



EXPERIENCE ERASMUS

Practice and Perspective in Four Subject Areas

FINAL REPORT

Erasmus Dissemination Project coordinated by the UK Socrates-Erasmus Council with participation from the National Agencies of Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovenia and Sweden.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
BACKGROUND	7
THE ERASMUS PROGRAMME.....	7
THE PROJECT.....	8
THE SURVEY	10
THE CASE STUDIES	14
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE	18
SUBJECT AREA WORK GROUP: ARCHITECTURE.....	19
SUBJECT AREA WORK GROUP: EDUCATION.....	22
SUBJECT AREA WORK GROUP: MATHEMATICS & INFORMATICS.....	25
SUBJECT AREA WORK GROUP: NATURAL SCIENCES.....	27
WORK GROUPS: TRANSVERSAL ISSUES.....	30
THE CASE STUDY PRESENTATIONS.....	37
CONCLUSIONS	38
RECOMMENDATIONS	41
ANNEXES	43
ANNEX I ERASMUS MOBILITY STATISTICS.....	44
ANNEX II LIST OF PARTICIPATING NATIONAL AGENCIES.....	57
ANNEX III LIST OF PARTICIPATING HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS.....	60
ANNEX IV QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES.....	64
ANNEX V SECTION D RESPONSES.....	72
ANNEX VI CASE STUDIES PRESENTED AT THE CONFERENCE.....	82
ANNEX VII CASE STUDIES POINTS MADE	91
ANNEX VIII CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS LIST.....	93

Foreword

Erasmus Experience: Practice and Perspective in Four Subject Areas

'Erasmus Experience: Practice and Perspective in Four Subject Areas' is a European Commission funded dissemination project to provide good practice models in four subject areas. Erasmus student mobility, the core of the Erasmus programme has continued to grow, but two or three subjects dominate and represent over 50% of the total mobility.

The Bologna Process, supported by all EU governments, has at its heart support for increasing and improving mobility. The European Commission has responded to this with proposals for a new generation of education programmes, which see mobility as the primary objective. Within the general context of Bologna, the new generation of programmes, and the Lisbon agenda to establish a dynamic and knowledge-based economy, this project has identified four subject areas of social, political and economic importance in which student mobility is relatively under-represented in the Erasmus programme: Architecture, Education, Mathematics & Informatics and Natural Sciences. It is our view that promoting high quality and increased student mobility in these areas will represent an important contribution to European education, economic, social and political objectives.

The project broke new grounds in bringing together in a conference academics, employers and Erasmus graduates, to identify good practice, obstacles to mobility and suggest ways to overcome these. The report on the project and the conference provide an excellent background for all those working to develop mobility in these subject areas.

Bringing together higher education institutions, academics, administrators, Erasmus graduates and employers presented a range of challenges, which are noted in the report. It is evident that among the crucial recommendations arising from the project are the need for universities to maintain active contact with Erasmus alumni, to work more closely with employers in promoting and developing the programme and to recognise the need for closer co-operation with professional bodies.

We are most grateful to the European Commission for supporting and funding the project and being represented at the conference.

The National Agencies worked together in a really effective team in developing the project objectives and their realisation, and in liaising with institutions, academics and administrative colleagues and graduates. I wish especially to thank the Austrian National Agency for all the arrangements in hosting the conference, especially Wolfgang Eckel and Michaela Prokesch.

The commitment and enthusiasm of all those participating in the conference made it a dynamic and lively experience which many participants hoped would be repeated in the future. I would like to thank all those who participated, particularly those who made presentations, acted as chairs for the working groups and rapporteurs, whose work is reflected in the report.

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

Finally, I would like to thank two individuals who have been critically important in the realisation of the project: Susan Slater for her excellent work on the survey, the conference and the final report, and the able assistance of Suzie Taylor. Without these two colleagues, the project would not have been realised.

John E Reilly MBE
Director
UK Socrates Erasmus Council

Executive Summary

Introduction

1. Erasmus, the Higher Education action within the Socrates programme, started in 1987. It is based on inter-university co-operation with a focus on student and teacher mobility.
 - Erasmus mobility takes place in all subject areas, in 31 countries.
 - The Bologna Process, endorsed by some 40 Governments, has at its heart support for increasing and improving mobility.
 - The European Commission has responded with proposals for a new generation of education programmes with mobility as a primary objective and a cumulative target of three million Erasmus students by 2011 (from a base of one million in 2002).
- 2.1 This project aimed to identify and disseminate good practice in four subject areas with relatively low Erasmus student mobility: Architecture, Education, Mathematics & Informatics, Natural Sciences; to identify obstacles to mobility and to suggest ways of overcoming them.
- 2.2 Twelve countries¹ and a variety of higher education institutions in all twelve countries participated.
- 2.3 Erasmus graduates, employers and professional bodies contributed to the project.

Activities

3. The project involved three distinct activities:
 - A Survey Questionnaire, with quantitative and qualitative questions;
 - Case Studies, consisting of statements from Erasmus graduates in successful employment and their Employers;
 - A Trans-national Conference, bringing together institutions, graduates and employers, held in Vienna in February 2005.
- 4.1 96 replies to the survey were received.
- 4.2 In some countries it proved difficult to recruit institutions, particularly in Mathematics & Informatics.
- 4.3 A number of institutions found some questions, in particular concerning professional bodies and recognition, difficult to answer.
- 4.4 Most institutions said that they had a surplus of places for outward Erasmus students.
- 4.5 Proficiency in the host language was widely regarded as important.
- 4.6 Finance was seen as the greatest obstacle to mobility.
- 4.7 Growth in Erasmus mobility was anticipated by the majority of institutions.

¹ The twelve countries taking part in the project are: Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, the United Kingdom

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

- 5.1 95 Case studies were received.
 - 5.2 Not all countries were able to identify Case Studies in all subject areas.
 - 5.3 A common problem was lack of information about Erasmus alumni.
 - 5.4 Several Case Studies were incomplete: in particular, it proved difficult to get statements from employers: some were ignorant about Erasmus, a small number refused to provide a statement.
 - 5.5 Employers were interested in graduates with experience of different cultures; more than a quarter said that an Erasmus experience had been a factor in selecting the graduate for the job.
 - 5.6 Employers did not seem concerned about linguistic competence, which was valued highly by graduates and institutions.
 - 5.7 Graduates felt that Erasmus had helped to make getting a job easier; they welcomed the broadening of the curriculum; they commented on the importance of increased competence in the host language.
 - 5.8 Institutions referred to the value of different approaches to the subject, the positive effects of personal development, maturity and independence, and linguistic competence.
-
- 6.1 The number of participants in the conference was 109.
 - 6.2 Work Group sessions used the results of the survey and experience of participants to address the four subject areas and transversal issues.
 - 6.3 Presentations by four graduates and employers in Case Studies brought issues into sharp focus.
 - 6.4 Participants were pleased to get new ideas; pleased to see common shared problems, and to share in solutions. They found that the conference focussed their minds on issues to emphasise when promoting the programme.

Results by Subject Area

- 7.1 **Architecture** is an international subject requiring an international experience.
 - 7.2 To increase student mobility in Architecture requires a flexible course structure.
 - 7.3 Academic and professional recognition needs further discussion at institutional and professional levels.
 - 7.4 Institutions should seek new partners to represent a wide range of cultures and improve the 'professional attractiveness' of the programme.
-
- 8.1 **Education** is critical to shape future generations of school pupils in the European Dimension.
 - 8.2 Curriculum flexibility is required. Rigid national degree structures or other state requirements can inhibit mobility.
 - 8.3 National / public employment requirements do not recognise the benefits of mobility. An Erasmus experience is, as a consequence, often not recognised as a feature of "employability".
 - 8.4 Competence in another language is important. All institutions should provide suitable intensive language courses.
-
- 9.1 **Mathematics & Informatics** is universal but different; an Erasmus experience can transform students from technicians to effective creative employees.
 - 9.2 Knowledge of English is fundamental in Mathematics & Informatics - host institutions should offer courses in English – although understanding the host country language is important.
 - 9.3 The social skills and competencies gained are key arguments for Mathematics & Informatics students to study abroad.

- 10.1 **Natural Sciences** require fresh insights and the establishment of networks for the future.
- 10.2 Although employers of Natural Sciences graduates attach importance to an experience abroad and value adaptability and openness to new ideas, Erasmus students appear not to be aware of this.
- 10.3 Natural Sciences degree courses are often highly prescribed; a broader curriculum including foreign study should be encouraged.
- 10.4 Professional bodies could influence the dissemination of the Bologna Process and mobility of students and university staff.

Information Problems

11. A number of points of concern were identified by the project that had not been anticipated:
 - Lack of communication between institutions and graduates and hence difficulty in finding and contacting graduates;
 - Lack of communication between institutions and employers and hence difficulty in involving employers;
 - The haphazard way in which students may or may not find out about the Erasmus programme;
 - A basic ignorance of what Erasmus can provide, not only in the outside world but also in institutions;
 - Widespread ignorance of professional bodies and other organisations: institutions in most cases not having active relations with potentially relevant organisations.

Summary

12. Obstacles to mobility, which need to be addressed, are:
 - Academic - especially in regard to the flexibility of curricula;
 - Linguistic - arrangements for language training inadequate;
 - Financial - support seen as inadequate for students and institutions;
 - Information - not reaching students, the public and employers in a suitable way.
13. Best Practice has been identified in relation to:
 - Provision of language training;
 - Use of incoming and returning Erasmus students as mentors, and promoters;
 - Good, close relations between central administration and academic departments; recognition of the importance of, and work involved in Erasmus; encouragement and support for 'academic champions';
 - Making maximum use of ICT: web sites, student record systems, databases, especially to ensure coherence.
- 14.1 Implications for higher education institutions:
- 14.2 Promotion of Erasmus is needed within the higher education sector as well as externally;
- 14.3 Databases of mobility are needed; web sites need to be more friendly, up to date, complete and better publicised;
- 14.4 Institutions' arrangements for keeping in touch with their former Erasmus students should be addressed;
- 14.5 Institutions should address issues of academic recognition, the management of learning agreements and the implementation of ECTS;

- 14.6 There should be wider provision and better publicised, language courses in the home institution across all disciplines. Language courses in the host country should be available with ECTS credits;
- 14.7 Institutions should encourage the role and work of the academic champion;
- 14.8 Professional bodies do not seem to feature in institutional policy or curriculum design. There may be a need for a more proactive relationship between institutions and professional bodies.

Recommendations

- 15.1 Some of the questions addressed by this project, and recommendations in this report, are likely to need the involvement of governments.
- 15.2 All parties should be encouraged to find and use Erasmus students and graduates to promote the programme.
- 15.3 The support of professional bodies and employers should be sought to promote mobility. Professional bodies should be encouraged to inter-work with one another and with institutions to be more accepting of each others' requirements.
- 15.4 Institutions should be more actively involved with employers and should gather data to support the view that the Erasmus experience imparts key skills for employability.
- 15.5 The collection, presentation and dissemination of statistics concerning mobility: within institutions, as well as in the higher education sectors and across the programme should be a high priority.
- 15.6 Greater flexibility should be provided within the curriculum.
- 15.7 Short intensive language courses in host countries should be more widely available.

Background

The Erasmus Programme

Erasmus is a higher education action within the education programme Socrates, which is funded by the European Commission. While Socrates dates from 1995, Erasmus started in 1987. Erasmus is based on inter-university cooperation and its main objectives relate to student and teacher mobility.

In 2001 the Erasmus programme celebrated its one millionth student. Recently the European Commission published a draft Directive for a new generation of education programmes, which proposes a target of three million by 2011, which would mean an annual total of 375,000 students from the current base of in the order of 125,000.

An Erasmus study period for students must last at least three months and must be granted full academic credit recognition. Erasmus mobility is available in all subject areas. There are subject areas which do not have a high representation of Erasmus students and which it is felt have the potential to increase their numbers for the benefit of students, universities and future employers. The table below gives the numbers of Erasmus students in each subject area in 2003/04, and the pro rata projected numbers in 2011 to satisfy the target proposed in the draft directive.

Subject Area	Erasmus student numbers, 2003/04 (provisional)	% of total Erasmus student numbers	Projected Erasmus student numbers in 2011
Agriculture	2573	2.0%	7506
Architecture, Urban and Regional Planning	4563	3.5%	13311
Art and Design	5798	4.5%	16914
Business Studies and Management Sciences	28251	22.0%	82413
Education, Teacher Training	3775	2.9%	11012
Engineering, Technology	13568	10.5%	39516
Geography, Geology	2267	1.8%	6613
Humanities	5027	3.9%	14664
Languages and Philological sciences	20331	15.8%	59309
Law	9173	7.1%	26759
Mathematics & Informatics	3991	3.1%	11277
Medical Sciences	6358	4.9%	18547
Natural Sciences	4894	3.8%	14277
Social Sciences	13393	10.4%	39070
Communication and Information Sciences	3312	2.6%	9662
Other Areas of study	1297	1.0%	3784
Total	128549	100.0%	375000

Further details of Erasmus mobility are given in Annex I.

The Project

The project is sponsored by the European Commission. It is designed to focus on subject areas with relatively low overall participation in the Erasmus programme. It identifies institutions with significant mobility over time in these subjects, and aims to discover the factors which lead to success. In so doing it will provide models for all institutions in these subject areas, and promote increasing mobility on the basis of the good practice models.

The four subject areas are Architecture, Education, Natural Sciences, and Mathematics & Informatics.

The twelve participating countries are Austria; Denmark; France; Germany; Greece; Ireland; the Netherlands; Poland; Romania; Slovenia; Sweden; the United Kingdom.

The actions taking place within the project were:

- A survey of a number of institutions, with significant Erasmus mobility over time in one of the four subject areas, in each participating country;
- Case Studies of employed former Erasmus students in each subject area and each country;
- An international conference.

National Agencies, which have been established in all participating countries (there are 31 countries involved in the Erasmus programme) are responsible both to the Member State Government and the Commission for the work, which they do. This includes setting up contracts with higher education institutions and disbursing the funds for the student mobility grants, teacher mobility grants and funds for universities to contribute to the costs of organising mobility. National Agencies are the key interface between the European Commission and universities and assist in a wide-range of ways to facilitate the programme and to promote it. A list of the twelve participating National Agencies is in Annex II.

Institutions of higher education play a critical role in promoting the programme to students, in organising the agreements with the partner institutions in other countries, and ensuring satisfactory programmes of study and academic recognition. Hence in any project associated with Erasmus, universities and their academic and administrative staff, particularly in their International and/or European Office, are critical to success.

Each country (National Agency) identified the institutions in its own country, on the basis of sustained outward mobility in the particular subject area, at a reasonable level over a period of two or three years, and invited each selected institution:

- To take part in a survey by questionnaire. The questionnaires were used to acquire background data from all the participating institutions and have been designed to elicit information on what factors contribute to success in mobility and what are the barriers in the chosen subject areas.
- To provide two case studies of former Erasmus students in employment in work related to their subject.
- Following the survey, to participate in the international conference with all the parallel institutions from all the participating countries. This conference, which was held in Vienna on 11 February 2005, explored all aspects of best practice arising out of the collective experience of all the institutions with the aim of contributing to the promotion of increased mobility in these subject areas.

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

The institutions were selected by the National Agencies, as far as possible:

- To ensure geographical coverage
- To ensure true subject balance
- To ensure coverage of a wide and representative variety of type of institution in each subject area
- To ensure coverage of a wide range of size of higher education institutions in each subject area.

The Survey

The Survey was intended to cover two institutions in each of the four subject areas – Architecture, Education, Mathematics & Informatics and Natural Sciences – from each of the twelve countries participating in the project.

Some National Agencies recruited a third institution in certain subjects and invited these to respond to the questionnaire. Some National Agencies experienced difficulties in recruiting institutions, especially in Mathematics & Informatics.

Some institutions sent in more than one response: for example, in some cases in Natural Sciences, they sent separate responses from the Biology, Chemistry and Physics Departments; in other cases they sent responses from the department and from the central administration, or from separate previously autonomous and distinct campuses. All responses were included in the analysis. A small number of institutions did not return questionnaires. These institutions were not invited to the conference.

The total number of questionnaires received was 96

Architecture	23
Education	28
Mathematics & Informatics	22
Natural Sciences	23

A table showing the institutions participating in the Survey is in Annex III.

The simple questionnaire consisted of four sections.

Section A identified the institution and the subject area.

Section B sought background quantitative data on the higher education institutions and their involvement in Erasmus at institution and subject-area levels.

Section C provided quantitative responses to a wide variety of questions covering issues related to student recruitment and retention; promotion of the programme and in particular the Erasmus mobility; academic and professional recognition; institutional commitment; the role of the academic co-ordinator; the role of the European/International Office; employment skills and other data on employment.

Section D addressed broader concerns such as problem areas, the role of professional bodies and motivation.

A summary of the responses is given in Annex IV.

Section B

The institutions participating in the Survey were of a variety of sizes and types. Three had more than 60,000 full time students. Apart from these three, the maximum number of students at a participating institution was 35,000. The minimum was 350. Twelve institutions had fewer than 2,000 students.

There were twelve mono-disciplinary institutions, the majority (seven) in Education, four in Architecture and one in Mathematics & Informatics.

The total number of Erasmus students covered by the Survey was roughly 13,500. This amounts to about 0.9% of the full time students in the institutions participating.

The total number of incoming Erasmus students to the institutions participating in the Survey was roughly 12,000. This means that overall there was an imbalance between the total inward and outward student mobility: for every 100 outward students the institution received on average 87 inward students. The imbalance varied greatly between institutions.

Section C

There were two types of question: the majority of the questions required the respondent to answer with a number between '1' signifying disagreement, and '4' meaning strong agreement; the other questions required a 'Yes' / 'No' answer. In the majority of cases, the questions were worded so that the expected 'best-practice' answer would tend to agree with the question. In practice, 61% of the 'Yes' / 'No' question replies were 'Yes'; 67% of the answers to the graded questions were positive, '4' or '3'. Institutions freely used the full range of answers, 47% of all answers being '4'.

Recruitment

Most institutions claimed that it was relatively easy to recruit students in the particular subject area, indeed more than half said that it was easy, and on average they did not seem to have difficulties recruiting students, once enrolled, into the Erasmus programme. Nevertheless, they generally had fewer students wanting to participate than they had Erasmus places in the subject area.

Language

Two thirds of the institutions considered that competence in the host language is important for Erasmus students. Language training was provided in the host country in many cases. However, relatively little language training seemed to be provided in the home country before departure. Most institutions claimed to take advantage of Erasmus Intensive Language Courses where available. In Mathematics & Informatics, the subject was taught in English in the majority of partner institutions.

The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) and Academic Recognition

The majority of institutions replied that ECTS Learning Agreements were used, credits obtained during the Erasmus study period were included in the final degree transcript, examination / assessment grades awarded during the Erasmus study period were used as part of the final degree assessment in the home institution, and ECTS was used for incoming students in the subject area.

Practical Work Experience

Practical work experience was an integral part of the degree for 60% of the institutions: in almost every case in Education, least in Architecture. Almost half of the replies stated that the work experience always gained credit recognition.

Returning and Incoming Erasmus Students

Overall, 70% of institutions said that returning Erasmus students were used as mentors for new Erasmus students, and 60% help with the recruitment of future Erasmus students. Institutions made less use of incoming Erasmus students for these purposes. Almost all the institutions had a positive view of incoming Erasmus students academically; in the majority of cases, these students took all

the normal assessments and, especially in Natural Sciences, they were considered to contribute towards the academic work of the department.

The Academic Programme Director

The academic programme director, who was virtually never the Head of Department, was widely seen as having significant influence in recruiting and retaining Erasmus students. There were mixed views about whether (s)he received recognition for the Erasmus work. (S)he generally met potential Erasmus students before their Erasmus study period and generally monitored student progress during the Erasmus study period. However, in few cases did the academic programme director visit Erasmus students while abroad.

Encouragement and Support

More than three quarters of replies indicated active support by academic colleagues for outgoing Erasmus students, and even more valued incoming Erasmus students. The institutions in the survey were overwhelmingly considered to encourage participation in Erasmus and to give real support to academic programme directors in all departments, contrasting with the impression noted above, given by responses to questions about the academic programme director.

European Office / International Office

Liaison between the European / International Department and the academic programme director was generally considered to be good, in most cases meeting on a regular basis. Generally, the European Office contributed to recruitment of Erasmus students, and managed Learning Agreements and other aspects of the programme, although generally, the European Office did not manage transcripts of records. The European Office published information in hard copy, and even more so on the web.

Relations with Partners

Generally, relations with partners were handled through the central administration. Contact between the academic programme director and colleagues in partner institutions was frequent in the majority of cases. The majority of institutions were satisfied with the speed of response from partners; 60% or more of partner institutions monitored students' progress, reported if it was unsatisfactory, and returned transcripts and grades in good time.

Teaching Staff Mobility, Growth

Half the replies considered that Erasmus teaching staff mobility was significant in the subject area, and half disagreed; the extremes were Education – generally positive – and Architecture and Natural Sciences – generally negative. Many considered that Erasmus teaching staff mobility was linked to Erasmus student mobility. The majority considered that teaching staff mobility provided opportunities to visit outgoing Erasmus students and to discuss the curriculum. Some growth in Erasmus outward mobility was anticipated in most subjects.

Details are given in Annex IV.

Section D

There were a number of blank responses to certain questions suggesting that the respondent did not fully understand the question in their own context.

Professional Bodies

The number of blanks to these 'Yes'/'No' questions suggested that institutions were unable to answer them. Quite often different institutions in a country gave completely opposite answers to the questions. It may be that the term 'Professional bodies' is not understood in the same sense in all countries.

Incentives

A feeling that academic incentives are important was particularly strong; linguistic incentives were seen to be the weakest. Throughout this section, Education was the least convinced, although even here the most common answer was '3' to most questions.

Difficulties

Almost half the replies said that there were no administrative difficulties; two thirds denied difficulties with academic recognition; almost 40% said that there were no linguistic difficulties; 69% denied any difficulties with professional requirements.

Obstacles – Overall

- The academic curriculum was not considered to be an obstacle, the only exception being Education;
- Professional requirements were not considered an obstacle to mobility. Again, Education was the exception;
- Perceptions of the academic experience were not considered to be an obstacle;
- Finance was considered the greatest obstacle, 31% of replies being '4' (serious), the most common reply '3'.

Details are given in Annex IV.

A summary of the 'Section D' comments is in Annex V.

The Case Studies

A Case Study is a graduate in the subject area who has been an Erasmus student and is now in successful employment related, if possible, to the degree.

The purpose of the Case Studies is to identify good practice relevant to the subject area; to produce inspirational examples; to encourage increased mobility and to promote more active employment. The Case Studies concept is designed to indicate the extent to which the Erasmus study period contributed to the employment career of the graduate, in terms of additional qualifications, motivation, outlook, or simply general added-value from experience in another country.

Each former Erasmus student was asked to try to assess this, commenting on their Erasmus experience and key aspects of the experience, which, from an employment/career point of view, they view as critical, by means of a personal statement.

