

# The Use of Lifelong Learning Programme, Erasmus Mundus and Tempus to Science & Technology cooperation in the EECA region



The **International Centre for Black Sea Studies (ICBSS)** was founded in 1998 as a not-for-profit organisation under Greek law. It has since fulfilled a dual function: on the one hand, it is an independent research and training institution focusing on the Black Sea region. On the other hand, it is a related body of the Organisation of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC) and in this capacity serves as its acknowledged think-tank. Thus the ICBSS is a uniquely positioned independent expert on the Black Sea area and its regional cooperation dynamics. **Moving towards a "Green Black Sea" is our new perspective**, one characterised by a focus on development, culture, as well as economic and social prosperity, one that goes beyond the traditional approach and makes the **concept of Sustainable Economic Development, Energy, Regional Governance and Stability our driving force**. Thus, the environmental dimension runs through all of our actions and aims.

---

The ICBSS launched the **Xenophon Paper** series in July 2006 with the aim to contribute a space for policy analysis and debate on topical issues concerning the Black Sea region. As part of the ICBSS' independent activities, the Xenophon Papers are prepared either by members of its own research staff or by externally commissioned experts. While all contributions are peer-reviewed in order to assure consistent high quality, the views expressed therein exclusively represent the authors. The Xenophon Papers are available for download in electronic version from the ICBSS' webpage under [www.icbss.org](http://www.icbss.org).

In its effort to stimulate open and engaged debate, the ICBSS also welcomes enquiries and contributions from its readers under [icbss@icbss.org](mailto:icbss@icbss.org)

Martin Felix Gajdusek and Gabriela Cikikyan

# The Use of Lifelong Learning Programme, Erasmus Mundus and Tempus to Science & Technology cooperation in the EECA region



June 2012

## Imprint

### Editorial Board:



International Bureau of the Federal Ministry of Education and Research Center (DLR), Germany



International Centre for Black Sea Studies ICBSS, Greece



Centre for Social Innovation ZSI, Austria

### Editor:

#### International Centre for Black Sea Studies (ICBSS)

4 Xenophontos Str., 105 57 Athens, Greece

Telephone: +30 210 324 2321

Telefax: +30 210 324 2244

[www.icbss.org](http://www.icbss.org), [icbss@icbss.org](mailto:icbss@icbss.org)

**Core drafting team:** Martin Felix Gajdusek (ZSI) and Gabriela Cikikyan (ZSI)

**Deliverable Lead:** Centre for Social Innovation (ZSI)

**Related Work Package:** WP2- Coordination with other EU policies

**Layout & Print:** Citronio, Athens

Greece, June 2012

ISBN: 978-960-6885-23-5

ISSN: 1790-8396

# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	7
<b>Chapter 1</b>	
<b>Executive summary</b>	9
<b>Chapter 2</b>	
<b>Introduction</b>	11
<b>Chapter 3</b>	
<b>Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP)</b>	13
3.1 Objectives of the LLP	14
3.2 Management of the LLP	15
3.3 Sub-programmes	16
3.3.1 Comenius	16
3.3.2 Erasmus	17
3.3.3 Leonardo Da Vinci	18
3.3.4 Grundtvig	18
3.3.5 Transversal programme	19
3.3.6 Jean Monnet Programme	21
3.4 S&T relevant elements of the Lifelong Learning Programme	21
3.5 Lifelong Learning Programme and EECA	25
3.5.1 EECA involvement in the management of the LLP	26
3.5.2 Opened actions with regards to the S&T elements of the LLP	26
3.5.3 Statistical overview of the EECA participation in the LLP call (excluding the Jean Monnet Programme )	27
3.5.4 Statistical overview EECA participation in the Jean Monnet Programme	33
<b>Chapter 4</b>	
<b>International cooperation in Education and Training: External programmes with relevance for the EECA countries and S&amp;T</b>	34
4.1 Erasmus Mundus	34
4.1.1 Management	35
4.1.2 S&T relevant elements of Erasmus Mundus	36
4.1.3 Erasmus Mundus & EECA	36

4.1.4 Allocated budget for the EECA in Erasmus Mundus (action 2) 2011 and 2012 calls for proposals	36
4.1.5 EECA involvement in the Erasmus Mundus programme definition, selection and implementation	38
4.1.6 Statistical overview of the EECA participation in the Erasmus Mundus calls	39
4.1.7. National perspective in Erasmus Mundus	46
4.1.8. Final remarks to the points raised by national Erasmus Mundus representatives	48
4.2 Tempus	48
4.2.1 Management	51
4.2.2 S&T relevant elements of the Tempus programme	51
4.2.3 Tempus and EECA	52
4.2.4 Allocated budget for the EECA in the Tempus 4 <sup>th</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> call for proposals	52
4.2.5 EECA involvement in the Tempus programme definition, selection and implementation	54
4.2.6 Statistical overview of the EECA participation in Tempus IV	54
4.2.7 National perspective in Tempus	59
4.2.8 Project level perspective in Tempus	66
4.2.9 Final remarks to the points raised by national Tempus representatives	69
<b>Chapter 5</b>	
<b>Future perspective: Erasmus for all</b>	70
<b>Chapter 6</b>	
<b>Summary</b>	72
<b>Chapter 7</b>	
<b>Recommendations on use of LLP, Tempus and Erasmus Mundus to S&amp;T cooperation</b>	76
Recommendations for the European Union stakeholders	76
Recommendations for representatives of the EECA countries	78
Recommendations for the HEI from the EECA countries	79
<b>Chapter 8</b>	
<b>List of contributors / interview partners</b>	80
<b>Annexes</b>	
ANNEX I: about authors	82
ANNEX II: abbreviations	83
ICBSS Xenophon papers	85

# Preface

This analytical paper has been written under the 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme funded project “S&T International Cooperation Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia” (IncoNet EECA)<sup>1</sup>.

