups of actors at European higher education institutions were surveyed in order to cover both the faculty level and the management level. The major data collection instrument was the central ERASMUS coordinator survey. Central ERASMUS coordinators are best informed of the implementation of the ERASMUS programme at their institutions. Yet, they naturally tend to have a relatively positive view of the programme and cannot be expected to have in-depth insight into the wide range of its institutional effects. Therefore, it was decided to complement the central coordinator survey by two additional surveys exploring the views of the university leadership (the legal representatives of the individual higher education institutions) and of the programme coordinators in decentralised institutional units. Thus, the three target groups of the survey were:

(1) university internationalisation/ERASMUS coordinators ("central ERASMUS coordinator survey"),

(2) faculty representatives responsible for the coordination of the ERASMUS programme in decentralised institutional units ("departmental ERASMUS co-ordinator survey"), and

(3) representatives of institutional leadership ("institutional leader survey").

Distinct questionnaires were developed for each of the three groups surveyed (see appendix 1). The common basic approach of these questionnaires was to system-atically explore with respondents:

a)   the extent to which various quality improvements were realised at the central institutional or department level;

b)   the relevance of individual ERASMUS tools and actions with respect to these changes; and

c)   if ERASMUS triggered, facilitated or contributed to quality improvement in the various areas of institutional activity covered by the surveys.

The questionnaires for central and departmental ERASMUS coordinators were largely identical and rather comprehensive, whereas the institutional leader ques-tionnaire was much shorter.

The contact details of central ERASMUS coordinators and university leaders were provided by the European Commission. Contact details (names and email addresses) of departmental ERASMUS coordinators, however, had to be requested from the central ERASMUS coordinators. For this reason and also because of the heterogeneity of the departmental programme coordinators group, the administra-tion of that survey was more complex.

All surveys were carried out electronically, i.e. its target groups were contacted by email only requesting to fill out an online questionnaire. The online question-naires were made available via the project website in four languages (English, French, German, and Spanish). To access them, respondents had to enter a person-al code provided in the contact email. In addition, questionnaires were sent out as

an email attachment in Word format (only in English). The attachment could be completed electronically and emailed back to the project team or printed and returned by mail or fax. As a third alternative, respondents could download the questionnaires in four languages from the project website for printout. The printouts could be returned by mail or fax. The replies sent as email attachment or as a paper copy were entered into the online questionnaires manually by the project team. Overall, 38 percent of departmental ERASMUS coordinators, 37 percent of institutional leaders and 33 percent of central ERASMUS coordinators responding did not use the online tool. Between 20 percent (central ERASMUS coordinators) and 30 percent (departmental ERASMUS coordinators) of valid questionnaires respectively were returned by email. Paper copies were sent by 13 percent of both central coordinators and university leaders and 8 percent of departmental coordinators. In addition, the online survey for central coordinators registered 194 logins with no entries at all and the department survey 301 such logins, i.e. overall 500 coordinators used their personal code to login to the online tool without then filling anything in.

The central ERASMUS coordinator survey was sent to all 2,283 higher education institutions participating in ERASMUS during the SOCRATES II period, i.e. between the academic years 2000/01 and 2006/07. The institutional leader survey was sent to 2,157 persons, i.e. all institutional leaders except for those 126 who concurrently were central ERASMUS coordinators. There were very few instances of unsuccessful contacting, i.e. only about two percent of the central ERASMUS coordinators and about one percent of the institutional leaders could not be reached; thus, the numbers of successful contacts were 2,231 and 2,136 respectively. The numbers of valid responses (logins with no or very few responses excluded) were 951 and 752 respectively. Thus, the response rate was 41 percent on the part of central ERASMUS coordinators and 35 percent on the part of the institutional leaders.

567 higher education institutions provided support for surveying the departmental ERASMUS coordinators either through the provision of contact addresses or by mailing the questionnaires directly to these persons. Further 462 institutions informed the project team that they do not have any departmental coordinators, while about half of the institutions did not support the project team in contacting departmental coordinators. As the number of departmental coordinators named by institutions was in some instances rather high, the project team decided to address only one coordinator per decentralised unit. Actually, 6,114 departmental ERASMUS coordinators at 547 institutions received the questionnaire. 923 persons from 328 institutions responded (logins with no or very few responses excluded). Thus, the response rate was 15 percent on the part of the persons from 60 percent of the institutions participating in the departmental ERASMUS coordinator survey (see Tables 1 and 2).

Altogether, questionnaires were received from more than 1,500 institutions of higher education. However, 525 institutions participated only in the central ERASMUS coordinator survey, 428 only in the institutional leader survey and 78 only in the departmental ERASMUS coordinator survey. In the departmental ERASMUS coordinator survey, from about half of the institutions two to five replies were received. In the case of almost 40 percent of the institutions, a single reply was sent to the project team, and just more than 10 percent of the institutions provided more than five replies (up to 30 replies).

**Table 1**
**Participation in the Three Surveys**

| | Number of contacts | Number of successful contacts | Responses | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | Total number | % online | Response rate % |
| Central ERASMUS coordinator survey | 2,283 | 2,231 | 951 | 67 | 41.7 |
| Institutional leader survey | 2,157 | 2,136 | 752 | 63 | 34.9 |
| Departmental ERASMUS coordinator survey | | 6,114 persons at 547 institutions | 903 persons at 328 institutions | 62 | 14.8 of persons contacted 60 % of institutions |

For all three surveys, the project team received replies from all 30 countries in which ERASMUS institutions were contacted (see table 2). For the central ERASMUS coordinator survey, the return rate for most countries ranged between 40 percent and 60 percent. It was higher for Estonia (71%), Finland (68%) and Bulgaria (67%) and lower for Spain (34%), Poland (34%), Malta (33%), the Netherlands (26%), Ireland (24%), the UK (21%), Cyprus (21%), and Turkey (17%). For the leadership survey, the return rate resulted high for Malta (67%) and Greece (59%) and comparatively low for Ireland (22%), Turkey (23%) and Portugal (24%). As far as the survey of coordinators in decentralised institutional units was concerned, the return rates for contacted institutions were high for Cyprus (100%), Lithuania (90%), Denmark (86%), Estonia (83%), Ireland (83%), and Turkey (83%) and low in France (23%), Norway (31%), and Bulgaria (36%).

**Table 2**
**Number of Responses and Response Rates by Country**

| | Central ERASMUS coordinator survey | | Institutional leader survey | | Departmental ERASMUS coordinator survey | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of responses | Response rate | Number of responses | Response rate | Number of responses | Response rate | Number of institutions | Percent. of institutions |
| AT | 28 | 40.0% | 25 | 39.7% | 11 | 1.1% | 5 | 71.4% |
| BE | 36 | 43.9% | 25 | 31.3% | 27 | 3.0% | 11 | 47.8% |
| BG | 24 | 68.6% | 14 | 40.0% | 9 | 1.0% | 5 | 35.7% |
| CY | 3 | 21.4% | 5 | 45.5% | 3 | 0.3% | 2 | 100% |
| CZ | 26 | 54.2% | 23 | 52.3% | 49 | 5.4% | 7 | 58.3% |
| DE | 161 | 58.3% | 101 | 38.3% | 122 | 13.5% | 49 | 73.1% |
| DK | 28 | 43.8% | 32 | 53.3% | 9 | 1.0% | 6 | 85.7% |
| EE | 15 | 71.4% | 13 | 57.1% | 6 | 0.7% | 5 | 83.3% |
| ES | 29 | 34.1% | 32 | 42.1% | 53 | 5.9% | 19 | 79.2% |
| FI | 32 | 68.1% | 23 | 52.3% | 26 | 2.9% | 13 | 65.0% |
| FR | 151 | 34.8% | 113 | 28.5% | 37 | 4.1% | 17 | 23.3% |
| GR | 16 | 44.4% | 19 | 59.4% | 28 | 3.1% | 9 | 60.0% |
| HU | 20 | 40.0% | 26 | 53.1% | 7 | 0.8% | 4 | 40.0% |
| IE | 8 | 24.2% | 7 | 21.9% | 10 | 1.1% | 5 | 83.3% |
| IT | 79 | 53.0% | - | - | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | 50.0% |
| IS | 4 | 57.1% | 30 | 24.8% | 71 | 7.9% | 26 | 78.8% |
| LI | 1 | 100% | 1 | 100% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Table 2 continued**

| | Central ERASMUS coordinator survey | | Institutional leader survey | | Departmental ERASMUS coordinator survey | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of responses | Response rate | Number of responses | Response rate | Number of responses | Response rate | Number of institutions | Percent. of institutions |
| LT | 24 | 58.5% | 13 | 29.3% | 25 | 2.8% | 9 | 90.0% |
| LV | 14 | 48.3% | 14 | 53.8% | 2 | 0.2% | 2 | 50.0% |
| MT | 1 | 33.3% | 2 | 66.7% | 3 | 0.3% | 1 | 100% |
| NL | 14 | 25.5% | 16 | 29.6% | 4 | 0.4% | 4 | 44.4% |
| NO | 19 | 41.3% | 17 | 37.0% | 9 | 1.0% | 4 | 30.8% |
| PL | 75 | 33.8% | 58 | 27.5% | 71 | 7.9% | 31 | 68.9% |
| PT | 37 | 46.3% | 17 | 24.3% | 109 | 12.1% | 25 | 65.8% |
| RO | 22 | 40.0% | 18 | 33.3% | 31 | 3.4% | 15 | 71.4% |
| SE | 16 | 42.1% | 14 | 36.8% | 6 | 0.7% | 4 | 44.4% |
| SI | 3 | 42.9% | 4 | 57.1% | 15 | 1.7% | 3 | 100% |
| SK | 10 | 47.6% | 12 | 57.1% | 11 | 1.2% | 6 | 54.5% |
| TR | 14 | 17.1% | 19 | 23.2% | 105 | 11.6% | 25 | 83.3% |
| UK | 32 | 21.1% | 42 | 29.3% | 3 | 4.0% | 16 | 50.0% |
| Missing | | | | | 7 | 0.8% | 2 | |
| Total | 951 | 41.7% | 752 | 34.9% | 903 | 14.8% | 328 | 60.5% |

## 2.3    Characteristics of the Participating Institutions

According to the central ERASMUS coordinator survey, 87 percent of the institutions covered were public. Obviously, the proportion of private higher education institutions is higher among institutions with less than 1,000 students. Moreover, there is a higher share of private institutions participating in ERASMUS in the countries having joined the European Union in 2004 than in the older EU member countries (see Table 3).

Table 3 shows as well that half of the institutions participating in ERASMUS award doctoral degrees, 83 percent award master's degrees, and almost all award bachelor's degrees, while at 2 percent of the institutions solely certificates below the bachelor's level are awarded. About three quarters of the institutions are universities in the typical European understanding, i.e. institutions more or less equally in charge of teaching and research.

42 percent of the institutions – not surprisingly many of them with small student numbers – are specialised in certain fields or groups of fields, e.g. music, fine arts, teacher education and engineering. One sixth of the institutions are characterized by a strong regional emphasis, i.e. less directed toward national or international links.

The relative distribution of central coordinator replies by countries largely represented the relative distribution of outgoing and incoming ERASMUS students among the individual countries. Only for Spain and Iceland was the share of survey replies greatly below the national share of ERASMUS students so that these countries are under-represented with respect to their ERASMUS participation. Bulgaria, Estonia, Italy and Latvia, on the contrary, are over-represented. About one quarter of the institutions from which central coordinators replied belonged to one of the 12 new EU member states.

Many institutions of higher education have participated in ERASMUS for quite a while. According to the central ERASMUS coordinator survey, two-thirds of them joined ERASMUS already before 2000 (see Table 4). Only one third joined in recent years, among them many small institutions as well as – understandingly – many institutions from countries joining the EU recently.

**Table 3**
**Institutional Profile by Number of Students and Country Group (percent; multiple replies) – Central ERASMUS Coordinator Survey**

| | Number of students | | | Country | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | < 1,000 | 1,000 - 9,999 | > = 10,000 | New MS* | Other PC** | Total |
| My institution has the legal status of a public institution | 79 | 88 | 95 | 83 | 88 | 87 |
| My institution awards Master's degrees or equivalent | 70 | 86 | 95 | 78 | 84 | 83 |
| My institution awards PhD titles | 25 | 44 | 92 | 58 | 48 | 50 |
| My institution awards only vocational certificates (no Bachelor's or Master's degrees) | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| My institution expects from its academic staff to be involved equally in teaching and research | 65 | 73 | 86 | 80 | 71 | 74 |
| My institution is specialised on music arts, teacher training, engineering or any other specific field of study | 71 | 35 | 17 | 46 | 40 | 42 |
| My institution understands itself as a regional institution (i. e. has not primarily a national or international remit) | 15 | 18 | 14 | 20 | 15 | 16 |
| N | (254) | (376) | (230) | (231) | (684) | (915) |

Question 1.1: Please provide the following information about your institution.
* New MS = New Member States
** Other PC = Other participating countries

**Table 4**
**Period of Joining the ERASMUS Programme (percent) – Central ERASMUS Coordinator Survey**

|  | Number of students | | | Country | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | < 1,000 | 1,000 - 9,999 | > = 10,000 | New MS* | Other PC** | Total |
| Before 2000 | 46 | 69 | 91 | 44 | 76 | 67 |
| After 2000 | 54 | 31 | 9 | 56 | 24 | 33 |
| N | (246) | (358) | (226) | (225) | (641) | (866) |

Question 1.3: In which year did your institution join the ERASMUS programme?
\* New MS = New Member States
\*\* Other PC = Other participating countries

Many institutions addressed in the survey reported high numbers of ERASMUS partner institutions. About half of them had more than forty partners, in one case even 900 partners. Cooperation in student mobility was reinforced by the use of credits, in the majority of cases by the application of ECTS in all departments, and further in about half of the cases by providing ECTS catalogue/information packages.

About half of the institutions cooperated actively with 60 percent or even more of their partner institutions. Many institutions were involved both in student exchange and staff exchange. More than half of the institutions were also active in Intensive Programmes, more than one third in Thematic Networks and more than one fifth in Curriculum Development Projects.

Again, more than half of the institutions for which information was provided participated in other education-oriented programmes of the European Union in the academic year 2006/07. LEONARDO stood out, but several institutions mentioned NORDPLUS, TEMPUS, ERASMUS MUNDUS and CEEPUS. Most of these programmes were repeatedly characterized as being financially more attractive than ERASMUS. Finally, various institutions underscored the role of national programmes for student exchange, such as the programmes of the German DAAD, of the government of the German state Baden-Württemberg and the Franco-Canadian CREPUC programme.

Of the responding departmental ERASMUS coordinators, almost one quarter were active in units of engineering or computer science. One out of six were active each in units of social sciences and natural sciences and about one out of ten in medical fields, teacher training, economics and business studies, languages and other areas of humanities. It is not possible to establish why the absolute numbers

of responses are fairly high in engineering and computer sciences as well as in natural sciences in comparison to the other fields of study.

According to the departmental ERASMUS coordinators, the average number both of incoming and outgoing students was 20. The figures were lower on average for units from new EU member states than for old EU member states. Also an average figure of almost 20 partners was named, whereby active involvement of only ten of them was reported for the academic year 2006/07. The average number of both incoming and outgoing mobile teachers was three. Only 22 percent of the departmental coordinators reported to be involved in other EU education-oriented programmes – about half of them in only one programme, various in two programmes and one of nine in more than two programmes. Bilateral Agreements as well as LEONARDO were named most frequently. It is by no means surprising that only a minority of departments is active in other ERASMUS-related activities as well as in other EU programmes. It is worth noting, though, that many coordinators emphasized that their unit did not receive any financial support to embark on activities of that kind from their institution.

## 2.4     How does ERASMUS impact on institutional development?

In the following, major reference will be made to the findings from the central coordinator survey. Findings from this survey will be systematically compared to the replies of departmental coordinators. The perspectives of university leadership, however, will be presented with respect to selected issues only.

According to the analysis of central coordinator replies, among a number of different institutional characteristics, only large differences in student numbers and the location of an institution in the new or the old EU member states have a systematic influence on the perception of ERASMUS impact. Therefore, only these two classifications will be used to differentiate the overall findings of the central coordinators survey.[1]

### 2.4.1   The Importance of individual ERASMUS tools and actions

Both, central ERASMUS coordinators and departmental ERASMUS coordinators were asked to rate the importance of various ERASMUS-related activities for their institutional or departmental mission. As Table 5 shows, student mobility was viewed most frequently as "important" or "very important". It is interesting to note that this view was more frequent with respect to outgoing student mobility than for incoming student mobility both among central ERASMUS coordinators

---

1   The role of the following criteria turned out to be marginal (a) offer of a broad range of fields of study vs. specialised institutions, (b) regional vs. national/international orientation of an institution, (c) public vs. private maintenance, (d) award of PhD degrees, and (e) length of participation in the ERASMUS programme.

(91% vs. 86%) and departmental ERASMUS coordinators (86% vs. 73%). Both, incoming and outgoing student mobility, were rated more frequently as important by respondents from large institutions of higher education than by small institutions as well as by respondents from recent EU member states more frequently than by respondents from older EU member states.

Teacher and other staff mobility were rated somewhat less frequently as important: by more than 70 percent of the central ERASMUS coordinators and by less than 70 percent of the departmental ERASMUS coordinators. The ratings hardly differed with regard to incoming and outgoing staff mobility. As regards institutional characteristics, we note the same patterns as before: respondents from large institutions consider staff mobility as more important than those from small institutions, and similarly respondents from new EU member states as compared to those from older EU member states. Other ERASMUS areas of support were rated as important by less than half of the respondents: Intensive programmes, Curriculum Development Projects, and Thematic Networks.