The employers were asked to contribute to the Case Study by a statement of attitudes to, interest in, and experience of Erasmus, commenting on the individual graduate as well as on the attitude of the enterprise to the sort of experience, which Erasmus entails and the value that it has for employment.

It is hoped that the graduates will serve as possible role-models, becoming involved possibly in an alumni network or activities; and that employers could have possible further involvement in promoting the employment potential of the Erasmus programme.

Two graduates and two employers from the most interesting Case Studies in each of the four subject areas were invited to participate in the conference, and selected graduates and employers were invited to make a presentation at the conference.

The Case Studies

Each institution was asked by its National Agency to provide two Case Studies if possible.

A range of difficulties with producing Case Studies was experienced. Not all countries were able to find Case Studies in all subject areas. In no case was there a common difficulty across all countries, but a fairly common problem was the lack of information about alumni, in particular Erasmus alumni, in universities.

The total number of Case Studies received was 95.

	Architecture	Education	Mathematics & Informatics	Natural Sciences	Total
Austria	1	4	2	1	8
Denmark		1	1		2
France	1	1	5	1	8
Germany	4	3	2	2	11
Greece	1	1	2	4	8
Ireland	1	2	4	1	8
Netherlands					
Poland	4	3	9	4	20
Romania	4	2	3	3	12
Slovenia	1	1	4	1	7
Sweden	1	1		2	4
United Kingdom	3	2	1	1	7
Total	21	21	33	20	95

A small number of institutions sent in more than two Case Studies: this was particularly the case in Mathematics & Informatics

In both Mathematics & Informatics and Natural Sciences, a number of Case Studies involved students who had graduated recently (or in a small number of cases were about to graduate), and whose employment is as a PhD student or research assistant at their university. The points that they made as graduates were helpful, and were noted. However, it was not considered that they should be invited to present at the conference. The points made in the statements by their university were noted under 'Employers' or 'Institutions' as appropriate.

Several of the Case Studies were incomplete. In particular, it sometimes proved difficult to get statements by employers. Some National Agencies suggested that this might be because they were ignorant of Erasmus. In a small number of cases the employer refused to provide a statement. A surprising number of institutions did not provide a statement.

After a thorough review of all Case Studies, those, which presented facets which were felt to be of widest interest in each subject area, were selected to participate in the conference. The selection was difficult and a number of interesting Case Studies could not be invited. However, it must be stressed that all the Case Studies provided information, which has contributed to the deeper understanding of the issues.

The Case Studies presented at the conference are in Annex VI to this paper. All the Case Studies are on the Project website: www.erasmus.ac.uk

Points made by Graduates, Employers and Institutions in Statements

A table giving statistics of points made by Graduates, Employers and Institutions in Case Study Statements is in Annex VII.

Graduates

Overall, three different aspects of the Erasmus experience were mentioned by one third of the graduates:

- They felt that Erasmus had helped make getting a job easier. The responses for the four different subjects were relatively similar in this case, Architecture being the most positive;
- They welcomed the broadening of the curriculum and the chance to study aspects of the subject not available at home;
- They commented on the importance of increased competence in the host language.

Employers

Fewer employers provided statements, and there was considerable disparity between them in depth of comments. Most employer statements were brief, Natural Science employers especially so.

Two aspects of Erasmus were mentioned by a significant number of employers:

- More than one third mentioned the importance of a graduate having experienced different cultures;
- More than one quarter said that an Erasmus-type experience had been a factor in selecting the graduate for the job – especially in Mathematics & Informatics and in Education.

In regard to particular subjects:

- Architecture employers were particularly interested in graduates being adaptable and open to new ideas; they tended to stress the importance of experiencing different cultures.
- Education employers appreciated the enrichment of the students' experience arising from Erasmus; they did not talk much about linguistic competence.
- Mathematics & Informatics employers appreciated Erasmus 'added value'; they were particularly interested in the use of English; they expressed no interest in character building or the graduate contributing new ideas.
- Natural Sciences employers made few points, but they attributed most importance to adaptability and openness to new ideas or ways of working; only one referred to character building or the graduate contributing new ideas.

Institutions

There were statements from 52 institutions. More than 60% of the institutions referred to:

- The value of different approaches to the subject, and aspects of the subject not available at home – particularly in Natural Sciences and Architecture;
- The positive effects of personal development, maturity and independence – 100% in Architecture, and almost three quarters in Education, but not considered important in Mathematics & Informatics or Natural Sciences.

More than 40% mentioned improvement in language competence as important. A number of institutions spoke of:

- The value of Erasmus students as representatives of the home country/institution /department abroad, contributing a positive image;
- Returning Erasmus students passing acquired knowledge to other people in the country;
- Erasmus students contributing to an international atmosphere;
- Erasmus mobility strengthening co-operation with partners;
- Erasmus cited by students as a reason for choosing to study at the institution.

There appeared to be some mismatches of perceived importance, for example:

- Graduates and institutions place high value on linguistic competence, but employers appear not to be particularly concerned;
- Employers of Natural Science graduates value adaptability and openness to ideas, whereas graduates do not mention this at all.

International Conference

The conference took place at the University of Veterinary Science in Vienna on Friday 11 February 2005.

A representative of the Commission attended the conference. Every participating National Agency was represented. Invitations were sent to:

- All institutions participating in the project which had returned questionnaires;
- Eight Case Studies – two graduates and two employers in each subject area;
- A number of professional bodies.

The total number of participants was 109.

The list of participants is in Annex VIII.

The Programme

After presentations on the objectives of the project and the results of the Survey, the participants were divided into Work Groups for wide-ranging discussions on questions raised by the Survey and Case Studies.

There were two Work Group sessions: the first based around the four subject areas; the second addressing transversal issues relevant to all the subject areas.

Each Work Group was led by a pre-selected chair / animator, and had a rapporteur.

There were four subject area Case Study presentations to the plenary meeting by graduates and employers.

Reports of the Work Group sessions were given to the plenary by the rapporteurs, leading to a closing discussion.

Subject Area Work Group: Architecture

The Work Group discussion opened with a review of statements and questions included in the prompts sheet. It was decided that the Group should focus on two questions:

1. What makes good student mobility?
2. How do you increase mobility?

Linguistic Issues – the Survey suggests that linguistic competence was not considered important in Architecture, although it is welcomed by graduates in the Case Studies where a number of employers and graduates considered that architecture is a language in its own right.

The Work Group acknowledged that language skills are not so relevant in this field, where more visual knowledge is required. Linguistic competence should be seen as an advantage of studying abroad and when seeking employment. The recognition of language and culture courses would help to facilitate participation.

Students' Development – the Case Studies suggest that graduates and their home institutions appreciate the social development, increase in confidence, cultural tolerance and open-mindedness seen in Erasmus students.

The Group considered that it is important for students of Architecture to study abroad: to see new places and new types of Architecture. It provides a unique broadening of horizons. The professional education at partner universities and the possibility of working with celebrated foreign architects were two aspects of the broader experience.

Academic Issues – the Case Studies show that graduates valued the different courses and teaching styles available abroad. While a few institutions welcomed this, few mentioned this as significant.

The Work Group noted:

- Architecture, in many countries, takes many years of study. For this reason, it was not considered problematic for a student to spend a year abroad. In some institutions exchange places in this subject area were for a whole year. Frequently, students also worked on projects while away.
- However, it was not easy to find appropriate courses at the partner institutions
- Learning Agreements were found to be an issue.
- The question was raised whether every architectural programme ought to have a compulsory year abroad. Some thought this was a good idea, others maintained that a compulsory year abroad was too restrictive.
- To increase student mobility course structures must be flexible.
- When the three cycle system, with a short first cycle, is introduced as a result of the Bologna Process² it may prove to be more difficult to fit in a year abroad within the first cycle, although credits and recognition should make it easier.

² The Bologna Process, which the governments of all Erasmus participating countries have agreed to make law, aims to establish a European area of higher education by 2010. Further details can be found on Bologna Process website: <http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/>

Credit Recognition, Use of ECTS – the Survey indicates that ECTS is used for the majority of students in this subject. However the ‘Section D’ comments by institutions frequently stressed the need for better credit recognition.

Members of the Group conceded that there had been some difficulties with academic recognition of courses. A ‘free’ or ‘experimental’ year was suggested as a way round this.

Professional Bodies – the Survey indicates that institutions are aware of professional bodies in Architecture, and generally do not consider that the professional bodies had much impact on the degree / diploma courses. Nevertheless, there were sometimes significant differences in responses between institutions in the same country suggesting that relations with professional bodies were not always clear. The Group recognised that academic and professional recognition were areas, which needed further discussion.

Employability – the Work Group discussed the extent to which employers valued graduates who had taken part in the Erasmus programme. A missing link was acknowledged between employers and universities.

- Some representatives maintained that employers were unaware of the Erasmus programme; others argued that small architectural firms practising locally in their own countries might not value foreign experience as much as larger companies.
- It was thought that employers valued the personal development inspired by the Erasmus experience, such as greater maturity/experience although they may not necessarily link these attributes to the Erasmus programme.
- It was thought that the graduates would find that staying in contact with the university as well as with the Erasmus students met abroad - an sort informal contact network for life - would be advantageous in getting a job.
- In some countries, students are employed thanks to their portfolio; if an employer is able to see from the portfolio that a student has had experience abroad then this was thought to be a good thing.
- The question of how to raise employers’ awareness of the Erasmus programme was considered, but there were no conclusions on this topic.

Increasing Student Mobility – the Survey suggests that institutions are generally happy with the level of Erasmus student mobility in this subject area and see little need to expand.

While some members of the Work Group maintained that there was no problem with Erasmus student mobility in the field of Architecture at their institution and that exchange places seldom remained vacant, it was noted that the population of incoming students was more heterogeneous and this required greater flexibility of courses. It was suggested that it would be helpful to look at mobility in each institution and assess whether we ‘want’ to increase it irrespective of whether we ‘need’ to. The academic champion was recognised as crucial to the success of the Erasmus programme. The Group made several suggestions for increasing Erasmus mobility:

- Increased architectural teaching staff mobility would lead to better promotion of the Erasmus programme to students. Barriers to teaching staff mobility were thought to be finance and linguistic competence.

- The best way forward was thought to be former Erasmus students as they can explain/talk about their experiences and bring the exchange to life; many in the group thought these students were the 'best' promotional tools. One HEI representative reinforced this point and said at their institution if one student chose to go to a new destination one year then the following year there would inevitably be more students choosing to go there.
- Identifying the 'correct' person to be the Erasmus departmental co-ordinator was central. Some academic co-ordinators are 'told' to be the Erasmus coordinator by their Head of Department. For best results, the person must be enthusiastic and 'want' to do the job rather than feel grudging that they 'have' to do it.
- There should be an academic representative responsible for Erasmus in every faculty. This enables the workload to be spread across the institution. It is important that academics and administrators work together effectively as a team.

Networks – the Work Group considered that former students are crucial to the promotion of the Erasmus programme.

- Students should maintain a link with their former institution.
- One graduate said that she was very keen to promote the Erasmus programme, but needed guidance on how she could go about doing it.
- The Work Group itself could provide a useful network and participants were encouraged to make new contacts.

Attractiveness of the Programme - the Work Group saw the way the programme was 'packaged' at each institution to be an issue. They considered that:

- it was important to seek out new partners and improve the 'professional attractiveness' of the programme;
- each country can be marketed by its own particular style of Architecture;
- students should take more responsibility for choosing their country destinations.

Subject Area Work Group: Education

Linguistic Issues – the Survey suggests that increased linguistic competence was highly valued by students, and regarded as important by institutions but not by employers although a number of Case Study graduates were employed as language teachers or in international organisations. The Work Group asked how important / valuable is competence in foreign / host language?

The Group:

- Suggested that most Education students travel on Erasmus because they participate in a language course in their home institution. Students who study subjects such as Mathematics or Natural Sciences or Geography, but who do not have competence in the host language, will have problems, for example, a student from England wishing to study for a semester in Poland, with little or no competence in Polish.
- Considered that competence in host language is important, and that all institutions should provide suitable intensive language courses for visiting Erasmus students.
- Noted that most institutions facilitate students who wish to learn / study in English, but that the Erasmus programme should result in the enhancement of minority languages. Providing English language classes across Europe should not be the goal.

Students' Development – the Survey suggests that graduates, employers and institutions in Education are in agreement about the importance of the development of social skills and confidence. Employers valued particularly the personal enrichment brought about by Erasmus.

The Work Group recognised Erasmus added value as higher self-awareness, self-confidence; improved language / social / cultural skills / competencies; broad-mindedness, tolerance and courage. They saw that Erasmus could lead to a change of career path (work abroad, different field), and that obstacles became a challenge, no longer deterring students.

Academic Issues - The Work Group saw different academic calendars representing a major difficulty for mobility and for recognition. More flexibility from higher education institutions was required but sometimes it was impossible due to rigid national degree structures / requirements. The Group suggested that they must try to harmonise the academic calendar and the beginning / end of semesters in their various institutions.

Credit Recognition, Use of ECTS – the Survey indicates that ECTS is used for the vast majority of students in these subject areas. However, the 'Section D' comments by institutions frequently stressed the need for better credit recognition.

The Work Group considered the academic calendar to be closely linked to the issue of credit recognition, and to be a problem: credit recognition depended on the semester during which students travel. They felt that teaching experience and final year assessments were serious concerns: students were reluctant to travel during the final year in case their results would be adversely affected.

The Group suggested that:

- The possibility of students being assessed in the host country while on Erasmus should be explored. Erasmus students' experiences and competences, gained during their sojourn abroad, should be included in the assessments conducted by their home institution, i.e. Erasmus experience should have an added value.
- While ECTS credit transfer was not a problem, students often got their credits, but in many cases they were not recognised in the final assessment procedures.
- There was evidence that Erasmus students had to make up the lost time they spent abroad, or the curriculum content they missed. This resulted in added pressure on students, and led to a reluctance to partake in Erasmus.
- There were issues in relation to the Learning Agreements between institutions, and there needed to be a greater understanding of these agreements, as well as a willingness to implement them fully and consistently across the board with stricter monitoring.

Professional Bodies / the Role of the Ministry – the Survey suggests that the role of the government, for example the Ministry of Education, was equivalent to that of a professional body. Comments indicated that the influence of the professional bodies, interpreted in this sense, could be wide, extending to the curriculum, the structure of courses, assessment and employment.

The Work Group recognised this: they commented that: “We are all committed. We bend the rules, where possible”.

However, the Group noted that there are certain things institutions cannot do because of the level of state control in Education, pointing out that:

- Initially Education was not included in the Bologna process;
- As things stand, a teaching qualification in one country is not recognised in the others.

They suggested that:

- Institutions needed support from above, i.e. European Commission, which should ensure more flexibility in relation to curricula, teaching practice, and assessment
- They might make education more attractive by introducing some kind of European Teaching Qualification. For this to happen, the necessary political will is required.
- Co-operating in the area of Curriculum Development would be helpful, but again Government support would be important, as often the government is responsible for the curriculum. The Group asked whether the Bologna Process could help to solve this.

Employability – The Work Group's discussion of how competence in a 'foreign' language could be marketed to employers led to discussion of employability. The Group noted that the main employer for graduates in education is the school, and that there were different scenarios in various countries.

- In some countries students are assigned to schools by the state based on objective factors. Their Erasmus experience is not taken into account.
- In others, where students themselves apply for teaching posts to individual schools, competence in the language can be important, but only when viewed in the context of a student's having a 'European perspective'.
- In general, Erasmus experience, from employer's point of view, was not taken into account, the emphasis being on teaching competence and examination results.
- It was noted that national / public employment requirements do not include/understand mobility as beneficial, therefore it does not bring any

advantage, indeed sometimes is a disadvantage, due to spent time away from the home institution.

Increasing Student Mobility – the Survey suggests that there was a general appreciation that an increase in student mobility in Education would be desirable, but there were felt to be many obstacles.

The Work Group asked why Education is under-represented in the Erasmus Programme, and made several points:

- Educational systems in the various countries are not compatible.
- The area of teaching practice, its provision and assessment while students are on Erasmus, is / can be a major stumbling block.
- Lecturers in home institutions were concerned that students who study abroad do not get the same level of attention, although the idea of Erasmus is to do something equivalent but different.
- Sending students abroad for three months can be a problem because of the necessity for students to have the opportunity for teaching practice. A possible solution would be some mechanism whereby students from one institution can be supervised and assessed while on Erasmus by the faculty from the host institution.
- The age of students who travel on Erasmus varies from country to country, e.g. students from Ireland are generally 19-20 years of age, while the average of those in Sweden or France who travel is 25 years of age. This can have implications in relation to maturity, money and language.
- Money can be an obstacle in a minority of institutions, and especially in Eastern European countries. Countries with better national schemes for student support were seen to have an advantage. It was suggested that more flexibility would be welcome, for example, shorter funded excursions.

The Work Group considered that there is an urgent need for more promotion of the positive effects of mobility in general, Erasmus in particular, to the general public and businesses (public and private), implying the need for a structured central marketing campaign.

The Work Group considered how institutions who frequently neglect them, can make best 'use' of former Erasmus students. Various examples of good practice were noted:

- Institutions in some countries, e.g. Holland, Germany, use a Buddy System.
- Former Erasmus students volunteer to link up with and support incoming Erasmus students, although it can be difficult to get volunteers due to pressure of time etc
- Some institutions invite former Erasmus students back to the institution to promote the Erasmus programme among prospective students.

The Group proposed the setting up of an alumni association for Erasmus students, asking about the possibility of funding from the European Commission for this. They considered that this would help in keeping track of former students and in promoting the Erasmus programme. Employers felt that greater visibility is needed for the Erasmus programme, e.g. publicity in educational magazines, setting up of website(s) for the proceedings of various conferences such as this.

Subject Area Work Group: Mathematics & Informatics

Linguistic Competence - the Survey suggests that the most important linguistic aspect of an Erasmus exchange for students in Mathematics & Informatics is the use of English, and that this is recognised by institutions and employers. However, a considerable number of graduates welcomed the increased competence in the language of the host country and, for some, this had contributed to their employment.

The Work Group agreed that exchange students' knowledge of English is fundamental in these subjects - host institutions should not shy away from offering courses in English; and that knowing the host language is of importance.

Students' Personal Development – the Case Studies suggest that institutions and employers are more concerned about the development of students' social skills, openness, cultural awareness and confidence, than are the students themselves. The Work Group found that social skills and competencies are probably among the main arguments for Mathematics & Informatics students to go abroad, and suggested that this argument should be stressed in the recruitment of exchange students.

Academic Issues – the Case Studies show that the graduates valued the different courses and teaching styles available abroad. On the other hand, while a few institutions welcomed it, few mentioned this as significant.

The Work Group made a plea for flexibility at the home university, and noted that the Diploma Supplement might allow for increased flexibility.

- It was felt that work to promote degree programmes with a flexible component, which can be used for study abroad, or for work experience, or for individual choice of study/course/module – or a combination of these - would be desirable.
- Joint degree programmes that involve two universities in two countries should be relatively easy to set up in subjects as international as Mathematics & Informatics, each institution in charge of half the degree.

Credit Recognition, Use of ECTS – the survey indicates that ECTS is used for the majority of students in these subject areas. However, the 'Section D' comments by institutions frequently stress the need for better credit recognition.

The Work Group suggested that smoother grade translations would be helpful. It was felt that work at the national level on promoting the full ECTS concept, both 'work load' and the grade scale, would help to ease the worries of carrying out an exchange.

Professional Bodies – the Survey indicates that institutions were generally aware of professional bodies in Mathematics & Informatics, sometimes extending the term to include major employers or employers' associations. Generally institutions seemed to have good relations with professional bodies, although it would appear that they had less influence in this subject area than in others. Their main impact on the degree / diploma courses was the compulsory requirement, in many cases, for a work placement.

The Work Group found that, while professional bodies do not yet seem to play a significant role in the Erasmus context, their potential role in promoting awareness among prospective employers of the benefits deriving from stays abroad could be stressed.

Employability – several graduates in the Case Studies spoke of the competitive nature of the labour market in this subject, and the majority felt that Erasmus had helped with employment. Some employers spoke about Erasmus ‘added value’.

The Work Group found that Erasmus does add value: by enhancing maturity and social skills. The Group asked the question: “does Erasmus increase the tendency to find employment abroad?” It suggested that further study is needed here.

Increasing Student Mobility – the Survey suggests that there is a general interest in increasing Erasmus student mobility in Mathematics & Informatics.

The Work Group discussed selling Erasmus to future Erasmus students, suggesting that the value of a stay abroad should be stressed aggressively:

- for personal development;
- for employability;
- improved language skills;
- the prospect of valuable academic experience should not be ignored;

and considered that the maturing effects of a trip abroad affect positively academic performance afterwards.

The Work Group considered that academics need to be more assertive in promoting the advantages of going abroad – this refers to professors (academic co-ordinators in the departments), not just administrative programme co-ordinators. This will require incentives for the academic co-ordinators: pay, time and recognition.

The Group considered:

- That language preparation needs more attention, and that all this should start early in the study;
- A student network based on returners at the individual university would be useful;
- Degree programmes with Erasmus content can be used in ordinary recruitment.

It was noted that non-advanced university degrees in Mathematics & Informatics do not depend very much on the location of the university, and so recruitment efforts must stress other benefits; as these benefits are considerable, the main task is to bring them out in the open.

Subject Area Work Group: Natural Sciences

Linguistic Issues – the Survey suggests that linguistic competence, while of interest, is of less importance in Natural Sciences than in other subjects, although the importance of the use of English especially for research was noted by several graduates.

The Work Group considered that linguistic competence is important for the presentation and discussion of the results of the research, especially English as the language that is used in most of publications and surveys. They noted that students also need a knowledge of the language of the country to which they go and that students from English speaking countries are not prepared to study in other languages.

The Group proposed a number of solutions:

- Increasing students' awareness that their language skills can be used in their future work,
- Language policy of the home universities, for example adapting the curriculum to include intensive courses and lectures given in English from the beginning of studies,
- Teaching staff mobility through visits to foreign universities giving lectures in their own languages, which would be beneficial for staff and for future outgoing students,
- Intensive courses in the language of the country (non-English speaking),
- Arranging students' field trips and research with the involvement of incoming students,
- Recognition of factors which influence the improvement of English competence of students who stay abroad, such as the ability to read newspapers, and communication with other students.

Students' Personal Development – the Case Studies suggest that, in Natural Sciences, employers want graduates to be open to new ideas and adaptable, but students do not mention this as an outcome of their Erasmus experience. The Work Group recognised that students are focused on their academic curriculum and do not realise the importance of promoting their experience of life outside the university. The Group saw that:

- Students have experience of traveling across the world, but sometimes no experience of staying and living for several months on their own in a different country,
- Although employers find it important that the person whom they hire has an experience of being abroad, Erasmus students are often not aware of this,
- Erasmus students are not aware of their abilities to be flexible, dynamic and that they can easily get used to the new circumstances.