The project aims to support and strengthen the scientific cooperation between the EU and EECA region. The main objectives of IncoNet EECA are:

- To support and facilitate a bi-regional EU – EECA S&T policy dialogue and, in the case of Russia and the Ukraine, a complementary bilateral S&T policy dialogue involving stakeholders from policy making, science community and industry;
- To address other EU policies and their instruments from which S&T cooperation with EECA could benefit. Emphasis is given to the European Neighbourhood Policy – ENPI and the Four Common Spaces with Russia (External Relations), the Development Cooperation (DCI), the Education Policy (Life Long Learning Programmes - LLL) and the Innovation policy (Competitiveness and Innovation Programme – CIP);
- To strengthen the participation of EECA in FP7 with emphasis on the ‘Cooperation’ Programme but addressing other Specific Programmes, such as ‘People’, ‘Ideas’, ‘Capacities – SMEs’;
- To raise the capacities of the EECA countries;
- To implement strategic analyses that will provide a knowledge base and scientific evidence for the bi-regional/ bilateral dialogue;
- To monitor and review the activities performed in the context of IncoNet EECA in order to assess the quality of the overall process and to ensure the sustainability of these activities beyond the 4-year duration of this project.

This report addresses the participation of the EECA countries in the Life Long Learning programme (LLP), Erasmus Mundus and Tempus with regards to academic institution building, human potential development and joint training activities. The analytical findings of this report result in the Draft recommendations for exploiting the opportunities and the synergies between S&T cooperation and Lifelong Learning Programme that will be further considered in international dialogue fora (e.g. policy stakeholder conferences). Recommendations have been tailored to the EC stakeholders, EECA stakeholders and the EECA Higher Education Institutions.

The added value of this report is that it not only provides a snapshot of the EECA participation in the given programmes, it also contains the EC perspective and outlook into the future under the Erasmus for All programme. Furthermore, the report at hand includes a comprehensive part on the practical experiences with studied programmes in the region at national as well as project level.

This report is a result of 8-month work involving a number of experts from the European Commission, EACEA as well as experts from National Tempus Offices and the Higher Educational Reform Experts. We would like to thank all our contributors for their kind inputs; a full list of contributors and interview partners is presented in Chapter 8, p. 80-81

.....

<sup>1</sup> [www.inco-eeca.net](http://www.inco-eeca.net)

The report has been also widely disseminated to the partners from the region (National Tempus Offices, Higher Education Reform Experts and all Tempus partners from the region) as well as to the European Commission. The feedback received in return has been very positive and authors of this report hope that this paper will help to create knowledge for the self-reflection phase of the concerned stakeholders which will result in an increased participation in the upcoming calls.

**Mr. Martin Felix Gajdusek & Ms. Gabriela Cikikyan**

June 2012



## Chapter 1

# Executive Summary

The objective of this deliverable is to address the activities in the **Life Long Learning programme (LLP), Erasmus Mundus and Tempus** towards academic institution building, human potential development and joint training activities with regards to S&T.

Firstly, the sub-programmes and actions are studied to identify the S&T relevant components of the programmes and to understand the role of S&T and particularly the relevant international cooperation activities in the concerned programmes.

Secondly, the sub-programmes open to EECA participation are presented in terms of eligibility and the participation rate of the EECA countries.

Thirdly, the input received from relevant EECA stakeholders is being present in order to identify the overall status quo and a potential for the improvement.

At last, based on findings of the analytical part and the input received from relevant EECA stakeholders, concrete recommendations for stronger EECA participation in the programme parts with a substantial S&T component are identified.

Draft recommendations for exploiting the opportunities and the synergies between S&T cooperation and Lifelong Learning Programme shall be further considered as a relevant topic within the upcoming Policy Dialogue Platforms and the White Paper.

Based on the report findings, following recommendations can be given:

### **Recommendations for the European Union Stakeholders**

- Individual mobility actions should be further opened up vis-à-vis the EECA countries;
- Erasmus mobility actions should be further enlarged towards the EECA countries;
- Jean Monnet Programme should consider EECA countries to a larger extent;
- Provide more funding for the third countries in the already opened up activities;
- Involve EECA countries to a larger extent in the programme definition;
- National Contact Points for the LLP and Erasmus Mundus could be set up in EECA;
- Create an open database of successful projects and for partner search;
- Establish regular study visits to the Tempus projects in the field.

### **Recommendations for representatives of the EECA countries**

- It is advisable for the EECA countries to converge to Bologna principles;
- Adoption of educational policies that would stimulate the participation of the educational institutions in international cooperation projects;
- Policy formulation based on the dialogue with HEIs should become a standard practice;

- Introduction of the framework for the transfer of results;
- Semi-institutionalisation of the HERE position.

**Recommendations for the HEI from the EECA countries**

- Introduce an internationalisation strategy;
- Promote internationalisation in practice via structural and systematic approach;
- A systematic development of contacts and partnerships with other HEIs;
- Promote language instruction at HEI level.