The same question also referred to the importance of various "tools" possibly employed by the higher education institutions in the context of ERASMUS. As Table 5 shows as well, many of both the central ERASMUS coordinators and the departmental ERASMUS coordinators considered almost all the "tools" addressed in the questionnaire (ECTS credit transfer, Learning Agreements, the Diploma Supplement, etc.) as important.

**Table 5**
**Importance of Various ERASMUS Actions and Tools by Institutional Size and Group of Countries (percent*) – Central ERASMUS Coordinator Survey and Departmental ERASMUS Coordinator Survey**

|  | Central ERASMUS coordinators | | | | | | Departmental ERASMUS coord. |
|  | Number of students | | | Country | | | |
|  | < 1,000 | 1,000 - 9,999 | > = 10,000 | New MS** | Other PC*** | Total | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Incoming student mobility | 79 | 85 | 94 | 88 | 84 | 86 | 73 |
| Outgoing student mobility | 87 | 91 | 97 | 98 | 89 | 91 | 86 |
| Incoming teacher and staff mobility | 66 | 72 | 75 | 90 | 65 | 71 | 64 |

**Table 5 continued**

| | Central ERASMUS coordinators | | | | | | Departmental ERASMUS coord. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of students | | | Country | | | |
| | < 1,000 | 1,000 - 9,999 | > = 10,000 | New MS** | Other PC*** | Total | Total |
| Outgoing teacher and staff mobility | 62 | 78 | 78 | 94 | 67 | 74 | 65 |
| Intensive Programmes | 38 | 45 | 52 | 56 | 42 | 46 | 47 |
| Curriculum Development Projects | 35 | 42 | 47 | 51 | 39 | 42 | 49 |
| Thematic Networks | 28 | 35 | 41 | 45 | 31 | 35 | 46 |
| Institutional networking under ERASMUS | 59 | 61 | 65 | 64 | 61 | 61 | 60 |
| Staff from your institution coordinating centralised projects | 44 | 45 | 58 | 58 | 45 | 49 | 49 |
| ECTS for credit transfer | 82 | 88 | 92 | 92 | 85 | 87 | 78 |
| Learning Agreements | 77 | 88 | 89 | 95 | 82 | 85 | 75 |
| The Diploma Supplement | 70 | 78 | 79 | 89 | 71 | 76 | 71 |
| The ERASMUS Policy Statement | 75 | 77 | 82 | 91 | 73 | 78 | 62 |
| N | (241) | (365) | (221) | (222) | (646) | (827) | (735) |

Question 2.1: For pursuing your institutions'/departments' general mission, policies and objectives, how important are - according to your experience - the following ERASMUS actions and tools?
* Points four and five on a five-point scale from 1 = "not important at all" to 5 = "very important".
** New MS = New Member States
*** Other PC = Other participating countries.

### 2.4.2　Utilisation of the ERASMUS Experience

With only few exceptions, central ERASMUS coordinators reported that their institutions exploited and transferred the experiences gained from all ERASMUS actions and tools which they were involved in. Institutional networking and other

actions (IP, CD, and thematic networks) scored lowest in this respect with 58 percent and 45 percent of institutions respectively saying that they exploited and transferred experiences. Institutions in new EU member states made particularly strong efforts to exploit and transfer experiences gained from staff mobility, centralised projects, ECTS and the ERASMUS Policy Statement.

**Table 6**
**Exploitation and Transfer of ERASMUS Actions and Tools (percent\*) –**
**Central ERASMUS Coordinator Survey**

| | Number of students | | | Country | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | < 1,000 | 1,000 - 9,999 | > = 10,000 | New MS** | Other PC*** | Total |
| Student Mobility | 89 | 94 | 94 | 95 | 91 | 92 |
| Staff mobility | 76 | 88 | 87 | 97 | 80 | 84 |
| Other actions (IP, CD, Thematic Networks) | 29 | 43 | 66 | 50 | 43 | 45 |
| ECTS for credit transfer | 80 | 87 | 92 | 92 | 84 | 86 |
| Development and implementation of the ERASMUS Policy Statement | 77 | 79 | 86 | 89 | 78 | 81 |
| Institutional networking under ERASMUS | 47 | 56 | 76 | 56 | 59 | 58 |
| N | (212) | (330) | (197) | (192) | (583) | (775) |

Question 2.2: Does your institution exploit and transfer the experiences gained from the following ERASMUS actions and tools for improving its teaching, research, student services or institutional management?
\* Points four and five on a five-point scale from 1 = "not important at all" to 5 = "very important".
\*\* New MS = New Member States
\*\*\* Other PC = Other participating countries.

The ratings of the departmental ERASMUS coordinators were more cautious than those of the central ERASMUS coordinators (see Table 7). Coordinators in the area of teacher training most often reported that they exploit and transfer the experience gained in most of the ERASMUS actions (see Table 7).

Two thirds of central ERASMUS coordinators reported that they analysed carefully the reports of former ERASMUS participants. The information derived from these analyses was discussed regularly both at central and departmental institutional level in more than half of the cases. Around half the institutions (almost three quarters in the new EU member states) also organized feedback seminars with former ERASMUS participants or compiled data bases on Europeanisa-

tion/internationalisation. The results of feedback seminars were discussed at the level of departments and at central institutional level. In the new EU member states, the results of feedback seminars were almost twice as often discussed at the central institutional level than in the other countries. Data bases on Europeanisation/internationalisation were considered as strategically relevant above all at central institutional level. It was less common that information derived from them fed into discussions at the level of departments (only at 14% of institutions). Europeanisation/internationalisation reports were published by just over one quarter of institutions. Conclusions of these reports frequently fed into discussions at central institutional level, but were only rarely considered at the level of departments (at 8% of institutions).

**Table 7**
**Exploitation and Transfer of ERASMUS Actions and Tools by Group of Fields of Study (percent\*) – Departmental ERASMUS Coordinator Survey**

| | Hum | SoS | Edu | Lan | Eco | Art | Eng | Nat | Law | Med | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Student mobility | 38 | 46 | 47 | 51 | 53 | 43 | 47 | 47 | 37 | 45 | 43 |
| Teacher mobility | 39 | 52 | 63 | 63 | 50 | 50 | 49 | 48 | 42 | 40 | 45 |
| Intensive Programmes | 30 | 53 | 61 | 45 | 52 | 35 | 31 | 36 | 44 | 37 | 37 |
| Curriculum Development Projects | 31 | 50 | 61 | 41 | 50 | 37 | 35 | 40 | 27 | 29 | 37 |
| Thematic Networks | 28 | 47 | 47 | 38 | 44 | 21 | 35 | 35 | 20 | 37 | 36 |
| ECTS for credit transfer | 45 | 57 | 58 | 52 | 39 | 37 | 51 | 48 | 43 | 44 | 46 |
| Development and implementation of the ERASMUS Policy Statement | 35 | 40 | 48 | 44 | 39 | 44 | 42 | 38 | 24 | 35 | 37 |
| Institutional networking under ERASMUS | 43 | 54 | 53 | 45 | 45 | 39 | 42 | 43 | 33 | 36 | 40 |
| N | (78) | (107) | (74) | (70) | (70) | (44) | (175) | (113) | (27) | (79) | (708) |

Question 2.2: Does your department exploit and transfer the experiences gained from the following ERASMUS actions and tools for improving its teaching, research, student services or management?
Hum: Humanities (without languages); SoS: Social sciences; Edu: Education, teacher training; Lan: Languages and philological sciences; Eco: Economics, management; Art: Art and design; Eng: Engineering, technology, informatics; Nat: Natural sciences; Med: Medical Sciences
\* Points four and five on a five-point scale from 1 = "not at all" to 5 = "to a high degree".

Ten percent of the departmental ERASMUS coordinators stated that they do not keep track of the implementation and outcomes of ERASMUS at all. 40 percent indicated that they do not do it systematically but that the teachers and students

participating in ERASMUS employ their experience in the daily work of the departments. The majority of the departmental ERASMUS coordinators stated that they analysed the reports of former ERASMUS participants (58%), and about half of them indicated that they discussed the implementation and outcomes of ERASMUS at committee meetings in the departments. About one fifth of them discuss the results of Intensive Programmes, Curriculum Development Programmes or Thematic Networks in which they participated (17%) or compile data bases on Europeanisation or internationalisation of their departments (20%).

## 2.5    Perceived Contribution of ERASMUS to Quality Enhancement

### 2.5.1   The Themes Addressed

The major aim of this study was to establish the role ERASMUS possibly has played in quality enhancement in higher education in Europe. For various areas of activities, both central ERASMUS coordinators and departmental ERASMUS coordinators were asked to state on a five-point scale
− the extent to which they observed that quality was enhanced ("how much progress" was "achieved"?),
− the extent to which participation in the ERASMUS programme had played a role for the "initiation" of respective activities, and
− the extent to which participation in the ERASMUS programme had played a role for "the further development" of respective activities.

The activities addressed were classified into five fields:
− student services,
− teaching and learning (departmental ERASMUS coordinator survey: and research),
− quality assurance and professionalisation,
− mobility, networks and cooperation, and finally
− institutional mission, management and profiling.

In these fields of activities, altogether 28 aspects were addressed in the central ERASMUS coordinator survey and 38 in the departmental ERASMUS coordinator survey. In each field, an open space was furnished in the questionnaire for naming further aspects, if applicable. Altogether, the aspects ranged from concrete measures within ERASMUS to general issues such as internationalisation and modernisation of higher education.

     The institutional leader survey primarily addressed aspects of institutional mission and profiling. Only few other individual aspects were covered in the respective questionnaire.

2.5.2   Student Services

Altogether, more progress was observed and ERASMUS was perceived to have played a more important role in the thematic area of student services than in the other four thematic fields named above. But there were differences according to the individual aspects of student services. In detail, as shown by tables 8 and 9, perceptions concerning progress were as follows

− 73 percent of the central ERASMUS coordinators and 64 percent of the departmental ERASMUS coordinators observed (very) high progress with respect to the counselling for study abroad,
− 70 percent and 52 percent respectively replied that there was (very) high progress concerning non-academic support for incoming students,
− 50 percent and 46 percent respectively observed (very) high progress in the non-academic support for outgoing students,
− 58 percent and 48 percent respectively did so concerning information in foreign languages.

In almost all aspects, central ERASMUS coordinators observed such progress clearly more often than departmental ERASMUS coordinators.

More or less equally often, ERASMUS was regarded as important for initiating the respective activities:

− counselling for study abroad: 75 percent of the central ERASMUS coordinators and 69 percent of the departmental ERASMUS coordinators agreed that ERASMUS had been important for initiating this kind of service,
− non-academic support for incoming students: 68 percent and 65 percent respectively agreed,
− non-academic support for outgoing students: 38 percent and 47 percent respectively agreed,
− information in foreign languages: 61 percent and 58 percent respectively agreed.

In contrast to the previous findings, the views of central ERASMUS coordinators and departmental ERASMUS coordinators did not differ substantially as regards the role played by ERASMUS in initiating these activities.

Finally, a role of ERASMUS for further enhancement was noted regarding

− counselling for study abroad by 65 percent of the central ERASMUS coordinators and 54 percent of the departmental ERASMUS coordinators,
− non-academic support for incoming students by 57 percent and 48 percent respectively,
− non-academic support for outgoing students by 31 percent and 34 percent respectively,
− information in foreign languages by 51 percent and 41 percent respectively.

Consistently, a contribution to further enhancement was observed less frequently than the initiation of activities in the field of student services. Altogether, the central ERASMUS coordinators saw somewhat more enhancement in most of those respects than the departmental ERASMUS coordinators.

**Table 8**
**Student Services: Progress Realised and Role Played by ERASMUS for Initiation and Enhancement by Institutional Size and Group of Countries (percent*) – Central ERASMUS Coordinator Survey**

| | Number of students | | | Country | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | < 1,000 | 1,000 - 9,999 | > = 10,000 | New MS** | Other PC*** | Total |
| *Improving the counselling for staff and students interested in study abroad* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 64 | 75 | 80 | 72 | 73 | 73 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 73 | 75 | 78 | 83 | 72 | 75 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 56 | 64 | 74 | 77 | 61 | 65 |
| *Improving the non-academic support for incoming students* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 55 | 75 | 81 | 68 | 71 | 70 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 60 | 71 | 75 | 77 | 65 | 68 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 41 | 59 | 72 | 64 | 55 | 57 |
| *Improving the non-academic support for your own students* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 39 | 53 | 56 | 53 | 49 | 50 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 37 | 35 | 40 | 38 | 38 | 38 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 23 | 31 | 36 | 34 | 30 | 31 |
| *Increasing student information in foreign language* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 46 | 59 | 70 | 69 | 54 | 58 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 54 | 63 | 64 | 70 | 58 | 61 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 39 | 50 | 63 | 64 | 47 | 51 |

Question 2.3: How much progress has your institution achieved with respect to the following activities? And, according to your perception, what role did your participation in the ERASMUS programme play for the initiation of these activities and their further development at your institution?
* Points four and five on a five-point scale from 1 = "none" to 5 = "very high"
** New MS = New Member States
*** Other PC = Other participating countries.

**Table 9**
**Student Services: Progress Realised and Role Played by ERASMUS for Initiation and Enhancement by Field of Study (percent\*) – Departmental ERASMUS Coordinator Survey**

|  | Hum | SoS | Edu | Lan | Eco | Art | Eng | Nat | Law | Med | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Improving the academic counselling for staff and students interested in study abroad* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 71 | 68 | 62 | 72 | 71 | 62 | 67 | 59 | 62 | 65 | 64 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 67 | 73 | 68 | 68 | 77 | 84 | 66 | 65 | 54 | 74 | 69 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 57 | 57 | 48 | 58 | 62 | 69 | 57 | 51 | 52 | 54 | 54 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Improving the non-academic support for incoming students* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 58 | 50 | 53 | 62 | 57 | 58 | 51 | 46 | 56 | 48 | 52 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 61 | 64 | 64 | 57 | 79 | 71 | 63 | 61 | 60 | 73 | 65 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 46 | 44 | 46 | 48 | 57 | 52 | 47 | 53 | 59 | 44 | 48 |

**Table 9 continued**

| | Hum | SoS | Edu | Lan | Eco | Art | Eng | Nat | Law | Med | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Improving the non-academic support for your own students* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 49 | 47 | 51 | 54 | 56 | 63 | 42 | 37 | 56 | 40 | 46 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 48 | 41 | 50 | 42 | 51 | 52 | 47 | 40 | 42 | 52 | 47 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 30 | 26 | 26 | 31 | 43 | 50 | 37 | 33 | 45 | 25 | 34 |
| *Increasing student information in foreign language* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 50 | 54 | 49 | 56 | 48 | 57 | 46 | 38 | 56 | 51 | 48 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 51 | 55 | 57 | 52 | 67 | 62 | 58 | 56 | 69 | 67 | 58 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 40 | 44 | 35 | 41 | 48 | 59 | 42 | 38 | 42 | 41 | 41 |

Question 2.3: How much progress has your department achieved with respect to the following activities? And, according to your perception, what role did your department's participation in ERASMUS play for the initiation of these activities and the achievement of progress in their implementation? Hum: Humanities (without languages); SoS: Social sciences; Edu: Education, teacher training; Lan: Languages and philological sciences; Eco: Economics, management; Art: Art and design; Eng: Engineering, technology, informatics; Nat: Natural sciences; Med: Medical Sciences
* Points four and five on a five-point scale from 1 = "none" to 5 = "very high".

Progress in student services and beneficial effects of ERASMUS in this area was most often stated by central ERASMUS coordinators of large institutions of higher education. Institutional size, however, played a minor role in the initiation of activities through ERASMUS than in the other two dimensions addressed.

In new EU member states, progress in the development of student services was not viewed higher than in the older EU member states for three of the four aspects addressed; only with regard to information in foreign languages, progress noted by central ERASMUS coordinators in the new EU member states exceeded that noted by central coordinators in the old EU member states. Central ERASMUS coordinators in new EU member states and older similar states hold similar views on average as regards the further enhancement of student services.

### 2.5.3   Teaching, Learning and Research

As regards teaching and learning, the large majority of central coordinators stated that there had been at least regular progress (points 3 to 5 on a 5 point scale) with respect to the different aspects covered by the survey. The only exception was the most formalised form of internationalisation, i.e. 'introducing joint degrees'. In this case, over half the central coordinators observed little or no progress at all. Furthermore, for the following three aspects, around one third of them observed little or no progress at all: setting up English/foreign language programmes (37%), internationalising the curricular content (33%) and introducing mandatory foreign language requirements as part of the curriculum (29%).

The central coordinators who participated in the survey observed greatest progress with respect to the fostering of soft skills of students, the modernisation of curricula, the introduction of mandatory foreign language requirements as part of the curriculum and the internationalisation of teaching and learning. In general, medium-sized institutions (between 1,000 and 9,999 students) reported greater progress than large institutions. Small institutions reported having achieved least progress. Only with respect to the introduction of joint degrees and the internationalisation of teaching and learning, was greater progress achieved at large institutions with at least 10,000 students. Small institutions remarkably lagged behind with respect to the setting up of English/foreign language programmes, the introduction of joint degrees and the internationalisation of teaching and learning. In the fields with the strongest progress at small institutions (modernising curricula, fostering soft skills of students and introducing mandatory foreign language requirements as part of the curriculum), however, progress was reported to be similar to that achieved by larger institutions.

The central coordinators from the 12 new EU member states observed much greater progress than those from other ERASMUS countries concerning the following aspects: introducing mandatory foreign language requirements as part of the curriculum, setting up English/foreign language programmes and internation-

alising teaching and learning. With respect to the modernisation of curricula, however, progress observed was similar in new EU countries and other ERASMUS countries.