The Group proposed a number of solutions to overcome these problems:

- Students should draw attention to their foreign experience in their curriculum vitae. They have to market the fact that they have been abroad and that they were living on their own in a different country and society; they are open minded because they were staying abroad and had a chance to understand another culture and different people.
- Promotion of new intensive programmes combining academic education and work, internships of two or three weeks.

The Group recommended that the Erasmus programme should also be an opportunity for students from "low income" backgrounds, and suggested that higher grants would allow these students to experience the culture of the country in which they are staying, instead of taking part-time jobs to support staying abroad.

Credit Recognition, Use of ECTS – the Survey indicates that ECTS is used for the vast majority of students in these subject areas. However, the ‘Section D’ comments by institutions frequently stress the need for better credit recognition.

The Work Group saw that universities, departments and some institutions did not have enough information about ECTS credits and the Bologna Process, and that there were different ways of recognising ECTS credits at partner universities.

The Group suggested:

- Better description of courses,
- Better dissemination of the ECTS system among universities’, departments’ and institutions’ staff and employees, in three ways:
 - i. Top down – by setting up complementary national systems of credits compatible with, and embedded within, the Erasmus programme,
 - ii. Bottom up – inside the institutions where the facts will be realised by those that use ECTS directly, creating their own systems,
 - iii. Horizontal – committing the leadership and setting up a project between similar institutions, a task for academics and co-ordinators concerned with internationalisation.
- Withholding financial support for institutions, which do not recognise ECTS.

Academic Issues – the Case Studies show that graduates value the different courses and teaching styles available abroad, but while a few institutions welcomed this, few mentioned this as significant.

The Work Group considered that many degree courses are highly prescribed, requiring specific scientific knowledge that determines which courses are core and which are optional. When students go abroad they miss some of the core courses and therefore they are not qualified to get a degree, as core courses can not be taken abroad.

The Group proposed:

- Convincing governments and institutions to be more flexible with degrees,
- Negotiation with deans about which courses can be taken abroad as complementary ones,
- Accumulation of core courses in one semester to enable students to go abroad and to take optional courses abroad,
- A broader curriculum expanded by foreign study, which would allow students to have different approaches to the same problem at different universities (home and host).

Professional Bodies – the Survey indicates that most institutions were aware of professional bodies in Natural Sciences, which generally had little impact on the degree / diploma courses. There was some evidence that professional bodies affected degree grades, or made recognition of grades from abroad difficult; but some, such as the UK Institute of Physics, seemed helpful.

The Group felt that professional bodies could have some influence in the dissemination of the Bologna Process and mobility of students and university staff.

Employability – the Group saw Erasmus alumni as important. They noted that it is difficult to locate alumni and to keep in contact with them.

They proposed that there should be active databases of alumni for future outgoing students and for employers, at departments of home universities, and at National Agencies, to follow the students' career after their return from abroad.

Increasing Student Mobility – the Survey suggests that there was a general interest in increasing Erasmus student mobility in Natural Sciences.

Conclusion

The view of the Work Group was that

- Apart from many aspects of foreign experience, the possibility of being an exchange student and living abroad has a human and social dimension. This is a unique opportunity to experience another culture, customs and people.
- An attribute of foreign experience that was ignored by graduates is the competence in a foreign language, which is very often valued by employers.
- It is necessary to promote the advantages of sending students abroad to teaching staff at home and host universities, to improve the mobility of students from faculties of Natural Science.
- The whole idea of students' personal and academic development abroad can be enhanced by efficient financial support. Therefore there is a need to increase the budget of the Erasmus Programme.

Work Groups: Transversal Issues

There were five parallel Work Group sessions each covering 'transversal issues'.

Linguistic Competence – the Case Studies suggest that graduates and institutions value this highly, but employers do not appear to consider it important. The Survey suggests that although language training in the home country before study abroad gives students confidence, it is not usually provided at this stage but that language training is widely available in the host country.

The Work Groups conceded that different subject areas had different perceptions and needs, but made the following points:

- Linguistic competence was perceived as being important. Linguistic knowledge gives access to cultural experiences. It is important to be able to communicate in the local language to gain access to people/country/culture. Lack of language skills was considered to inhibit recruiting in some countries.
- Language was thought to be the key to the integration of students at another university and should be promoted to students to improve integration in the host country.
- Language was seen as a tool in every discipline, and should be taught as a tool, not as an academic subject. Language departments should be encouraged to promote language learning to students across the disciplines.
- Proficiency in another language is an asset as it opens a certain mindset, which can be important for employment.
- Learning languages takes time; students could be encouraged to take part in more language courses in the first year, concentrating more on the courses of their subjects later. Languages and Erasmus should be promoted to students from the moment they arrive at university.
- In order to promote language learning, language courses in the host country should be accredited with ECTS credits given for language and cultural courses.
- It is not possible to teach all outgoing students, and all languages, in the home institution before leaving. More important is the support of incoming students with language and cultural courses. Intercultural knowledge and understanding are important for employers and students. The focus should be put on the incoming students for language preparation, this duty being included in the bilateral agreements of each university.
- All institutions must be reminded of the Erasmus Intensive Language Courses in the less spoken languages, available to all students prior to the study period abroad. Students should be encouraged to take part in these.
- The 'buddy' system helps incoming students and could also be used to teach the local language.
- English is perceived as an international language and many countries provide courses in English to attract students.
 - i. English is seen by some subject areas (Sciences) as a lingua franca.
 - ii. Journals for this subject area may only be published in English.
 - iii. According to an employer, knowledge of English is absolutely necessary. English was identified as a 'teaching language'.
 - iv. There was some suggestion that every student should be able to work in English plus another language beside his/her own.
 - v. Students competent in English might be encouraged to go and study in Poland or the Czech Republic for example, if they know that the lessons will be taught in English. This arrangement would allow them to learn the host language outside the lecture halls.

The Curriculum, Courses Available, Academic Issues – the Case Studies show that the graduates valued the different courses and teaching styles available abroad, but while a few institutions welcomed this few mentioned this as significant. The Work Groups identified a number of problems with curricula:

- Courses are very structured;
- Multidisciplinary degrees worked well for home students, but did not work well for incoming students who have a structured study path at their home university;
- There were no possibilities to broaden the curriculum;
- It was difficult or impossible to fit the curriculum into the students' path of study at the host university;
- University staff could be afraid to send students abroad for a variety of reasons, e.g. because they might not return;
- Inadequate recognition meant that students would have to take the same subjects again at their home university;
- Courses change and it could be a problem to get them accredited by partners;
- Students who came back from abroad were sometime behind with their curriculum compared to the students who stayed at home;
- There were no courses in other languages (especially in English);
- The home curriculum was often considered better. It could be difficult to make colleagues accept that 'different' is not necessarily of a lesser quality.

In their discussions, the Groups suggested:

- One may learn more elsewhere as the curriculum is different. If students have the opportunity to take courses not offered at their home institution then they would benefit from increased knowledge in their subject area. Institutions need to find ways of giving credit for other courses. What would be the point of sending students elsewhere to follow the same curriculum?
- More flexibility in the curriculum was seen as crucial. Broadening the curriculum by offering courses from other faculties or in different languages, and multidisciplinary courses were / would be welcome. However, it was noted that flexibility does not come about automatically, and examination requirements, for example at the end of a professional degree programme, would be important.
- A reorganisation of courses within curriculum, and the introduction of short, intensive courses, which are connected with field trips, would be helpful.
- Teaching staff mobility should support student mobility. It was suggested that staff mobility could lead to student mobility. It was stated that co-operative/flexible teaching staff led to easier exchanges.
- The structure of staff mobility was questioned. It was noted that teaching staff mobility should be carefully planned so that lectures/conferences given by visiting staff are meaningfully incorporated/integrated into the host institution programme in order to maximise student attendance.

Learning Agreements, Credit Recognition - Problems with the learning agreement and credit recognition were discussed by the Work Groups:

- The learning agreement was acknowledged to be important.
- Too many students see Learning Agreements as a problem. When students go abroad, they often find that they are unable to follow courses selected prior to their departure.
 - i. This problem was attributed to unsuitable courses being selected by the students, and inadequate or outdated information about courses on university websites.
 - ii. Website pages should be better constructed to facilitate choice of areas of study and give better information about host institutions.

- Academic recognition was a problem for many institutions.
- A strict adherence to the Learning Agreement would solve the problems of recognition and ECTS credits. It must be an institutional responsibility to handle recognition, including learning agreements, naming a person or body to ensure recognition. It should not be done by individual professors.
- Learning agreements should be filled in with help of the Academic Co-ordinator, developed by the student with assistance of the tutor to advise about the curriculum. If, on arrival, no course was possible, then the student should contact again the home academic co-ordinator to change the agreement.
- Links with fewer partner universities, but good ones, who recognise system of transferring credits (ECTS) was recommended.

Employability and Employment – the Case Studies suggest that many employers are unaware of the Erasmus programme although interested in the characteristics that an Erasmus experience imparts. Problems raised by Work Groups included:

- Employers are often not interested in ex-Erasmus students: they think that the students do not have skills which are adequate for the local market – “from the point of view of employer, staying abroad is a waste of time”.
- When employers are aware of the advantages of hiring students or ex-students with foreign study experience, they often do not have any information about Erasmus students.
- A failure of the home and host universities to train people to face real life and to find a job.

The Work Groups considered that

- If the Erasmus idea could be ‘sold’ to companies, companies would willingly support the programme, financially and by employing Erasmus students, so helping the programme to flourish – a ‘win-win’ situation.
- There is an Erasmus value-added, which contributes to the future employee’s profile and needs to be brought to the employers’ attention. The Erasmus experience impacts on:
 - i. Personal development - they are more mature and have broader horizons after studying abroad;
 - ii. Cultural awareness - it was universally recognised that the Erasmus programme contributed to personal development including openness and tolerance towards other cultures
 - iii. Linguistic skills;
 - iv. Distinctiveness - the ‘Erasmus factor’.
- The ‘Erasmus factor’ could be the determining factor when several students with the same qualification go for the same job. In a competitive market an international outlook is absolutely necessary, equating to Erasmus study abroad.
- Students should be encouraged to ‘market’ the ‘Erasmus factor’ by explaining to employers why it makes them different.

The Work Groups considered promotion of the Erasmus programme with employers, in companies and other institutions outside the educational institutions, feeling that people working for/in Erasmus over-estimated the knowledge of Erasmus among people in the 'outside world'.

- The dissemination of Erasmus information should reach employers, and the programme should be promoted in industrial publications as well as in educational supplements, with more articles in specialised journals.
- Erasmus students should be encouraged to draw to their employers' attention the benefits of the programme in their CVs and interviews.
- The European Union might be able to help by facilitating internship programmes in various institutions and companies.
- The idea should be disseminated that it is of benefit to the company to have ex-Erasmus students, and information should be disseminated by the host university about Erasmus students' ability to participate in international firms' projects.

The Value of Incoming, and Former Erasmus Students – the Survey shows that almost all institutions welcomed incoming Erasmus students. Many indicated that they made use of incoming Erasmus students and returning Erasmus students in a variety of ways. However, there was wide variation between institutions in all subjects and from all countries in the extent to which they saw Erasmus students as a resource. Several institutions / departments spoke of the returning Erasmus students enriching the institution in a variety of ways:

- "Either by confirming what we do or by providing insightful criticism"; "returning students feedback to the institution . . . they are more critical";
- Mobility programmes support the process of internationalisation;
- Using Erasmus mobility to improve the academic level of the good students;
- Mentoring / tutoring incoming students;
- Erasmus mobility strengthens co-operation with partners;
- Different working methods from incoming students were welcome.

The Work Groups suggested that the reintegration of Erasmus students after they return to the home institution is an issue:

- The group should not only to be used for information and promotion but also needs help after return,
- Involvement of students who have been abroad in promoting the possibilities of studying abroad was invaluable.

Institutional Support for Erasmus Mobility – the Survey is confusing: the quantitative replies in 'Section C' suggest that on the whole institutions are supportive of academic programme directors, but the comments in 'Section D' do not support this and often plead for more or better support.

The Groups considered the role and work of the academic co-ordinator.

- It is absolutely necessary that this person should be supported, by receiving resources (more staff necessary due to the Bologna Process), or by a reduction of teaching hours for the academic co-ordinator, and this work should be relevant for promotion.
- International policies mean extra work, even more with the implementation of the Bologna Process. The workload for the academic co-ordinator with teaching, research and administration is growing. Departmental support to free the academic co-ordinator of duties is necessary.

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

- More support from partner universities would be welcomed. E-mails are often not answered or take too long.
- Formal recognition of the work of individual co-ordinators is necessary. External funding could help.
- The change of personnel is viewed as a problem: there needs to be continuity of the Erasmus co-ordinator. Continuity ensures the programme runs smoothly. Constant changes have led to disruption at some institutions.
- Efforts at raising awareness should be directed at academic staff at the home university, referring to both sending students, and receiving students.
- Both the personal benefits for the students and the formal requirement of Learning Agreements should be addressed in working with academic staff.
- Ways to increase the interest of academic staff in Erasmus mobility were suggested:
 - i. Dissemination of the advantages of sending students abroad among teaching staff by the departmental coordinators;
 - ii. Arranging 'open days' for students to show staff the evidence of mobility of students in Europe, including presentations by ex-Erasmus students;
 - iii. Creation of an institutional policy that will motivate students to go abroad;
 - iv. Coordination of the promotion of mobility, "it should be a part of everyday life not something special", "it is natural to be mobile";
 - v. Improvement of administrative procedure, creating a partnership of administrative bodies and educational staff working well together.

Academic Champion - The role of the academic champion was seen as crucial, and an extension of that of the Erasmus academic co-ordinator.

- The academic champion can only thrive when supported at all levels in the institution.
- Academic Champions need more recognition and more support.
- This person should receive recognition for their hard work whether this is a reduction in their normal teaching hours to compensate for the increased workload, or simply a word of thanks now and again.

The Groups asked how do we locate the academic champion? And how do we keep him or her? It was noted that being the Erasmus co-ordinator often results in an increased workload and the co-ordinators' other responsibilities were frequently not reduced to compensate for this. This was outlined as a problem in locating and safeguarding the academic champion. The Group felt that co-ordinators should receive more recognition for their work. The need for more resources was outlined as important.

Erasmus Alumni – the Survey shows that there is a big gap in information about Erasmus students after they have graduated.

All Work Groups shared concern at this situation, admitting that it is difficult to monitor students' career after they graduate, although it seemed that some countries and institutions did not share this concern. However in many countries life long learning is becoming widespread and continual professional development is the reality in many fields. It was noted that institutions need to know more about where the graduates work, which could imply a network for Europe or for the whole world. The Work Groups considered that:

- Former Erasmus students were identified as the greatest resource of the Erasmus programme. They could be a valuable factor in increasing student mobility. They are the best resources to entice others, disseminate and publicise the advantages of the Erasmus experience. Keeping in touch with Erasmus alumni was seen as important.

- The problem of locating alumni was addressed. There is a need to compile a list of past students. As universities make databases of graduates generally, perhaps an Erasmus network could develop, with possible use of marketing future exchange programmes.
- In some countries, e.g. UK, institutions have to provide the first destinations of all their graduates. Their Erasmus students should therefore be easy to track down.
- A link between Erasmus and employers was seen as having potential for the promotion for the programme.
- An alumni database was thought to be an important tool in life long learning, as it would encourage graduates to remain in contact with their former institution and perhaps even return to take refresher courses.
- The development of an effective alumni database at every institution was identified as very important, it could be a tool for life long learning.
- The alumni database being developed within the framework of Erasmus Mundus Action 4 was thought to be a possible model on which to base this.
- There are several implications for a database as far as setting up, financing, updating and whose responsibility it would be: for example, should it be at faculty level, institution level, country level or European wide?
- The database must be interactive, updated regularly and monitored by a designated member of staff. Problems with developing such a database were outlined as:
 - i. Financial – where will the funding come from?
 - ii. Ownership – where will the database be held? At faculty or institution level?
 - iii. Staffing – who will manage the database?
- It was proposed that a website should be set up for this project. One possible model suggested was on the lines of 'Friends Reunited'.
- In addition to alumni organisations, student clubs based on returnees would be helpful.

Finance – in the Case Studies, few students speak about finance as an obstacle to mobility (with the exception of Natural Sciences). However, in the questionnaire responses, student finance is frequently cited by institutions as the major obstacle. The Work Groups considered that finance was a cause of low student mobility and probably of greater importance than revealed by the Survey. It was seen as a major problem for students from Eastern European countries, and a matter for regret that it often happens that students have to work to afford to stay abroad.

It was felt that additional financial support would increase mobility. This funding could be spent on students, or on teacher exchanges, or on co-ordinators' incentives. The Groups suggested that this required an increase in EU expenditure, and wondered whether joining forces might make other EU funding available. They recognised that there is pressure on the increased Erasmus programme budget to provide more money for the promotion of the programme, payment for programme coordinators and student grants. It was suggested that some of these expenses might be partly paid by companies, which are interested in Erasmus students' internships.

Increasing Student Mobility – the Survey suggests that overall there is an interest in increasing Erasmus student mobility. In any case, the Erasmus programme plans to increase student mobility by a factor of three over the next six years.

The main causes of low mobility identified by the Work Groups were:

- Selection - some countries/institution have particular criteria. At some institutions there is the impression amongst the students that Erasmus is only for the elite students. Some students therefore never consider applying. This misconception needs to be changed.
- Approval - individual faculties/tutors may prevent or discourage students from going on Erasmus. Academics have a great deal of power when it comes to deciding who will go abroad; if they do not approve a student's application, then the application will not even reach the international office for consideration. Some academics were reluctant to send students abroad fearing that they might fail.
- Finance - there is a discrepancy between countries and institutions in the way students may get extra funding; Northern Europe is usually perceived as an expensive destination.
- Duration - the minimum requirement of three months abroad is too long for some countries in some areas of study and could cause difficulties, as it is a substantial amount of time for students on short courses. More flexibility in the duration of the Erasmus stay was called for by some.
- In addition, especially in the UK, students' lack of linguistic competence and confidence is often blamed for their negative response to mobility. However, it was suggested that lectures given primarily in English and in some other languages would help overcome existing obstacles.

The Work Groups considered that, in order to stimulate student mobility help must be expected from networks, National Agencies, governments, employers and professional bodies, all of whom can testify to and reinforce the advantages of the Erasmus experience.

It was considered that promotion of the programme would be needed to increase visibility of the programme. This would mean the need for a coordinated professional marketing campaign. The Groups recognised that people do not know about Erasmus mobility: evidenced by weak responses from employers due to inadequate knowledge of what Erasmus is, implying that people working for or in Erasmus over-estimate the external knowledge of the programme.

- These other problems could be solved by coordinated promotion of the 'Erasmus brand', as a trademark for companies, administrative institutions and universities. It was felt that the value of 'Erasmus' is sizeable. The programme name must not be changed.
- Good examples, such as case studies, must be marketed. One suggestion was to include in every call for Professorship, 'international experience will be appreciated!'
- Teacher mobility and student mobility should go hand in hand, promoted together, and the formal requirements on the teacher mobility programmes made light.
- The involvement of professional bodies and institutions (National Agencies) should be sought to promote the mobility of students in Europe.
- The best promoters of 'Erasmus' will be students and academic champions.
- 'Erasmus' could be promoted with student unions at institutions.
- Lobbying for resources in the local community could be a productive course.

The Case Study Presentations

Presentations to the conference by four former Erasmus students and four employers, representing the four subject areas, brought the Erasmus experience and its value to life.

The graduates exemplified points made in Case Studies:

- Erasmus study abroad reinforces understanding of what had been learnt at home, in a different culture.
- They put what had been learnt abroad into use professionally.
- The motivation of recognition by peers in other countries.
- The personal and professional benefits of broadening horizons.
- The benefit of operating in a rich international environment.
- Erasmus leads to a realisation of the importance of mobility.
- The importance of international contacts and friendships.

The employers were mostly with firms that had factories, offices or programmes in many different countries requiring multinational co-operation. Again, they reinforced messages in the Case Studies, bringing them into focus.

They sought in employees:

- Broadness, open-mindedness, flexibility, adaptability, maturity
- The ability to bring new ideas, and to adapt rapidly to new ideas
- Willingness to experiment
- An attitude of questioning.

They stressed the importance of having lived and worked in another country, regardless of which foreign country it might be, citing:

- Tolerance of other cultures and ways of thinking,
- Different approaches to, and ways of solving problems
- Language skills not important.

They suggested that employers needed to be made more aware of the 'Erasmus' brand.

Conclusions

The aims of the project are to identify and disseminate good practice in subject areas with relatively low student mobility considering their importance, and to identify obstacles to mobility and suggest ways of overcoming them.

- Architecture is a genuinely international subject requiring an international experience.
- Education is critical to shaping future generations of school pupils in the European Dimension.
- Mathematics & Informatics is universal but different; an Erasmus experience can transform students from technicians to effective creative employees.
- Natural Sciences needs fresh insights and the establishment of networks for the future.

The Survey, Case Studies and Conference have addressed these aims broadly and in depth. In addition to these issues, the project has identified a number of other questions that had not been anticipated.

- Lack of communication between institutions and graduates.
- Difficulty in finding graduates: e.g. in Natural Sciences and Mathematics & Informatics; frequently the only Erasmus graduates that an institution could contact were still working or studying within the university.
- Difficulty in involving employers, persuading them to provide statements: some refused to provide statements, many employer statements were superficial or of little help and it was seldom evident that they were aware of Erasmus.
- The haphazard way by which students may or may not find out about the Erasmus programme – inconsistent methods of promotion.
- A basic ignorance of what Erasmus can provide, for example in linguistic preparation, not only in the outside world but also within an institution.
- The novelty of colleagues from a range of countries and institutions and employers meeting to discuss issues.
- Data which was assumed to be easily available proved not to be: the underlying data proved to be difficult to obtain, inconsistent, hard to interpret and unreliable.
- There was widespread ignorance of professional bodies and other organisations; institutions did not in most cases have relations with potentially relevant organisations, who appeared often not to be interested in Erasmus.

The Post-Conference Evaluation

The post-conference evaluation shows:

- One day was too short for all the material, activities and discussions that were involved in the conference.
- Participants were relieved to see that their problems, and reasons for choices in dealing with them, were shared by others in all disciplines represented.
- Participants were pleased to pick up new ideas to take back home.
- Participants were interested in the statistics of mobility, although many had doubts about their accuracy.. It seemed however that these statistics were not widely available in such a broad context, and there is variation in what is measured in different subjects and countries.
- The presentations from graduates and employers had a vibrancy of communication that cannot be replicated in the prose descriptions.
- Participants found that the conference focussed their minds on issues to emphasise when promoting the programme.
- People would like further meetings like this because of the focus, issues and international perspectives.

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

- Part of the success of the conference is that it involved such a wide cross section: employers, students, National Agencies, people from government, institutional administrators and academics. Getting so many, and such a wide variety of stakeholders together seemed to be unique and was valuable.
- The report should be disseminated widely.