## Chapter 2

# Introduction

This deliverable aims to identify the activities within the Life Long Learning programme (LLP), Erasmus Mundus and Tempus that are of relevance to academic institution building, human potential development and joint training activities.

To this end, the **sub-programmes of the Lifelong Learning Programme** are briefly presented so as to define in a next step the actions that are most relevant to academic institution building, human potential development and joint training activities. Secondly, the relevant sub-programmes that are open to the EECA participation are presented in terms of eligibility criteria and performance of the EECA countries in the calls of the identified sub-programmes.

The report **has been extended with the programmes aiming at international cooperation in education and training (ET), Erasmus Mundus and Tempus** as these are instrumental for mobility and international cooperation of higher education institutions (HEIs). For these programmes, the same logic has been applied as for the sub-programmes of the LLP.

This report also outlines the perspective from the national and project level. To this end, **stakeholders from the region** have been approached and their input which identifies some opportunities and challenges at the national level is summarised and fed into the recommendations for improving the EECA participation in the programmes. Draft recommendations for exploiting the opportunities and the synergies between S&T cooperation and the Lifelong Learning Programme shall be further considered in the framework of the Policy Stakeholder Conferences organised in the IncoNet EECA.

It is by now undisputed, that **well educated and highly skilled individuals are key drivers of the knowledge society**. They are responsible for the materialisation of knowledge in the field of science and technology (S&T); and by this means contribute to advance the technological progress, innovation level, competitiveness and economic growth. Moreover, skilled individuals have the potential to contribute essentially to a knowledge based society.

The **key component** of the studied programmes is the **generation of highly skilled human capital**. This report focuses on this group as defined in the OECD “Canberra Manual<sup>2</sup>” within the category of **Human Resources in Science and Technology (HRST)**.

HRST refers to the human resources who successfully completed education at the third level in S&T field of study or are employed in S&T occupation where the above qualifications are normally required. This report follows the term “science” in its broadest sense meaning “knowledge” or “knowing”, and technology is being understood as the “application of knowing”. Thus, HRST are human resources that are actually or potentially devoted to the systematic generation, advancement, diffusion and application of scientific and technological knowledge. Third level graduates possess all necessary potential to advance the level of human knowledge and enhance the nation-

.....  
<sup>2</sup> OECD (1995): The Measurement of Scientific and Technological Activities Manual on the Measurement of Human Resources devoted to S&T.”CANBERRA MANUAL”. OECD AND ECSC-EC-EAEC, Brussels.

al and international S&T with their individual endeavours. Moreover, human resources employed in the S&T occupation contribute to the practical generation of knowledge and thus also to the advancement of the knowledge-based society<sup>3</sup>.

At the level of educational institutions, HRST encompasses large group of academic, teacher and administrative staff as well as students at higher educational institutions and relevant stakeholders. Furthermore, this report studies also HRST stemming from the civil society, private enterprises or state administration that are active in the educational, research sector and policies. These individuals are recognized as crucial carriers of modernisation efforts, institution building and internationalisation of the educational sector.

Enhancement of individual competencies through **mobility and joint trainings** is understood as a key factor advancing the S&T level of societies. As such, it is one of the **key aspects dealt with in this report**. **Student and academic mobility** is of crucial importance as it enables cross-pollination of knowledge and good practices across different geographical regions, scientific sectors or disciplines.

At institutional level, **international cooperation** with other educational institutions appears to provide an extra motivational stimulus for all participants in the educational process by enabling them to collect international experience and to exchange knowledge necessary for their modernisation efforts. International cooperation aims at the **institution building** in education and training which is achieved within the EU Lifelong Learning Programmes by means of capacity building, trainings, mobility and modernisation activities. On international scale, international cooperation, knowledge transfer and joint research activities are important as well.

Embedded in the current developments, the majority of the EECA countries have already, or are about to join the **European Higher Education Area (EHEA)**, which sets certain quality standards for the HEIs. Tempus and Erasmus Mundus are important programmes supporting these efforts. In particular, the S&T components of the LLP Programme, Erasmus Mundus and Tempus, which will be presented in this report, are of crucial importance to achieve the goals of the EHEA.

.....

<sup>3</sup> HRST in European terms was first time measured in 2000 and since then, the proportion of HRST on European total labour force shows both absolute and relative increase over the years. According to EUROSTAT, 34 % of total labour force in 2000 was active in S&T, whereas in year 2009 this number grew to 40, 1%. The authors of this report would like to mention that the HRST statistics is not undisputed. However it gives a reasonable indication on the HRST status in the EU.

## Chapter 3

# Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP)

The field of education and lifelong learning enjoys the highest priority **since the Lisbon Strategy and the Education and Training 2010 work programme** was introduced in 2000 and 2001<sup>4</sup>. These strategic documents show that the EU has acknowledged the importance of its human capital and understood that lifelong learning is a crucial means that fosters knowledge society as a key to higher growth and employment rates.

EU Education and training policies are currently defined within the **Strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training (ET 2020)** – as a part of the Europe 2020 Strategy and a successor of the earlier Education and Training 2010 work programme.

The strategic framework (ET 2020) emphasises the relevance of the pre-primary, primary, secondary, higher and vocational education and training, where the lifelong learning needs to play a pivotal role.

The strategy furthermore lays down following objectives:

- Making LLL and mobility a reality;
- Increase quality and efficiency of education and learning;
- Promote equity, social cohesion and active citizenship; and
- Enhance creativity and innovation on all levels of education and training.