**Table 10**
**Teaching, Learning and Research: Progress Realised and Role Played by ERASMUS for Initiation and Enhancement by Institutional Size and Group of Countries (percent\*) – Central ERASMUS Coordinator Survey**

| | Number of students | | | Country | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | < 1,000 | 1,000 - 9,999 | > = 10,000 | New MS** | Other PC*** | Total |
| *Modernizing curricula* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 52 | 58 | 55 | 55 | 56 | 55 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 36 | 33 | 38 | 51 | 30 | 35 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 22 | 29 | 35 | 41 | 24 | 29 |
| *Fostering soft skills of students* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 59 | 65 | 64 | 67 | 61 | 63 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 48 | 41 | 52 | 64 | 40 | 46 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 39 | 45 | 55 | 63 | 40 | 46 |
| *Introducing mandatory foreign language requirements as part of the curriculum* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 47 | 50 | 50 | 60 | 45 | 49 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 27 | 26 | 38 | 35 | 27 | 29 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 29 | 34 | 36 | 44 | 29 | 33 |
| *Internationalising the curricular content* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 33 | 39 | 37 | 40 | 35 | 36 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 32 | 38 | 58 | 51 | 38 | 41 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 21 | 33 | 46 | 42 | 29 | 32 |

**Table 10 continued**

|  | Number of students | | | Country | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | < 1,000 | 1,000 - 9,999 | > = 10,000 | New MS** | Other PC*** | Total |
| *Setting up English/foreign language programmes* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 27 | 47 | 44 | 49 | 36 | 40 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 32 | 41 | 49 | 52 | 36 | 40 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 22 | 39 | 46 | 49 | 31 | 36 |
| *Introducing joint degrees* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 15 | 26 | 35 | 24 | 25 | 25 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 18 | 31 | 48 | 36 | 31 | 32 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 9 | 26 | 41 | 30 | 24 | 26 |
| *Internationalising teaching and learning* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 42 | 50 | 52 | 57 | 45 | 48 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 42 | 51 | 54 | 58 | 47 | 50 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 32 | 43 | 46 | 55 | 36 | 41 |

Question 2.3: How much progress has your institution achieved with respect to the following activities? And, according to your perception, what role did your participation in the ERASMUS programme play for the initiation of these activities and their further development at your institution?
* Points four and five on a five-point scale from 1 = "none" to 5 = "very high".
** New MS = New Member States
*** Other PC = Other participating countries.

The departmental ERASMUS coordinators had been presented a more extensive list of aspects of teaching, learning, and research than central coordinators. However, many of the formulations were identical or similar to those posed to the central ERASMUS coordinators so that the results are comparable. In general, similar to the thematic field of student services, the departmental ERASMUS coordinators less frequently observe progress – for example not more than 53 percent see a progress in fostering soft skills of students. In addition to the aspects covered by both the questionnaires for central and departmental coordinators, the departmental ERASMUS coordinators had been asked whether they observed progress as regards various aspects of research; this was responded affirmatively by about one third of them (see Table 11).

**Table 11**
**Teaching, Learning and Research: Progress Realised and Role Played by ERASMUS for Initiation and Enhancement by Field of Study (percent\*) – Departmental ERASMUS Coordinator Survey**

|  | Hum | SoS | Edu | Lan | Eco | Art | Eng | Nat | Law | Med | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Revising curricula substantially* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 42 | 51 | 50 | 57 | 58 | 49 | 51 | 49 | 32 | 42 | 49 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 16 | 25 | 14 | 16 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 23 | 20 | 34 | 21 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 20 | 26 | 18 | 28 | 33 | 24 | 21 | 21 | 20 | 27 | 23 |
| *Introducing new curricula* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 42 | 51 | 46 | 43 | 55 | 51 | 50 | 42 | 29 | 39 | 46 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 12 | 27 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 27 | 21 | 17 | 18 | 29 | 22 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 14 | 24 | 11 | 27 | 29 | 24 | 19 | 17 | 26 | 22 | 20 |
| *Fostering soft skills of students* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 52 | 51 | 58 | 50 | 69 | 63 | 56 | 51 | 23 | 45 | 53 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 37 | 40 | 43 | 27 | 34 | 52 | 41 | 44 | 30 | 45 | 41 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 39 | 34 | 26 | 35 | 43 | 43 | 40 | 36 | 39 | 33 | 36 |
| *Introducing mandatory foreign language requirements as part of curricula* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 35 | 43 | 31 | 48 | 49 | 21 | 37 | 33 | 35 | 38 | 37 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 19 | 31 | 20 | 14 | 24 | 31 | 25 | 27 | 37 | 40 | 28 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 39 | 35 | 13 | 33 | 30 | 30 | 33 | 27 | 48 | 27 | 30 |
| *Internationalising the curricular content* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 29 | 31 | 26 | 32 | 27 | 33 | 29 | 19 | 13 | 27 | 28 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 31 | 39 | 24 | 35 | 23 | 45 | 35 | 34 | 38 | 38 | 34 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 35 | 25 | 20 | 33 | 28 | 41 | 29 | 22 | 30 | 26 | 26 |

**Table 11 continued**

|  | Hum | SoS | Edu | Lan | Eco | Art | Eng | Nat | Law | Med | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Setting up English/foreign language programmes* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 27 | 31 | 32 | 48 | 43 | 20 | 38 | 33 | 46 | 31 | 34 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 24 | 43 | 43 | 34 | 37 | 45 | 37 | 38 | 40 | 32 | 36 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 7 | 28 | 15 | 36 | 42 | 24 | 36 | 28 | 42 | 21 | 29 |
| *Introducing joint degrees* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 9 | 18 | 11 | 24 | 33 | 23 | 20 | 12 | 25 | 16 | 18 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 20 | 19 | 18 | 31 | 29 | 35 | 29 | 19 | 18 | 20 | 24 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 15 | 16 | 12 | 31 | 33 | 21 | 24 | 14 | 22 | 19 | 21 |
| *Internationalising teaching and learning* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 36 | 48 | 40 | 54 | 58 | 44 | 41 | 39 | 52 | 40 | 44 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 42 | 52 | 52 | 38 | 52 | 62 | 43 | 43 | 52 | 48 | 45 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 37 | 40 | 27 | 44 | 54 | 52 | 44 | 26 | 45 | 32 | 38 |
| *Introducing mandatory work placements in curricula* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 25 | 31 | 33 | 33 | 43 | 24 | 30 | 20 | 22 | 25 | 26 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 15 | 13 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 24 | 13 | 12 | 11 | 20 | 14 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 11 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 13 | 16 | 14 | 11 | 18 | 14 | 14 |
| *Introducing ICT-based learning* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 22 | 27 | 40 | 47 | 31 | 24 | 34 | 19 | 22 | 24 | 28 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 12 | 11 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 17 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 19 | 11 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 12 | 11 | 10 | 20 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 9 |

**Table 11 continued**

|  | Hum | SoS | Edu | Lan | Eco | Art | Eng | Nat | Law | Med | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Increasing interdisciplinarity between degree programmes* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 32 | 31 | 29 | 41 | 25 | 23 | 34 | 24 | 23 | 23 | 27 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 20 | 17 | 15 | 9 | 13 | 27 | 15 | 18 | 22 | 24 | 17 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 14 | 16 | 11 | 18 | 11 | 23 | 10 | 8 | 13 | 16 | 13 |
| *Introducing new types of examinations* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 24 | 29 | 32 | 31 | 28 | 16 | 25 | 15 | 21 | 29 | 24 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 23 | 13 | 15 | 13 | 19 | 22 | 18 | 12 | 42 | 24 | 19 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 11 | 11 | 10 | 14 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 21 | 17 | 11 |
| *Introducing new teaching approaches* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 40 | 36 | 42 | 38 | 45 | 35 | 36 | 24 | 33 | 30 | 34 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 26 | 24 | 23 | 9 | 20 | 31 | 22 | 21 | 30 | 33 | 23 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 23 | 19 | 12 | 18 | 24 | 17 | 15 | 12 | 10 | 23 | 16 |
| *Increasing the number of international publications* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 42 | 43 | 43 | 42 | 33 | 25 | 38 | 41 | 39 | 30 | 39 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 17 | 28 | 25 | 20 | 28 | 22 | 16 | 18 | 15 | 23 | 21 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 19 | 24 | 17 | 19 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 17 | 15 | 17 |

**Table 11 continued**

|  | Hum | SoS | Edu | Lan | Eco | Art | Eng | Nat | Law | Med | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Integrating an international perspective in national research projects* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 49 | 44 | 42 | 51 | 36 | 21 | 36 | 40 | 36 | 26 | 38 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 22 | 28 | 27 | 21 | 38 | 31 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 27 | 23 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 20 | 26 | 20 | 20 | 29 | 7 | 16 | 12 | 28 | 14 | 18 |
| *Increasing the societal relevance and impact of research topics* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 38 | 41 | 35 | 42 | 33 | 21 | 26 | 29 | 29 | 26 | 30 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 14 | 15 | 17 | 10 | 21 | 13 | 11 | 15 | 5 | 25 | 16 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 14 | 18 | 13 | 18 | 18 | 8 | 12 | 14 | 22 | 17 | 14 |
| *Strengthening excellence and international competitiveness of research* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 37 | 36 | 40 | 45 | 29 | 23 | 41 | 43 | 52 | 31 | 38 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 15 | 19 | 22 | 9 | 22 | 12 | 12 | 17 | 14 | 24 | 18 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 18 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 19 | 7 | 15 | 15 | 24 | 16 | 17 |

Question 2.3: How much progress has your department achieved with respect to the following activities? And, according to your perception, what role did your department's participation in ERASMUS play for the initiation of these activities and the achievement of progress in their implementation? Hum: Humanities (without languages); SoS: Social sciences; Edu: Education, teacher training; Lan: Languages and philological sciences; Eco: Economics, management; Art: Art and design; Eng: Engineering, technology, informatics; Nat: Natural sciences; Med: Medical Sciences
* Points four and five on a five-point scale from 1 = "none" to 5 = "very high".

Whereas for the thematic field of student services, it was found that respondents noted an initiating role of ERASMUS in almost all those aspects where progress was reported, for the thematic field of teaching and learning, the central ERASMUS coordinators perceived to a lesser extent an initiating role of ERASMUS. For example, whereas 49 percent reported that mandatory foreign language requirements had grown, only 29 percent stated that this had been initiated by ERASMUS. There were, however, also areas of change for which ERASMUS as a rule was seen as the trigger: For example, it does not come as a surprise to note that ERASMUS was regarded the initiator for the introduction of joint degrees.

Also, the majority of departmental ERASMUS coordinators considered the changes in teaching and learning to be only partly due to ERASMUS. Again, there were exceptions: as regards the internationalisation of teaching and learning, about the same proportion of departmental ERASMUS coordinators observed substantial change (44%) as perceived ERASMUS as having played a crucial role for initiating this change (45%).

Finally, ERASMUS was noted on average almost as often as supportive for achieving progress as it was viewed as having initiated change. This holds true for the responses both by the central and the departmental ERASMUS coordinators.

However, there is a wide and consistent difference in the perceptions of central and departmental coordinators across the various aspects when the role of ERASMUS for initiating change and contributing to progress in the various areas of teaching and research is considered. The same holds true as regards country groups: respondents from new EU member states see more progress than respondents from the other member states with respect only to few aspects, but more or less consistently perceive a stronger contribution of ERASMUS to that progress than respondents from old member states.

Progress made in teaching, learning and research was most frequently reported by departmental ERASMUS coordinators from language fields as well as from economics and business studies. Departmental coordinators from these fields also reported relatively often to perceive a strong contribution of ERASMUS to that progress. Respondents from art and design less often noted that progress had been made than respondents from the above named fields of study; however, if they noted change, they frequently stated to perceive a strong role of ERASMUS in the context of achieving that change.

### 2.5.4   Quality Assurance and Professionalisation

Quality assurance is high on the agenda of ERASMUS institutions. In this field, a similarly high share of central coordinators reported regular progress as in the field of teaching and learning. On average, progress as regards quality assurance and professionalisation is more often stated than progress with respect to teaching, learning, and research.

As regards the aspects which questionnaires addressed in the domain of quality assurance and professionalisation, we note that more than half of the central ERASMUS coordinators observe progress in the majority of aspects covered. Among departmental ERASMUS coordinators, more than half of respondents observe progress for half of the aspects addressed. Progress is often noted in improving the transparency and transferability of student qualifications, modernising the learning infrastructure and introducing students' assessment of teaching. More than half of the central ERASMUS coordinators, but only one third of the departmental ERASMUS coordinators, reported that student and graduate surveys were introduced. The establishment of training of teachers in foreign language and intercultural knowledge/understanding was reported by about one quarter each of the central and departmental ERASMUS coordinators.

The role of ERASMUS for initiating progress or being supportive for achieving success in quality assurance, however, was seen as relatively weak as compared to its role for the thematic fields of student services or teaching, learning and research. Only with respect to improving the transparency and transferability of qualifications, ERASMUS was attributed a major role (see Table 12).

**Table 12**

**Quality Assurance and Professionalisation: Progress Realised and Role Played by ERASMUS for Initiation and Enhancement by Institutional Size and Group of Countries (percent\*) – Central ERASMUS Coordinator Survey**

| | Number of students | | | Country | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | < 1,000 | 1,000 - 9,999 | > = 10,000 | New MS** | Other PC*** | Total |
| *Improving the transparency and transferability of student qualifications* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 58 | 61 | 61 | 67 | 57 | 60 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 50 | 51 | 56 | 52 | 53 | 53 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 38 | 40 | 50 | 42 | 42 | 42 |
| *Introducing/extending language training and intercultural training for teachers* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 22 | 33 | 28 | 32 | 27 | 28 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 29 | 32 | 28 | 40 | 27 | 30 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 16 | 24 | 22 | 28 | 20 | 22 |

**Table 12 continued**

|  | Number of students | | | Country | | |
|  | < 1,000 | 1,000 - 9,999 | > = 10,000 | New MS** | Other PC*** | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Introducing regular student and/or graduate surveys on student satisfaction* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 38 | 62 | 51 | 55 | 51 | 52 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 16 | 20 | 25 | 33 | 17 | 21 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 9 | 20 | 21 | 24 | 15 | 17 |
| *Modernising the learning infrastructure* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 47 | 62 | 57 | 60 | 54 | 56 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 12 | 10 | 8 | 17 | 7 | 10 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 10 | 12 | 13 | 17 | 9 | 12 |

Question 2.3: How much progress has your institution achieved with respect to the following activi-
ties? And, according to your perception, what role did your participation in the ERASMUS programme
play for the initiation of these activities and their further development at your institution?
* Points four and five on a five-point scale from 1 = "none" to 5 = "very high".
** New MS = New Member States
*** Other PC = Other participating countries.

The responses of central ERASMUS coordinators from large institutions differed
only moderately from those from medium-size or small institutions. Differences
by group of countries were also small as regards progress made in general. How-
ever, respondents from old EU member states noted even less frequently than
respondents from new EU member states that ERASMUS had been important for
developing the field of quality assurance and professionalisation.

The responses of departmental ERASMUS coordinators varied in some re-
spects by fields of study according to all the three dimensions addressed. Respon-
dents from language subjects as well as from economics and business often noted
progress in relation to quality assurance and professionalisation. An initiating role
of ERASMUS for change was most often reported by respondents from art and
design as well as from law, and a supportive role of ERASMUS for achieving
progress by respondents from language fields, economics and business and law
(see Table 13).

**Table 13**
**Quality Assurance and Professionalisation: Progress Realised and Role Played by ERASMUS for**
**Initiation and Enhancement by Field of Study (percent*) – Departmental ERASMUS Coordinator Survey**

|  | Hum | SoS | Edu | Lan | Eco | Art | Eng | Nat | Law | Med | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Improving the transparency and transferability of student qualifications* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 57 | 51 | 49 | 65 | 53 | 63 | 55 | 41 | 55 | 54 | 52 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 53 | 41 | 29 | 44 | 43 | 39 | 43 | 35 | 48 | 43 | 43 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 45 | 34 | 33 | 47 | 33 | 44 | 34 | 24 | 50 | 32 | 34 |
| *Introducing/extending language training and intercultural training for teachers* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 25 | 22 | 32 | 37 | 33 | 18 | 28 | 20 | 46 | 26 | 27 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 21 | 29 | 20 | 21 | 25 | 36 | 25 | 23 | 29 | 20 | 24 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 24 | 21 | 16 | 31 | 31 | 19 | 23 | 19 | 26 | 17 | 21 |
| *Introducing the regular evaluation of teaching by students* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 55 | 56 | 49 | 57 | 52 | 31 | 58 | 49 | 44 | 53 | 54 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 14 | 19 | 11 | 7 | 9 | 20 | 10 | 17 | 19 | 22 | 14 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 9 | 15 | 12 | 20 | 13 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 11 |

**Table 13 continued**

|  | Hum | SoS | Edu | Lan | Eco | Art | Eng | Nat | Law | Med | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Introducing regular graduate surveys* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 27 | 34 | 22 | 34 | 40 | 26 | 29 | 27 | 22 | 31 | 32 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 11 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 13 | 20 | 7 | 14 | 21 | 18 | 12 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 11 | 9 | 7 | 14 | 14 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 13 | 10 | 9 |

Question 2.3: How much progress has your department achieved with respect to the following activities? And, according to your perception, what role did your department's participation in ERASMUS play for the initiation of these activities and the achievement of progress in their implementation? Hum: Humanities (without languages); SoS: Social sciences; Edu: Education, teacher training; Lan: Languages and philological sciences; Eco: Economics, management; Art: Art and design; Eng: Engineering, technology, informatics; Nat: Natural sciences; Med: Medical Sciences
* Points four and five on a five-point scale from 1 = "none" to 5 = "very high".