Obstacles to Mobility

- Academic:
 - The curriculum was often seen as inflexible, with a lack of opportunities for students to broaden their study, although this broadening was perceived by students and institutions as highly desirable;
 - Selection criteria were seen as too stringent;
 - There were many doubts about credit recognition and the effectiveness of the implementation of ECTS.
- Language:
 - Linguistic competence was seen as important, but arrangements for, or provision of, language training is not sufficient, not always well known, not appropriate, or not an attractive option academically.
- Finance:
 - Financial support was seen as inadequate, in particular for students from disadvantaged backgrounds.
- Information:
 - The provision of information about Erasmus, the opportunities it provides and the benefits of mobility appeared all too often not readily available for students, or potential students.

Best Practice

- Language:
 - Provision of appropriate language teaching in the home institution for students in all disciplines
 - Promotion of Erasmus Intensive Language Courses
 - Provision of language training in the host country for incoming students.
- Use of incoming and returning Erasmus students:
 - As 'buddies' / mentors for future Erasmus students
 - As promoters of the programme within the institution, in schools, to employers
 - As input to the department's evaluation of its performance / offerings.
- Central administration:
 - Good and close relations with the academic departments
 - Recognition of the importance, and work involved in Erasmus
 - Speedy well-publicised arrangements for dealing with centralised issues concerning partners, such as approving new arrangements.
- Use of ICT:
 - Friendly, complete, up to date and well publicised web sites with relevant academic and practical data for all students, including incoming students
 - Student record systems that include information about Erasmus
 - Databases of partners and partnerships.
- Academic Champions:
 - Encouragement and support for Erasmus academic departmental co-ordinators;
 - Recognition of the role and work of the academic champion;
 - Continuity of personnel in these key roles.

Increasing Mobility – it was acknowledged that increasing mobility is important in all the subject areas, in its own right and within the Bologna Process.

- Institutional staff need to be motivated.
- The programme needs to be better publicised, within schools (pre-University) and within higher education institutions.
- Obstacles need to be overcome.
- 'Fun' should not be neglected; it is a major incentive
- Finance – greater funding would be helpful, to be spent:
 - on students,
 - on teacher exchanges,
 - on co-ordinators' expenses,
 - for the development of web sites and databases,
 - on promotion.

Professional Bodies – It was surprising and puzzling that these do not appear to feature in university policy or curriculum design to any great extent. More work needs to be undertaken on the whole issue of professional accreditation of academic qualifications in all the participating countries. It was not clear from the institutional and departmental responses what the process for professional recognition entailed. This suggests that there may be a need for a more proactive relationship between universities and professional bodies designed to enhance awareness of the importance of the Erasmus experience.

Implications – There are implications for institutions: these relate to students; to institutions' procedures and arrangements, their relations with external organisations including employers and professional bodies; and the higher education sector. There are implications for National Agencies in relation to the higher education sector, the Commission and government.

- Promotion of Erasmus is needed within the higher education sector: to heads of institution – institutional 'buy-in'.
- Use of ICT: a database of mobility is needed; web sites need to be more friendly, up to date, complete and better publicised.
- Erasmus alumni: institutions' arrangements for keeping in touch with their former Erasmus students appeared to be patchy at best, and institutions should address this.
- Involvement of government: some of the questions addressed by this Project, and recommendations in this report, are likely to need the involvement of governments.

Recommendations

- There is a case for doing more to bring the key stakeholders together in meetings, for something which is fundamental to the future of Europe.
- Promotion of the 'Erasmus brand':
 - All parties should be encouraged to find and use Erasmus students and graduates to promote the programme;
 - Graduates should be encouraged to mention Erasmus in their CVs;
 - The added-value that Erasmus creates, the 'Erasmus factor', should be promoted to employers;
 - The support of professional bodies should be sought to promote mobility.
- It is argued that the Erasmus experience equips graduates far better for employment, but institutions do not gather data that supports this and employers of Erasmus graduates are hard to find – this is a challenge.
- There is a need for better collection, presentation and dissemination of statistics concerning mobility within institutions, as well as in the higher education sectors and across the programme.
- There should be wider provision of, and better publicised, language courses in the home institution, taught as a tool across all disciplines. Language courses in the host country should be available with ECTS credits.
- Greater flexibility should be provided within the curriculum to facilitate mobility.
- Institutions should address issues of academic recognition, the management of Learning Agreements and the implementation of ECTS.
- Short intensive courses in host countries should be more widely available.
- Institutions should encourage the role and work of the academic champion.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I Erasmus Mobility Statistics

- 1 The statistics in the following tables are intended to give a picture of Erasmus student mobility in the twelve participating countries and the four subject areas and in the Erasmus programme as a whole.
- 2 The data on Erasmus student mobility from 1998 onwards, and of Erasmus teaching staff mobility, comes from the reports on the Erasmus mobility of each individual Erasmus student and teacher provided annually by the National Agencies and collected into a database by the UK Socrates-Erasmus Council. The National Agencies collect the details of individual Erasmus mobilities from higher education institutions or from individual students, by a variety of methods.
- 3 There can be slight inconsistencies in statistics, as data provided is not always complete or occasionally is amended to correct errors or reflect changes in circumstances; and the number of Erasmus students can be imprecise as a small number go to two or even three different countries and so inflate the figures slightly.
- 4 It is not possible to provide an accurate estimate of the extent of take-up of Erasmus mobility in all subjects, for a variety of reasons:
 - Subject definitions are inconsistent, between Erasmus subject codes, Eurostat subjects, and the higher education sector statistics of particular countries.
 - Each Erasmus student record includes a single subject code. This cannot always reflect accurately the subject, course or department of study in both the home and the host institution.
 - Different countries' systems count part-time students differently.

Table I1a: Total Erasmus student numbers, 1987 – 2003

- By 2002 there had been one million Erasmus students.
- The annual rate of growth, which was only three percent in 2000, is now increasing. Nevertheless, this trend will need a significant further and continuing increase to meet the new programme targets.

Table I1b: Numbers of Erasmus students in each subject area, 1997 – 2003, in the whole programme

- Erasmus student mobility is dominated by Business Studies and Management Science, and Languages, Social Sciences and Engineering.
- The share of the total Erasmus student mobility in the subject areas Education and Natural Sciences is falling.

Tables I2a/b: Numbers of inward and outward Erasmus students for the twelve participating countries, in the four subject areas, for the two most recent years.

- There is imbalance, particularly marked for example for UK, the newly acceded countries and Sweden in all subjects.
- There are some weaknesses in outward mobility as a percentage of the country's total Erasmus mobility, for example Ireland and the UK in Architecture; France, Ireland and Romania in Education; Denmark, the Netherlands and UK in Mathematics & Informatics; Denmark, the Netherlands and Slovenia in Natural Sciences.
- The share in Erasmus student mobility of the twelve countries participating in the project seems to be falling in Education, but rising in Mathematics & Informatics.

Tables I3a and I3b: Numbers of Erasmus students using ECTS, in the twelve participating countries and four subject areas, in 2002/2003 and 2003/2004

- The use of ECTS is increasing, significant in the context of the Bologna Process.
- Some countries seem to be out of line in reporting the use of ECTS for outward student mobility in some subjects, for example from Austria and Greece in Architecture.

Tables I4: Numbers of Erasmus students taught in the language of the host country, by subject area, 2002/2003 and 2003/2004

- The amount of teaching in the host language is falling, in all subjects and especially in Education and in Mathematics & Informatics.

Tables I5: Erasmus teaching staff mobility, 2002/2003 and 2003/2004

- There are significant differences between student and teaching staff mobility in the shares of the different subject areas, although Languages, Engineering and Business Administration are the three largest. For example, Education accounts for eight percent of teaching staff mobility, Mathematics & Informatics and Natural Sciences are also more strongly represented in teaching staff mobility.
- There is significantly less imbalance, in individual countries and in subject areas.
- There are more outgoing than incoming teachers for the twelve participating countries; whereas for student mobility, there are more incoming than outgoing.
- There are some examples of apparently consistent under-representation: for example from Romania in Education; from Ireland and Denmark in Mathematics & Informatics; from Denmark and Netherlands in Natural Sciences.

Table I1a

Total of all Erasmus Student Mobility from 1987 to 2003

Year	Number of Participating Countries	Number of students (rounded to nearest 500)	Cumulative total number of students (rounded)	Annual rate of growth (where participating countries are stable)
1987/1988	12	3,000	3,000	
1988/1989	12	10,000	13,000	233.3%
1989/1990	12	19,500	32,500	95.0%
1990/1991	12	28,000	60,500	43.6%
1991/1992	12	36,500	97,000	30.4%
1992/1993	19	51,500	148,500	
1993/1994	19	62,500	211,000	21.4%
1994/1995	19	73,500	284,500	17.6%
1995/1996	19	84,500	369,000	15.0%
1996/1997 *	18	80,000	449,000	
1997/1998	18	86,000	535,000	7.5%
1998/1999	24	97,500	632,500	
1999/2000	29	107,500	740,000	
2000/2001	29	111,000	851,000	3.3%
2001/2002	30	115,500	966,500	
2002/2003	30	124,000	1,090,500	7.4%
2003/2004 **	30	135,500	1,226,000	9.3%

* 1996/1997 was a transitional year leading in to full implementation of Erasmus in the Socrates programme

** data for 2003/2004 is provisional at the time of publication

Participating Countries

1987	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, the United Kingdom
1992	Austria, Finland, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland
1996	{Switzerland left the programme}
1998	Cyprus, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia
1999	Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania
2000	Malta {Cyprus left the programme}
2001	Cyprus rejoined the programme
2004	Turkey joined the programme

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

Table 11b

Numbers of Erasmus Students by Subject Area, 1997 to 2003

Erasmus student numbers rounded to the nearest 50

Subject	1997/1998		1998/1999		1999/2000		2000/2001		2001/2002		2002/2003		2003/2004*	
	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%
Agricultural Sciences	1500	1.7	1750	1.8	2050	1.9	2200	2.0	2450	2.1	2500	2.0	2750	2.0
Architecture, Urban and Regional Planning	2650	3.1	3400	3.5	3800	3.5	4100	3.7	4200	3.6	4450	3.6	4850	3.6
Art and Design	3250	3.8	3800	3.9	4550	4.2	4700	4.3	5100	4.4	5650	4.6	6150	4.5
Business Studies and Management Sciences	20800	24.0	20350	20.9	22200	20.6	23100	20.9	24650	21.3	26500	21.4	29250	21.6
Education, Teacher Training	3200	3.7	3800	3.9	3800	3.5	4150	3.8	4250	3.7	4250	3.4	4300	3.2
Engineering, Technology	8000	9.2	9550	9.8	10700	9.9	10900	9.9	11650	10.1	13000	10.5	14250	10.5
Geography, Geology	1200	1.4	1650	1.7	1750	1.6	1800	1.6	2050	1.8	2200	1.8	2350	1.7
Humanities	3100	3.6	3650	3.7	4100	3.8	4400	4.0	4250	3.7	4700	3.8	5200	3.8
Languages and Philological Sciences	16350	18.9	17900	18.4	19200	17.8	19200	17.4	19400	16.8	20200	16.3	21100	15.6
Law	6950	8.0	7900	8.1	8600	8.0	8700	7.9	8750	7.6	8800	7.1	9600	7.1
Mathematics, Informatics	1900	2.2	2250	2.3	2650	2.5	2700	2.4	2850	2.5	3450	2.8	4200	3.1
Medical Sciences	3600	4.2	4500	4.6	5200	4.8	5250	4.8	5700	4.9	6250	5.0	7100	5.2
Natural Sciences	3300	3.8	4250	4.4	4750	4.4	4500	4.1	4600	4.0	4850	3.9	5100	3.8
Social Sciences	8650	10.0	10000	10.3	11050	10.3	11200	10.1	11800	10.2	12700	10.2	14250	10.5
Communication and Information Sciences	1350	1.6	1800	1.8	2100	2.0	2350	2.1	2700	2.3	3150	2.5	3600	2.7
Other Areas of Study	800	0.9	900	0.9	1100	1.0	1150	1.0	1150	1.0	1300	1.0	1500	1.1
Total	86600		97450		107600		110400		115550		123950		135550	

* 2003/2004 data is provisional at the time of going to press

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

Table 12a
Numbers of Erasmus Students for the Twelve Countries Participating in the Project, 2002/2003

Country	Total number of Erasmus students for country		Architecture				Education				Mathematics & informatics				Natural Sciences			
	Outward	Inward	Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward Number	Inward		Outward		Inward				
	Number	Number	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%			
Austria	3312	2834	149	4.5	120	4.2	263	7.9	225	7.9	121	3.7	74	2.6	107	3.2	83	2.9
Denmark	1847	2883	45	2.4	127	4.4	104	5.6	122	4.2	22	1.2	111	3.9	35	1.9	147	5.1
France	19396	18825	436	2.2	620	3.3	367	1.9	452	2.4	551	2.8	426	2.3	769	4.0	728	3.9
Germany	18494	16113	768	4.2	554	3.4	555	3.0	308	1.9	573	3.1	485	3.0	760	4.1	592	3.7
Greece	2115	1545	126	6.0	67	4.3	71	3.4	86	5.6	78	3.7	76	4.9	94	4.4	76	4.9
Ireland	1627	3472	18	1.1	23	0.7	12	0.7	87	2.5	53	3.3	160	4.6	50	3.1	111	3.2
Netherlands	4241	6349	118	2.8	277	4.4	429	10.1	321	5.1	60	1.4	100	1.6	82	1.9	234	3.7
Poland	5419	994	247	4.6	21	2.1	112	2.1	34	3.4	168	3.1	20	2.0	352	6.5	26	2.6
Romania	2701	355	67	2.5	7	2.0	30	1.1	12	3.4	141	5.2	5	1.4	233	8.6	13	3.7
Slovenia	422	129	25	5.9	7	5.4	8	1.9	10	7.8	14	3.3	7	5.4	3	0.7	4	3.1
Sweden	2656	5320	64	2.4	159	3.0	65	2.4	301	5.7	82	3.1	205	3.9	105	4.0	303	5.7
United Kingdom	7947	16987	114	1.4	305	1.8	193	2.4	637	3.7	97	1.2	639	3.8	241	3.0	899	5.3
Total	70177	75806	2177	3.1	2287	3.0	2209	3.1	2595	3.4	1960	2.8	2308	3.0	2831	4.0	3216	4.2
Numbers of Erasmus students for the whole programme																		
30 countries	123897	123897	4464	3.6	4464	3.6	4244	3.4	4244	3.4	3442	2.8	3442	2.8	4842	3.9	4842	3.9

Note The whole programme is balanced: the total number of outward students is the same as the total number of inward students for each subject area. Each country is imbalanced, however, to a degree in every subject, some more than others. The twelve participating countries as a group receive more Erasmus students than they send, in total and in each of the four subject areas.

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

Table I2b
Numbers of Erasmus Students for the twelve countries participating in the project, 2003/2004

** Provisional

Country	Total No. of Erasmus Students for Country		Architecture				Education				Mathematics & Informatics				Natural Science			
	Outward	Inward	Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward	
	Number	Number	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Austria	3727	3159	129	3.5	159	5.0	260	7.0	202	6.4	146	3.9	78	2.5	143	3.8	65	2.1
Denmark	1686	3393	54	3.2	171	5.0	74	4.4	108	3.2	20	1.2	153	4.5	33	2.0	204	6.0
France	21008	20256	519	2.5	606	3.0	320	1.5	434	2.1	570	2.7	578	2.9	846	4.0	808	4.0
Germany	20710	16862	762	3.7	592	3.5	535	2.6	346	2.1	803	3.9	501	3.0	882	4.3	623	3.7
Greece	2385	1593	149	6.2	55	3.5	81	3.4	84	5.3	104	4.4	63	4.0	87	3.6	81	5.1
Ireland	1705	3584	30	1.8	34	0.9	24	1.4	96	2.7	45	2.6	174	4.9	62	3.6	100	2.8
Netherlands	4389	6724	109	2.5	266	4.0	354	8.1	303	4.5	55	1.3	113	1.7	51	1.2	261	3.9
Poland	6276	1456	321	5.1	28	1.9	126	2.0	30	2.1	301	4.8	19	1.3	361	5.8	27	1.9
Romania	3005	536	64	2.1	10	1.9	47	1.6	34	6.3	176	5.9	8	1.5	206	6.9	20	3.7
Slovenia	546	201	24	4.4	14	7.0	17	3.1	7	3.5	3	0.5	9	4.5	2	0.4	0	0.0
Sweden	2667	6079	64	2.4	174	2.9	69	2.6	303	5.0	46	1.7	333	5.5	84	3.1	374	6.2
United Kingdom	7548	16619	97	1.3	280	1.7	163	2.2	554	3.3	92	1.2	676	4.1	220	2.9	878	5.3
Total	75652	80462	2322	3.1	2389	3.0	2070	2.7	2501	3.1	2361	3.1	2705	3.4	2977	3.9	3441	4.3
Number of Erasmus students for the whole programme																		
Thirty Countries	135446	135446	4852	3.6	4850	3.6	4275	3.2	4275	3.2	4195	3.1	4195	3.1	5117	3.8	5117	3.8

Note: The whole programme is balanced: the total number of outward students is the same as the total number of inward students for each subject area
 Each country is imbalanced, however, to a degree in every subject, some more than others.
 The twelve participating countries as a group receive more Erasmus students than they send, in total and in each of the four subject areas

Table I3a

Numbers of Erasmus Students using ECTS – 2002/2003

Country	Total for country				Architecture				Education				Mathematics & Informatics				Natural Sciences			
	Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward	
	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%
Austria	1,347	40.7	2,056	72.5	70	47.0	73	60.8	202	76.8	151	67.1%	84	69.4	58	78.4	51	47.7	59	71.1
Denmark	1,690	91.5	2,291	79.5	15	33.3	92	72.4	89	85.6	97	79.5%	22	100.0	95	85.6	35	100.0	111	75.5
France	16,794	86.6	12,590	66.9	269	61.7	378	61.0	203	55.3	345	76.3%	398	72.2	274	64.3	600	78.0	468	64.3
Germany	12,466	67.4	11,926	74.0	461	60.0	409	73.8	455	82.0	226	73.4%	428	74.7	324	66.8	429	56.4	429	72.5
Greece	795	37.6	1,075	69.6	46	36.5	30	44.8	33	46.5	60	69.8%	13	16.7	69	90.8	29	30.9	42	55.3
Ireland	1,049	64.5	2,869	82.6	18	100.0	17	73.9	12	100.0	68	78.2%	8	15.1	142	88.8	23	46.0	83	74.8
Netherlands	4,241	100.0	4,909	77.3	118	100.0	210	75.8	429	100.0	256	79.8%	60	100.0	71	71.0	82	100.0	182	77.8
Poland	4,457	82.2	724	72.8	207	83.8	16	76.2	73	65.2	22	64.7%	133	79.2	18	90.0	265	75.3	20	76.9
Romania	2,329	86.2	218	61.4	58	86.6	2	28.6	28	93.3	8	66.7%	138	97.9	2	40.0	217	93.1	9	69.2
Slovenia	314	74.4	89	69.0	18	72.0	4	57.1	5	62.5	8	80.0%	14	100.0	7	100.0	2	66.7	1	25.0
Sweden	2,326	87.6	4,227	79.5	53	82.8	112	70.4	60	92.3	261	86.7%	79	96.3	166	81.0	86	81.9	219	72.3
United Kingdom	4,519	56.8	13,149	77.4	95	83.3	202	66.2	139	72.0	561	88.1%	41	42.3	478	74.8	106	44.0	639	71.1
Total	52,327	74.6	56,123	74.0	1,428	65.6	1,545	67.6	1,728	78.2	2,063	79.5%	1,418	72.3	1,704	73.8	1,925	68.0	2,262	70.3
Whole Programme	90,224	72.8	90,224	72.8	2,958	66.3	2,958	66.3	3,260	76.8	3,260	76.8%	2,543	73.9	2,543	73.9	3,418	70.6	3,418	70.6

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

Table I3b

Numbers of Erasmus Students using ECTS, 2003/2004

** Provisional

Country	Total for country				Architecture				Education				Mathematics and Informatics				Natural Sciences			
	Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward	
	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%	ECTS	%
Austria	1871	50.2	2463	78.0	62	48.1	122	76.7	206	79.2	139	68.6	81	55.5	72	92.3	86	60.1	48	73.8
Denmark	1608	95.4	2681	79.0	33	61.1	128	74.9	72	97.3	85	78.7	20	100.0	128	83.7	33	100.0	152	74.5
France	18657	88.8	14277	70.5	404	77.8	352	58.1	182	56.9	350	80.6	501	87.9	425	73.5	665	78.6	587	72.3
Germany	14827	71.6	12921	76.7	503	66.0	418	70.6	436	81.5	286	82.7	615	76.6	375	74.9	577	65.4	456	72.3
Greece	1068	44.8	1122	70.4	53	35.6	30	54.5	45	55.6	66	78.6	32	30.8	55	87.3	27	31.0	56	69.1
Ireland	1276	74.8	2879	80.3	30	100.0	28	82.4	10	41.7	83	86.5	20	44.4	151	86.8	46	74.2	76	76.0
Netherlands	4388	100.0	5310	79.0	109	100.0	202	75.9	354	100.0	254	83.8	55	100.0	87	77.0	51	100.0	205	78.5
Poland	5698	90.8	1066	73.2	286	89.1	19	67.9	111	88.1	19	63.3	268	89.0	11	57.9	328	90.9	19	70.4
Romania	2680	89.2	347	64.7	42	65.6	6	60.0	47	100.0	25	73.5	175	99.4	6	75.0	193	93.7	17	85.0
Slovenia	444	81.3	143	71.1	16	66.7	8	57.1	12	70.6	6	85.7	2	66.7	9	100.0	1	50.0	0	0.0
Sweden	2280	85.5	4968	81.6	54	84.4	133	76.4	66	95.7	251	82.8	40	87.0	266	79.6	74	88.1	290	77.5
United Kingdom	4453	59.0	12960	78.0	74	76.3	203	72.5	108	66.3	479	86.5	43	46.7	500	74.0	105	47.7	643	73.2
Total	59250	78.3	61137	76.0	1666	71.7	1649	69.0	1649	79.7	2043	81.7	1852	78.4	2085	77.1	2186	73.4	2549	74.1
Whole Programme	100857	74.5	100875	74.5	3146	64.8	3146	64.8	3280	76.7	3280	76.7	3164	75.4	3164	75.4	3595	70.3	3595	70.3

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

Table I4a
Numbers of Erasmus Students in the Whole Programme, by Subject Area, 2002/2003 and 2003/2004: Taught in the Language of the Host Country