**The Lifelong Learning (LLL) paradigm** recognises that in a knowledge based economy, all citizens need an ongoing access to learning so as to increase their qualifications. As such, continuous human development across the life span and increased transnational mobility are important.

The European Council defines lifelong learning as “...all learning activity, undertaken on an ongoing basis with the aim of improving knowledge, skills and competence”, which have to cover “learning from the pre-school age to that of post-retirement, including the entire spectrum of formal, non-formal and informal learning”<sup>5</sup>.

In terms of S&T elements studied in this report, the main focus will be on the HEIs, but also teachers and teaching staff from other types of schools as well as educational establishments and eligible organisations will be considered.

**The Programme for EU Action in the Field of Lifelong Learning** (the Lifelong Learning Programme – LLP) aims to create a sound, coherent and efficient framework in education and training, so as to respond better to the lifelong learning paradigm. The programme has been institutionalised based on the Decision no 1720/2006/ec of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 November 2006<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/doc78\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/doc78_en.htm)

<sup>5</sup> Council Resolution of 27 June 2002 on lifelong learning (2002/C 163/01): <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2002:163:0001:0003:EN:PDF>

<sup>6</sup> Decision No 1720/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 November 2006 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/lex/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:327:0045:0068:EN:PDF>

With a significant budget of EUR 6.97 billion for 2007 to 2013, the new programme replaces the existing education, vocational training and e-Learning programmes, which ended in 2006<sup>7</sup>.

The LLP 2007-2013 consists of the following individual sub-programmes:

- **Four Sectoral Programmes** which address the needs of the schools, higher education, vocational training and adult education sectors in Comenius (schools), Erasmus (higher education), Leonardo da Vinci (vocational education and training) and Grundtvig (adult education);
- **Transversal Programme**, targeted at cross-sectoral areas (policy cooperation and innovation in lifelong learning, languages, development of innovative ICT, dissemination and exploitation of results);
- **Jean Monnet Programme** responds to the increasing need for knowledge and dialogue on the European integration and thus targets teaching, research and reflection on European integration and key European institutions and associations.

The LLP is established as a European programme with a competence to adopt measures in areas that are not subject to national level; in particular it promotes activities such as **multilateral partnerships, networks and transnational mobility** that are especially relevant to the scope of this report. At the heart of the LLP programme lies the transnational mobility that also received a significant proportion of the total funding<sup>8</sup>.

### 3.1 Objectives of the LLP

The Lifelong Learning Programme aims to “contribute through lifelong learning to the development of the EU as an advanced knowledge society, with sustainable economic development, more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. In particular, it aims to foster interchange, cooperation and mobility between education and training institutions and systems within the EU so that they become a world quality reference”<sup>9</sup>.

The Lifelong Learning Programme further focuses on the following specific objectives<sup>10</sup>:

1. To contribute to the development of quality LLL, and to promote high performance, innovation and a European dimension of LLL;
2. To help improve the quality, attractiveness and accessibility of the LLL opportunities within Member States;
3. To reinforce the contribution of lifelong learning to social cohesion, active citizenship, intercultural dialogue, gender equality and personal fulfilment;

<sup>7</sup> [http://www.salto-youth.net/downloads/4-17-1578/Report\\_Tool%20fair%20II\\_01.pdf](http://www.salto-youth.net/downloads/4-17-1578/Report_Tool%20fair%20II_01.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> e.g. in Erasmus, not less than 60 % of the overall funding is to be allocated to mobility, in Leonardo da Vinci, not less than 60% of the available funding is to be devoted to mobility and partnerships, in Grundtvig, not less than 55 % of the overall funding is allocated to mobility and partnerships

<sup>9</sup> Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP), Guide 2012, Education and Culture DG  
[http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc848\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc848_en.htm)

<sup>10</sup> Decision no 1720/2006/ec of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 November 2006

4. To help promote creativity, competitiveness, employability and the growth of an entrepreneurial spirit;
5. To promote language learning and linguistic diversity; to support the development of innovative ICT-based content for LLL;
6. To promote cooperation in quality assurance in all sectors of education and training in Europe;
7. To encourage the best use of results, innovative products and processes and to exchange good practice in the fields covered by the LLP, in order to improve the quality of education and training.

## 3.2 Management of the LLP

The **Directorate General for Education and Culture** (DG EAC) is in charge of effective and efficient management of the LLP programme. In this task, DG EAC is supported by the LLP Committee that comprises of the EU Member States and representatives of other LLP participating countries.

**The LLP Committee** is a political body that comprises of the representatives from EU Member States and gives opinions or is consulted on measures of the LLP. Usually, national ministries of education and training from the LLP participating countries are present in the LLP Committee. It is a common practice for national ministries to nominate national experts that are involved in working groups for the respective LLP sub-programmes.

“Centralised” actions, such as networks, multilateral projects, accompanying measures as well as operating grants, unilateral and multilateral projects under the Jean Monnet Programme are managed by the EACEA. The “decentralised actions” cover individual mobility, bilateral and multilateral partnerships or multilateral projects (Transfer of Innovation under the Leonardo da Vinci programme) are run by **national agencies** in the 33 LLP participating countries.

### 3.3 Sub-programmes

This subchapter outlines the individual LLP sub-programmes (the four sectoral programmes, transversal programme and Jean Monnet Programme) by offering an overview of their main objectives, target groups, and action types.