2.5.5  Mobility, Networks and Cooperation

In this field, the central coordinators observed medium progress but a rather high contribution of the ERASMUS programme to that progress. It does not come as a surprise that an increase of student mobility was most often reported both by the central and the departmental ERASMUS coordinators as a recent aspect of change and that a strong role of ERASMUS was observed in contributing to this. Also staff mobility is named often in this context, though less frequently than student mobility.

For all other five aspects of mobility, networks and cooperation, substantial progress is noted by more than one third of the central ERASMUS coordinators: increasing participation in international projects (44%), increasing staff participation in international conferences (41%), increasing the number of staff with responsibilities for internationalisation (39%), increasing effects of international institutional networks (35%), and increasing cooperation with the economic sector (35%). In those aspects comprising international ties, ERASMUS was often seen as having had an initiating and also a supporting effect for achieving success, while for other aspects the role of ERASMUS was regarded minimal (see Table 14).

**Table 14**
**Mobility, Networks and Cooperation: Progress Realised and Role Played by ERASMUS for Initiation and Enhancement by Institutional Size and Group of Countries (percent\*) – Central ERASMUS Coordinator Survey**

| | Number of students | | | Country | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | < 1,000 | 1,000 - 9,999 | > = 10,000 | New MS** | Other PC*** | Total |
| *Increasing the number of outgoing teachers and students* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 51 | 63 | 73 | 71 | 60 | 62 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 74 | 80 | 82 | 82 | 78 | 79 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 62 | 72 | 81 | 83 | 67 | 71 |
| *Increasing the number of incoming teachers and students* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 48 | 57 | 67 | 63 | 54 | 56 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 69 | 77 | 78 | 81 | 73 | 75 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 51 | 64 | 71 | 73 | 59 | 62 |

**Table 14 continued**

| | Number of students | | | Country | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | < 1,000 | 1,000 - 9,999 | > = 10,000 | New MS** | Other Other PC*** | Total |
| *Increasing the number of staff with a responsibility for internationalisation* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 31 | 38 | 48 | 46 | 36 | 39 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 51 | 59 | 63 | 66 | 55 | 58 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 36 | 43 | 54 | 58 | 39 | 44 |
| *Increasing the effects of international institutional networks* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 32 | 37 | 36 | 33 | 36 | 35 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 44 | 49 | 43 | 50 | 45 | 46 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 29 | 35 | 34 | 38 | 32 | 33 |
| *Increasing the participation in international projects* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 36 | 42 | 54 | 48 | 42 | 44 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 43 | 39 | 37 | 44 | 38 | 39 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 27 | 28 | 34 | 38 | 27 | 30 |
| *Increasing the attendance or organisation of international conferences by your academic staff* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 34 | 40 | 51 | 51 | 37 | 41 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 35 | 26 | 25 | 36 | 26 | 28 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 21 | 20 | 20 | 28 | 18 | 21 |
| *Increasing the cooperation with the economic sector* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 27 | 42 | 32 | 36 | 35 | 35 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 18 | 15 | 17 | 24 | 14 | 16 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 13 | 14 | 12 | 21 | 11 | 14 |

Question 2.3: How much progress has your institution achieved with respect to the following activities? And, according to your perception, what role did your participation in the ERASMUS programme play for the initiation of these activities and their further development at your institution?
* Points four and five on a five-point scale from 1 = "none" to 5 = "very high".
** New MS = New Member States
***Other PC = Other participating countries.

For all aspects of mobility, international networking and cooperation, most progress was reported for large institutions of higher education. At this group of institutions, ERASMUS was however viewed as having an initiating effect only for a minority of aspects. Rather than initiating change, the ERASMUS programme was seen as supporting progress in institutional development. Interestingly, three as-

pects were more often reported by the central coordinators at small institutions to have been initiated by ERASMUS than by those at medium-sized or large institutions: increasing the participation in international projects (43%), increasing the attendance or organization of international conferences (35%) and increasing cooperation with the economic sector (18%). Here, ERASMUS had obviously been of particular benefit to small institutions.

For all aspects, the central coordinators at institutions in new EU member states observed more often that ERASMUS had initiated and supported relevant activities than the central coordinators at institutions in other ERASMUS countries.

As regards mobility, networks and cooperation, also university leaders were asked to assess the changes that had taken place and the role ERASMUS had played in that context. About two-thirds of the university leaders perceived a substantial progress in the participation in international networks and projects, and almost all noted that ERASMUS had an initiating and subsequently a supportive effect on this change. University leaders also noted more often substantial progress with regard to some other aspects of networking and cooperation than central ERASMUS coordinators, however not a strong role played by ERASMUS.

The departmental ERASMUS coordinators observed less often a progress in many aspects of mobility, networks and cooperation than the central ERASMUS coordinators (see Table 15). Where progress in that direction was noted, ERASMUS was seen as playing an initiating role. However, the proportion of respondents noting a supportive role of ERASMUS was often clearly lower than that of those noting an initiating effect of ERASMUS.

The departmental ERASMUS coordinators varied in their responses to mobility, networks and cooperation more strongly by field of study than in their responses to the previously covered thematic areas. General progress in the thematic field of mobility, networks and cooperation, was most often perceived by respondents from social sciences and law and least often by respondents from medicine. An initiating role of ERASMUS was most often seen by respondents from law and education, while least often by respondents from natural sciences and humanities. Finally, a supportive effect of ERASMUS for achieving progress was most often named by respondents from art and design, engineering and language fields, while such a supportive effect of ERASMUS was least often stated by respondents from the natural sciences.

**Table 15**
**Mobility, Networks and Cooperation: Progress Realised and Role Played by ERASMUS for Initiation and Enhancement by Field of Study (percent\*) – Departmental ERASMUS Coordinator Survey**

| | Hum | SoS | Edu | Lan | Eco | Art | Eng | Nat | Law | Med | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Increasing the number of outgoing students* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 50 | 59 | 49 | 52 | 65 | 57 | 57 | 46 | 65 | 49 | 52 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 70 | 79 | 85 | 66 | 81 | 68 | 82 | 76 | 77 | 78 | 78 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 62 | 64 | 56 | 64 | 72 | 77 | 72 | 55 | 64 | 60 | 65 |
| *Putting teaching periods abroad of your teachers on a regular basis* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 28 | 33 | 35 | 30 | 25 | 26 | 17 | 20 | 27 | 16 | 22 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 51 | 62 | 62 | 60 | 54 | 59 | 53 | 42 | 73 | 47 | 55 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 27 | 37 | 44 | 44 | 40 | 42 | 44 | 32 | 35 | 34 | 39 |
| *Increasing the number of incoming students* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 43 | 50 | 44 | 49 | 58 | 61 | 36 | 32 | 62 | 38 | 40 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 68 | 79 | 76 | 72 | 82 | 63 | 75 | 72 | 65 | 71 | 73 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 60 | 58 | 56 | 60 | 62 | 61 | 59 | 45 | 64 | 53 | 55 |
| *Putting teacher periods of foreign teachers at your department on a regular basis* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 21 | 30 | 23 | 30 | 25 | 32 | 19 | 16 | 27 | 11 | 20 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 42 | 61 | 61 | 65 | 60 | 50 | 52 | 41 | 54 | 49 | 53 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 31 | 43 | 33 | 40 | 34 | 56 | 37 | 28 | 36 | 31 | 35 |

**Table 15 continued**

|  | Hum | SoS | Edu | Lan | Eco | Art | Eng | Nat | Law | Med | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Increasing the effects of international networks* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 30 | 29 | 28 | 32 | 38 | 31 | 28 | 24 | 42 | 29 | 27 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 35 | 36 | 43 | 44 | 43 | 53 | 48 | 30 | 61 | 42 | 42 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 23 | 27 | 26 | 38 | 35 | 29 | 34 | 22 | 33 | 29 | 29 |
| *Increasing the participation in international projects* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 29 | 30 | 33 | 37 | 32 | 16 | 34 | 31 | 35 | 24 | 31 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 23 | 30 | 41 | 37 | 36 | 31 | 32 | 25 | 33 | 38 | 34 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 19 | 27 | 21 | 31 | 29 | 22 | 26 | 18 | 18 | 25 | 22 |
| *Increasing the attendance or organisation of international conferences by your academic staff* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 47 | 59 | 44 | 47 | 32 | 41 | 39 | 43 | 50 | 35 | 41 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 15 | 19 | 30 | 15 | 18 | 30 | 18 | 10 | 31 | 23 | 20 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 19 | 24 | 22 | 19 | 18 | 23 | 15 | 15 | 25 | 24 | 18 |
| *Increasing the cooperation with the economic sector* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 14 | 23 | 12 | 15 | 26 | 26 | 31 | 32 | 8 | 12 | 21 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 4 | 11 | 11 | 13 | 11 | 14 | 13 | 10 | 18 | 13 | 12 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 11 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 13 | 4 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 8 |

Question 2.3: How much progress has your department achieved with respect to the following activities? And, according to your perception, what role did your department's participation in ERASMUS play for the initiation of these activities and the achievement of progress in their implementation?
Hum: Humanities (without languages); SoS: Social sciences; Edu: Education, teacher training; Lan: Languages and philological sciences; Eco: Economics, management; Art: Art and design; Eng: Engineering, technology, informatics; Nat: Natural sciences; Med: Medical Sciences
* Points four and five on a five-point scale from 1 = "none" to 5 = "very high".

### 2.5.6 Institutional Mission and Profiling

Across all aspects in the field 'institutional mission and profiling', progress was widespread. About half of the central ERASMUS coordinators observed that substantial progress had been made by their institutions with respect to the six dimensions of institutional mission and profiling covered by the questionnaire. This was most pronounced for improving both the international and the national visibility of their higher education institutions as well as for establishing an internationalisation strategy. As one could expect, ERASMUS was most often seen as improving international visibility and, at least at the stage of initiation, as playing a role in establishing an internationalisation strategy (see Table 16).

**Table 16**
**Institutional Mission and Profiling: Progress Realised and Role Played by ERASMUS for Initiation and Enhancement by Institutional Size and Group of Countries (percent*) – Central ERASMUS Coordinator Survey**

| | Number of students | | | Country | | |
| | < 1,000 | 1,000 - 9,999 | > = 10,000 | New MS** | Other PC*** | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Introducing the regular reflection on and evaluation of institutional strategies* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 44 | 50 | 55 | 56 | 47 | 49 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 28 | 21 | 26 | 32 | 22 | 25 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 15 | 22 | 27 | 31 | 17 | 21 |
| *Improving the international visibility and attractiveness of the institution* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 52 | 62 | 71 | 70 | 59 | 62 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 55 | 52 | 47 | 63 | 47 | 51 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 39 | 46 | 55 | 57 | 42 | 46 |
| *Improving the national visibility and attractiveness of the institution* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 52 | 64 | 66 | 72 | 56 | 60 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 24 | 26 | 23 | 38 | 20 | 25 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 18 | 28 | 27 | 42 | 18 | 24 |
| *Increasing the tendering for project-related funding* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 35 | 42 | 49 | 52 | 40 | 43 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 30 | 19 | 25 | 31 | 21 | 24 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 20 | 17 | 23 | 30 | 16 | 20 |

to be continued

**Table 16 continued**

|  | Number of students | | | Country | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | < 1,000 | 1,000 - 9,999 | > = 10,000 | New MS** | Other PC*** | Total |
| *Professionalizing institutional management* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 40 | 49 | 52 | 59 | 43 | 47 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 19 | 15 | 22 | 25 | 17 | 19 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 12 | 17 | 21 | 26 | 14 | 17 |
| *Establishing and developing an institutional internationalisation strategy* | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 46 | 61 | 68 | 68 | 55 | 58 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 52 | 52 | 42 | 54 | 46 | 48 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 33 | 40 | 42 | 48 | 35 | 38 |

Question 2.3: How much progress has your institution achieved with respect to the following activities? And, according to your perception, what role did your participation in the ERASMUS programme play for the initiation of these activities and their further development at your institution?
* Points four and five on a five-point scale from 1 = "none" to 5 = "very high"
** New MS = New Member States
***Other PC = Other participating countries.

For four out of the six aspects, it was at small institutions that ERASMUS most often initiated relevant activities: introducing regular reflection on and evaluation of institutional strategies, establishing and developing an institutional internationalisation strategy, improving the international visibility and attractiveness of the institution and increasing the tendering for project-related funding. The differentiation of data by new EU countries and other ERASMUS countries confirms the overall picture: As in other thematic fields, ERASMUS more often initiated activities in new EU countries than in other ERASMUS countries.

Also the university leaders were asked to provide information about the relevance of the ERASMUS programme for institutional missions and profiling. The replies of members of university leadership were similar to those of the central coordinators for the following three aspects:
− professionalising/modernising institutional management;
− enhancing the international visibility and attractiveness of their institution;
− enhancing the national visibility and attractiveness of their institution.

Both groups of respondents often noted substantial change and perceived a substantial role of ERASMUS for enhancing both the international and national visibility and attractiveness of their institution, and both groups of respondents noted

less often changes and impact of ERASMUS concerning the professionalisation and modernisation of institutional management.

As far as progress in the establishment of an institutional internationalisation strategy was concerned, however, the members of university leadership held a more positive view than central coordinators: 70 percent of university leaders noted progress in terms of the establishment of an institutional internationalisation strategy. About similarly large proportions of university leaders and central ERASMUS coordinators considered the initiating role of ERASMUS as important. However, university leaders believed more often than the central ERASMUS coordinators that ERASMUS was supportive in achieving progress in the establishment of an institutional internationalisation strategy.

The questionnaire for members of university leadership covered the aspect of improving/diversifying the financial basis of an institution which was not included in the questionnaire for central coordinators. 63 percent of university leaders noted that progress was achieved in improving and diversifying the financial basis of the higher education institutions, but only very few noted an important role of ERASMUS in that respect.

The departmental ERASMUS coordinators noticed clearly less often than university leaders or central coordinators progress in the development of institutional missions and profiles. However, they stated relatively often that ERASMUS was important for the initiation of such activities (see Table 17).

The statements of the departmental ERASMUS coordinators on the thematic field of institutional mission and profiling varied only marginally by field of study as far as progress in general is concerned. The strongest role of ERASMUS was perceived by respondents from art and design, while the weakest was named by respondents from natural sciences as regards the initiation of change and by respondents from education and teacher training as regards support for actual change.

**Table 17**
**Institutional Mission and Profiling: Progress Realised and Role Played by ERASMUS for Initiation and Enhancement by Field of Study (percent\*) – Departmental ERASMUS Coordinator Survey**

|  | Hum | SoS | Edu | Lan | Eco | Art | Eng | Nat | Law | Med | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Introducing an internationalisation strategy for the department* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 31 | 35 | 30 | 39 | 48 | 35 | 36 | 33 | 30 | 44 | 38 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 35 | 40 | 35 | 37 | 47 | 48 | 30 | 32 | 55 | 46 | 39 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 29 | 33 | 21 | 32 | 35 | 46 | 29 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 30 |
| *Introducing the regular reflection on and evaluation of the department's activities* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 33 | 41 | 38 | 35 | 42 | 27 | 36 | 28 | 24 | 31 | 34 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 25 | 25 | 23 | 19 | 23 | 40 | 16 | 19 | 25 | 28 | 22 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 16 | 16 | 10 | 17 | 18 | 21 | 16 | 18 | 9 | 17 | 15 |
| *Improving the international visibility and attractiveness of the department* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 48 | 47 | 51 | 54 | 42 | 49 | 43 | 43 | 56 | 49 | 45 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 31 | 48 | 46 | 40 | 41 | 63 | 41 | 31 | 38 | 49 | 43 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 22 | 33 | 21 | 33 | 35 | 40 | 34 | 30 | 26 | 34 | 32 |

**Table 17 continued**

|  | Hum | SoS | Edu | Lan | Eco | Art | Eng | Nat | Law | Med | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Improving the national visibility and attractiveness of the department* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 44 | 47 | 48 | 45 | 40 | 59 | 53 | 53 | 62 | 38 | 47 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 26 | 24 | 36 | 27 | 24 | 29 | 22 | 19 | 36 | 30 | 26 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 9 | 18 | 15 | 22 | 17 | 12 | 21 | 22 | 39 | 23 | 21 |
| *Increasing the tendering for project-related funding* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Progress realised | 28 | 31 | 27 | 24 | 23 | 28 | 29 | 31 | 21 | 30 | 29 |
| b. Initiated by ERASMUS | 20 | 17 | 23 | 21 | 23 | 20 | 14 | 12 | 20 | 18 | 16 |
| c. Enhancement through ERASMUS | 12 | 13 | 6 | 8 | 12 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 5 | 17 | 11 |

Question 2.3: How much progress has your department achieved with respect to the following activities? And, according to your perception, what role did your department's participation in ERASMUS play for the initiation of these activities and the achievement of progress in their implementation? Hum: Humanities (without languages); SoS: Social sciences; Edu: Education, teacher training; Lan: Languages and philological sciences; Eco: Economics, management; Art: Art and design; Eng: Engineering, technology, informatics; Nat: Natural sciences; Med: Medical Sciences
* Points four and five on a five-point scale from 1 = "none" to 5 = "very high".

## 2.6        Conflicts between ERASMUS and Institutional Strategies

Only two aspects of ERASMUS were conceived as problematic and conflicting with institutional strategies by a substantial number of central ERASMUS coordinators. First, at almost one third of the institutions, the amount of time required for raising the funds and administering the central ERASMUS actions was viewed as out of proportion in comparison with the benefits of these activities. Second, at one fifth of the institutions critique was voiced that ERASMUS activities were costly for the higher education institutions and absorbed too many administrative, financial and human resources. The replies to the questionnaire for university leadership confirmed this picture.