Subject	2002/2003					2003/2004 (Provisional)				
	No		Yes		Total	No		Yes		Total
	number	%	number	%	number	number	%	number	%	number
Agricultural Sciences	685	27.6	1,799	72.4	2,484	994	36.4	1,740	63.6	2,734
Architecture, Urban and Regional Planning	743	16.6	3,721	83.4	4,464	884	18.2	3,968	81.8	4,852
Art and Design	1,220	21.7	4,409	78.3	5,629	1,579	25.7	4,575	74.3	6,154
Business Studies and Management Sciences	6,113	23.1	20,394	76.9	26,507	8,519	29.2	20,650	70.8	29,169
Education, Teacher Training	1,074	25.3	3,170	74.7	4,244	1,342	31.4	2,933	68.6	4,275
Engineering, Technology	2,593	19.9	10,412	80.1	13,005	3,715	26.0	10,556	74.0	14,271
Geography, Geology	476	21.6	1,723	78.4	2,199	582	24.9	1,755	75.1	2,337
Humanities	538	11.4	4,177	88.6	4,715	761	14.7	4,433	85.3	5,194
Languages and Philological Sciences	1,489	7.4	18,706	92.6	20,195	2,049	9.7	19,060	90.3	21,109
Law	1,157	13.1	7,643	86.9	8,800	1,652	17.2	7,933	82.8	9,585
Mathematics, Informatics	618	18.0	2,824	82.0	3,442	1,041	24.8	3,154	75.2	4,195
Medical Sciences	1,262	20.2	4,975	79.8	6,237	1,761	24.8	5,326	75.2	7,087
Natural Sciences	901	18.6	3,941	81.4	4,842	1,169	22.8	3,948	77.2	5,117
Social Sciences	2,551	20.1	10,143	79.9	12,694	3,340	23.4	10,912	76.6	14,252
Communication and Information Sciences	592	18.8	2,560	81.2	3,152	761	21.1	2,845	78.9	3,606
Other Areas of Study	292	22.7	996	77.3	1,288	406	26.9	1,103	73.1	1,509
Total	22,304	18.0	101,593	82.0	123,897	30,555	22.6	104,891	77.4	135,446

Table I4b

Numbers of Outgoing Erasmus Students from the Twelve Countries Participating in the Project, who were Taught in the Language of the Host Country – 2002/2003

Country	Total number of outgoing Erasmus students for the country			Architecture			Education			Mathematics & Informatics			Natural Sciences		
	Yes		Total Number	Yes		Total Number	Yes		Total Number	Yes		Total Number	Yes		Total Number
	Number	%		Number	%		Number	%		Number	%		Number	%	
Austria	2,619	79.1	3,312	142	95.3	149	97	36.9	263	94	77.7	121	95	88.8	107
Denmark	1,070	57.9	1,847	43	95.6	45	91	87.5	104	18	81.8	22	14	40.0	35
France	16,157	83.3	19,396	350	80.3	436	196	53.4	367	479	86.9	551	657	85.4	769
Germany	15,853	85.7	18,494	691	90.0	768	483	87.0	555	512	89.4	573	641	84.3	760
Greece	1,409	66.6	2,115	101	80.2	126	49	69.0	71	48	61.5	78	56	59.6	94
Ireland	1,404	86.3	1,627	12	66.7	18	6	50.0	12	51	96.2	53	33	66.0	50
Netherlands	2,817	66.4	4,241	74	62.7	118	255	59.4	429	23	38.3	60	30	36.6	82
Poland	3,928	72.5	5,419	190	76.9	247	94	83.9	112	126	75.0	168	209	59.4	352
Romania	2,077	76.9	2,701	52	77.6	67	27	90.0	30	105	74.5	141	202	86.7	233
Slovenia	336	79.6	422	21	84.0	25	6	75.0	8	12	85.7	14	3	100.0	3
Sweden	2,507	94.4	2,656	64	100.0	64	64	98.5	65	79	96.3	82	101	96.2	105
United Kingdom	6,449	81.0	7,957	58	50.9	114	115	59.6	193	74	76.3	97	183	75.9	241
Total	56,626	80.7%	70,187	1,798	82.6%	2,177	1,483	67.1%	2,209	1,621	82.7%	1,960	2,224	78.6%	2831

Table I5a**Number of Erasmus Teachers for the Whole Programme, by Subject Area – 2002/2003 and 2003/2004**

Home Subject Area	2002/2003		2003/2004 (provisional)	
	Erasmus Teacher numbers	% of Total Erasmus Teacher numbers	Erasmus Teacher numbers	% of Total Erasmus Teacher numbers
Agricultural Sciences	540	3.2	576	3.1
Architecture, Urban and Regional Planning	490	2.9	514	2.8
Art and Design	1,055	6.2	1,217	6.6
Business Studies and Management Sciences	1,820	10.8	1,970	10.7
Education, Teacher Training	1,384	8.2	1,496	8.1
Engineering, Technology	2,306	13.6	2,479	13.5
Geography, Geology	558	3.3	550	3.0
Humanities	672	4.0	764	4.1
Languages and Philological Sciences	2,405	14.2	2,685	14.6
Law	577	3.4	683	3.7
Mathematics, Informatics	953	5.6	1,042	5.7
Medical Sciences	1,055	6.2	1,184	6.4
Natural Sciences	866	5.1	900	4.9
Social Sciences	1,572	9.3	1,633	8.9
Communication and Information Sciences	273	1.6	334	1.8
Other Areas of Study	386	2.3	387	2.1
Total	16,912	100.0	18,414	100.0

Table I5b

Numbers of Erasmus Teachers for the Twelve Countries Participating in the Project, 2002/2003

Country	Total for country		Architecture				Education				Mathematics & Informatics				Natural Sciences			
	Outward	Inward	Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward	
	Number	Number	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Austria	598	521	18	3.0	16	3.1	200	33.4	91	17.5	44	7.4	34	6.5	21	3.5	23	4.4
Germany	2380	2248	57	2.4	74	3.3	134	5.6	139	6.2	161	6.8	124	5.5	113	4.7	95	4.2
Denmark	304	304	17	5.6	10	3.3	72	23.7	48	15.8	9	3.0	9	3.0	1	0.3	11	3.6
France	1861	1984	75	4.0	57	2.9	97	5.2	85	4.3	115	6.2	129	6.5	130	7.0	128	6.5
Greece	296	559	4	1.4	14	2.5	15	5.1	41	7.3	22	7.4	51	9.1	27	9.1	42	7.5
Ireland	171	220	1	0.6	3	1.4	9	5.3	24	10.9	4	2.3	10	4.5	14	8.2	3	1.4
Netherlands	689	539	21	3.0	10	1.9	82	11.9	73	13.5	28	4.1	17	3.2	13	1.9	17	3.2
Poland	884	640	18	2.0	19	3.0	31	3.5	29	4.5	48	5.4	33	5.2	70	7.9	46	7.2
Romania	706	584	18	2.5	8	1.4	5	0.7	15	2.6	49	6.9	45	7.7	51	7.2	58	9.9
Sweden	428	471	8	1.9	11	2.3	38	8.9	87	18.5	19	4.4	27	5.7	21	4.9	29	6.2
Slovenia	70	78	3	4.3	3	3.8	4	5.7	4	5.1	9	12.9	7	9.0	5	7.1	5	6.4
United Kingdom	1345	1331	36	2.7	34	2.6	132	9.8	120	9.0	67	5.0	95	7.1	67	5.0	55	4.1
Total	9,732	9,479	276	2.8	259	2.7	819	8.4	756	8.0	575	5.9	581	6.1	533	5.5	512	5.4
Whole Programme	16,912	16,912	490	2.9	490	2.9	1,384	8.2	1,384	8.2	953	5.6	953	5.6	866	5.1	866	5.1

Table I5c

Number of Erasmus Teachers for the Twelve Countries Participating in the Project, 2003/2004 **Provisional

Country	Total for country		Architecture				Education				Mathematics & Informatics				Natural Sciences			
	Outward	Inward	Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward		Outward		Inward	
	Number	Number	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Austria	623	560	13	2.1	10	1.8	198	31.8	76	13.6	36	5.8	40	7.1	17	2.7	17	3.0
Germany	2,398	2364	65	2.7	53	2.2	131	5.5	129	5.5	172	7.2	142	6.0	114	4.8	95	4.0
Denmark	331	331	16	4.8	17	5.1	92	27.8	31	9.4	3	0.9	23	6.9	5	1.5	13	3.9
France	2,039	2112	89	4.4	72	3.4	94	4.6	74	3.5	92	4.5	130	6.2	128	6.3	122	5.8
Greece	337	526	7	2.1	12	2.3	9	2.7	42	8.0	30	8.9	56	10.6	36	10.7	45	8.6
Ireland	168	251	0	0.0	2	0.8	11	6.5	22	8.8	2	1.2	13	5.2	15	8.9	4	1.6
Netherlands	684	485	16	2.3	14	2.9	88	12.9	49	10.1	28	4.1	12	2.5	9	1.3	10	2.1
Poland	947	734	23	2.4	15	2.0	48	5.1	33	4.5	63	6.7	42	5.7	81	8.6	58	7.9
Romania	807	621	14	1.7	14	2.3	6	0.7	32	5.2	53	6.6	37	6.0	56	6.9	56	9.0
Sweden	508	449	11	2.2	3	0.7	39	7.7	72	16.0	27	5.3	23	5.1	20	3.9	19	4.2
Slovenia	73	103	3	4.1	4	3.9	0	0.0	9	8.7	12	16.4	11	10.7	5	6.8	2	1.9
United Kingdom	1,303	1292	38	2.9	37	2.9	137	10.5	122	9.4	90	6.9	96	7.4	67	5.1	64	5.0
Total	10,218	9828	295	2.9	253	2.6	853	8.3	691	7.0	608	6.0	625	6.4	553	5.4	505	5.1
Whole Programme	18,414	18,414	514	2.8	514	2.8	1,496	8.1	1,496	8.1	1,042	5.7	1,042	5.7	900	4.9	900	4.9

ANNEX II

Participating National Agencies

AUSTRIA

Sokrates Nationalagentur
Schreyvogelgasse 2
A-1010 Wien
Tel: (43) 1 534.08.17/25
Fax: (43) 1 534.08.20
Email: office@sokrates.at
Internet: <http://www.sokrates.at>

DENMARK

CIRIUS
Fiolstraede 44
DK-1171 Copenhagen K
Tel: (45) 33 95 77 00
E-mail: cirius@ciriusmail.dk
Internet: <http://www.ciriusonline.dk>

FRANCE

Agence Sokrates-Leonardo da Vinci
25, Quai des Chartons
F-33080 Bordeaux Cedex
Tel: (33) 5 56.00.94.00
Fax: (33) 5 56.00.94.80
Email : contact@socrates-leonardo.fr
estelle.duprat@socrates-leonardo.fr
Internet: <http://www.socrates-leonardo.fr>

GERMANY

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD)
Kennedyallee 50
D-53175 Bonn
Tel: (49) 228 882.556
Fax: (49) 228 882.555
E-mail: arbeitsstelle.eu@daad.de
Internet: <http://www.daad.de>

GREECE

I.K.Y.
Directorate of Special Programmes and International Scholarships
Unit for European Union Programmes
Lyssicratous 14
GR-10558 Athens
Tel: (30) 210 3726300 / 3236690
Fax: (30) 210 3312759 / 3221863
Erasmus email: erasmus@iky.gr
General email: socrates@iky.gr
Internet: <http://www.iky.gr>

IRELAND

Higher Education Authority
3rd floor
Marine House
Clanwilliam Court
IRL-Dublin 2
Tel: (353) 1 661.27.48
Fax: (353) 1 661.04.92
Email: erasmus@hea.ie
Internet: <http://www.hea.ie>

NETHERLANDS

Nuffic
Dutch National Agency for Socrates
Postbus 29777
NL-2502 LT Den Haag
Tel: (31) 70 42.60.260
Fax: (31) 70 42.60.399
Email: socrates@nuffic.nl
Internet: <http://www.nuffic.nl/programma/internationalisering/socrates/index.html>

POLAND

Fundacja Rozwoju Systemu Edukacji, Program Socrates
(Foundation for the Development of the Education System, Socrates Programme)
ul. Mokotowska 43
PL - 00-551 Warszawa
Tel: (48) 22 622.34.47/ 629.25.74
Fax: (48) 22 622.37.10
Email: socrates@socrates.org.pl
internet: www.socrates.org.pl

Erasmus

Tel: (48) 622.37.12 (ext. 104, 105, 106, 408, 430)
E-mail: erasmus@socrates.org.pl

ROMÂNIA

A.N.P.C.D.E.F.P
(National Agency for Community Programmes in Domain of Education and Vocational Training)
Bld. Schitu Magureanu Nr. 1
Etaj 2 – Sector 5
RO-050025 Bucuresti
Tel: (40) 1 311.35.05 / 312.11.87
Fax: (40) 1 311.35.00
Email: agentie@socrates.ro
Internet: <http://www.socrates.ro>

SLOVENIA

CMEPIUS, Centre of the Republic of Slovenia for Mobility and European Educational Programmes

Ob železnici 16

SI-1000 Ljubljana

Tel: (386) 1 5864.251

Fax: (386) 1 5864.231

Email: socrates@cmepius.si

Internet : <http://www.cmepius.si>

SWEDEN

International Programme Office for Education and Training

Box 220 07

S-104 22 Stockholm

Tel: (46) 8 453.72.00

Fax: (46) 8 453.72.01

Email: info@programkontoret.se

Internet: <http://www.programkontoret.se>

UNITED KINGDOM

UK Socrates-Erasmus Council

Rothford

Giles Lane

Canterbury

Kent

CT2 7LR

Tel: 00 44 (0)1227 762712

Fax: 00 44 (01)1227 762711

Email: info@erasmus.ac.uk

Internet: www.erasmus.ac.uk

ANNEX III – List of Participating Institutions

Country	Subject	Name of Institution	No. of Responses	No. of case studies	Name of Institution	No. of Responses	No. of case studies	Name of Institution	No. of Responses	No. of Case Studies
Austria	Architecture	Universität für Bodenkultur, Wien	1		Leopold-Franzens Universität Innsbruck	1	1			
Austria	Education	Pädagogische Akademie des Bundes in der Steiermark	1	2	Pädagogische Akademie des Bundes in Wien	1	2	Pädagogische Akademie der Erdiözese Wien		
Austria	Maths & IT	Universität Wien	1	2						
Austria	Natural Sciences	Universität für Bodenkultur, Wien	1		Universität Wien	1	1			
Denmark	Architecture	Royal Danish Academy of fine Arts	1		Aarhus School of Architecture					
Denmark	Education	Aarhus Dag - University College	1		CVU-Jelling	1	1			
Denmark	Maths & IT	Niels Brock Copenhagen Business College	1		University of Copenhagen		1			1
Denmark	Natural Sciences	University of Aarhus	1		University of Copenhagen	1				
France	Architecture	École d'Architecture Paris Val-de-Seine	1		École d'Architecture et de paysage de Bordeaux	1	1			
France	Education	IUFM de Versailles	1	1	IUFM de Grenoble	1				
France	Maths & IT	Université de Metz	1	1	Université des Sciences et Technologies de Lille	1	4			
France	Natural Sciences	Université Rene Diderot Paris VII	1		Université de Montpellier 2	1	1			
Germany	Architecture	TU München	1	1	TU Cottbus	1	2	U Hannover	1	1

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

Country	Subject	Name of Institution	No. of Responses	No. of case studies	Name of Institution	No. of Responses	No. of case studies	Name of Institution	No. of Responses	No. of Case Studies
Germany	Education	PH Karlsruhe	1	1	U Lüneburg	1	1	PH Ludwigsburg	1	1
Germany	Maths & IT	TU München	2	1	FH Darmstadt	1	1			
Germany	Natural Sciences	FU Berlin	1	1	U Jena	1	1	U Marburg		
Greece	Architecture	National Technical University	1		Aristotle University of Thessaloniki	1	1			
Greece	Education	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki	2	1	National & Kapodistrian University of Athens			University of Patras		
Greece	Maths & IT	Technological Educational Institution of Thessaloniki	1	1	Athens University of Economics and Business	1	1	National & Kapodistrian University of Athens		
Greece	Natural Sciences	National & Kapodistrian University of Athens	1		University of Crete	1	1	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki	3	3
Ireland	Architecture	University College Dublin	1	1	Dublin Institute of Technology	1				
Ireland	Education	St Patrick's College Druncondra	1	1	Mary Immaculate College	1	1			
Ireland	Maths & IT	Trinity College Dublin	1	4	Dublin City University	1				
Ireland	Natural Sciences	Dublin Institute of Technology	1	1	Dublin City University	1				
Netherlands	Architecture	Technical University, Delft	1		Technical University Eindhoven					
Netherlands	Education	Hogeschool Arnhem Nijmegen			INHOLLAND	1				
Netherlands	Maths & IT	Hanzehogeschool Groningen	1		Hogeschool van Utrecht					
	Natural Sciences	Rijksuniversiteit Groningen			University of Utrecht					

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

Country	Subject	Name of Institution	No. of Responses	No. of case studies	Name of Institution	No. of Responses	No. of case studies	Name of Institution	No. of Responses	No. of Case Studies
Netherlands										
Poland	Architecture	Politechnika Warszawska	1	2	Politechnika Gdansk	1	2			
Poland	Education	Akademia Pedagogiczna w Krakowie	1	2	Uniwersytet Śląski w Katowice	1	1			
Poland	Maths & IT	Politechnika Wrocławski	1	2	Polska-Japońska Wyższa Szkoła Technik Komputerowych Warszawa	1	2	Politechnika Śląska	1	5
Poland	Natural Sciences	Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza	1	2	Uniwersytet Wrocławski	1	2			
Romania	Architecture	Bucharest University of Architecture	1	1	Timisoara Politechnica University	1	2	Iasi Politechnica University	1	1
Romania	Education	Timisoara Vest University	1	1	University of Pitesti	1	1	Babes Bolyai of cluj Napoca		
Romania	Maths & IT	University of Bucharest	1		University of Iasi	1	1	Babes Bolyai of cluj Napoca	1	2
Romania	Natural Sciences	University of Bucharest	1	1	University of Iasi	1	1	Babes Bolyai of cluj Napoca	1	1
Slovenia	Architecture	University of Ljubljana	1	1						
Slovenia	Education	University of Primorska	1		University of Ljubljana	1	1	University of Maribor	1	
Slovenia	Maths & IT	University of Ljubljana		1	University of Maribor		4			
Slovenia	Natural Sciences	University of Ljubljana			University of Maribor					
Sweden	Architecture	Royal Institute of Technology	1		Lund University	1	1	Chalmers University of Technology		
Sweden	Education	Malmö University	1	1	Jönköping University	1		Hogskolan Dalarna		

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

Country	Subject	Name of Institution	No. of Responses	No. of case studies	Name of Institution	No. of Responses	No. of case studies	Name of Institution	No. of Responses	No. of Case Studies
Sweden	Maths & IT	Royal Institute of Technology			Blekinge Institute of Technology	1		Linköping University		
Sweden	Natural Sciences	Uppsala University	1	2	Lund University	1		The Royal Institute of Technology		
United Kingdom	Architecture	University of Bath	1	2	University of Strathclyde	1	1			
United Kingdom	Education	Stranmillis University College	1	1	St Mary's University College	1	1			
United Kingdom	Maths & IT	Queens University Belfast	1	1	Durham University	1				
United Kingdom	Natural Sciences	University of Wales Bangor	1		Imperial College London	1				

Annex IV

Summary of Survey Responses to Questionnaire: Section C

	QUESTION	Choices	Response				
			Overall	Architecture	Education	Mathematics & Informatics	Natural Sciences
C1	How easy is it to recruit students to your institution in this subject area?	1(difficult), 2, 3 or 4 (easy)	Overall 51% replied '4' (easy)	68% replied '4',	50% '4', 27% '3'	33% '4', 57% '2' or '3'	50% '4', 29% '1' or '2'
C2	How easy is it to recruit students, when enrolled, into the Erasmus programme at your institution in this subject area?	1 (difficult), 2, 3, 4 (easy)	Overall, 28% replied '4' (easy), the most common reply being '3'	64% replied '4'	12% '4'	19% '4', more than 60% '2' or '3'	17% '4', 42% '3'
C3	Are there more students wanting to participate than you have Erasmus places in this subject area?	1 (fewer), 2, 3 or 4 (many more)	Overall 40% replied '1' (fewer)	Only 14% replied '4', the most common reply being '3'	50% '1', 35% '2'	38% '1', more than 50% '2' or '3'	42% '1', 29% '2'
	Language						
C4	How important for this subject is language competence in the host language for Erasmus students?	1 (not), 2, 3 or 4 (very)	Overall 28% replied '4' (very important), the most common (44%) being '3'	Only 14% replied '4', 54% '3'	50% '4'	Only 14% '4', 66% '2' or '3'	29% '4', 50% '3'
C5	Is teaching in this subject provided in the host language in all, most, some or none of the host countries?	1 (none), 2, 3 or 4 (all)	Overall 28% replied '4' (all), the most common reply being '3'	23% replied '4', 50% '3'	35% '4'	28% replied '4', the most common reply '2'	25% '4', 70% '2' or '3'
C6	Is language training in the host language provided for your students in this subject at your institution before their Erasmus study period?	1 (no), 2, 3 or 4 (always)	Overall 33% replied '1' (no), the rest were evenly divided	23% '1', 41% '2'	38% '1', 27% '4'	33% '1'	55% '1'
C7	Is language training in the host language provided for your students in the host country in all, most, some or none of the host countries?	1 (none), 2, 3 or 4 (all)	Overall half the replies were '3' (most), only 3 saying '1' (none)	64% '3', 27% '2'	Almost 20% of replies were '4'	52% '3', 33% '2'	More than 20% of replies were '4', 42% '3'

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

	QUESTION	Choices	Response				
			Overall	Architecture	Education	Mathematics & Informatics	Natural Sciences
C8	Do your students participate in Erasmus Intensive Language Courses in those countries where these are provided?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4	37% replied '4', 55% were positive ('3' or '4'), 24% '1'	50% '4', 18% '3'	Equal number of positive and negative replies, 39% '4', 35% '1'	38% '4', 52% '1' or '2'	21% '4', 38% '3'
C9	Is this subject taught in English in none, some, many or all of your partner institutions?	1 (none), 2, 3 or 4 (all)	Considerable variety, 43% '2', 41% '3'	64% '2', 73% negative, 27% '3'	55% negative, 46% '2', 36% '3'	81% '3' (most) or '4' (all)	58% '1' or '2'
ECTS and Academic Recognition							
C10	Are ECTS Learning Agreements used in this subject?	1 (no), 2, 3 or 4 (always)	More than ¾ of the replies, 76%, were '4'	68% '4'	85% '4'	81% '4'	69% '4'
C11	Are credits obtained during the Erasmus study period included in the final degree transcript?	1 (no), 2, 3 or 4 (always)	Almost ¾ of replies (73%) were '4'	73% '4'	62% '4', 12% '1'	76% '4'	77% '4'
C12	Are the examination / assessment grades awarded during the Erasmus study period used as part of the (final degree) assessment in your institution?	'Y' or 'N'	¾ (74%) of replies were 'Yes'	64% 'Y'	62% 'Y'	76% 'Y'	77% 'Y'
C13	Is ECTS used for incoming students in this subject area?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (always)	81% of replies were '4', only 7% '1' or '2'	86% '4'	81% '4'	71% '4', 90% '3' or '4'	83% '4', 8% '3'
Practical Work Experience							
C14	Is practical work experience an integral part of your institution's degree qualification in this subject area?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (always)	Overall, the replies included 60% '4' (always), 19% '1' (never).	50% positive ('3' or '4'), 50% negative	96% '4'	61% '3' or '4', 38% '4'	63% '3' or '4', 46% '4'
C15	Does practical work experience gain credit recognition for Erasmus students from your institution in this subject area?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (always)	Almost half the replies (47%) were '4', 27% '1'	46% '1', 13% '4'	73% '4'	40% '4', 40% '1'	46% '4', 13% '1'
Returning and Incoming Erasmus Students							
C16	Are returning Erasmus students used by your department as mentors for new Erasmus students?	1 (no), 2, 3 or 4 (normally)	Overall, 70% of replies were positive ('4' or '3')	41% '4', 36% '3'	39% '4', 23% '3'	66% '3' or '4'	71% positive, 42% '3'