Figure 1 – Sub-programmes of the Lifelong Learning Programme<sup>11</sup>

#### 3.3.1 Comenius

The Comenius programme deals with the first phase of education, from pre-school and primary to secondary schools.

The programme aims to increase the mobility of pupils and the educational staff, to foster the establishment of school partnerships among EU Member States (MS) as well as to foster the European dimension and quality of teacher training. In addition, the Comenius Programme also encourages language learning, the use of ICT and supports actions that aim at the improvement of school management and innovation of learning approaches.

The programme targets all members of the education community up to the end of upper secondary education: pupils, teachers and other educational staff, schools, educational authorities, associations, non-government organisations, teacher training institutes, higher education institutions (HEI) and research centres.

Possible **types of Comenius actions** include mobility for pupils, teachers, short in-service training for staff as well as different partnerships (regional, school, internet platforms) and large-scale multilateral projects and networks.

.....

<sup>11</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc/call12/part1\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc/call12/part1_en.pdf)



### 3.3.2 Erasmus

Erasmus is the EU's flagship education and training programme for mobility and cooperation in higher education across Europe. Within 23 years of its existence, the programme has supported mobility of more than 2 million Erasmus students<sup>12</sup> and contributed significantly to the European dimension of higher education by supporting student, teacher mobility and multilateral cooperation among European higher education institutions.

The objectives of the Erasmus programme include the enhancement of quality and volume of student, teacher staff mobility and multilateral cooperation throughout Europe; to foster the cooperation between higher education institutions and enterprises as well as to increase the compatibility between higher education and advanced vocational education qualifications in Europe. Moreover, the programme prioritizes the development of innovative practices in education and training at tertiary level and the development of innovative ICT-based content for lifelong learning.

The Erasmus Programme addresses all stakeholders in the tertiary education system - students and trainees, higher education institutions, teachers, trainers and other staff within those institutions; associations, enterprises, social partners, public and private bodies, research centres and bodies concerned with lifelong learning issues. The programme is open to business in actions such as teaching abroad, participation in university cooperation projects or hosting a student placement.

Possible **types of Erasmus actions** are manifold. The programme targets students by providing funding for studies, placements abroad as well as intensive language courses and intensive programmes. Beside student mobility, the programme funds teacher and enterprise staff assignments abroad and higher education staff seeking training abroad. In addition, Erasmus programme supports higher education institutions to work together through intensive programmes, networks and multilateral projects and supports them to reach out to the world of business.

In 2010, around 90% of the European universities from 31 countries took part in the programme. Student mobility remains the most significant part of the Erasmus programme with around 213,000 supported student mobilities annually. Company placements, which were until 2007 part of Leonardo da Vinci Programme, became the fastest growing action of the programme.

Erasmus university cooperation encompasses multilateral projects and networks (plus accompanying measures) that aim to stimulate joint policy developments. These actions receive annually around EUR 20 million to fulfil their objectives. In 2010<sup>13</sup>, a total of 57 networks and multilateral projects have been approved. The biggest proportion of 49 selected multilateral projects aimed at curriculum development and modernisation of higher education as well as cooperation between universities and enterprises. In total, eight networks have been approved for funding, out of which seven were funded under the academic network priority, the remaining one was a structural network.

As from the LLP Call 2011, the Erasmus Multilateral Projects are divided into five "priorities"<sup>14</sup>:

.....

<sup>12</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education\\_culture/publ/pdf/erasmus/2million\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/erasmus/2million_en.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/education/pub/pdf/higher/erasmus0910\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/pub/pdf/higher/erasmus0910_en.pdf)

For elaborated priorities for each subprogramme's actions please consult the LLP General Call for Proposals 2011-2013, Strategic Priorities 2012 [http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc/call12/prior\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc/call12/prior_en.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> Formerly (2007-2010) Erasmus multilateral projects were subdivided into 4 sub-actions: Curriculum Development; Modernisation of Higher Education; Cooperation between universities and enterprises; Virtual Campuses.

- Cooperation between higher education institutions and enterprises;
- Social dimension of higher education;
- Mobility strategies and removal of barriers to mobility in higher education;
- Support to the modernisation agenda of higher education;
- Fostering the excellence and innovation in higher education.

With regards to the Erasmus Multilateral Networks, these were reduced in 2011 to Academic Networks only, which are designed to promote European co-operation and innovation in specific subject areas by furthering innovation and the exchange of methodologies and good practices<sup>15</sup>.

### 3.3.3 Leonardo da Vinci

The Leonardo da Vinci programme links policy to practice in the field of vocational education and training (VET) other than at tertiary level.

The main objective of the programme is to support the quality and mobility for people involved in vocational education, to enhance the level of cooperation between institutions active in the sector as well as to support innovative practices, development of ICT-based solutions and language learning in education.

This programme is aimed at stakeholders involved in all forms of vocational education and training except at tertiary level: people learning in these sectors; people in the labour market; institutions or organisations providing learning opportunities in the fields covered by the programme; teachers, trainers and other staff within those institutions or associations, enterprises, social partners; persons and bodies responsible for systems and policies concerning any aspect of vocational education and training; research centres and bodies concerned with lifelong learning issues; higher education institutions and non-profit organisations.