However, while survey replies identify a resource conflict between ERASMUS activities and other institutional activities considered to be strategically relevant, hardly any other conflicts were named by the central ERASMUS coordinators as existing between ERASMUS activities and other activities of enhancing the quality of improvement, openness, and internationalisation.

From the perspective of central institutional ERASMUS coordinators and members of university leadership, problems concerning academic issues or possible conflicts between European and third country mobility and cooperation, teaching and research or national and international networking were not relevant to their institutions.

Among the departmental ERASMUS coordinators, about a quarter considered the time needed for applying for and participating in centralised ERASMUS actions out of proportion in comparison to the benefits. Also, one sixth considered that ERASMUS absorbed too many resources.

In addition, the departmental ERASMUS coordinators named two more areas of conflict:
− whereas the implementation of ERASMUS required broad international networking, they preferred to concentrate their contacts on the most fruitful and suitable partners,
− the ERASMUS experience at foreign universities may motivate graduates to take an advanced degree abroad although their home university would like to retain them.

Asked more specifically whether they noted barriers in the implementation of ERASMUS activities, almost half of the departmental ERASMUS coordinators underscored the lack of financial means to cover the costs of ERASMUS activities (48%), notably those from education and teacher training (63%) as well as those from art and design (58%). Almost half of the respondents noted a lack of interest of academic staff in centralised ERASMUS actions (47%).

Only few coordinators in the departments stated that the implementation of the Bologna three cycle structure was a barrier for ERASMUS teacher mobility (9%)

whereas almost a quarter of the central coordinators thought that this could be the case (23%).

## 2.7      Expectations and Recommendations

Asked what impact of ERASMUS they would expect in the coming five years, three quarters of the central ERASMUS coordinators and almost as many university leaders expected that the impact of the ERASMUS programme on their institutions would increase. Only 5 percent of the central ERASMUS coordinators and 3 percent of the university leaders expected a decrease of the impact of the ERASMUS programme. The remaining coordinators in both groups expected that the institutional impact of ERASMUS would remain the same.

The expectations of the departmental ERASMUS coordinators were slightly more cautious: two-thirds expected an increase and 5 percent a decrease of the impact of ERASMUS. Departmental ERASMUS coordinators from the subject field of art and design were most optimistic (78% expected an increase), whereas respondents from languages and philological fields as well as those from law (56% each) were least often optimistic.

Although this is already a rather positive outlook, expectations with respect to the future impact of internationalisation activities other than ERASMUS were even more optimistic. 86 percent of the central ERASMUS coordinators, 88 percent of the university leaders and 76 percent of the departmental ERASMUS coordinators expected that the relevance of other internationalisation activities to their institutions would increase in the future.

In all three surveys, respondents were asked to rate the importance of the various new ERASMUS actions foreseen for the period 2007-2013:

− Student mobility for placement in enterprises abroad was viewed as important by 71 percent of the university leaders. About two-thirds each of the central ERASMUS coordinators and of the departmental ERASMUS coordinators considered this activity important as well, and some of them reported that their institutions and units would be planning to become active in this domain; there were substantial differences, though, by field of study with strongest interest from the part of art and design and the weakest interest from the part of law.

− Activities for the modernisation of higher education were viewed as important by 70 percent of the university leaders surveyed. 53 percent of the departmental ERASMUS coordinators reported that their unit was already taking part or intended to take part in the new action "Modernisation of higher education".

− Additionally, cooperation between universities and enterprises as well as staff mobility for training in enterprises or higher education institutions abroad were rated positively by more than half of the university leaders and the departmental ERASMUS coordinators.

− The respondents were less frequently in favour of inviting staff from foreign enterprises for teaching assignments or virtual campuses projects.

Finally, central ERASMUS coordinators and departmental ERASMUS coordinators were invited, in the form of an open question, to make suggestions on how ERASMUS could be made more beneficial to their respective institutions and departments. Actually half of the respondents made suggestions:

− Many suggestions (30% on the part of the central ERASMUS coordinators and 22% on the part of the departmental ERASMUS coordinators) referred to funding, e.g. to an overall increase of funding or to an increase of funds provided for the individual mobile persons, or for supporting certain cost items (for example accommodation, travelling, language training and network building).

− Quite frequently as well (more than 20% and 7% respectively) they called for a reduction of formal requirements ('bureaucracy'). For example, online forms should be simplified, unified for all types of institutions and kept unchanged over the years.

− Almost as many suggestions referred to issues regarding the organisation of the ERASMUS programme or the cooperation among partners.

Table 18 provides an overview of further suggestions made by central ERASMUS coordinators. One should bear in mind, though, that many of the statements summarized in Table 18 were suggestions made only by single or small numbers of respondents. The open question helped to collect a broad range of ideas for improvement, but it did not intend to establish how widely these views are shared.

Suggestions made by departmental ERASMUS coordinators in their majority also referred to the overall setting of the ERASMUS programme. Notably, they called for greater flexibility concerning the exchange conditions as well as for improved information on and promotion of ERASMUS exchanges.

Altogether, however, the departmental ERASMUS coordinators made many recommendations to be taken up by the higher education institutions themselves, such as the extension of foreign language provision or improved support in searching for suitable partner universities. They also proposed additional service for incoming students, e.g. more assistance at the beginning of their study period abroad, improved ways of handling visa where necessary, improved information and increased provision of internships. Finally, suggestions were made how to get better and more meaningful feedback from the mobile students.

**Table 18**
**Individual Suggestions to Make ERASMUS More Beneficial to Participating Institutions by Means Other than Funding and Programme Management – Central ERASMUS Coordinators**

| Suggestions concerning the organisation of the ERASMUS programme | |
| --- | --- |
| Countries | - Participation of non-EU countries |
| | - To make EU countries more attractive for students who prefer to go to the USA or Australia |
| Exchange Conditions | - Support also for shorter study periods abroad for students and staff |
| | - Support for more than a single study period abroad |
| | - Support for study abroad already from first semester onwards |
| | - New types of activities, for example short visits by student groups, exhibitions, research projects |
| | - A higher flexibility of conditions |
| Centralised Projects | - More funds for curriculum development |
| Information and promotion | - Improved dissemination of information about ERASMUS to rectors, managers, and central coordinators |
| | - Dissemination of information online and through the organisation of international meetings (e.g. seminars, events) with the participation of different HEIs (thereby helping to build networks) |
| | - Promotion of ERASMUS among students, families, academic and non academic staff |

| Suggestions concerning the contribution of participating institutions | |
| --- | --- |
| Recognition | - Better guarantee of the quality of study abroad |
| Courses offered | - Stronger elements of internationally-oriented courses |
| ECTS | - Unified implementation of ECTS |
| | - Flexibility in the numbers of credits awarded |
| Decentralisation | Decentralisation of the ERASMUS processes: |
| | - Country/EU level: less bureaucracy, more autonomy to HEI |
| | - Institutional level: higher decentralisation of tasks within individual HEIs, thus reducing the workload of the central coordination offices |

**Table 18 continued**

Suggestions concerning the contribution of participating institutions

| Enterprises | - Strengthening of the cooperation with enterprises as a strategy to find internships and placements for students |
| | - Fundraising through cooperation with industry |
| Staff involvement | - Increased involvement of staff: administrative personnel, teachers, coordinators |
| Language Training | - Increased foreign language training for students and staff intending to go abroad |
| Networks | - More intensive networking: more contacts with partner institutions, more bilateral agreements, and international cooperation projects |

## 2.8      Conclusion

In response to three questionnaires, 951 central ERASMUS coordinators at higher education institutions, 752 institutional leaders and 903 departmental ERASMUS coordinators (within departments of higher education institutions) provided information on the institutional impact of the ERASMUS programme. The response rates can be viewed as satisfactory, and the composition of respondents seems to be by and large representative for all coordinators and institutional leaders at the more than 2,000 European higher education institutions involved in ERASMUS.

Altogether the views of the three groups of respondents were similar. The surveys revealed, first, that the three groups of survey respondents – insitutional leaders, central ERASMUS coordinators and departmental ERASMUS coordinators – agree on the *relative importance* of different activities and impact areas of the ERASMUS programme although, overall, departmental coordinators are more sceptical and organisational leaders are more positive about the *magnitude* of the impact. Secondly, larger institutions tend to report a greater impact of the ERASMUS programme in most areas. Thirdly, institutions in the new EU member states reported to have gained more from the ERASMUS programme in terms of quality improvement than institutions in the old member states. Different perceptions with respect to the existence and degree of change between persons from different fields of study and the role of ERASMUS in this context are noteworthy in many instances. Altogether, changes and respective influences of ERASMUS are most often reported for art and design and least often for the natural sciences.

The questionnaires aimed to establish – for various thematic areas – the extent to which change was observed in recent years, the extent to which ERASMUS played an initiating role for changes realised and the extent to which ERASMUS

actually supported change or progress. The responses suggest that most changes were identified in the field of student services and that ERASMUS played a very beneficial role for developments in this area. In other areas – teaching, learning and research, quality assurance and professionalisation, mobility, networks and cooperation as well as in institutional profiling – progress was visible as well and ERASMUS has played a major role but the ratings were lower on average.

As regards the individual aspects of the five fields just mentioned, substantial changes were reported most frequently in the domains closely linked to mobility, but also beyond that, in detail:

− Improvement of counselling for staff and students interested in study abroad,
− improvement of the non-academic support for incoming students,
− fostering of the students' soft skills,
− increase of the number of outgoing teachers and students,
− increased national as well as international visibility and attractiveness of the institution, and finally
− improvement of the transparency and transferability of the students' compe-tences and qualifications.

Respondents report that student mobility is in the heart of the ERASMUS activi-ties and that outgoing student mobility has the strongest impact on their institu-tions. Some other elements of the ERASMUS programme such as credit transfer (ECTS) and learning agreements were named frequently as having a strong impact as well. Altogether the responses suggest that the persons responsible for ERASMUS within higher education institutions consider ERASMUS as having an important impact on the institution irrespective of whether the immediate benefi-ciaries are the students, the teachers or the institution as a whole.

An initiating effect of ERASMUS was reported in many respects. However, it is not surprising to note that such an effect was most frequently observed with regard to the operation of mobility, such as the frequency of mobility or the quan-tity or quality of services for the mobile students, while quality assurance or pro-filing of the higher education institutions are less frequently named in this context. Altogether, ERASMUS was more often seen as a trigger for change than actually being supportive for implementing change.

Naturally, the ERAMUS programme has the strongest influence first on mobil-ity itself, second on the institutional setting of support for mobility, third on the international dimensions of various activities, and fourth on international coopera-tion beyond the scope of ERASMUS. However, a by no means insignificant num-ber of respondents argued that ERASMUS also plays a role for the modernisation of teaching and learning and specifically for the teaching and learning infrastruc-ture, for fostering students' soft skills, for curriculum revision in general, for im-proving the support systems for students in general, for extending evaluation and other activities of reflection of various processes and achievements, for increasing

the cooperation with the economic sector, and for professionalizing the institutional management.

Critique was most frequently voiced that ERASMUS does not provide sufficient funding. Often, a conflict is seen in that ERASMUS is considered valuable in general but that the work required to run the programme and the institutional resources absorbed are viewed to be out of proportion compared to the resources provided and the benefits expected. Almost one quarter of respondents believe that ERASMUS overly favours a broad spread of partnership for student exchange, while it might be more beneficial to scholars to concentrate on a smaller number of suitable and fruitful partnerships. Finally, stimulation of mobility was also seen by some respondents as endangering a loss of highly qualified students: these students might decide to continue advanced study abroad, whereas the home institution would have liked to retain them.

Critique was directed by respondents also towards their own institutions. Among others, more efforts were seen as necessary to stimulate the involvement of a larger number of teachers. Only a few departmental ERASMUS coordinators stated that the Bologna cycle structure had turned out to be a barrier for student mobility.

Among the recommendations for future improvement, many addressed the funding situation of ERASMUS and the overall organisation and management of the programme. Additionally, many single recommendations were made which call for changes on the part of the individual higher education institutions.

The majority of respondents believed that the new elements of the ERASMUS programme envisaged for 2007-2013 were useful; especially student mobility for placements in enterprises abroad was seen as an important new tool. In general, the survey results revealed a rather positive outlook: The overall expectation for the coming five years was that the impact of ERASMUS and especially that of other internationalisation activities would further increase. Thus, those involved are convinced that the ERASMUS programme and other internationalisation activities have the potential to expand their contribution to university development even beyond the comprehensive impact identified by this study for the years 2000 to 2006.

# APPENDIX 1

## The ERASMUS Programme: Basic Objectives and Developments

Hans Vossensteyn and Manuel Souto

The ERASMUS programme is named after the humanist and theologian De-siderius Erasmus of Rotterdam (1465-1536) who used to be a travelling scientist. He left a bequest to the University of Basel to establish mobility grants and as such laid the foundations for the current ambitions of the ERASMUS programme, which places great importance of mobility and scientific career development through learning. After a number of years of pilot student exchanges, the ERASMUS programme was proposed by the European Commission in 1986 and adopted in June 1987.

ERASMUS has become the "flagship" educational programme of the European Community (subsequently the European Union) within a short period from its inauguration. Since its start the programme has enabled over 1.9 million students and 140,000 members of university staff to be mobile within Europe. At present the ERASMUS programme enables around 200,000 students annually to study and work abroad. In addition, it supports close co-operation between higher education institutions across Europe. Around 90% of European higher education institutions (more than 3,100) take part in ERASMUS covering 31 European countries.[1]

The ERASMUS programme, together with a number of other educational programmes, was incorporated into the SOCRATES Programme in 1995. The SOCRATES programme was replaced with the SOCRATES II Programme (2000-2006) on 24 January 2000. In 2007, ERASMUS became part of the EU's Lifelong Learning Programme (2007-2013) which replaced the SOCRATES Programme as the overall umbrella. Under the current Lifelong Learning Programme (2007-2013) the annual budget is over € 400 million for the 31 participating countries per year.

---

[1] The 31 countries taking part under the Socrates II programme are: the 27 European Union Member States: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom; four EFTA countries: Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway; and Turkey.

**Objectives, Actions, and Tools of the ERASMUS programme**

The wider objectives of the SOCRATES Programmes were to:
− strengthen the European dimension in education at all levels and to facilitate wide transnational access to education,
− promote a quantitative and qualitative improvement in knowledge of the languages of the European Union,
− promote cooperation and mobility in the field of education, and
− encourage innovation in the development of educational practices and materials including, where appropriate, the use of new technologies, and to explore matters of common policy interest in the field of education.

Under the Lifelong Learning Programme, the general aim of the ERASMUS programme is to create a European Higher Education Area and foster innovation throughout Europe. More specifically, the ERASMUS programme aims to encourage and support academic cooperation and mobility of higher education students and teachers within the European Union, the European Economic Area (Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway) as well as candidate countries such as Turkey. In addition, the programme supports higher education institutions to work together through intensive programmes, networks and multilateral projects.

The ERASMUS programme under the Lifelong Learning programme has a number of specific objectives:
1. to improve the quality and volume of student and teaching staff mobility throughout Europe (at least 3 million student exchanges by 2012);
2. to improve the quality and number of multilateral cooperation between higher education institutions in Europe;
3. to improve and increase cooperation between higher education institutions and enterprises; and
4. to spread innovation and new pedagogic practices between universities in Europe.

The European Commission is responsible for the ERASMUS programme's overall implementation and its Directorate-General for Education and Culture coordinates its different actions. The actions within the framework of the ERASMUS programme can be divided into "decentralised" and "centralised" actions. The decentralised actions concern the mobility actions that are run by national agencies in the 31 participating countries. Centralised actions such as networks, multilateral projects and the award of the Erasmus University Charter are managed by the Executive Agency for Education, Audiovisual and Culture based in Brussels.

The actions of the ERASMUS programme under the Lifelong Learning[2] programme include the following decentralised actions:

− Student *mobility* for:
  − studying abroad (3 months up to 1 year) based on recognition of credits earned;
  − Student mobility for placements in enterprises, training centres or research centres abroad (3 months up to 1 year as a general rule)*,
− Higher education institution (HEI) *staff mobility* for:
  − *teaching assignments* through which teachers from foreign higher education institutions or enterprises can be attracted;
  − further *training** in foreign enterprises and higher education institutions*;
− *Linguistic preparation courses* (EILC) with a maximum of 6 weeks and a minimum of 60 teaching hours;
− *Intensive programmes* to bring together students and staff from at least three participating countries to work or teach together in subject related work for a period of 2-6 weeks (this action was a centralised action under Socrates2 (2000-2006);
− *Preparatory visits* to help higher education institutions establish contacts with prospective partner institutions with a view to organising new mobility initiatives, inter-institutional agreements; ERASMUS intensive programmes; or ERASMUS student placements.

The following centralised actions:
− *Multilateral projects* for the development of study programmes, cooperation between universities and enterprises*, modernisation of higher education* and virtual campuses*;
− *Academic networks* designed to promote innovation in a specific discipline, set of disciplines or multidisciplinary area;
− *Structural networks** designed to help improve and modernise a specific aspect of a higher education organisation, management, governance or funding (such as broadening access to higher education, promoting the "knowledge triangle" of education, research and innovation, improving university management, enhancing quality assurance); and
− *Accompanying measures* to promote the objectives of ERASMUS and to help ensure that the results of ERASMUS-supported activities are brought to the attention of the wider public, for example by information and communication, monitoring activities, development of databases and dissemination of results at conferences. As a general trend actions supporting cooperation between higher

---

2   New ERASMUS actions under the Lifelong Learning Programme are indicated by a *.

education institutions and (foreign) enterprises have gained importance, under the new LLL programme. Enterprises can benefit from:
–   student placements;
–   having their staff teach in a HEI abroad;
–   higher education institutions' staff receiving training in their enterprise; and
–   multilateral projects on university-enterprise cooperation and modernisation.