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

	QUESTION	Choices	Response				
			Overall	Architecture	Education	Mathematics & Informatics	Natural Sciences
C17	Are incoming Erasmus students used by your department as mentors for potential Erasmus students?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 normally)	Overall, the responses were quite evenly distributed, with 55% negative	54% '3' or '4'	27% '4', but 55% negative	57% positive	79% '1' or '2', with 42% '2'
C18	Are returning Erasmus students used by your university to help with recruitment of future Erasmus students in this subject area?	1 (no), 2, 3 or 4 normally)	Overall, 60% of the replies were positive, with one third '4'	59% positive, but 32% '1' (no)	42% '4', 15% '1'	52% positive, with 19% '4' and 19% '1'	33% '4', 29% '3'
C19	Are incoming Erasmus students used by your university to help with recruitment of future Erasmus students in this subject area?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (many ways)	Overall, 54% of replies were negative, with 17% '4'	55% negative, 18% '4'	58% negative, 23% '4'	62% '3' or '4'	43% '1', 21% '2'
C20	Does the department have a student evaluation at the end of the Erasmus study period?	'Y' or 'N'	Almost 2/3 of replies (65%) were 'Y'	77% 'Y'	58% 'Y'	57% 'Y'	67% 'Y'
C21	If the answer to Q20 is 'yes', are the results of the evaluation made available to the University, the Department, the students?	1 (Univ), 2 (Dept), 3 (both), 4 (all)	37 blanks were generally associated with 'N' for Q20; 46% of replies were '4' (all), 2/3 '3' or '4'	8 blanks, 57% '4'	11 blanks, 53% '4'	9 blanks, 43% '4', 2/3 positive	9 blanks, 33% '4', 67% positive
C22	Are changes to the programme made as a result of student evaluation?	'Y' or 'N'	14 blanks associated with 'N' for C20, roughly equal 'Y' and 'N' counts	2 blanks, 65% 'N'	7 blanks, 70% 'Y'	2 blanks, 60% 'Y'	3 blanks. 38% 'Y'
C23	Do incoming students contribute to the academic work of the department?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (lots)	Overall 55% negative ('1' or '2'), 14% '4'	50% positive, 36% '3', 18% '1'	65% '1' or '2'	52% '3' or '4'	54% '1' or '2'
C24	Do incoming Erasmus students take all the normal assessments?	'Y' or 'N'	Overall, 72% of replies were 'Y'	77% 'Y'	58% 'Y'	76% 'Y'	69% 'Y'
C25	Do incoming Erasmus students satisfy the academic expectations of the department?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (in many ways)	Overall, 87% of replies were positive with 41% '4', and 46% '3'	86% positive, 59% '3'	81% positive, 50% '3'	91% positive, 48% '4'	92% positive, 58% '4'

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

	QUESTION	Choices	Response				
			Overall	Architecture	Education	Mathematics & Informatics	Natural Sciences
	The Academic Programme Director:						
C26	Does the academic programme director have significant influence in recruiting and retaining Erasmus students this subject area?	1 (none), 2, 3 or 4 (significant)	Overall, 86% of replies were positive, with 62% '4' and 24% '3'	78% positive, 46% '4'	81% positive, 58% '4'	86% positive, 67% '4'	Zero negative replies, 79% '4', 21% '3'
C27	Does the academic programme director receive recognition for the Erasmus work?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (significant)	Overall, the replies were evenly balanced	63% negative, 41% '2'	61% positive, 42% '4'	51% positive, 38% '3'	54% negative, but 25% '3'
C28	In this department, is the academic programme director the Head of department?	'Y' or 'N'	Overall, 86% of the replies were 'N'	82% 'N'	81% 'N'	91% 'N'	100% 'N'
C29	Does the academic programme director meet potential Erasmus students before their Erasmus study period?	1 (never), 2, 3, 4 (frequently)	Overall, 90% of replies were positive, 72% '4'	73% '4', 18% '3'	77% positive, 65% '4'	67% '4'	100% positive, 83% '4'
C30	Does the academic programme director monitor student progress during the Erasmus study period?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (always)	Overall, almost ¾ of replies were positive, 40% '4'	77% positive, 41% '3'	72% positive, 35% '4'	81% positive, 43% '3'	79% positive, 50% '4'
C31	Does the academic programme director visit your Erasmus students in this subject while abroad?	1 (none), 2, 3, 4 (all)	Overall, 86% of replies were negative, with 33% '1'	91% negative, 68% '2'	81% negative, 39% '1'	91% negative, 48% '1'	83% negative, 25% '1'
	Encouragement and Support						
C32	Do academic colleagues in the department actively encourage / support outgoing Erasmus students?	1 (no), 2, 3 or 4 (always)	More than ¾ of replies were positive	64% positive, 34% '4'	77% positive, 54% '3'	79% positive, 52% '3'	83% positive, 41% '4'
C33	Do academic colleagues in the department value incoming Erasmus students?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (yes)	Overall, 89% of replies were positive	91% positive, 51% '4'	85% positive, 46% '4'	85% positive, 52% '3'	92% positive, 54% '3'
C34	Does your institution actively encourage participation in Erasmus?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (yes)	Overall, 83% of replies were '4'	91% '4'	81% '4'	76% '4' and 24% '3'	92% '3' or '4', 83% '4'
C35	Does your institution give real support to academic programme directors in all departments?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (yes)	Overall, 83% of replies were positive, 60% '4'	64% positive, 41% '4'	88% positive, 58% '4'	81% positive, 62% '4'	88% positive, 71% '4'

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

	QUESTION	Choices	Response				
			Overall	Architecture	Education	Mathematics & Informatics	Natural Sciences
	European Office / International Office	0 if none					
C36	Is there good liaison between the department academic programme director and the European Office?	1 (poor), 2, 3 or 4 (good)	Overall, 80% of the replies were '4' (good)	77% '4'	73% '4', 12% '3'	60% '4', 21% '3'	88% '4', 8% '3'
C37	Does the European Office meet the academic programme director on a regular basis?	1 (never), 2, 3, 4 (regular)	Overall, more than half of replies were '4' (regular), and 84% positive	87% positive, 46% '4'	73% positive, 54% '4'	79% positive, 55% '4'	84% positive, 42% '4'
C38	Does the European Office contribute to the recruitment of outward Erasmus students?	1 (never), 2, 3, 4 (yes, strongly)	Overall, 63% of replies were positive, with 43% '4'	68% positive, 41% '4'	65% positive, 46% '4'	56% positive, 35% '4'	55% positive, 42% '4'
C39	Does the European Office manage the administration of Learning Agreements?	'Y' or 'N'	Overall, 61% of replies were 'Y'	46% 'Y', 54% 'N'	68% 'Y'	60% 'Y'	67% 'Y'
C40	Does the European Office manage the transcripts of records?	'Y' or 'N'	Overall, 57% of replies were 'N'	68% 'N'	62% 'Y'	65% 'N'	58% 'N'
C41	Does the European Office manage other aspects of the exchange?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (all)	Overall, 86% of replies were positive (many, or all), 49% '3'	78% positive, 46% '4'	90% positive, 45% '4'	90% positive, 25% '4'	86% positive, 31% '4'
C42	Does the European Office publish information for all the students in hard copy?	'Y' or 'N'	Overall, 82% of replies were 'Y'	68% 'Y'	73% 'Y'	95% 'Y'	83% 'Y'
C43	Does the European Office publish information for all the students on the web?	'Y' or 'N'	Overall, 89% of replies were 'Y'	86% 'Y'	73% 'Y'	100% 'Y'	88% 'Y'
	Relations with Partners						
C44	Are relations with partners handled through the central university administration?	1 (not at all), 2, 3, 4 (all)	Overall, 2/3 of the replies were positive (many or all)	50% positive	66% positive, 44% '4'	54% positive, 33% '3'	83% positive, 52% '3'
C45	Does the academic programme director have frequent contact with colleagues in the partner institutions?	1 (never), 2, 3, 4 (often)	Over 70% of replies were positive, '4' or '3'; zero '1'	54% positive, 41% '3'	66% positive, 42% '4'	52% positive, 33% '3'	83% positive, 52% '3'

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

	QUESTION	Choices	Response				
			Overall	Architecture	Education	Mathematics & Informatics	Natural Sciences
C46	Is the response from partner institutions rapid?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (always)	Overall, 80% of replies were positive, with 67% '3' and zero '1'	57% '3', 43% '2'	89% '3'	95% positive, 71% '3'	71% positive, 50% '3'
C47	Do the partner institutions monitor students' progress?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (always)	Overall, almost 2/3 of replies were '4' or '3'	50% '3', 41% '2'	81% positive, 58% '3'	67% positive, 43% '4'	58% positive, 42% '2'
C48	Do the partner institutions report if a student's progress is unsatisfactory?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (always)	Overall, 60% of replies were positive, but 25% were '1' (no)	41% '1'	78% positive	67% positive, 43% '4'	58% positive
C49	Do partner institutions return transcripts and grades at the end of the study period in good time?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (always)	Overall, 72% of replies were positive, no '1's	43% '3', 41% '2'	89% '3' or '4'	76% positive	63% positive
	Teaching Staff Mobility, Growth						
C50	Is Erasmus teaching staff mobility significant in this subject area	1 (no), 2, 3 or 4 (v significant)	Overall, half the replies were positive, half negative	68% negative '1' or '2'	73% positive '3' or '4'	57% positive	62% negative
C51	Is Erasmus teaching staff mobility closely linked to Erasmus student mobility?	1 (not at all), 2, 3, 4(closely)	Overall, 62% of replies were positive	82% '3' or '4'	75% '3' or '4'	67% '3' or '4'	54% '1' or '2', but 33% '4'
C52	Does Erasmus teaching staff mobility provide an opportunity to visit outgoing Erasmus students?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (normal)	Overall, 60% of replies were positive	55% '4', 32% '2'	54% positive	77% positive	55% positive, with 42% '4'
C53	Does Erasmus teaching staff mobility provide an opportunity to discuss the curriculum for outgoing Erasmus students?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4(significant)	Overall, 58% of replies were positive, 32% '4'	50% positive, 50% negative, 26% '4'	57% positive, 42% '3'	76% positive, 52% '4'	50% positive, 50% negative, more '4's than '1's
C54	Is growth anticipated in Erasmus outward mobility in this subject area?	1 (no), 2, 3 or 4 (significant)	Overall, 57% of replies were positive, 41% '3'	54% positive, 46% '3', 23% '1'	58% positive, 46% '3', 35% '2'	67% positive, 43% '3'	50% positive, 50% negative.

Summary of Survey Responses to Questionnaire: Section D

			Architecture	Education	Mathematics & Informatics	Natural Sciences
D1a	Professional bodies: do the professional bodies specify particular subjects in the curriculum?	'Y' or 'N'	All institutions answered the question. 52% 'Y'	3 blanks, 56% 'Y'	2 blanks, 58% 'Y'	2 banks, 55% 'Y'
D1b	Professional bodies: do the professional bodies specify work experience?	'Y' or 'N'	Zero blanks, 65% 'N'	3 blanks, 60% 'Y'	2 blanks, 68% 'N'	1 blank, 70% 'N'
D1c	Professional bodies: do the professional bodies specify the level of pass?	'Y' or 'N'	Zero blanks, 65% 'N'	2 blanks, 58% 'N'	2 blanks, 68% 'N'	1 blank, 61% 'N'
D1d	Professional bodies: do the professional bodies restrict recognition of credits from other countries?	'Y' or 'N'	0 blanks, 91% 'N'	2 blanks, 69% 'N'	2 blanks, 95% 'N'	0 blanks, 88% 'N'
D1e	Professional bodies: do the professional bodies evaluate the degree at the institution?	'Y' or 'N'	0 blanks, 57% 'N'	3 blanks, 60% 'Y'	2 blanks, 53% 'Y'	2 blanks, 68% 'N'
D1f	Professional bodies: do the professional bodies validate or accredit the degree?	'Y' or 'N'	0 blanks, 57% 'N'	3 blanks, 56% 'Y'	2 blanks, 53% 'N'	2 blanks, 64% 'N'
D1g	Are there other ways in which professional bodies are influential?	Please comment below. See Annex V for comments				
D2a	Incentives: are students encouraged to participate in Erasmus primarily for academic reasons?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (yes)	39% '4'	35% '4'	67% '4'	38% '4'
D2b	Incentives: do students consider that Erasmus will add value to their degree?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (yes)	48% '4', zero '1'	1 blank, 50% '4', zero '1'	81% '4'	75% '4'
D2c	Incentives: do students consider that Erasmus will make them more employable?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (yes)	44% '4'	2 blanks, 25% '4', 62% '3' or '2'	67% '4'	58% '4'
D2d	Incentives: do students participate in Erasmus mainly for linguistic reasons?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (yes)	26% '1', 43% '2'	19% '1', 54% '2'	10% '1', 43% '2'	33% '1'
D2e	Are there other ways in which students could be encouraged to participate in Erasmus in this subject area?	Please comment below. See Annex V for comments				
D3a	Difficulties: Are there any particular administrative difficulties with managing Erasmus in this subject area?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (serious)	39% '1'	54% '1'	62% '1'	33% '1'

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

		Please comment below. <i>See Annex V for comments</i>				
D3b	Difficulties: Are there any particular difficulties with academic recognition for Erasmus students in this subject area?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (serious)	52% '1'	57% '1'	91% '1'	75% '1'
		Please comment below. <i>See Annex V for comments</i>				
D3c	Difficulties: Are there any particular linguistic issues for Erasmus students in this subject area?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (serious)	30% '1'	29% '1', 61% '2'	48% '1'	50% '1'
		Please comment below. <i>See Annex V for comments</i>				
D3d	Difficulties: Are there any particular difficulties with professional requirements in partner countries for Erasmus in this subject area?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (serious)	74% '1'	61% '1'	71% '1'	4 blanks, 71% '1'
		Please comment below. <i>See Annex V for comments</i>				
D4a	Obstacles to mobility: is the academic curriculum in this subject an obstacle to mobility?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (serious)	70% '1'	25% '1', 39% '2'	71% '1'	71% '1'
D4b	Obstacles to mobility: are the professional requirements an obstacle to mobility?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (serious)	87% '1'	46% '1'	86% '1'	83% '1'
D4c	Obstacles to mobility: is student finance an obstacle to mobility?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (serious)	17% '4', 43% '3'	22% '4', 32% '3'	29% '4', 29% '3'	42% '4', 33% '3'
D4d	Obstacles to mobility: are perceptions of the quality of the academic experience in the host institution an obstacle to mobility?	1 (no), 2, 3, 4 (serious)	57% '1'	68% '1'	67% '1'	67% '1'
D4e	Are there other obstacles to mobility in this subject?	Please comment below <i>See Annex V for comments</i>				
D5	The questionnaire has tried to elicit detailed information on the way in which the Erasmus programme works for you. We would welcome: i. any additional comments which you would wish to make, particularly highlighting aspects of good / best practice in your and/or your partner institution ii. specific proposals for increasing mobility in your subject from your University and more widely in your country.					
	<i>See Annex V for comments</i>					

Questionnaire responses: Points Made by Respondents in their Comments to Section D

Architecture	
D1g	<p>Are there any other ways in which professional bodies are influential?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no professional bodies in Landscape Architecture (Austria) • The professional body acts as external examiners at the final exam (Denmark) • There is collaboration between Regional Council of Architects and the school through commissions dealing with training and professional experience (France) • As members of evaluation groups (Germany) • Universities are autonomous, no external body has the right to intervene (Greece) • Not in relation to the Socrates programme; supportive (Ireland) • Influential in the validation of professional degree (Netherlands) • Enrolment procedures (Poland)
D2e	<p>Are there other ways in which students could be encouraged to participate in Erasmus in this subject area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students go to improve their linguistic skills; a good way to interest students could be short courses like Intensive Programmes (Austria) • Culture / contacts; political and cultural exchange (Germany) • 10% - 20% of the Architecture class go already, no further encouragement is necessary. Intensive Programmes and other short-term exchanges might be a useful alternative (Ireland) • For many years, Architecture and related fields have been very internationally oriented, which affects the numbers of exchange students (Netherlands) • Contracts between universities or faculties allowing students to take mutually recognised diplomas (Poland) • Cultural reasons, links potentially useful for future professional work (Slovenia) • Interest in cultural variations (Sweden) • The main incentive in this subject area is that it will be a positive experience; should encourage by easing credit requirements, students are very 'mark conscious'; a high percentage of international staff might have a positive impact (UK)
D3a	<p>Administrative difficulties?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are only limited places in the countries where the students want to go to study (Austria) • ECTS is not yet implemented fully in all partners, meaning that there are difficulties with learning agreements and understanding transcripts (France) • Different start and end of terms prevent students moving apart from 12 months abroad (Germany) • Commencement dates and academic calendars can be problematic (Ireland) • Lack of EU funding for professional visits, meetings etc (Netherlands) • Confusion over different, unclear, administrative procedures (Poland) • Variations in lengths of courses (e.g. 4–10 years); variations in the proportions of course to studio work (Sweden) • Calendar incompatibility (UK)

D3b Academic recognition difficulties?

- No difficulties, learning agreements are signed, students get recognition. Recognition seems more problematic in this subject area, perhaps it is more difficult to evaluate (Austria)
- Our students exchange on a free choice semester, without a compulsory programme to attend at the host institution. More academic control would be helpful (Netherlands)
- Different educational systems cause problems, for example in the application of ECTS where only pass/fail procedures exist. In Poland, students receive additional financial support when their yearly average mark is above a certain level, this information about marks is needed from partners so that students can apply (Poland)
- Some obligatory subjects are too focussed on local conditions (Slovenia)
- No problems if less than 100% recognition, real problems if aiming for 100% (Sweden)
- See comment above on 'mark consciousness'; there is a high degree of variation in the type of project given (UK)

D3c Linguistic issues?

- Students prefer Spanish or English. We send them to Scandinavia because they offer appropriate courses in English; linguistic issues in Architecture are no different from other subjects, we advertise EILCs (Austria)
- The students tend to ask for English speaking schools (Denmark)
- Incoming students should have German language skills as planning in Germany, as part of the culture, is hard to understand otherwise; there are possible problems when the host language is less widely taught, a student's choice will be restricted by language abilities (Germany)
- Problems in places where the language of instruction is different from the standard language, e.g. Barcelona where the language of instruction is Catalan (Netherlands)
- Participation in Erasmus depends on passing a language test (Poland)
- Visual language is more than helpful in architecture, especially in the design studio (Slovenia)
- Incoming UK students do not use the normal EU English used by other students and teachers (Sweden)
- Northern countries are OK, Southern more problematic (UK)

D3d Difficulties with professional requirements?

- Not specific to Erasmus, but entry into the profession after studies, as exercising the profession depends on national regulations and is more or less controlled according to the different countries (France)
- Finding partners can be difficult where the professional body is structured differently (Ireland)
- There are problems where a student wants to be recognised professionally in another country: most countries have different criteria for the profession (Netherlands)
- Southern European countries' legislation gives a wider professional responsibility which affects a number of compulsory courses not included in the Northern European curricula (Sweden)

D4 Are there any other obstacles to mobility in this subject?

- The language of the host country is to some extent an obstacle, many focus on English courses or programmes (Denmark)
- The installation of the Bachelors / Masters system in the Netherlands has led to the stop of incoming students from there because of mandatory / fewer choice of modules. Similar obstacles are likely in Germany in the course of the implementation of Bologna (Germany)

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

- The length and demanding nature of the courses may be a deterrent (Ireland)
- An important obstacle is the organisation and workload at the home institution. (Netherlands)
- Insufficient information provided by partners on the content and academic quality of courses (Poland)
- Many students are initially interested then fail to go on to Erasmus because of fears about marks and assessments at the host; coping with language; financial position; Part 1 granted at the end of year 3 can be a problem if the student is away in year 3 (UK)

D5(i) Additional comments, good practice

- Close relations between the International Office and academics, and consistent procedures; for several years there have been more applications than places, meaning that the best students are nominated. The relevance of study abroad is growing, seen as valuable on the CV (Austria)
- Erasmus is one third of student mobility in this institution, and 25% of students spend one or two semesters abroad (Denmark)
- Personal contact between department co-ordinators is vital, intensive programmes guarantee these contacts (Germany)
- Because we are a small school, we have to limit the number of partnerships we engage in (Ireland)
- For incoming students: well informed before arrival, arrangement of housing, assistance/support/introduction by international office on arrival, language centre. For outgoing students: information, e.g. from former Erasmus students, a clear web site, administrative support for the application procedures, advice on studies (Netherlands)
- Better management of Learning Agreements, clearer deadlines, more consistent application forms (Poland)
- Architecture projects - a direct and visible way of communication, helping overcome obstacles. It shows cultural similarities and differences in a way that enables discussion in a constructive atmosphere (Sweden)

D5(ii) Proposals for increasing mobility

- Prefer to concentrate on quality rather than quantity; trying to increase outward teaching staff mobility is proving difficult. Many professors run architectural offices and do not want to be away for long, are also acknowledged experts so do not need the experience (Austria)
- Mobility would increase if more courses were offered in English and if the UK opened up for student exchange (Denmark)
- An exchange / international-proof curriculum, better detailed information about host institutions, more EU funding for e.g. co-ordination of networks (Netherlands)
- Better information on web sites of schools of architecture, more teaching staff mobility with better financial support, wider contacts with English speaking faculties especially in the UK; the exchange level has reached saturation no significant growth expected (Poland)

Education

D1g Are there any other ways in which professional bodies are influential?

- The aims and curriculum of the subject area are issued by the Ministry (Denmark)

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

- Teachers in Germany are civil servants, so 'professional body' has little significance. The Ministries of Education and Science have huge influence. (Germany)
- The faculty perception of DES (the ministry) means that staff are reluctant to allow students to miss essential courses in curriculum areas; regular meetings between college management / staff with DES who oversee the degree programme (Ireland)
- No crucial influence (Poland)
- All set by university and ministry of Education, no professional bodies are involved (Sweden)

D2e Are there other ways in which students could be encouraged to participate in Erasmus in this subject area?