**The Leonardo da Vinci actions** include mobility of people in initial vocational training, in labour market, and mobility of professionals in VET. Partnerships focusing on the themes of mutual interest involving the business partners belong to the programme actions as well. Next to that, multilateral projects aim to enhance the attractiveness, quality and performance of VET systems and practices. Thematic networks pool the expertise of experts and organisations with regards to the specific field of VET. Variety of thematic networks ranges from development of innovation in VET to transfer of innovation in VET.

### 3.3.4 Grundtvig

The Grundtvig Programme rounds up the LLP by covering adult education as a whole in all forms of learning: formal, informal and non-formal. Secondly, it tries to tackle the challenge of ageing population by focusing on people lacking basic education and qualifications and furthermore people living in rural or disadvantaged areas.

The overall objective of the programme is to improve the quality and accessibility of mobility to

.....  
<sup>15</sup> Formerly (2007-2010) Erasmus Multilateral Networks were subdivided into 2 sub-actions: Academic Networks and Structural Networks.

adult learners as well as to improve cooperation between educational providers from the sector. The programme targets especially learners from vulnerable and marginal social groups. Developments of innovative practices, as well as ICT are important targets as well.

The programme is aimed at learners in adult education; institutions or organisations providing learning opportunities in adult education; teachers and other staff; establishments involved in the initial or further training of adult education staff; associations; persons and bodies responsible for systems and policies concerning any aspect of adult education at local, regional and national level; research centres; enterprises; non-profit organisations and HEIs.

**Funded mobility actions** include Grundtvig workshops, in-service training courses, assistantships, visits and exchanges and senior volunteering projects. Organisations may get involved in learning partnerships that are small scale projects mainly aimed at cooperation in the field of learner participation or management of adult education. *Multilateral projects* are substantially larger, 1-3 years lasting actions with at least three partner organisations, aimed at innovation and fostering the quality of adult education in Europe. *Networks* are relatively large 3-year projects with more than 10 partners that provide a forum for discussion and exchange of information on key issues and contribute to policy shaping.

### 3.3.5 Transversal programme

The Transversal programme promotes projects spanning across two or more of the targeted educational sectors covered under more than one sub-programme only, so as to ensure that these achieve the best results<sup>16</sup>. Transversal programme consists of four key activities as presented in this section.

#### Key Activity 1: Policy co-operation

Key Activity (KA) 1 aims to support the development of policies and co-operation at all levels of education and training in order to enhance the quality of education and training, monitor the progress towards given targets, identify strengths and weaknesses of the system and strengthen the collection of data and research across the EU.

Grants are provided to policy-makers, experts and officials from national, regional or local authorities; directors of education, training, guidance and accreditation organisations; representatives of social partners; universities, academic and research institutes; as well as other education practitioners.

These can participate in **following actions**: study visits and European research and comparative study projects. A new Action has been included in the Call for 2011: networks<sup>17</sup>. The networks should be made of at least ten partners from relevant sectors and levels of policy-making from 8 LLP participating countries that endeavour learner-centred, flexible and inclusive lifelong learning environments.

.....

<sup>16</sup> Some exceptions may apply to the Key Activity 1 and Key Activity 4.

<sup>17</sup> LLP Guide Part IIb: [http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc/call11/fiches/pol3\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc/call11/fiches/pol3_en.pdf)

### Key Activity 2: Languages

This key activity aims to increase the attractiveness of language learning, to boost access to the language learning facilities as well as to develop learning and teaching materials.

Participation is open to any organization working directly or indirectly in the field of language learning. Every language is eligible for funding under multilateral projects and networks, supposed that the added value is clearly stated and is complementary to the work done in the field so far.

In Key Activity 2, three types of actions are possible. *Multilateral projects* in this key activity aim to develop new language learning materials and to promote the language awareness and access to language learning resources. Moreover, *networks* as large-scale projects aim to contribute to the development of language policies, promote language learning and disseminate project results and good practices. As a complementary measure to these actions serve *accompanying measures* that cover communication activities, thematic monitoring of projects and dissemination and exploitation of project results.

With regards to projects concerned with the development of pedagogical materials for the learning of specific languages, consortium must include organisations that represent the community of each of the target languages. Moreover, organisations from the eligible countries where the target languages are recognised (i.e. used/spoken as national, regional/minority languages) are to be part of the consortium.

### Key Activity 3: Information and communication technologies

The use of ICT has proved central to enhance efficiency in various sectors of society and to simplify the search and dissemination of information. As such, Key Activity 3 aims to foster innovative practices on how to integrate ICT solutions in learning and training, whereas it does not support the development of ICT itself.

The funded projects may include use of ICT in simulations, discovery learning, attracting drop-outs back to education, enabling learning outside school environments and tackling the 'digital divide' between those with access to technologies and skills, and those without.

Supported types of actions are twofold. ICT *Multilateral Projects*<sup>18</sup> should develop innovative practices or services with clear multiplier effects in the field of innovative ICT-based content, services, pedagogies and practices for lifelong learning. Next to that, *networks* support building of partnerships and networking of learner communities intending to exchange the ideas and increase visibility and awareness of ICT for learning<sup>19</sup>.

### Key Activity 4: Dissemination and exploitation of project results

This activity lies at heart of the EU efforts to come closer to the EU citizen. In line with this, dissemination and awareness-raising on the results, impact and achievements of the LLP are considered as very important.

Under this key activity, *multilateral projects* as a supported action type aim to create a reference framework for dissemination of the LLP results, impact and achievements as well as best practices. The key activity also supports the exploitation and implementation of innovative products.