To further support mobility and cooperation, ERASMUS has developed a number of *tools*, these include:

–   The *European Credit Transfer System* (ECTS) that facilitates better recognition and transfer of study credits that are awarded at host institutions. ECTS has later been taken up as one of the main building blocks of the Bologna process;

–   The *Diploma Supplement* (DS), developed in cooperation with the Council of Europe and UNESCO, a document attached to a higher education diploma which aims at improving international 'transparency' and facilitating the academic and professional recognition of qualifications (diplomas, degrees, certificates etc.). It is designed to provide a description of the nature, level, context, content and status of the studies that were successfully completed by the individual named on the original qualification to which this supplement is appended. It should be free from any value-judgements, equivalence statements or suggestions about recognition. It is a flexible non-prescriptive tool which is designed to save time, money and workload. It is capable of adaptation to local circumstances;

–   The *ERASMUS University Charter* (EUC) which aims to guarantee a high level of quality in mobility and cooperation by setting out fundamental principles for all ERASMUS actions that participating institutes must follow. The EUC replaced the previous Institutional Contracts in 2003/2004. Higher education institutions which want to participate in ERASMUS actions must have an EUC;

–   The *European Policy Statement* (EPS) which has been changed under the Lifelong Learning Programme into the ERASMUS Policy Statement which a higher education institution is required to define its internationalisation/European strategy. Institutions need an EPS in order to gain and retain the status of a participating university in the ERASMUS programme;

–   *Learning agreements* are standardised forms in which hosting and home institutions of mobile students agree on the gained study credits for particular course units;

–   *Transcript of records* is a standardised form in which the value of study credits and the marks awarded are defined to facilitate the recognition of the currency of the study period abroad; and

–   *Training agreements\** introduced under the Lifelong Learning Programme for student mobility for placement in an enterprise.

# APPENDIX 2: ERASMUS SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

**Appendix 2a: ERASMUS survey on quality improvement: institutional leaders**

**Appendix 2c: ERASMUS survey on quality improvement: decentral ERASMUS coordinators**

**Appendix 2b: ERASMUS survey on quality improvement: central ERASMUS coordinators**

# Annex 2a: ERASMUS survey on quality improvement: institutional leaders

Dear Sir or Madam,

Please note

- This survey addresses ERASMUS under SOCRATES II and under the Lifelong Learning Programme.
- This survey does <u>not</u> address the ERASMUS MUNDUS programme.
- It takes approximately 15 minutes to answer the questions.
- If you want to answer a question by 'I don't know', please leave the corresponding text field blank or do not tick any of the boxes referring to that part of the question
- Please fill in the questionnaire electronically (by using the "insert" key and marking the relevant boxes with an "X") and email it back to us or print the questionnaire and fax it or send it back by post after having filled it in (see contact details below).

We assure you that any information you provide will be handled in strict accordance with data protection regulations and only made available in an aggregated and anonymous form.

Prof. Dr. Ulrich Teichler, Dr. Ute Lanzendorf

***Please return the questionnaire to:***
***University of Kassel, International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER-Kassel), ERASMUS,***
***Mönchebergstr. 17, D-34109 Kassel, Germany, Fax: +49 (0)561 / 804 7415***

*Should you require assistance or further information, please turn to Ms Sandra Buerger at INCHER-Kasselt*
*at Erasmus@incher.uni-kassel.de, Tel.: +49 (0)561 / 804-3020*

**1      How would you summarize the impact of ERASMUS on your institution?**

|  | I don't agree at all | | | | I very much agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| My institution's participation in the ERASMUS programme supports institutional change and modernisation ...................... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| At my institution, too few activities are undertaken under ERASMUS to expect any noteworthy institutional impact............. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

*If you choose box 4 or 5 at this option (too few activities), please continue with question 7*

**2      For pursuing your institution's general mission, policies and objectives, how important do you consider the following ERASMUS actions and tools (ECTS, the ERASMUS Policy Statement)?**

|  | The action/tool is | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | not important at all | | | | very important | We are not involved |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| ERASMUS student mobility for study purposes | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| ERASMUS teacher mobility for teaching assignments | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| ERASMUS funded European projects for curriculum development | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Staff from your institution performing coordinating functions in ERASMUS projects | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Institutional networking under ERASMUS | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| ECTS for international credit transfer | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Formulating and implementing the ERASMUS Policy Statement/University Charter | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**3 How much progress has your institution achieved with respect to the following activities? And, according to your perception, what role did your institution's participation in ERASMUS play for the initiation of these activities and the achievement of progress in their implementation at your institution?**

| | Progress realized | | | | | ERASMUS initiated the activity | | ERASMUS is/was supportive for achieving progress | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | None | | | | Very high | Yes | No | Not at all | | | | Very strongly |
| Modernising the learning infrastructure (classrooms, computers etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Evaluating the professional impact of student qualifications by means of regular graduate surveys | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the participation in international networks and projects (in teaching, research or at the institutional level) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Fostering the regular reflection on and evaluation of institutional strategies | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Professionalizing/modernising institutional management | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Establishing an institutional internationalisation strategy | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Enhancing the international visibility and attractiveness of your institution | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Enhancing the national visibility and attractiveness of your institution | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Improving/diversifying the financial basis of your institution's operation | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Strengthening the cooperation with the economic sector (industry, services etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing cooperation with interest groups in your university's region (politics, industry, trade unions, cultural associations etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Other, please specify: _____

**4      To what extent are the following possible problems and conflicts relevant to your institution?**

| | Not at all relevant | | | Very much relevant | | Not applicable |
|---|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| ERASMUS is extremely costly/absorbs too many administrative, financial and human resources............... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The implementation of the Bologna three cycle structure is in conflict with ERASMUS student mobility....... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Incoming ERASMUS students occupy places of potential fee paying students ............................................ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| ERASMUS consumes resources which we would like to use for attracting excellent international students for degree study........................................................................................................................ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| ERASMUS experience at foreign universities motivates our graduates to take an advanced degree abroad although we would like to retain them at our institution ................................................... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| ERASMUS consumes financial and personnel resources which we would like to use for intensifying research.................................................................................................................................... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The implementation of ERASMUS requires broad international networking but we prefer to focus on the most fruitful or suitable academic partnerships.......................................................................... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

If you have encountered further problems or conflicts, please specify:

_____


**5      How do you expect the impact of ERASMUS and other international activities to develop in the coming five years?**

| | Decrease significantly | Remain the same | | | Increase significantly |
|---|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I expect the impact of ERASMUS to ............................................................................. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| I expect the impact of other internationalisation activities to....................................... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

_____

**6** **For pursuing your institution's general mission, policies and objectives, how important do you expect the following new ERASMUS actions for the period 2007-2013 to become in future?**

|  | Not important at all | | | | Very important |
|---|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student mobility for placement in enterprises abroad | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Staff mobility for training in enterprises/higher education institutions abroad | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The invitation of staff from foreign enterprises for teaching assignments | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

*New types of ERASMUS funded projects*

| | | | | | |
|---|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| _ Co-operation between universities and enterprises | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| _ Modernisation of higher education (increasing the overall relevance of curricula, developing lifelong learning strategies, diversifying funding sources and developing internal management systems or quality assurance mechanisms) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| _ Virtual Campuses enabling virtual mobility and contributing to the extension of ICT-based learning | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**7** **What do you suggest for the future of the ERASMUS programme in order to make it more beneficial to your institution?**

_____

**8** **Does your institution experience major institutional or system barriers to the implementation of ERASMUS (i.e. barriers which are beyond the reach of the ERASMUS programme)?**

Barriers at the institutional level (for example lack of interest of potential participants etc.) _____

Barriers at the system level (stemming for example from education policy, legislation, the socio-economic situation etc.)

_____

☐ No, my institution does not experience major institutional or system barriers to the implementation of the ERASMUS programme.

**9** **If you have further comments, please specify** _____

## Thank you very much for your kind co-operation.

# Annex 2b: ERASMUS survey on quality improvement: central ERASMUS coordinators

Dear ERASMUS coordinator,

by means of this questionnaire, we would like to ask you to provide information and your view on the impact of the ERASMUS programme on your institution.

Please note
- This survey addresses ERASMUS under SOCRATES II and the Lifelong Learning Programme.
- It does not address the ERASMUS MUNDUS programme.
- If you want to answer a question by 'I don't know', please leave the corresponding text field empty or do not tick any of the boxes referring to that part of a question.
- It takes approximately 45 minutes to answer the questions.

Please fill in the questionnaire electronically (by using the "insert" key and marking the relevant boxes with an "X") and email it back to us or print the questionnaire and fax it or send it back by post after having filled it in (see contact details below).
We assure you that any information you provide will be handled in strict accordance with data protection regulations and only made available in an aggregated and anonymous form.

Prof. Dr. Ulrich Teichler, Dr. Ute Lanzendorf

University of Kassel, International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER-Kassel), ERASMUS,
Mönchebergstr. 17, D-34109 Kassel, Germany
Fax: +49 (0)561 804 7415, http://www.uni-kassel.de/incher
Should you require assistance or further information, please turn to
Ms Sandra Buerger at INCHER-Kassel at Erasmus@incher.uni-kassel.de, Tel.: +49 (0)561 804 3020.

## 1. Institutional Profile

**1.1**    **Please provide the following information about your institution.**

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| My institution … (Multiple replies possible) | | |
| … has the legal status of a public institution | ☐ | ☐ |
| … awards Master's degrees or equivalent | ☐ | ☐ |
| … awards PhD titles | ☐ | ☐ |
| … awards only vocational certificates (no Bachelor's or Master's degrees) | ☐ | ☐ |
| … expects from its academic staff to be involved equally in teaching and research | ☐ | ☐ |
| … is specialized on music, arts, teacher training, engineering or any other specific field of study | ☐ | ☐ |
| … understands itself as a regional institution (i.e. has not primarily a national or international remit) | ☐ | ☐ |

**1.2**    **Please state the approximate number of (international) students and of academic staff at your institution for whom teaching was a key activity in 2006/07.**

_____ national students    _____ academic staff for whom teaching was a key activity    _____ international students
(full-time equivalents)                                      (incl. ERASMUS- students)

**1.3**    **In which year did your institution join the ERASMUS programme?** _____

**1.4**    **How many years have you personally been involved in the organisation of ERASMUS activities at your institution?** _____ **years**

**1.5**    **Does your institution have an ECTS catalogue/information package in English?**    ☐ Yes                    ☐ No

**1.6**    **How many academic departments/faculties at your institution use ECTS as an internal credit accumulation system?**

_____ departments/faculties of a total of            _____ departments/faculties.

**1.7 Please state the approximate number of your ERASMUS partner institutions and indicate with approximately how many of them you carried out joint activities in 2006/07.**

My institution has about _____ ERASMUS partner institutions. There were joint activities with approximately _____ of them in 2006/07.

**1.8 For how many centralised projects under ERASMUS did your institution receive support in the academic year 2006/07?**

|  | IP | CD | Thematic Networks |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of projects supported as partner institution | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Number of projects supported as co-ordinating institution | _____ | _____ | _____ |

**1.9 Did your institution participate in any other important programmes of student/staff exchange, higher education cooperation etc. apart from ERASMUS in the academic year 2006/07?**

In comparison to ERASMUS, this programme is characterized by

|  | attractive grants | | high academic requirements | | high number of participants | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Yes, in the programme (please specify) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Yes, in the programme (please specify). | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Yes, in the programme (please specify)…………………………………….. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

☐ No, my institution did not participate in any other important programme of student/staff exchange, higher education cooperation etc. in 2006/07.

## 2. The Institutional Impact of the ERASMUS programme

**2.1 For pursuing your institution's general mission, policies and objectives, how important are – according to your experience - the following ERASMUS actions and tools? And does your institution make own funds available for these actions or tools to supplement the ERASMUS grant?**

| | The action/tool is… | | | | | We make supplementary institutional funds available | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | not important at all | | | very important | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Yes | No |
| Incoming student mobility under ERASMUS | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| Outgoing student mobility under ERASMUS | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| Incoming teacher and staff mobility under ERASMUS | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| Outgoing teacher and staff mobility under ERASMUS | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| Intensive Programmes | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| Curriculum Development Projects | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| Thematic Networks | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| Institutional networking under ERASMUS | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| Staff from your institution coordinating centralised projects | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| ECTS for credit transfer | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| Learning Agreements | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| The Diploma Supplement | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| The ERASMUS Policy Statement | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |

**2.2 Does your institution exploit and transfer the experiences gained from the following ERASMUS actions and tools for improving its teaching, research, student services or institutional management?**

We exploit and transfer experience for improving our teaching, research, student services or institutional management from…

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| … ERASMUS student mobility | □ | □ |
| … ERASMUS staff mobility | □ | □ |
| … centralised projects (IP, CD, Thematic Networks) | □ | □ |
| … ECTS for credit transfer | □ | □ |
| … the development and implementation of the ERASMUS Policy Statement | □ | □ |
| … institutional networking under ERASMUS | □ | □ |

**2.3 How much progress has your institution achieved with respect to the following activities? And, according to your perception, what role did your participation in the ERASMUS programme play for the initiation of these activities and their further development at your institution?**

| | Progress realized | | | | | ERASMUS initiated the activity | | ERASMUS was supportive for achieving progress | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| *Teaching and learning* | None | | | | Very high | Yes | No | Not at all | | | | Very strongly |
| Modernising curricula (substantial revision or development of new curricula) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Fostering soft skills of students (teamwork, communication, intercultural awareness etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Introducing mandatory foreign language requirements as part of the curriculum | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Internationalising the curricular content (incl. joint curricula) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Setting up English/foreign language programmes | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Introducing joint degrees | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Internationalising teaching and learning (teaching in English by own teachers, inviting foreign lecturers, foreign language books in the university library etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Other, please specify: _____ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| *Quality assurance/professionalisation* | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Improving the transparency and transferability of student qualifications | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Modernising the learning infrastructure (classrooms, computers etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Introducing /extending language training and intercultural training for teachers | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Introducing regular student and/or graduate surveys on student satisfaction | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Other, please specify: _____ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

|  | Progress realized | | | | | ERASMUS initiated the activity | | ERASMUS was supportive for achieving progress | | | | |
|---|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
|  | 1 None | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Very high | Yes | No | 1 Not at all | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Very strongly |
| ***Student services*** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Improving the counselling for staff and students interested in study abroad | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Improving the non-academic support for incoming students (with respect to grants, accommodation, organisation of leisure activities, visa issuing etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Improving the non-academic support for your own students (accommodation, organisation of leisure activities etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing student information in foreign language (student guides and university website, foreign language proficiency of administrative staff etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Other, please specify: _____ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| ***Mobility, networks and cooperation*** | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the number of outgoing teachers and students | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the number of incoming teachers and students | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the number of staff with a responsibility for internationalisation | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Maximizing the effects of international institutional networks | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the participation in international projects (research or teaching-related) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the attendance or organisation of international conferences | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the cooperation with the economic sector (industry, services etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| ***Institutional mission and profiling*** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Introducing the regular reflection on and evaluation of institutional strategies | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Professionalizing institutional management | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Establishing and developing an institutional internationalisation strategy | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Improving the international visibility and attractiveness of the institution | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Improving the national visibility and attractiveness of the institution | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the tendering for project-related funding (teaching or research) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Other, please specify: _____ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**2.4 To what extent are the following problems and conflicts that may occur in the context of the implementation of ERASMUS actions relevant at your institution?**

| | No problem at all | | | | Very serious problems |
|---|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Outward mobile students have difficulties to re-integrate into their programme after they return from abroad | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Incoming students have little interest in academic learning | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| ERASMUS is extremely costly/absorbs too many administrative, financial and human resources | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| In relation to the amount of time required to tender for and participate in centralised actions (IP, CD, Thematic Networks) the benefits of projects for your institution are marginal | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The objective of increasing the number of fee paying foreign students is in conflict with the absorption of capacities by incoming ERASMUS students | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The objective of attracting the most excellent international students for degree study is in conflict with the resource requirements of ERASMUS actions | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The objective of increasing the retention of students at your institution for advanced study is in conflict with ERASMUS student mobility | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The objective of intensifying research at your institution is in conflict with your staff spending time for the organisation of ERASMUS | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The objective of focussing academic partnerships to the most fruitful or suitable ones is in conflict with the implementation of ERASMUS actions | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The objective of establishing and enhancing institutional networks in your home country is in conflict with the international networking required to implement ERASMUS actions | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

If you have encountered further problems, please specify: _____

**2.5    To what extent are the following possible barriers to the implementation of ERASMUS relevant at your institution?**

| | Not at all | | | | Highly relevant |
|---|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Decrease of interest of your students in temporary study abroad…………………………………………………………………….. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Insufficient foreign language proficiency of students to spend a temporary study period abroad………………………………………. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Insufficient number of grants to support all students interested in ERASMUS mobility………………………………………………... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Recognition of study abroad remains incomplete for your returning ERASMUS students…………………………………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Lack of interest among academic staff in participating in ERASMUS teacher mobility…………………………………………………….. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The implementation of the Bologna three cycle structure is in conflict with ERASMUS student mobility……………………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The implementation of the Bologna three cycle structure is in conflict with ERASMUS teacher mobility……………………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The general objective of shortening the study times of degree students is in conflict with ERASMUS student mobility…………….. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Too little support of students, teacher or other staff interested in ERASMUS outgoing mobility by the potential host institutions abroad…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Lack of interest among academic staff of your institution in the centralised actions of ERASMUS (IP, CD, Thematic Networks)….. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Lack of financial means to cover own institutional costs related to ERASMUS…………………………………………………………... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Difficulties in finding suitable partner institutions for ERASMUS activities………………………………………………………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

If there are further barriers to the implementation of ERASMUS at your institution, please specify:

_____

**2.6   Does your institution systematically keep track of the implementation and outcomes of ERASMUS actions? And at which level of your institution does this information feed into discussions and decision-making processes about enhancing the implementation of ERASMUS? (Multiple replies possible)**

|  |  | This information feeds into discussions | |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | at the level of departments | at central institutional level |
| ☐ | Yes, we analyse the reports of former ERASMUS participants …………………….. | ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | Yes, we organize feedback seminars with former ERASMUS participants ………….. | ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | Yes, we compile data bases on Europeanisation / internationalisation ……………….…… | ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | Yes, we regularly publish Europeanisation/internationalisation reports ……….…………… | ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | Other, please specify: _____ | ☐ | ☐ |

**2.7   How do you expect the impact of ERASMUS and other international activities on your institution to develop in the coming five years?**

|  | Decrease significantly | | Remain the same | | Increase significantly |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I expect the impact of ERASMUS to…………………………………………………………... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| I expect the impact of other internationalisation activities to………………………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**2.8    Do you participate or have concrete plans to participate in the following new ERASMUS actions under the Lifelong Learning Programme?**

| | We participate | We have concrete plans to participate | No |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student mobility for placements in enterprises…………………………………………... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mobility of non-academic staff……………………………………………………………... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Projects on Modernisation of higher education………………………………………….... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Projects on co-operation between universities and enterprises………………………... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Projects on Virtual Campuses……………………………………………………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

## 3. Enhancing the Institutional Impact of the ERASMUS programme

**3.1 What would you suggest for the future of ERASMUS in order to make it more beneficial to your institution?**

_____

**3.2 According to your professional experience, what factors could trigger a further increase of ERASMUS student mobility at your institution?**

_____

*We would be very pleased if you could provide us information on any institutional, regional or national evaluation studies with reference to the ERASMUS programme known to you. Please use the space below or send an email to* ***ERASMUS@incher.uni-kassel.de***

# Thank you very much for your kind co-operation.

# Annex 2c: ERASMUS survey on quality improvement: decentral ERASMUS coordinators

Dear ERASMUS coordinator,

by means of this questionnaire, we would like to ask you to provide information and your view on the impact of the ERASMUS programme on your department.