- Positive influence on personality, self confidence, independence (Austria)
- The value of a cultural encounter (Denmark)
- Knowledge of other educational systems; 'go abroad and grow up' – reports of returned students almost always emphasise personal development (France)
- The German teacher training programme state-run, with a state final qualification. Successful students are employed solely on their exam results, no independent application process for an employer. Hence, Erasmus plays no part in the recruiting process. This affects a student's decision whether to participate (Germany)
- Structural change to allow student mobility without missing essential elements would encourage many more to participate in Erasmus; provide information about Erasmus opportunities at an earlier date, for example when marketing in schools (Ireland)
- Culture, personal development; higher grants, especially to Northern European countries (Netherlands)
- Meetings of former Erasmus students with potential candidates (Poland)
- Reason for small numbers is the low number of partners in this subject (Romania)
- Promote social and cultural aspects of study abroad (Sweden)

D3a Administrative difficulties?

- The organisation of the Erasmus programme changes frequently (Austria)
- The structure of the Danish model, not being module / course based, restricts the time and duration of exchanges (Denmark)
- It is difficult to find a three month period free for European mobility, and only possible for trainees for primary schools since those for secondary schools are in charge of a class for the whole year for their teaching practice (France)
- Difficult to find and keep partners in countries that our students would like to go to (Germany)
- Essential elements have to be completed on return, discouraging many students (Ireland)
- No difficulties, praise for administrative staff at home and in partner institutions (Poland)

D3b Academic recognition difficulties?

- Some incoming students have problems with home institution (Austria)
- A few senior lecturers are concerned when their students go to non-Nordic speaking countries (Denmark)
- New degree courses are much more strictly regulated than the old ones, so it is harder to fit in the modules done abroad (France)
- Erasmus credits count, but Erasmus grades do not count (Germany)
- It is hard to attain equivalence with essential elements (Ireland)
- The programme requirements are equivalent in most cases (Poland)

D3c	Linguistic issues?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students can speak English, but not so much other less-taught languages (Austria) • The university used to fund language courses in Spanish, Italian, Dutch and Polish, but the funding is being phased out; some students refuse to go to particular countries for language reasons (Germany) • Written tests in the host country language (Greece) • Sometimes there are problems understanding lectures, and doing some assessments or exams as native speakers (Ireland) • Some incoming students lack English proficiency (Netherlands) • No problems, there is a relatively international lexicon of terminology (Poland) • Students are required to take language tests before departure (Romania) • It is becoming increasingly hard to recruit students to go to countries where English is not used. Very few students can cope at an academic level in German, French, Italian or Spanish (Sweden)
D3d	Difficulties with professional requirements?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Danish model offered at Colleges of Education is not easily compatible with many European university programmes / structures (Denmark) • Teacher training nationally oriented and excluded from the Bologna process, at least in this German Land (Germany) • Meeting the Erasmus directive of equivalent courses is very difficult (Ireland)
D4	Are there any other obstacles to mobility in this subject?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very tight structure in Danish teacher education and national examinations (Denmark) • Sometimes family reasons, child care (Germany) • The B Ed is an intensive 3-years with multiple periods of teaching practice, which does not lend itself to study periods away from the normal curriculum. For example, those doing Academic Irish cannot participate, Religious Education has to be made up on return in order to get Diploma to enable teaching. There is a perception that foreign language would harm academic performance and the degree grade. (Ireland) • Placements in schools tend to be year-long assistantships which are difficult to interrupt for study abroad (Netherlands) • The main obstacle is the low level of the Erasmus grant (Romania) • The average age of student teachers is 26, many are female with families making it hard to study abroad (Sweden)
D5(i)	Additional comments, good practice
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guaranteed academic recognition (ECTS counsellors had said 'model of good practice'), provide detailed Erasmus information, quality of co-operation with hosts (Austria) • Information should be complete, full and available to all exchange students (Denmark) • Willingness and conviction of team and management, very good network of partners. Policy remains frail, ECTS and delivery of a professional Master would strengthen set-up (France) • There are too many 'one way streets' – students prefer English but it is difficult if not impossible to achieve reciprocity, students want to go from this institution but few students want to come here; very good experience with 'International Class'; the structure of teacher education is different in different countries. Very often undergraduates who go abroad under one subject area (not Education) opt to become

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

teachers as post-graduates. The post-grad course is so tightly structured that a period abroad is not possible (Germany)

- Home students can mentor incoming students, giving the home students a first international experience (Netherlands)
- This university has set up a new department charged with the total implementation of ECTS, professional recognition, publicity and marketing in this subject area (Romania)

D5(ii) Proposals for increasing mobility

- Better financial support for students, academic recognition in **all** institutions (Austria)
- Better possibilities for academic recognition in all subject areas, more flexible structures and alternative methods of assessment (Denmark)
- More money for every student would help; Germany should modify its system of teacher employment to allow international experiences to become criteria for employment, a mutually recognised general diploma of European teacher education should be introduced. (Germany)
- Universities in new member states should try to improve the image and conduct studies in foreign languages to attract incoming students (Poland)
- Solution to increased mobility: sign more bilateral agreements (Romania)
- Encourage innovation, make more use of ICT (Romania)

Mathematics & Informatics

D1g Are there any other ways in which professional bodies are influential?

- Professional bodies have more of an advisory status in Austria (Austria)
- Many professional bodies and employers recognise maturity and give preference to students that have lived and studied abroad. We organise workshops and conference in collaboration with professional bodies. Through obligatory industrial placements we take into consideration the requirements of industry and the job market. Careers offices link graduates with the home and international job market (Greece)
- Only in setting curriculum standards (Ireland)
- While not specifying particular subjects or pass levels, professional bodies would withhold accreditation if dissatisfied. They accept Erasmus credits as valid.

D2e Are there other ways in which students could be encouraged to participate in Erasmus in this subject area?

- Teaching staff mobility helps increase numbers, knowing someone at the department before going there (Austria)
- Publish ideas for projects / theses abroad (Denmark)
- We offer a lot of foreign language courses; every year we have visiting Erasmus professors, which helps students to find courage (France)
- Future postgraduate or doctorate opportunities abroad; transfer of know-how in recent technologies (Greece)
- Better host language provision for pre-Erasmus students, both teaching and core-subject text books (Ireland)
- Personal development (Netherlands)
- Higher scholarships / grants; the possibility, post-Erasmus, of offers of grants, doctorate studies, employment; participation in international projects / contests (Poland)
- No need to encourage, good students are always interested in Erasmus (Romania)
- Higher grants; deep rooted engagement from the institution's management and academic staff (Sweden)
- More specific promotion at the stage of choice of degree course (UK)

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

D3a	Administrative difficulties?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information comes sometimes very late (Austria) • It's more work for professors and administration (France) • Convincing department colleagues that flexibility is important (Ireland) • Time schedules do not match; accommodation problems in host countries (Netherlands) • Problems common to all subject areas are finance, visas; IT students frequently have jobs and do not want to lose them given the state of the job market (Poland) • The structure of the academic year is different in some countries; visa formalities (Romania) 	
D3b	Academic recognition difficulties?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECTS is mostly, but not always, applicable (Austria) • Erasmus semesters are part of the studies (France) • Academics value the diversity that the year abroad brings, there is no difficulty in this subject area with credit recognition (Ireland) 	
D3c	Linguistic issues?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some languages are considered too 'exotic' by students (Austria) • There are few programmes delivered in English by partners (Denmark) • Socrates universities should offer a set of English spoken courses as well as from the home language (Germany) • There is a need for increased resources for core subject teaching in the host language, and better English course provision for incoming students (Ireland) • English is used by students and in books, no problem (Netherlands) • Most students want to go to places where they can study in English (Sweden) • Language is no problem for postgraduates working on projects or dissertations. Few undergraduates are confident to sit exams and attend final year lectures in a foreign language; because of 'European Studies' aspect, students usually competent (UK) 	
D3d	Difficulties with professional requirements?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some French students require a work placement within an incompatible time-frame (Ireland) • Mainly on the MSc cycle, where study is focussed on particular subjects (Romania) 	
D4	Are there any other obstacles to mobility in this subject?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A newly introduced 6 month limit on scholarships might reduce the outward mobility by up to one third and might lead to an end of student exchange with UK (Austria) • They feel so well at the home university (Denmark) • No co-ordination between the design of the semesters in Europe (France) • Different starting times for semesters (Greece) • Mathematical aspects are approached very differently in some host institutions; in some cases students are concerned about the prospect of an unfamiliar academic system; numbers on the IT degree are declining because of market, meaning fewer Erasmus students (Ireland) • Sometimes it is difficult to find suitable projects that fit the study programmes (Netherlands) 	

ERASMUS EXPERIENCE: PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVE IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS

- Increasingly students have part-time jobs; final year students who go abroad are remote from the job market; the financial aspect is usually attractive, certainly not off-putting (UK)

D5(i) Additional comments, good practice

- Tasks are divided between the academic programme director and the European Office with good working relations. Teaching assignments and monitoring visits at partner institutions, involving student representatives in organising the exchange. Acting as a group of partners, e.g. through intensive programmes. Mutual support with curriculum development. Making student and staff mobility part of a domain specific education offer (e.g. IT security) so that students can understand that only by being part of larger European networks will they remain competitive in the long term (Austria)
- Students don't have enough money and the grant is too low (France)
- Flexibility with linguistic problems of incoming students, teaching courses in English, special subjects for examinations in English, free meals and bus passes and financial help with accommodation costs for incoming students. Some partner institutions have student tutors who help incoming students and get ECTS credits as a reward. We have recently organised a volunteer Erasmus student group to help all incoming students (Greece)
- Each department has a Erasmus co-ordinator who works closely with the central administration, confirms the acceptance of the student onto the course. Many departments hold special events for outgoing Erasmus students, involving also returning Erasmus students. The University is a member of a group of top universities and can share best practice, and participates in the European Programmes in Education and Training Task Force. The University committee structure enables feedback to all departments. Two partner institutions operate efficient on-line application systems (Ireland)
- A good functioning network of partners is essential (Netherlands)
- Importance of continuity of programme directors and close links with partners, use of PhD students to facilitate collaborative research programmes; the department makes good use of incoming and returning students in promotion, and meets potential students several times. The Department as a whole is committed. Language tuition starts in the first year (UK)

D5(ii) Proposals for increasing mobility

- A partner visit programme is essential for creating student mobility (Austria)
- Continuous efforts, meetings with students at department level 2 or 3 times a year, the Erasmus office always welcoming, the Erasmus student association provides information on a continuous basis to Informatics students; more advertisements of our institution and country, increasing teaching staff mobility to promote our institution and organise student mobility, higher Erasmus student grants (Greece)
- Hold an open day to promote Erasmus within the university and nationwide (Ireland)
- Motivation by fellow students a crucial factor in increasing student mobility (Netherlands)
- English language is very important, so encourage partnerships with institutions in countries where English is spoken or used for teaching (Romania)
- Allow students to change courses, from Maths to Maths with European Studies, at the end of the first year (UK)

Natural Sciences

D1g Are there any other ways in which professional bodies are influential?

- At postgraduate level (France)
- Difficult to recognise grades and examinations from abroad (Germany)
- Advisory committee; the Institute of Physics provides support and teaching materials; also voluntary validation / accreditation of degree (Ireland)
- Representatives for 'important' employers are members of Faculty boards; providing project work (Sweden)
- Professional bodies provide degree holders with one year's membership allowing them to benefit from networking events, job finding and enhancing student portfolios; the Institute of Physics accredits degree programmes, the core is in line with Institute of Physics requirements (UK)

D2e Are there other ways in which students could be encouraged to participate in Erasmus in this subject area?

- Higher mobility grants; employment, PhD opportunities (France)
- Students will gain knowledge of other systems and a feel of Europe without boundaries (Germany)
- By doing Project work, when in countries whose language is not widely used (Greece)
- The current response is good (Ireland)
- Some academics are discouraged from sending students abroad because some of the students who do go abroad to study do not return to complete their degrees (Poland)
- By increasing the Erasmus grant; more inward teaching staff mobility, including talking to home students as well as lecturing and doing demonstrations (Romania)
- Make study abroad compulsory; promotion of unexpected benefits such as publication in scientific journals; tell students of opportunities of projects that they might not have at home; currently send c 20% of cohort, not seeking to increase (UK)

D3a Administrative difficulties?

- The evaluation of the students' training sessions in laboratories is not always available to our central office which is just given a comprehensive mark; yearly renewal of bilateral agreements, very slow response times from partners (France)
- Accommodation for incoming students (Ireland)
- Structure of the academic year (calendar) difference can cause big problems; finding accommodation in expensive countries; visa formalities (Romania)
- Very important to meet partners to find appropriate courses / project work for outgoing students (Sweden)
- Postgraduate placements in the summer are problematic for reporting deadlines; sometimes students do not communicate problems at all or until late in the day; conversion of a wide variation of course marks from many partners requires time, attention and experience to be fair to all (UK)

D3b Academic recognition difficulties?

- Not at this level (France)
- Difficult because many universities are very theoretical, we mainly recognise practical work (Germany)
- There are problems when ECTS credits only are received and not marks (Poland)
- It is sometimes difficult to find courses for incoming students (Sweden)
- There are some problems with incoming students who return at Easter without having taken assessments (UK)

D3c	Linguistic issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sometimes exams are only in the host language (Germany) • Fluency in foreign languages is low as an English-speaking country (Ireland) • We offer courses taught in English. Outgoing students take courses in the host language (Sweden) • Spanish incoming students are less well-prepared than others, but improving. Outgoing students have a minimum of two years language training (UK)
D3d D4	Difficulties with professional requirements? – NO comments Are there any other obstacles to mobility in this subject?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial problems and increasing complexity of registration process (France) • The minority languages (Greece) • Lack of funding to send students abroad (Ireland) • The low Erasmus grant, although this does not seem to discourage students in other subjects; most want to study in English, when not possible practical research in laboratories under supervision would be best, but not suitable for undergraduates in their second year (Poland) • Shortage of accommodation for incoming students, also a problem for outgoing students (Sweden) • Students usually save on fees and living expenses while abroad (UK)
D5(i)	Additional comments, good practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because Greek is a minority language, incoming students can work in English, but have to do practical work, alternatively project work can covered by ECTS credits (Greece) • The programme works well. It is very important to have close and continuous contacts with partners. More incentives are needed for teaching staff mobility: time, money, recognition (Sweden) • The active involvement of an academic ‘champion’ who has benefited from teaching staff mobility. Allowing students ‘professional’ recognition for work done abroad, e.g. publications. Research-based placements to minimise language issues as English is the language of research; incoming students and former exchange students enrich the department culturally and academically and have significant input into the exchange scheme. Languages staff in the humanities programme often provide students with advice and support which helps retain motivation. Students abroad are monitored and supported by two academic visits and frequent email contact. (UK)
D5(ii)	Proposals for increasing mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased teaching staff mobility would lead to increased student mobility (Sweden) • This university is concentrating on postgraduate student mobility, refinement of partners is under way, new members of staff are asked about Erasmus contacts, however the three months minimum makes things difficult (UK)

ANNEX VI
CASE STUDIES

Presented at the
UK Dissemination Project
Good Practice Conference

VIENNA, AUSTRIA

FEBRUARY 2005

Home Country: Austria
Subject Area: Architecture
Home Institution: Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck
Host Country: Spain
Host Institution: Escola Tecnica Superior D'Arquitectura de Barcelona
Year of Stay: 1996 –1997 (12 months)
Graduated: 2000 (Dipl.Ing)
Employer: Institute for Building Construction and Design, Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck, Austria

Student Statement: Markus Malin

In 1993, I felt the need for personal and professional reorientation. I then had the opportunity of going to work in an architect's office in Brazil, with the exchange program IAESTE. I came back full of images, ideas and energy. After this, I decided to go to Barcelona and I went to the design studio of Enric Miralles, a famous Spanish architect. So I started to learn Spanish. The period in Barcelona was one of the greatest personal and professional experiences in my life. I got to know what international networking and interdisciplinary really means. The fact that students from all over Europe and America were studying there created a kind of melting pot. It was a variety of people with different cultures, languages, professions and ideologies.

There was a big reservoir of creativity, which fundamentally influenced the development of my professional work. Erasmus really was the basis for my current position. In January 2000 I passed my studies with a distinction at the University of Innsbruck, and started my professional career at the Institute. I am convinced this kind of interaction of practical experience and theoretical background is the future of modern architectural education. Architecture is based on individuality and originality, which is very important in such creative studies. This fact increases the value and necessity of programmes such as Erasmus, as they give students the opportunity to see different kinds of working methods.

Employer Statement: Professor Patrik Schumacher (Institute for Building Construction and Design, Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck)

With respect to enrichment through exchange programmes like the Erasmus programme, I would like to give an example from - The AADRL - Design Research Laboratory at the Architectural Association School of Architecture in London. It is a 16-month post-professional course offering a Master of Architecture (MARCH) degree. We work with 90 students from 33 countries, supported by engineers and innovative firms. In this heterogenic team are synergetic effects, which we realize through creating multiple, changing working groups. The differences caused by architectonical culture is generating new creative potentials and new working methods supported by usual software-products like 3ds max and Maya, which are becoming the new platform of communication.

This kind of international networking is also one of the characteristic attitudes of the working process at our Institute of Construction and Design in Innsbruck. Most of our employees have therefore, studied at foreign universities mainly with the Erasmus programme! One of our focuses is to create an international network out of these pre-existing contacts with partner universities. This should be the platform for activities like exhibitions, workshops and exchanges of students and teaching staff, in order to guarantee the students an interesting and varied architectural education. Erasmus is an important support for our efforts and we hope that our contribution strengthens the idea of the programme.

Home Country: France
Subject Area: Education
Home Institution: IUFM de Versailles
Host Country: Poland
Host Institution: University of Krakow
Year of Stay: 2000 (3 months)
Graduated: 2001 (Bachelors Degree)
Employer: Primary School, France.

Student Statement: Céline Pastor

At a time when Europe is redeveloping its economic, social and cultural identity, we must deepen our knowledge and understanding of our European neighbours and identify and strengthen the positive ties that will ultimately lead us to greater cohesion. When I learnt I could undertake one year of my teaching studies in another part of Europe I was immediately interested. I saw an opportunity to make a contribution and to grow both professionally and personally by discovering the educational system and pedagogical practice in another country.

Although there were numerous possibilities in terms of selecting a country, I was mindful of choosing a country from Eastern Europe, as it was a part of Europe I didn't know. I felt the 'old' Europe had much to offer in the complexity of its socio-economic and historic background. For this reason, I chose to make Poland my host country for one semester of my second year of IUFM. In order to make an objective analysis of the differences which underlie the Polish and the French educational system, it was important, not only to understand the pedagogical orientations of the country, but also the actual teaching methods and practice demonstrated within Polish primary schools. My experience of the French system allowed me to discuss the differences between our two systems in more detail with the Polish teachers. Having the opportunity to observe classes and participate in the preparation of lessons and classroom materials allowed me to practice teaching, which later facilitated my adaptation to my new position as a first year teacher. When I returned to France I was able to share my experience with my colleagues and even prolong it to some extent by setting up a correspondence programme with the class of a French/Polish teacher in Poland. Important cross-cultural links were established and my appreciation of the teaching profession as a whole has grown in both breadth and depth. I wanted to utilise my experience in Poland as a basis for my second year final essay. I compared the methods of teaching sport in Poland and France. Through this research and analysis I was able to extend and deepen my knowledge and understanding of teaching sport in France. In retrospect, this has greatly benefited my professional practice.

In conclusion, at the end of the exchange, my objectives were not only met, but surpassed. My collaboration with the local teaching teams was extremely fruitful. Discussions with teachers and observations of classes allowed me to extend my own professional practice, notably the idea of interdisciplinary activity as an essential element of the education system. This was an immensely rich experience of lasting professional and personal value. I would support all those studying to become teachers or already working within the profession to participate in the Erasmus programme at the first opportunity.

Employer Statement: unavailable

Home Country: Germany
Subject Area: Education
Home Institution: Universität Lüneburg
Host Country: Spain
Host Institution: Universidade da Coruña
Year of Stay: 1995-1996 (1 year)
Graduated: 1993
Employer: University Studies Abroad Consortium (USAC), Lüneburg, Germany

Student Statement: Iris Heine

In 1995 I was accepted by the Erasmus programme. During two semesters at the Universidade da Coruña, Spain, I took classes in intercultural and cross-cultural communication, European Education, teacher training, etc. I had daily classes at a public language school to improve my Spanish and I did an internship at the counselling department of a high school. I got a broader view on the two different educational systems with both their advantages and disadvantages.

After my two semesters in Spain I went back to Lüneburg and focused more and more on the intercultural aspects of my studies. I finished university in 1999 with a degree in Educational Science. I taught students between the ages of thirteen and fifteen in classes intended to supplement the regular curriculum at Zernike College. This year provided another opportunity to get to know another culture, a different educational system, and a new language.

In conclusion, my experiences in Spain and the Netherlands coupled with my intercultural studies in Germany profoundly influenced my approach to the professional, social and intercultural aspects of my job, especially in enabling me to help exchange students with their daily problems and to instruct them in a foreign language.

Employer Statement: Eva Vosshagen (University Studies Abroad Consortium (USAC), Lüneburg, Germany)

One of the major criteria for hiring Mrs. Heine for the USAC Program was her experience in study abroad. She is extremely flexible and tolerant of different viewpoints. Ms. Heine applies her intercultural competence in her job in many different ways. As a German instructor, she knows about the difficulties foreign students with little or no knowledge of German face in the host country. She is always aware of the necessary abilities that students should have as soon as possible, even if these are not part of the official class curriculum required by the home institution.

She is able to both challenge and motivate students in class. She also knows from her own experience, about the typical progress and the steps backwards in language learning, and the possible frustrations that result in that area. This opens her to the needs of non-native speakers who, often for the first time in their lives, have to function in a foreign environment. As the programme assistant, Ms Heine's main responsibility is student advising. This includes academic as well as personal advising. She is responsible for setting up field trips and an extracurricular culture programme. Last but not least, she is always aware of cultural differences and the impact they have on students. The fact that she studied abroad helps her to show empathy towards typical problems and issues of students in intercultural situations. It is obvious that Ms Heine's experience as an exchange student is the basis of her professional success.

Home Country: Greece
Subject Area: Mathematics & Informatics
Home Institution: Athens University of Economics and Business
Host Country: Sweden
Host Institution: Lund University
Year of Stay: 2000 (6 months)
Graduated: 2000 (MSc)
Employer: Accenture SA, Halandri, Greece

Student Statement: Thodoris Karatasos

During my time abroad I got to know new people, new habits, and new cultures and learned how to respect other people's characteristics and particularities. This knowledge was appreciated at interviews since the day-to-day work in an international company like Accenture requires collaboration with people from other countries as well as participation in multicultural teams.