.....

<sup>18</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc/call11/fiches/ict1\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc/call11/fiches/ict1_en.pdf)

<sup>19</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc/call11/fiches/ict2\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc/call11/fiches/ict2_en.pdf)

### 3.3.6 Jean Monnet Programme

The Jean Monnet Programme stimulates teaching, research and reflection on European integration at higher education institutions throughout the world. With projects running in 68 countries and reaching more than 500,000 students a year, programme contributes to raise awareness and encourages public and academic discussion on European integration. Moreover, the programme safeguards that a broad range of institutions deals with topics of European integration while respecting their academic autonomy.

The programme is aimed at students, researchers, organisations, information and research providers, public and private bodies concerned with the field of European integration in all forms relevant to higher education within and outside the Community.

The Jean Monnet Programme supports **3 types of actions**:

1. Support for teaching, research and reflection on European integration at the level of HEI world-wide, which includes unilateral, multilateral projects and networks. Multilateral projects and networks may include support for the establishment of multilateral research groups in the field of European integration;
2. Operating grants to the selected European Centres on European integration;
3. Operating grants allotted to some European associations active in the fields of education and training.

## 3.4 S&T relevant elements of the Lifelong Learning Programme

This subchapter presents the sub-programmes of the Lifelong Learning Programme that show strongest relevance to the third level education as well as research, mobility, teacher training and academic institution building.

In particular, actions will be highlighted that concern

- academic institution building and innovation in educational policies;
- individual mobility (third level students and graduates, training activities for academic staff);
- research.

At the sub-programme level, we can conclude that **Erasmus Programme** alongside with the **transversal programme KA1: Policy Co-operation and Jean Monnet Programme** are the sub-programmes that are most linked to the elements described. The Erasmus Programme is the most relevant programme for the target group of this report as it deals with the third level education in general, supporting individual mobility as well as institutional capacity building in the frame of multilateral projects and networks. Following tables illustrates different S&T components of individual sub-programmes.

	Comenius	Erasmus	Leonardo da Vinci	Grundtvig
Individual mobility	In-service training of educational staff, assistantships for future teachers	Student (study, company placements) & staff mobility (teaching, training)	VET Professionals	Mobility of adult education staff, assistantships for future teachers
Institutional cooperation	Multilateral Projects, Networks, Regional School Partnerships	Academic Networks, Multilateral Projects	Multilateral Projects (Transfer of Innovation, Development of Innovation), Networks	Multilateral Projects, Networks
Research aspect	-	-	-	-

	KA1	KA2	KA3	KA4	Jean Monnet Programme
Individual mobility	Study Visits Specialists and Decision Makers	-	-	-	-
Institutional cooperation	Networks	Multilateral Projects, Networks	Multilateral Projects, Networks	Multilateral Projects	-
Research aspect	Studies and Comparative Research	-	-	-	Jean Monnet Information and Research Activities

Table 1 - LLP sub-programme actions relevant for S&T, based on the Call for Proposals 2011<sup>20</sup>

<sup>20</sup> LLP Guide 2012 [http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc1943\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc1943_en.htm)

## 1. Institutional cooperation

Actions that are containing all three elements and from them strong institutional cooperation element are the actions **multilateral projects and networks**. Multilateral Projects aim mostly at the academic institution building, whereas networks focus more at the educational innovation at the policy making level. Both of them containing study element and academic mobility and training that should strengthen the former goals.

These actions enhance the development and improvement of the educational system as a whole by developing and transferring innovation and good practice; and promoting cooperation between educational institutions and other stakeholders. An integral part of these projects are also rather small studies contributing to reaching project objectives complemented with academic training and mobility.

These actions, together with accompanying measures, are the only LLP actions in which the innovative character of the project is a criteria being assessed during the selection process. This shows that EC factors in the term innovation as an evaluation indicator towards the Innovation Union. Innovative character in terms of the LLP has been defined as “innovative solutions to clearly identified needs for clearly identified target groups. It will achieve this either by adapting and transferring innovative approaches which already exist in other countries or sectors, or by developing a brand new solution not yet available in any of the countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme<sup>21</sup>”. In this sense, the solution does not necessarily need to provide a completely new innovation, yet it can ensure that the innovation is tailored and implemented in the new geographical, cultural and political environment whose benefits outrank benefits of the previous solution.

**Multilateral Projects** target the improvement of the quality of teacher training as well as teaching methods, methodology, and development of new strategies, school curriculum or teaching materials for the training of teachers or students. Compared to Partnerships action that are small-scale projects focusing more on the cooperation and knowledge sharing process, Multilateral Projects should achieve one particular and measurable outcome. Multilateral projects can be actively engaged in improving the management of education institutions, teaching process as well as introduction of educational themes at policy level by means of comparative analyses, development of statistical indicators and databases of good practices.

In addition to this, **Leonardo da Vinci Multilateral Projects** are strongly focused on the development of an innovative contents, methods and procedures filling the gaps in VET systems, and on the transfer of the existing innovation to new legal, systemic, sector and geographic environments.

**Networks** bring together a defined broad number of relevant stakeholders from different levels of the educational sector that aim to promote European cooperation and innovation in their subject area or discipline. The networks promote educational innovation by elaborating comparative analyses, case studies, formulating recommendations and by disseminating them. Networks are open to a wide range of actors including professional associations, NGOs, state institutions and enterprises. It is also recommended to include policy-makers in the consortia so as to ensure a lasting and widespread effect on the educational sector.