Please note
- This survey addresses ERASMUS under SOCRATES II and the Lifelong Learning Programme.
- This survey does <u>not</u> address the ERASMUS MUNDUS programme.
- The term 'department' is used throughout the questionnaire to address departments as well as faculties
- If you want to answer a question by 'I don't know', please leave the corresponding text field empty or do not tick any of the boxes referring to that part of the question.
- It takes approximately 45 minutes to answer the questions.
- Please fill in the questionnaire electronically (by using the "insert" key and marking the relevant boxes with an "X") and email it back to us or print the questionnaire and fax it or send it back by post after having filled it in (see contact details below).

We assure you that any information you provide will be handled in strict accordance with data protection regulations and only made available in an aggregated and anonymous form.

Prof. Dr. Ulrich Teichler, Dr. Ute Lanzendorf

**Please return the questionnaire to**

**University of Kassel, International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER-Kassel), ERASMUS, Mönchebergstr. 17, D-34109 Kassel, Germany, Fax +49 (0)561 804 7415**

Should you require assistance or further information, please turn to
Ms Sandra Buerger at INCHER-Kassel at <u>Erasmus@incher.uni-kassel.de</u>, Tel.: +49 (0)561 804 3020.

**<span style="color:red">You may fill in the questionnaire electronically by using the "insert" key and marking the relevant boxes with an "X" and then email it back to us.</span>**

## 1. The Profile of your Department

**1.1    Please provide information on the disciplinary profile of your department in the academic year 2006/07. Please tick the respective boxes**

| ☐ Humanities (without languages) | ☐ Languages and philological sciences | ☐ Engineering, technology, informatics | ☐ Medical sciences |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ Social sciences | ☐ Economics, management | ☐ Natural sciences | ☐ Other areas of study, please specify:_____ |
| ☐ Education, teacher training | ☐ Art and design | ☐ Law | |

**1.2    Please state the approximate number of (international) students enrolled at your department in the academic year 2006/2007**

Approximate number of national students (full-time or part-time): _____     Approximate number of international students (excl. ERASMUS): _____

Approximate number of incoming ERASMUS students: _____     Approximate number of outgoing ERASMUS students: _____

**1.3    Please state the approximate number of staff involved in teaching at your department and the approximate number of teachers sent and received under ERASMUS in the academic year 2006/2007**

Approximate number of teachers in your department (full-time equivalent):_____     Approximate number of incoming ERASMUS teachers:_____

Approximate number of outgoing ERASMUS teachers:_____

**1.4    When did your department join the ERASMUS programme?**

In the year _____

**1.5    How many years have you personally been involved in the organisation of ERASMUS activities at your department?**

_____ years

**1.6 Has your department implemented ECTS?**

☐ Yes, for all programmes ☐ Yes, for some programmes ☐ No

**1.7 Does your department have an ECTS course catalogue/information package in English?**

☐ Yes ☐ No

**1.8 Please state the approximate number of your ERASMUS partner departments and indicate with how many of them there were joint activities in 2006/07.**

My department has _____ ERASMUS partner departments. There were joint activities with approximately _____ of them in 2006/07.

**1.9 For how many centralised projects under ERASMUS did your department receive support in the academic year 2006/07?**

|  | IP | CD | Thematic Networks |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of projects supported as partner institution | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Number of projects supported as co-ordinating institution | _____ | _____ | _____ |

**1.10 Did your department participate in other <u>important</u> programmes of student/staff exchange, higher education cooperation etc. apart from ERASMUS in the academic year 2006/07?**

|  | In comparison to ERASMUS, this programme | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | offers attractive grants | | has high academic requirements | | has a high number of participants | |
|  | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Yes, in the programme (pls specify): .................................................................................................................. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Yes, in the programme (pls specify): .................................................................................................................. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Yes, in the programme (pls specify): .................................................................................................................. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

☐ No, my department did not participate in any other important programme of student/staff exchange, higher education cooperation etc. in 2006/07.

## 2. The Impact of ERASMUS on Your Department

**2.1 For pursuing your department's general mission, policies and objectives, how important are – according to your perception – the following ERASMUS actions and tools? And does your department make own funds available for these actions or tools to supplement the ERASMUS grant?**

| | For my department, the action/tool is… | | | | | | Our department makes supplementary funds available | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | not important at all | | | | very important | We are not involved | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | Yes | No |
| Incoming student mobility under ERASMUS…………………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Outgoing student mobility under ERASMUS…………………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Incoming teacher and staff mobility under ERASMUS…………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Outgoing teacher and staff mobility under ERASMUS………….....…… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Intensive Programmes……………………………………………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Curriculum Development Projects………………………………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Thematic Networks………………………………………………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Institutional networking under ERASMUS……………………………….. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Staff from your department coordinating centralised projects…………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| ECTS for international credit transfer…………………………………….. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The Learning Agreement…………………………………………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The Diploma Supplement………………………………………………….. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The development and implementation of the ERASMUS Policy Statement…………………………………………………………………….. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**2.2 Does your department exploit and transfer the experience gained from the following ERASMUS actions and tools for improving its teaching, research, student services or management?**

| For improving our teaching, research, student services or management, we exploit and transfer experience from … | To a high degree | | | | Not at all | We are not involved |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| …ERASMUS student mobility | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| …ERASMUS staff mobility | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| … Intensive Programmes | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| … Curriculum Development Projects | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| … Thematic Networks | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| …ECTS for international credit transfer | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| …the development and implementation of the ERASMUS Policy Statement | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| …institutional networking under ERASMUS | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**2.3 How much progress has your department achieved with respect to the following activities? And, according to your perception, what role did your department's participation in ERASMUS play for the initiation of these activities and the achievement of progress in their implementation?**

| | Progress realized | | | | | ERASMUS initiated the activity | | ERASMUS is/was supportive for achieving progress | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Yes | No | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| *Teaching, learning and research* | None | | | | Very high | | | Not at all | | | | Very strongly |
| Revising curricula substantially | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Introducing new curricula | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Fostering soft skills of students (teamwork, communication, etc) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Introducing mandatory foreign language requirements as part of curricula | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Internationalising curricular content (incl. joint curricula) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Setting up English/foreign language programmes | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Introducing joint degrees | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Internationalising teaching and learning (teaching in English by own teachers, inviting foreign lecturers, using foreign language literature etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Introducing mandatory work placements in curricula | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Introducing ICT-based learning | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing interdisciplinarity between degree programmes | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Introducing new types of examinations | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Introducing new teaching approaches (problem-oriented learning or similar) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the number of international publications (with foreign co-authors, foreign editors or in foreign language) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Integrating an international perspective in national research projects | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the societal relevance and impact of research topics | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Strengthening excellence and international competitiveness of research | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Other, please specify:

._____

|  | Progress realized | | | | | ERASMUS initiated the activity | | ERASMUS is/was supportive for achieving progress | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Yes | No | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| ***Quality assurance/professionalization*** | None | | | | Very high | | | Not at all | | | | Very strongly |
| Improving the transparency and transferability of student qualifications | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Introducing the regular evaluation of teaching by students | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Introducing regular graduate surveys | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Introducing/extending language training and intercultural training for teachers | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Other, please specify:

_____

***Student services***

| | Progress realized | | | | | ERASMUS initiated the activity | | ERASMUS is/was supportive for achieving progress | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Improving the academic counselling for staff and students interested in study abroad…………………………………………………………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Improving the non-academic support for incoming students (with respect to grants, accommodation, organisation of leisure activities, visa issuing etc.)…. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Improving the non-academic support for your own students (with respect to grants, accommodation, organisation of leisure activities etc.)……………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing student information in foreign language (student guides and department website, foreign language proficiency of administrative staff etc.)…. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Other, please specify:

_____

| | Progress realized | | | | | ERASMUS initiated the activity | | ERASMUS is/was supportive for achieving progress | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| ***Mobility, networks and cooperation*** | None | | | | Very high | Yes | No | Not at all | | | | Very strongly |
| Increasing the number of outgoing students…………………………………... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Putting teaching periods abroad of your teachers on a regular basis…………. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the number of incoming students……………………………….. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Putting teaching periods of foreign teachers at your department on a regular basis………………………………………………………………………….. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the effects of international networks………………………………. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the participation in international projects (relating to teaching or research)……………………………………………………………………. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the attendance or organisation of international conferences by your academic staff…………………………………………………………………. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the cooperation with the economic sector (industry, services etc.). | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Other, please specify:

_____

***Management and profiling***

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Yes | No | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Introducing an internationalisation strategy for the department……………….... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Introducing the regular reflection on and evaluation of the department's activities…………………………………………………………………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Improving the international visibility and attractiveness of the department…… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Improving the national visibility and attractiveness of the department………….. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Increasing the tendering for project-related funding (for teaching or research purposes)…………………………………………………………………………. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Other, please specify:

_____

**2.4** **To what extent are the following problems and conflicts that may occur in the context of the implementation of ERASMUS actions relevant to your department?**

| | Not at all relevant | | | | Highly relevant | We are not involved |
|---|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Outward mobile students have difficulties to re-integrate into their programme after their return | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Incoming students have little interest in academic learning | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| ERASMUS is extremely costly/absorbs too many administrative, financial and human resources | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| In relation to the amount of time required to tender for and participate in Intensive Programmes, their benefits for your department are marginal | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| In relation to the amount of time required to tender for and participate in Curriculum Development Projects, their benefits for your department are marginal | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| In relation to the amount of time required to tender for and participate in Thematic Networks, their benefits for your department are marginal | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Incoming ERASMUS students occupy places of potential fee paying foreign students | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| ERASMUS consumes resources which we would like to use for attracting excellent international students for degree study | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| ERASMUS experience at foreign universities motivates our graduates to take an advanced degree abroad but we would like to retain them at our institution | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| ERASMUS consumes financial and personnel resources which we would like to use for intensifying research | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The implementation of ERASMUS requires broad international networking but we prefer to focus on the most fruitful and suitable academic partnerships | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The implementation of ERASMUS requires broad international networking but we prefer to establish and enhance networks in our country | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

If you have encountered further problems or conflicts, please specify:

_____

**2.5 To what extent are the following possible barriers to the implementation of ERASMUS relevant to your department?**

| | Not at all relevant 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Highly relevant 5 | We are not involved ☐ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Decrease of interest of your students in temporary study abroad | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Insufficient foreign language proficiency of students to spend a temporary study period abroad | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Insufficient number of grants to support all students interested in ERASMUS mobility | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Recognition of study abroad remains incomplete for your returning ERASMUS students | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Lack of interest among academic staff in participating in ERASMUS teacher mobility | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The formalities involved in the mobility of students or teachers deter academic staff from promoting student mobility or becoming involved in teacher mobility | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The implementation of the Bologna three cycle structure is in conflict with ERASMUS student mobility | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The implementation of the Bologna three cycle structure is in conflict with ERASMUS teacher mobility | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The general objective of shortening the study times of degree students is in conflict with ERASMUS student mobility | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Too little support of students, teacher or other staff interested in ERASMUS outgoing mobility by the potential host departments abroad | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Lack of interest among academic staff in the centralised actions of ERASMUS (IP, CD, Thematic Networks) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Lack of financial means to cover own costs related to ERASMUS | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

If there are further barriers to the implementation of ERASMUS at your department, please specify:

**2.6 Does your department systematically keep track of the implementation and outcomes of ERASMUS? (Multiple replies possible)**

☐ Yes, we analyse the reports of former ERASMUS participants.
☐ Yes, the implementation and outcomes of ERASMUS are discussed at committee meetings at my department.
☐ Yes, we discuss the results of Intensive Programmes, Curriculum Development Projects or Thematic Networks in which we participated.
☐ Yes, we compile data bases on Europeanisation/internationalisation.
☐ Yes, we compile regular Europeanisation/internationalisation reports.
☐ Other, please specify: _____
☐ We do not systematically keep track of the implementation and outcomes of ERASMUS but teachers and students who participated bring in their experience in the daily work of my department.
☐ No, we do not systematically keep track of the implementation and outcomes of ERASMUS.

**2.7 How do you expect the impact of ERASMUS and other international activities for your department to develop in the coming five years?**

|  | decrease significantly | | remain the same | | increase significantly |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I expect the impact of ERASMUS to | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| I expect the impact of other internationalisation activities to | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**2.8 Does your department already participate or have concrete plans to participate in the following new ERASMUS actions under the Lifelong Learning Programme?**

|  | We participate | We have concrete plans to participate | No |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student mobility for placements in enterprises …………………………........ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mobility of non-academic staff ……………………………………………............. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Modernisation of higher education projects …………………………………….... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Co-operation between universities and enterprises projects…………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Virtual Campuses projects …………………………………………………………… | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

## 3.     Enhancing the Impact of the ERASMUS programme

**3.1     What would you suggest for the future of ERASMUS in order to make it more beneficial to your department?**

_____

_____

**3.2     According to your professional experience, what factors could trigger an increase of the proportion of your department's students in ERASMUS mobility?**

_____

_____

Could you please give us the title and author or send us a copy of any institutional, regional or national ERASMUS evaluation study known to you?

_____

_____

**Could you please enter your PIN (from our email):**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |

# Thank you very much for your kind co-operation.

# Publikationen des
# Internationalen Zentrums für Hochschulforschung Kassel
# (INCHER-Kassel)
# der Universität Kassel

**http://www.incher.uni-kassel.de/**

**(A) Reihe "Hochschule und Beruf"**
**(Campus-Verlag, Frankfurt/M. und New York)**

TEICHLER, Ulrich und WINKLER, Helmut (Hg.): Praxisorientierung des Studiums. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1979 (vergriffen).

TEICHLER, Ulrich (Hg.): Hochschule und Beruf. Problemlagen und Aufgaben der Forschung. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1979 (vergriffen).

BRINCKMANN, Hans; HACKFORTH, Susanne und TEICHLER, Ulrich: Die neuen Beamtenhochschulen. Bildungs-, verwaltungs- und arbeitsmarktpolitische Probleme einer verspäteten Reform. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1980.

FREIDANK, Gabriele; NEUSEL, Aylâ; TEICHLER, Ulrich (Hg.): Praxisorientierung als institutionelles Problem der Hochschule. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1980.

CERYCH, Ladislav; NEUSEL, Aylâ; TEICHLER, Ulrich und WINKLER, Helmut: Gesamthochschule - Erfahrungen, Hemmnisse, Zielwandel. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1981.

HERMANNS, Harry; TEICHLER, Ulrich und WASSER, Henry (Hg.): Integrierte Hochschulmodelle. Erfahrungen aus drei Ländern. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1982.

HOLTKAMP, Rolf und TEICHLER, Ulrich (Hg.): Berufstätigkeit von Hochschulabsolventen - Forschungsergebnisse und Folgerungen für das Studium. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1983 (vergriffen).

HERMANNS, Harry; TKOCZ, Christian und WINKLER, Helmut: Berufsverlauf von Ingenieuren. Eine biografie-analytische Untersuchung auf der Basis narrativer Interviews. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1983.

CLEMENS, Bärbel; METZ-GÖCKEL, Sigrid; NEUSEL, Aylâ und PORT, Barbara (Hg.): Töchter der Alma Mater. Frauen in der Berufs- und Hochschulforschung. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1986.

GORZKA, Gabriele; HEIPCKE, Klaus und TEICHLER, Ulrich (Hg.): Hochschule - Beruf - Gesellschaft. Ergebnisse der Forschung zum Funktionswandel der Hochschulen. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1988.