My Erasmus period was the perfect school of how to behave in such teams, where the differences among attitudes are the rule and not the exception. Since being employed in Accenture I have been asked several times to travel abroad, most of the times for working with colleagues from other countries, but also for training and attending seminars. Having experience of the Erasmus programme has inspired me with confidence and I can now adapt easily to new working environments. I was also taught different ways of working and organising my schedule and daily tasks.

Employer Statement: Nicolas Moschatos (Manager, Accenture S.A, Halandri, Greece)

Not so long ago a good university education was a passport to success and a secure path for career development. Yet, the competition between individuals has increased e.g. more candidates for the same position. In that very demanding and competitive landscape, one of the main characteristics that has flourished giving a significant advantage to the individual is the development of a 'business culture', and by that I mean the capability to interact, communicate, and collaborate and co exist with people of different culture, race, religion and particularities.

Nowadays, in the era of globalisation, people are starting to see and acknowledge the necessity of multinational companies. Accenture, being one of the top consulting companies with active presence in more than 46 countries around the world, was one of the pioneer companies to foster and encourage this new 'business culture' by using people from different countries to deliver projects. Towards this direction the influence of the Erasmus programme on new professionals is quite evident. Recently, I had the chance to have Thodoris involved in one of my multilingual / national projects and I was amazed by his degree of cooperation and fast adaptation to what was needed to work with people from other countries. I hope this programme will expand in the near future. Personally, I will be glad to see people from that programme joining our firm in Greece, as a bright example of this new culture.

Home Country: Romania
Subject Area: Mathematics & Informatics
Home Institution: Babes-Bolyai University
Host Country: Italy
Host Institution: Università degli Studi di Bari
Year of Stay: 2002 (6 months)
Graduated: 2003 (Master in Applied Mathematics)
Employer: Ministry of Education and Research, Bucharest, Romania

Student Statement: Diana Ivan

From a professional point of view, this period abroad was a real milestone. First of all, I was able to observe a new teaching paradigm. I had the opportunity to present my observations to my teachers and my colleagues during a meeting with the Chair of Numerical and Statistical Analysis. I was able to answer many questions regarding the modular and independent study, as well as about the curricula. My experience served as an informative plus for my University. Thanks to my good results in Italy, I was asked to be a teaching assistant for the Chair of Numerical and Statistical Analysis. I could use my new acquired knowledge and techniques while teaching Probability and Statistics during the university year 2002-2003.

After the Master graduation in Romania, I had the opportunity to apply for the job position of advisor for European Integration. Given my prior experience, I chose the Ministry of Education and Research and I am now working with Radu Damian, Secretary of State for Higher Education and European Integration. At the moment the main task is to implement the Bologna Process. As proven by my research study that I accomplished during April-June 2004 at the Council of Europe, I remain convinced that the mobility and the international experience helps both career and personal development.

Employer Statement: Radu Damian (Secretary of State, Ministry of Education and Research, Bucharest, Romania)

Diana Ivan has worked in the Ministry of Education and Research since November 2003 under my direct supervision. She was employed after a contest organised by the joint collaboration of the Ministry of European Integration and our Ministry. The positive result of the contest was also due to her Erasmus experience as the language test was a key factor.

Within the ministry, Diana Ivan is involved in implementing the Bologna Process which will establish, by 2010, the European Higher Education Area. More specifically the main objectives of the process are to harmonise the structure of higher education in Europe, to boost mobility and to increase the quality of the educational process. In implementing those objectives Diana Ivan makes use of her Erasmus experience as the Erasmus programme offers the young student the opportunity to observe different educational structures and have access to quality education.

I consider that the Erasmus mobility of Diana Ivan has contributed to her high performance in this job, and as her employer I am pleased to signal what I consider to be a good practice model.

Home Country: Ireland
Subject Area: Natural Sciences
Home Institution: Dublin Institute of Technology
Host Country: Sweden
Host Institution: Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm
Year of Stay: 1995 (3 months)
Graduated: 1995 (Graduateship of the Institute of Biology)
Employer: Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

Student Statement: Mary Hunt

I returned to full-time education at the Dublin Institute Technology as a mature student in 1991, having previously worked in the banking sector for several years. I was interested in undertaking my final year project work outside Ireland, with a view to extending my horizons and experiencing another culture, both from a career and personal point of view. I myself am now actively involved in supervising other Irish students who come to Stockholm on project placements.

The Erasmus programme experience was an excellent one for me from several points of view. The key aspects were the ability to travel to an internationally renowned institute in Europe to undertake my undergraduate project. It was a combined opportunity to experience a new culture and begin learning a new language. From a career point of view, the Erasmus programme paved the way in education to becoming a PhD. Having completed my undergraduate project in Stockholm, I was invited to return to the group at Karolinska Institutet and undertake a PhD project/programme here. Without the assistance of the Erasmus programme, I would never have had the opportunity to initially travel to Sweden to work on a project, which successfully culminated in my PhD in November 2001.

From a career and employment point of view, the support from the Erasmus programme provided me with the opportunity to gain contact with an international institute and a network of scientists in Sweden. It provided me with new confidence and motivation as a person. It provided me with skills and new perspectives, which were the foundation for my current success as an internationally recognised researcher.

Employer Statement: Professor Stefan Alexson (Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden)

My first practical experience with this programme was in 1995, when I met Mary Hunt, undergraduate student from the Dublin Institute of Technology. She is now currently working as a post doc fellow in my group. As an employer, my experience of the Erasmus programme has been extremely positive. In the area of natural sciences, it can be difficult to find suitably motivated students to undertake a PhD. As an employer, I feel that the Erasmus programme has been indispensable in providing a flow of students of an extremely high class from Dublin Institute of Technology to Karolinska Institutet.

The support from the Erasmus programme in allowing students to travel to a university in another European country helps students to develop personal skills, which are invaluable in their career and in their future employment. As a potential employer, the fact that students travel to another European country on an Erasmus programme shows independence, self-drive and motivation, qualities which are extremely important in a future employee.

Home Country: Slovenia
Subject Area: Architecture
Home Institution: University of Ljubljana
Host Country: Germany
Host Institution: Universität Hannover, Fachbereich Architektur
Year of Stay: 2000-2001 (9 months)
Graduated: 2002 (Diploma, univ dipl. Ing. Arch.)
Employer: ILUMINIUM d.o.o, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Student Statement: Matevž Juvančič

I participated in the Erasmus programme in 2000/2001 in the field of Architecture at the University of Hannover. After my return I graduated and enrolled as a postgraduate at the Faculty of Architecture in Ljubljana. At the moment, I am preparing my PhD. I am not employed in the strictest sense of the word since I benefit from my ongoing student status. After two years of working in an architectural firm, I opened up my own firm for planning, architecture and interior design. I also work as a journalist for a national daily paper Delo d.d. and as a technical associate for the Faculty of Architecture.

As a student of Erasmus I cannot say that I benefited directly from the exchange, but I would like to outline some positive indirect benefits of the programme. The exchange made me aware of what is expected from students in Germany compared to in my home faculty in Slovenia e.g. the structure of studies and advantages and disadvantages of each educational system. This boosted my self-awareness and broadened my knowledge.

Studies and contacts made during this exchange made me aware that the time and conditions in my home country were ripe for opening my own firm. My organisational skills were also much improved since I had to manage my job as an editor at home and my studies abroad, as well as generally settling into the foreign country. My thought processes were broadened thanks to cooperation on projects with several exchange and local students.

Last, but by no means least, my language skills greatly improved as I became fluent in German. This new situation forced me into contact with different people at different levels. I no longer felt shy in approaching foreign people, which is perhaps one of the cultural peculiarities of my country. Its inhabitants generally speak foreign languages at a very high level when compared with other EU nations, but are too shy or too self-conscious to use their skills.

There are probably numerous more benefits that I have not thought of, which may come in handy in positions of management, work, postgraduate studies and which broaden one's general knowledge. Although my firm is small, we are making progress and it looks like we are going to grow fast.

Employer Statement: self-employed

Home Country: Sweden
Subject Area: Natural Sciences
Home Institution: Uppsala University
Host Country: Germany
Host Institution: Universität Heidelberg
Year of Stay: 1996 -1997 (one year)
Graduated: 2002 (PhD Mathematics)
Employer: Saab Systems, Järfälla, Sweden.

Student Statement: Lars Lindhagen

My year as an Erasmus exchange student in Heidelberg, Germany, was a most enjoyable time. I took a number of course topics that are not covered strongly at my home university (Uppsala, Sweden), eg algebra and Galois theory. Although my PhD thesis (in mathematics) did not depend explicitly on any of these topics, I do appreciate the general knowledge value and broader experience they have given me. It seems to be a general truth that knowledge in one area can enhance another, although the relationship may, at first glance, seem superficial. The same holds true, to a lesser extent, for my current position at Saab Systems. I cannot say that my work now has anything at all to do with the subjects I studied in Heidelberg. Nevertheless, I guess that the stay in Germany has added some non-tangible values like experience of other countries and cultures.

Employer Statement: Anders Mattsson (Saab Systems, Järfälla, Sweden)

Saab Systems is a company that has a large proportion of sales outside Sweden. For this reason it is important to have employees who can speak foreign languages and have knowledge of other cultures. In many ways Sweden is a small country with small cultural differences. Spending a year in another country with another culture gives students a unique experience of something else. It is only by actually living in a place for a long period of time that you really learn how people reason there. If you do not have that experience then the risk is that you are not aware of other ways of thinking and just assume therefore that people you meet are more or less like yourself. On the other hand you can also learn that there are similarities between countries where you first saw differences. Everything is important, like how people behave when they are happy or sad, how you do business, what you eat and so on. Hopefully a year abroad makes you more tolerant to other cultures but also more aware that there can be a difference in how people reason in different countries.

Students who spend a year abroad and managed their studies have proved that they can do something in a new environment. This can make them more secure and independent in the future when they are faced with new situations. Obviously students that participate in the Erasmus programme improve their knowledge of a foreign language This can be very useful, but for most employees at Saab Systems English is the only language except Swedish that is regularly used. Students that can show on their CV that they have studied abroad have an advantage when they try to get a job. What country they have been to is not so important.

ANNEX VII

Statistics of Points made in Case Study Statements

Case Studies: points of significance made in Statements			<u>Architecture</u>		<u>Education</u>		<u>Maths & IT</u>		<u>Nat. Science</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
Students		Total number	21		21		33		20		95	
	Personal	social skills development / confidence	8	38.1%	8	38.1%	4	12.1%	5	25.0%	25	26.3%
		personal enrichment	4	19.0%	2	9.5%		0.0%		0.0%	6	6.3%
		cultural tolerance / comfort / respect	8	38.1%	3	14.3%	5	15.2%	2	10.0%	18	18.9%
		adaptability, organisational skills	2	9.5%	3	14.3%	4	12.1%	1	5.0%	10	10.5%
		teamwork	2	9.5%	1	4.8%		0.0%		0.0%	3	3.2%
		open-mindedness	4	19.0%	2	9.5%	1	3.0%		0.0%	7	7.4%
		independence, responsibility		0.0%		0.0%	3	9.1%		0.0%	3	3.2%
		increased motivation		0.0%	3	14.3%	2	6.1%	1	5.0%	6	6.3%
		European Awareness		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1	5.0%	1	1.1%
	Linguistic	use of English language	2	9.5%	3	14.3%	15	45.5%	4	20.0%	24	25.3%
		learning new language	2	9.5%		0.0%	2	6.1%	2	10.0%	6	6.3%
		increased competence / confidence	6	28.6%	8	38.1%	10	30.3%	6	30.0%	30	31.6%
	Academic	practical and theoretical experience, greater variety	7	33.3%	2	9.5%	4	12.1%	8	40.0%	21	22.1%
		better or different resources	1	4.8%		0.0%	1	3.0%	2	10.0%	4	4.2%
		greater variety of learning / teaching styles	4	19.0%	4	19.0%	7	21.2%		0.0%	15	15.8%
		different aspects of subject / broadening curriculum (not available in home institution)	9	42.9%	2	9.5%	13	39.4%	9	45.0%	33	34.7%
		better work recognised / higher grades	2	9.5%		0.0%	2	6.1%		0.0%	4	4.3%
		different methodological experiences	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	1	3.0%	2	10.0%	4	4.3%
	Professional	international team-working / networking	4	19.0%		0.0%	6	18.2%	6	30.0%	16	16.8%
		affected style or working / learning	6	28.6%	7	33.3%	3	9.1%	4	20.0%	20	21.1%
		personal contacts, connections, international experts	2	9.5%	1	4.8%	4	12.1%	4	20.0%	11	11.6%

		'professional' recognition by peers	2	9.5%		0.0%	1	3.0%		0.0%	3	3.2%
	Career	encourage thinking of going / working abroad	2	9.5%		0.0%	3	9.1%		0.0%	5	5.3%
		choices affected by other cultures / experiences	2	9.5%		0.0%	3	9.1%	1	5.0%	6	6.3%
		multicultural environment useful on CV	2	9.5%	1	4.8%	2	6.1%		0.0%	5	5.3%
		made getting a job easier	7	33.3%	8	38.1%	11	33.3%	8	40.00	34	35.8%
Employers		total number	15		17		18		16		66	
		Erasmus added value	3	20.0%	2	11.8%	5	27.8%	2	12.5%	12	18.2%
		importance of experience of different cultures	7	46.7%	6	35.3%	6	33.3%	4	25.0%	23	34.8%
		foreign experience desirable	1	6.7%	2	11.8%	2	11.1%		0.0%	5	7.6%
		international networking, team-working	2	13.3%	2	11.8%	3	16.7%	2	12.5%	9	13.6%
		open to new ideas, different working styles, adaptable	4	26.7%	2	11.8%	2	11.1%	4	25.0%	12	18.2%
		enriched experience making a better member of staff / character building / contributing new ideas	4	26.7%	7	41.2%		0.0%	1	6.3%	12	18.2%
		greater social competence, confidence	2	13.3%	3	17.6%	2	11.1%	1	6.3%	8	12.1%
		foreign languages important / useful	2	13.3%	2	11.8%	3	16.7%	2	12.5%	9	13.6%
		English language useful		0.0%	2	11.8%	6	33.3%	2	12.5%	10	15.2%
		Erasmus type experience criterion in selection for job	2	13.3%	5	29.4%	7	38.9%	3	18.8%	17	25.8%
Institutions		total number	11		15		12		14		52	
		improvement in language competence	5	45.5%	7	46.7%	5	41.7%	4	28.6%	21	40.4%
		proof of flexibility and initiative, open-mindedness	2	18.2%	10	66.7%	2	16.7%	3	21.4%	17	32.7%
		different approaches to subject, aspects not available at home	8	72.7%	7	46.7%	6	50.0%	12	85.7%	33	63.5%
		positive effect on personal development, maturity, independence	11	100.0 %	11	73.3%	4	33.3%	5	35.7%	31	59.8%
		looks good on CV, good in job market	4	36.4%	3	20.0%	4	33.3%	5	35.7%	16	30.8%
		cultural competence, value of multicultural experience, tolerance	5	45.5%	9	60.0%	1	8.3%	3	21.4%	18	34.6%
		academic competence, Erasmus as Quality Assurance	1	9.1%	4	26.7%	2	16.7%	4	28.6%	11	21.2%

ANNEX VIII

International Conference Participant List

RAPPORTEURS

Family Name	Forename	Organisation	Country
Heller	Michelle	University of Innsbruck	Austria
Doyle	John	Mary Immaculate College	Ireland
Bagger Laursen	Kjeld	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
Meczyński	Michał	Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza Poznaniu	Poland
Siberry	Laurence	Stranmillis University College	United Kingdom

CHAIRS

Surname	Forename	Organisation	Country
Michel	Michèle	Ecole d'Architecture et de Paysage de Bordeaux	France
Kamenopoulou	Eleftheria	Greek National Agency	Greece
Hibler	David	UK National Agency	United Kingdom
Janssen	Joukje	Dutch National Agency	Netherlands
Pajnič	Neža	Slovenian National Agency	Slovenia

CASE STUDIES

GRADUATES

Family Name	Forename	Organisation	Country
Malin	D.I. Markus	University of Innsbruck	Austria
Manos	Efstratios	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki	Greece
Fung	Alice	University of Bath	UK
Frühwirth	Silvia	Teacher Training College in Vienna	Austria
Kandler	Petra	Teacher Training College in Vienna	Austria
Bergen Soerensen	Diana	CVU Jelling	Denmark
Pastor	Céline	IUFM de Versailles	France
Heine	Iris	Universität Lüneburg	Germany
Toutountzi	Eleftheria	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki	Greece
Caplice	Carol	Mary Immaculate College	Ireland
Nic Aogáin	Brídín	St Patrick's College	Ireland
Cahill	Maeve	St Mary's University College	United Kingdom
Lausten	Niels Jakob	University of Copenhagen	Denmark
Karatasos	Thodoris	Athens University of Economics and Business	Greece
Woods	Justin	Trinity College Dublin	Ireland
Ivan	Diana	Babes-Bolyai University	Romania
Artemiadou	Vassilia	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki	Greece
Hunt	Mary	Dublin Institute of Technology	Ireland

EMPLOYERS

Family Name	Forename	Organisation	Country
Juvančič	Matevž	Iluminium d.o.o.	Slovenia
Vosshagen	Eva	University Study Abroad Consortium	Germany
Howard	Margaret	Scoil Bhride - Primary School - Cork	Ireland
Moschatos	Nicolas	Accenture S.A.	Greece
Korka	Mihai	Romanian Ministry of Education and Research	Romania
Tsibloulis	Ioannis	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki	Greece
Mattsson	Anders	Saab Systems	Sweden

HIGHER EDUCATION REPRESENTATIVES

Family Name	Forename	Organisation	Country
Hodnik Čadež	Tatjana	University of Ljubljana	Slovenia
Georgescu	Luminita	University of Pitesti	Slovenia
Bak	Inger	Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts	Denmark
Balasa	Doinita Alina	University of Bucharest	Romania
Bauer	Thomas	Teacher Training College in Vienna	Austria
Bejdevi	Asa	Jönköping University	Sweden
Bock	Hans Joern	CVU Jelling	Denmark
Bonde	Poul	Aarhus Universitet	Denmark
Borucka	Justyna	Politechnika Gdańska	Poland
Convery	Catherine	University College Dublin	Ireland
Coutsolelos	Athanasios	University of Crete	Greece
Craig	Alan	University of Durham	United Kingdom
Daraban	Daciana	Universitatea de Arhitectura in Bucharest	Romania
De Comite	Francesco	Université des Sciences et Technologies de Lille	France
Denkowska	Joanna	Politechnika Śląska	Poland
Dines	Peter	Pädagogische Hochschule Ludwigsburg	Germany
Dolga	Lia	Universitatea "politechnica" din Timosoara	Romania
Dubielewicz	Iwona	Politechnika Wroclawska	Poland
Fäldt	Göran	Uppsala University	Sweden
Forsyth	Robert	Imperial College London	United Kingdom
Gallagher	Hellen	Mary Immaculate College	Ireland
Gash	Hugh	St Patrick's College Drumcondra	Ireland
Grigoriadou	Efthalia	Technological Educational Institution of Thessaloniki	Greece
Grospietsch	Thorsten	Freie Universität Berlin	Germany
Hornig	Sabine	Fachhochschule Darmstadt	Germany
Huckriede	Bernd	Brandenburgische Technische Universität Cottbus	Germany

Family Name	Forename	Organisation	Country
Jokisz	Ida	Polsko - Japońska Wyższa Szkoła Technik Komputerowych	Poland
Kaczmarek	Maria	Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu	Poland
Kneppeck	Carola	Technische Universität München	Germany
Vitsios	Konstantinos	Athens University of Economics and Business	Greece
Lazaridou	Maria	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki	Greece
LeBleu	Bernard	Université de Montpellier	France
Lieberman	Oren	University of Strathclyde	United Kingdom
Linhofer	Susanne	Teacher Training College in Styria	Austria
Lundahl	Bo	Malmoe University	Sweden
Ovaa	Maggy	Inholland University	Netherlands
Malgorzata	Pamula	Akademia Pedagogiczna Krakowie	Poland
McKeag	Michael	The Queen's University of Belfast	United Kingdom
Mitas	Andrzej	Uniwersytet Śląski	Poland
Motschmann	Bettina	Universität Lüneburg	Germany
Mudge	Steven	University of Wales, Bangor	United Kingdom
Nedwed	Monika	Teacher Training College in Styria	Austria
Oltean	Stefan	Babes-Bolyai University	Romania
Rădulescu	Vlad	"Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iasi	Romania
Rahbek	Kirsten	CVU Jelling	Denmark
Rijkeboer	Yolande	Hanze University Groningen	Netherlands
Rönn	Johanna	Blekinge Institute of Technology	Sweden
Ryan	Brid Ann	Dublin Institute of Technology	Ireland
Ryńska	Elżbieta	Politechnika Warszawska	Poland
Saruleanu	Sabina	The "GH. Asachi" Technical University of Iasi	Romania
Schmidt-Dengler	Maria	University of Vienna	Austria
Schroeder	Sylvia	Dublin City University	Ireland
Solecki	Andrzej	Uniwersytet Wrocławski	Poland
Teichmann	Virginia	Pädagogische Hochschule Karlsruhe	Germany
Ulma	Dominique	IUFM de Versailles	France
Vogel	Carl	Trinity College Dublin	Ireland
Wehlitz	Ingrid	Aarhus College of Education	Denmark
Williams	Catherine	Trinity College Dublin	Ireland
Zupančič Strojan	Tadeja	University of Ljubljana	Slovenia

OTHER

Family Name	Forename	Organisation	Country
Daniel-Ramirez-Schiller	Carin	Sokrates Nationalagentur	Austria
Eckel	Wolfgang	Sokrates Nationalagentur	Austria
Mißbeck-Winberg	Christiane	CIRIUS	Denmark
Charuau	Solène	Agence Socrates-Leonardo da Vinci	France
Morhard	Bettina	Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD)	Germany
Schmidt	Britta	Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD)	Germany
Kamenopoulou	Eleftheria	I.K.Y.	Greece
Kerr	Mary	Higher Education Authority - Erasmus	Ireland
Sherry	Louise	Higher Education Authority - Erasmus	Ireland
Janssen	Joukje	Nuffic	Netherlands
Pedersen	Vidar	Centre for International University Cooperation (SIU)	Norway
Staszalek	Anna	Fundacja Rozwoju Systemu Edukacji	Poland
Nen	Madlena	Agentia Nationala Socrates	Romania
Pajnič	Neža	CMEPIUS	Slovenia
Rusanen	Jari	Information Programme Office for Education and Training	Sweden
Hibler	David	UK Socrates-Erasmus Council	United Kingdom
Reilly	John	UK Socrates-Erasmus Council	United Kingdom
Slater	Susan	UK Socrates-Erasmus Council	United Kingdom
Taylor	Suzie	UK Socrates-Erasmus Council	United Kingdom
Martinez-Macias	Pedro	European Commission	Belgium