OEHLER, Christoph: Hochschulentwicklung in der Bundesrepublik seit 1945. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1989 (vergriffen).

TEICHLER, Ulrich: Europäische Hochschulsysteme. Die Beharrlichkeit vielfältiger Modelle. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1990.

BECKMEIER, Carola und NEUSEL, Aylâ: Entscheidungsverflechtung an Hochschulen - Determinanten der Entscheidungsfindung an deutschen und französischen Hochschulen. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1991.

EKARDT, Hanns-Peter, Löffler, Reiner und Hengstenberg, Heike: Arbeitssituationen von Firmenbauleitern. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1992.

NEUSEL, Aylâ; TEICHLER, Ulrich und WINKLER, Helmut (Hg.): Hochschule - Staat - Gesellschaft. Christoph Oehler zum 65. Geburtstag. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1993.

FUCHS, Marek: Forschungsorganisation an Hochschulinstituten. Der Fall Maschinenbau. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1994.

ENDERS, Jürgen: Die wissenschaftlichen Mitarbeiter. Ausbildung, Beschäftigung und Karriere der Nachwuchswissenschaftler und Mittelbauangehörigen an den Universitäten. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1996.

TEICHLER, Ulrich, DANIEL, Hans-Dieter und ENDERS, Jürgen (Hg.): Brennpunkt Hochschule. Neuere Analysen zu Hochschule, Politik und Gesellschaft. Frankfurt/M. und New York 1998.

ENDERS, Jürgen und BORNMANN, Lutz: Promotion und Beruf. Ausbildung, Berufsverlauf und Berufserfolg von Promovierten. Fankfurt a.M. und New York: Campus 2001.

SCHWARZ, Stefanie und TEICHLER, Ulrich (Hg.): Universität auf dem Prüfstand – Konzepte und Befunde der Hochschulforschung. Frankfurt a.M. und New York: Campus 2003.

TEICHLER, Ulrich: Hochschule und Arbeitswelt Konzeptionen, Diskussionen, Trends. Frankfurt/M. und New York: Campus 2003.

TEICHLER, Ulrich: Hochschulstrukturen im Umbruch. Eine Bilanz der Reformdynamik seit vier Jahrzehnten. Frankfurt/M. und New York: Campus 2005.

TEICHLER, Ulrich: Die Internationalisierung der Hochschulen. Neue Herausforderungen und Strategien. Frankfurt/M. und New York: Campus 2007.

KEHM, Barbara M. (Hg.): Hochschule im Wandel. Die Universität als Forschungsgegenstand. Frankfurt/M. und New York: Campus 2009.

**(B) Reihe "Werkstattberichte"**
**(Jenior Verlag, Lassallestr. 15, D-34119 Kassel,**

HERMANNS, Harry; TKOCZ, Christian und WINKLER, Helmut: Soziale Handlungskompetenz von Ingenieuren, Rückblick auf Verlauf und Ergebnisse der Klausurtagung in Hofgeismar am 16. und 17. November 1978. 1979 (Nr. 1).

HERMANNS, Harry; TKOCZ, Christian und WINKLER, Helmut: Ingenieurarbeit: Soziales Handeln oder disziplinäre Routine? 1980 (Nr. 2) (vergriffen).

NEUSEL, Aylâ und TEICHLER, Ulrich (Hg.): Neue Aufgaben der Hochschulen. 1980 (Nr. 3).

HEINE, Uwe; TEICHLER, Ulrich und WOLLENWEBER, Bernd: Perspektiven der Hochschulentwicklung in Bremen. 1980 (Nr. 4) (vergriffen).

NERAD, Maresi: Frauenzentren an amerikanischen Hochschulen. 1981 (Nr. 5).

LIEBAU, Eckart und TEICHLER, Ulrich (Hg.): Hochschule und Beruf - Forschungsperspektiven. 1981 (Nr. 6) (vergriffen).

EBHARDT, Heike und HEIPCKE, Klaus: Prüfung und Studium. Teil A: Über den Zusammenhang von Studien- und Prüfungserfahrungen. 1981 (Nr. 7).

HOLTKAMP, Rolf und TEICHLER, Ulrich: Außerschulische Tätigkeitsbereiche für Absolventen sprach- und literaturwissenschaftlicher Studiengänge. 1981 (Nr. 8) (vergriffen).

RATTEMEYER, Volker: Chancen und Probleme von Arbeitsmaterialien in der künstlerischen Aus- und Weiterbildung. Mit Beiträgen von Hilmar Liptow und Wolfram Schmidt. Kassel 1982 (Nr. 9).

CLEMENS, Bärbel: Frauenforschungs- und Frauenstudieninitiativen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Kassel 1983 (Nr. 10) (vergriffen).

DANCKWORTT, Dieter: Auslandsstudium als Gegenstand der Forschung - eine Literaturübersicht. Kassel 1984 (Nr. 11).

BUTTGEREIT, Michael und TEICHLER, Ulrich (Hg.): Probleme der Hochschulplanung in der Sowjetunion. Kassel 1984 (Nr. 12).

Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung (Hg.): Forschung über Hochschule und Beruf. Arbeitsbericht 1978 - 1984. Kassel 1985 (Nr. 13).

DALICHOW, Fritz und TEICHLER, Ulrich: Anerkennung des Auslandsstudiums in der Europäischen Gemeinschaft. Kassel 1985 (Nr. 14).

HORNBOSTEL, Stefan; OEHLER, Christoph und TEICHLER, Ulrich (Hg.): Hochschulsysteme und Hochschulplanung in westlichen Industriestaaten. Kassel 1986 (Nr. 15).

TEICHLER, Ulrich: Higher Education in the Federal Republic of Germany. Developments and Recent Issues. New York und Kassel: Center for European Studies, Graduate School und University Center of the City University of New York und Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung, Gesamthochschule Kassel. New York/Kassel 1986 (Nr. 16).

KLUGE, Norbert und OEHLER, Christoph: Hochschulen und Forschungstransfer. Bedingungen, Konfigurationen und Handlungsmuster. Kassel 1986 (Nr. 17) (vergriffen).

BUTTGEREIT, Michael: Lebensverlauf und Biografie. Kassel 1987 (Nr. 18).

EKARDT, Hanns-Peter und LÖFFLER, Reiner (Hg.): Die gesellschaftliche Verantwortung der Bauingenieure. 3. Kasseler Kolloquium zu Problemen des Bauingenieurberufs. Kassel 1988 (Nr. 19).

TEICHLER, Ulrich: Wandel der Hochschulstrukturen im internationalen Vergleich. Kassel 1988 (Nr. 20) (vergriffen).

KLUCZYNSKI, Jan und OEHLER, Christoph (Hg.): Hochschulen und Wissenstransfer in verschiedenen Gesellschaftssystemen. Ergebnisse eines polnisch-deutschen Symposiums. Kassel 1988 (Nr. 21).

KRÜGER, Heidemarie: Aspekte des Frauenstudiums an bundesdeutschen Hochschulen. Zur Studiensituation von Frauen im Sozialwesen und in den Wirtschaftswissenschaften - ausgewählte Ergebnisse einer empirischen Untersuchung. Kassel 1989 (Nr. 22) (vergriffen).

KRAUSHAAR, Kurt und OEHLER, Christoph: Forschungstransfer, betriebliche Innovationen und Ingenieurarbeit. Kassel 1989 (Nr. 23) (vergriffen).

STRÜBING, Jörg: "Technik, das ist das Koordinatensystem, in dem wir leben..." - Fallstudien zu Handlungsorientierungen im technikwissenschaftlichen Forschungstransfer. Kassel 1989 (Nr. 24).

GORZKA, Gabriele; MESSNER, Rudolf und OEHLER, Christoph (Hg.): Wozu noch Bildung? - Beiträge aus einem unerledigten Thema der Hochschulforschung. Kassel 1990 (Nr. 25) (vergriffen).

ENDERS, Jürgen: Beschäftigungssituation im akademischen Mittelbau. Kassel 1990 (Nr. 26) (vergriffen).

WETTERER, Angelika: Frauen und Frauenforschung in der bundesdeutschen Soziologie - Ergebnisse der Soziologinnen-Enquête. Kassel 1990 (Nr. 27) (vergriffen).

TEICHLER, Ulrich: The First Years of Study at Fachhochschulen and Universities in the Federal Republic of Germany. Kassel 1990 (Nr. 28) (vergriffen).

TEICHLER, Ulrich: Recognition. A Typological Overview of Recognition Issues Arising in Temporary Study Abroad. Kassel 1990 (Nr. 29).

SCHOMBURG, Harald, TEICHLER, Ulrich und WINKLER, Helmut: Studium und Beruf von Empfängern deutscher Stipendien am Asian Institute of Technology. Kassel 1991 (Nr. 30).

JESSKE-MÜLLER, Birgit, OVER, Albert und REICHERT, Christoph: Existenzgründungen in Entwicklungsländern. Literaturstudie zu einem deutschen Förderprogramm. 1991 (Nr. 31).

TEICHLER, Ulrich: Experiences of ERASMUS Students. Select Findings of the 1988/89 Survey. 1991 (Nr. 32).

BECKMEIER, Carola und NEUSEL, Aylâ: Entscheidungsprozesse an Hochschulen als Forschungsthema. 1992 (Nr. 33).

STRÜBING, Jörg: Arbeitsstil und Habitus - zur Bedeutung kultureller Phänomene in der Programmierarbeit. Kassel 1992 (Nr. 34).

BECKMEIER, Carola und NEUSEL, Ayâ: Leitungsstrategien und Selbstverständnis von Hochsschulpräsidenten und -rektoren. Eine Pilotstudie an zehn ausgewählten Hochschulen. Kassel 1992 (Nr. 35).

TEICHLER, Ulrich und WASSER, Henry (Hg.): American and German Universities: Mutual Influences in Past and Present. Kassel 1992 (Nr. 36)

MAIWORM, Friedhelm; STEUBE, Wolfgang und TEICHLER, Ulrich: ECTS in its Year of Inauguration: The View of the Students. Kassel 1992 (Nr. 37).

OVER, Albert: Studium und Berufskarrieren von Absolventen des Studienganges Berufsbezogene Fremdsprachenausbildung an der Gesamthochschule Kassel. Kassel 1992 (Nr. 38).

MAIWORM, Friedhelm; STEUBE, Wolfgang und TEICHLER, Ulrich: ECTS dans l'Année de son Lancement: Le Regard des Etudiants. Kassel 1992 (Nr. 39).

WINKLER, Helmut (Hg.): Qualität der Hochschulausbildung. Verlauf und Ergebnisse eines Kolloquiums an der Gesamthochschule Kassel. Kassel 1993 (Nr. 40).

MAIWORM, Friedhelm; STEUBE, Wolfgang und TEICHLER, Ulrich: ERASMUS Student Mobility Programmes 1989/90 in the View of Their Coordinators. Select Findings of the ICP Coordinators' Reports. Kassel 1993 (Nr. 41) (vergriffen).

MAIWORM, Friedhelm; STEUBE, Wolfgang und TEICHLER, Ulrich: Les Programmes ERASMUS en Matière de Mobilité des Etudiants au Cours de l'Année 1989/90. Analyse présentée à partir des points de vue des coordinateurs. Kassel 1993 (Nr. 41a).

MAIWORM, Friedhelm; STEUBE, Wolfgang und TEICHLER, Ulrich: Experiences of ERASMUS Students 1990/91. Kassel 1993 (Nr. 42) (vergriffen).

MAIWORM, Friedhelm; STEUBE, Wolfgang und TEICHLER, Ulrich: Les éxpériences des étudiants ERASMUS en 1990/91. Kassel 1993 (Nr. 42a).

OVER, Albert und TKOCZ, Christian: Außeruniversitäre Forschungseinrichtungen in den neuen Bundesländern. Zu den Empfehlungen des Wissenschaftsrates. Kassel 1993 (Nr. 43).

FUCHS, Marek und OEHLER, Christoph: Organisation und Effizienz von Forschungs-instituten. Fallstudien zu technikwissenschaftlicher Forschung an westdeutschen Hoch-schulen. Kassel 1994 (Nr. 44).

WINKLER, Helmut (Hg.): Kriterien, Prozesse und Ergebnisse guter Hochschulausbildung. Dokumentation eines Kolloquiums an der Universität Gesamthochschule Kassel. Kassel 1994 (Nr. 45).

MAIWORM, Friedhelm und TEICHLER, Ulrich: ERASMUS Student Mobility Programmes 1991/92 in the View of the Local Directors. Kassel 1995 (Nr. 46).

MAIWORM, Friedhelm und TEICHLER, Ulrich: The First Years of ECTS in the View of the Students. Kassel 1995 (Nr. 47).

OEHLER, Christoph und SOLLE, Christian: Die Lehrgestalt der Soziologie in anderen Studiengängen. Kassel 1995 (Nr. 48).

MAIWORM, Friedhelm; SOSA, Winnetou und TEICHLER, Ulrich: The Context of ERASMUS: a Survey of Institutional Management and Infrastructure in Support of Mobility and Co-operation. Kassel 1996 (Nr. 49).

KEHM, Barbara M. und TEICHLER, Ulrich (Hg.): Vergleichende Hochschulforschung. Eine Zwischenbilanz. Kassel 1996 (Nr. 50).

KEHM, Barbara M.: Die Beteiligung von Frauen an Förderprogrammen der Europäischen Union im Bildungsbereich. Kassel 1996 (Nr. 51).

TEICHLER, Ulrich: Higher Education und Graduate Employment in Europe. Select Findings from Previous Decades. Kassel 1997 (Nr. 52).

KREITZ, Robert und TEICHLER, Ulrich: Teaching Staff Mobility. The 1990/91 Teachers´ View. Kassel 1998 (Nr. 53).

SCHRÖDER, Manuela und DANIEL, Hans-Dieter, in Zusammenarbeit mit Karin Thielecke: Studienabbruch. Eine annotierte Bibliographie. Kassel 1998 (Nr. 54).

BARBLAN, Andris; KEHM, Barbara M.; REICHERT, Sybille und TEICHLER, Ulrich (Hg.): Emerging European Policy Profiles of Higher Education Institutions. Kassel 1998 (Nr.55).

WASSER, Henry: Diversity in Higher Education. Kassel 1999 (Nr. 56).

BARBLAN, Andris; REICHERT, Sybille, SCHOTTE-KMOCH, Martina und TEICHLER, Ulrich (Hg.): Implementing European Policies in Higher Education Institutions. Kassel 2000 (Nr.57).

OEHLER, Christoph und SOLLE, Christian: Professionalisierung und Gesellschaftsbezug. Lehrgestalt der Soziologie in der Grundlagenausbildung von Lehramtsstudierenden. Kassel 2000 (Nr. 58).

YALCIN, Gülsen: Entwicklungstendenzen im türkischen Hochschulwesen am Beispiel der Stiftungsuniversitäten. Kassel 2001 (Nr. 59)

MAIWORM, Friedhelm und TEICHLER, Ulrich in Zusammenarbeit mit Annette Fleck: Das Reform-Experiment ifu – Potenziale, Risiken und Erträge aus der Sicht der Beteiligten. Kassel 2002 (Nr. 60).

JAHR, Volker; SCHOMBURG, Harald und TEICHLER, Ulrich: Internationale Mobilität von Absolventinnen und Absolventen europäischer Hochschulen. Kassel 2002 (Nr. 61).

HAHN, Karola und LANZENDORF, Ute (Hg.): Wegweiser Globalisierung – Hochschulsektoren in Bewegung: Länderanalysen aus vier Kontinenten zu Marktchancen für deutsche Studienangebote. Kassel 2005 (Nr. 62).

KEHM, Barbara M. (Hg.): Mit SOKRATES II zum Europa des Wissens - Ergebnisse der Evaluation des Programms in Deutschland. Kassel 2005 (Nr. 63).

ENDERS, Jürgen und MUGABUSHAKA, Alexis- Michel: Wissenschaft und Karriere. Erfahrungen und Werdegänge ehemaliger Stipendiaten der DFG. Kassel 2005 (Nr. 64).

KOGAN, Maurice und TEICHLER, Ulrich (Hg.): Key Challenges to the Academic Profession. Paris und Kassel: UNESCO Forum on Higher Education Research und Knowledge und International Centre for Higher Education Research Kassel 2007 (Nr. 65)

LOCKE, William und TEICHLER, Ulrich (Hg.) The Changing Conditions for Academic Work and Careers in Select Countries. Kassel 2007 (Nr. 66)

KEHM, Barbara M.: Locking Back to Look Forward. Analyses of Higher Education after the Turn of the Millennium. Kassel 2008 (Nr. 67)

ADAMCZAK, Wolfgang; DEBUSMANN, Robert; KRAUSE, Ellen and MERKATOR, Nadine: Traumberuf ForschungsreferentIn? Kassel (Nr. 68)

MUGABUSHAKA, Alexis-Michel; SCHOMBURG, Harald und TEICHLER, Ulrich (Hg.) Higher Education and Work in Africa - A Comparative Empirical Study in Selected Countries Kassel 2008 (Nr. 69)

LANZENDORF, Ute. (Hg.): Wegweiser Globalisierung –Hochschulsektoren in Bewegung II. Länderanalysen zu Marktchancen für deutsche Studienangebote. Kassel 2009 (Nr. 70)

SCHOMBURG, Harald (Hg.): Generation Vielfalt. Bildungs- und Berufswege der Absolventen von Hochschulen in Deutschland 2007-2008. Kassel (im Druck) (Nr. 71).

ALESI, Bettina und MERKATOR, Nadine (Hg.): Aktuelle hochschulpolitische Trends im Spiegel von Expertisen. Internationalisierung, Strukturwandel, Berufseinstieg für Absolventen. Kassel 2010 (Nr. 72)