.....

<sup>21</sup> E.g. in [http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc/call12/fiches/com9\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc/call12/fiches/com9_en.pdf)

**Apart from KA1 Networks, KA 1 Roma Multilateral Projects and Roma Networks** were introduced in the Call 2012. These actions aim to support the creation of transnational co-operation projects to develop lifelong learning measures for Roma integration joining-up educational and other social measures.

**Comenius Regional Partnerships** promote cooperation activities between the educational authorities, schools and other actors from two regions that aim to improve the educational offer for young people. Among others, these activities comprise of S&T relevant research and small studies, staff exchange, exchange of experience and best practice among the participating institutions as well as job shadowing and self-evaluation activities.

## 2. Individual mobility actions

Moreover, **individual mobility actions** are crucial to increase the qualification level of students, third level graduates and teaching professionals as these enable them to collect international experience and network with their peers. This contributes practically and prospectively to the bottom-up creation of a knowledge-based society.

**Erasmus individual mobility** aims to foster highly-qualified, open-minded and internationally experienced young people as carriers of the knowledge-based society. Moreover, teacher mobility supports further enhancement of teacher competences in trainings as well as their placements in the institutions abroad.

**Leonardo da Vinci VET Professionals** action supports training of VET professionals as well as improvement and transfer of competencies and innovative methods and practices in vocational training.

**Grundtvig Visits and Exchanges for Adult Educational Staff** can take a form of a teaching assignment, a study of aspects of adult education in the host country or study and provision of expertise on policy-related dimensions of adult education based on recipient's personal expertise

## 3. Research

Next to that, **KA 1: Policy Co-operation and the Jean Monnet Programme** include research activities under its European Research and Comparative Study Projects and Networks (KA1) and JM Multilateral Research Groups action.

**Jean Monnet Actions** aim in general to stimulate the discussion on European integration and support a wide range of actions that are committed to reach this goal. As such, they can be described as rather small scale actions. The only project type that requires an establishment of a consortium are Multilateral Research Groups with funding of EUR 80 000 for a 2-year project duration. **Jean Monnet Information and Research Activities** enforce discussion and reflection on European integration. Eligible applicants are HEI, associations of professors and researchers from the field. As from 2012, a new action **Jean Monnet Information and research activities for learning EU at school**<sup>22</sup> provides support for the information and research activities in the primary, secondary as well as VET facilities.

**KA1 Studies and Comparative Research Action** gathers state-of-the art scientific knowledge on

.....

<sup>22</sup> Jean Monnet Information and research activities for learning EU at school



sectors relevant to the new strategic framework for cooperation in the field of E&T 2020.

Beside the requirements stated for each action in the annual call for proposals, strategic priorities were defined for 2011-2013. Potential applicants should be familiar with these priorities so as to increase their chance for approval.

### 3.5 Lifelong Learning Programme and EECA

A pilot was introduced in the 2010 call **opening the multilateral projects and the networks under Comenius, Erasmus, Leonardo da Vinci, Grundtvig and the Key Activities KA2, KA3 and KA4<sup>23</sup>** of the transversal programme to organisations established in a third country (i.e. in any country outside the countries formally participating in the LLP). The involvement of third countries is an additional option to the main LLP proposal and as such should clearly contribute to the added value of the project as a whole.

The EECA countries are considered as third countries in this respect.

To participate in the Lifelong Learning Programme, the organisations from the third countries have to be legal bodies according to national law. These organisations can only be involved as partners in a project and cannot take the role of an applicant neither the role of a coordinator.

Third country participation was implemented through an additional, optional part in the application form that was assessed separately by the experts on the basis of its own award criterion for international cooperation and a separate budget of maximal EUR 25,000:

**9. International cooperation (where applicable).** Third country participation adds value to the grant application, the activities proposed for the third country partner(s) are appropriate and the budget required for this purpose represents good value for money<sup>24</sup>.

As a result, those applications including third country partners received two separate and independent scores: one for the main part of the application and one for the third country part. For both parts to be accepted each award criterion had to attract a score of >2/5.

There was therefore no specific advantage or disadvantage in opting for the possibility to include partners from third countries. As a result, it is possible that the main LLP application is accepted and the third country part rejected, although this is not a common outcome: there have only been 4 cases in total where the main application was accepted and the third country part rejected (2 in 2010 (KA2 and Erasmus) and 2 in 2011 (Comenius and Erasmus).

**The calls 2010 and 2011 encouraged participation from the following categories of third countries:**

.....

<sup>23</sup> Based on the information kindly provided by EACEA

<sup>24</sup> [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/funding/2011/documents/call\\_llp/01\\_instructions\\_2011\\_v01\\_en.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/funding/2011/documents/call_llp/01_instructions_2011_v01_en.pdf)

- Candidate countries and Western Balkans;
- Countries addressed by the EU Neighbourhood Policy and Russia;
- Countries identified by the EU as being of a particular priority in the context of developing a strategic policy dialogue in education, and training or multilingualism.

In addition to this, the **Jean Monnet Programme** operates from 2001 on a world-wide basis. The network is currently active in 68 countries on the five continents and the universities from all countries in the world are eligible to apply for Jean Monnet projects. Eligible applicants in the Programme are exclusively the HEI which are to be formally recognised in their country of origin as higher education institution and have a proper legal status before they can participate.

### 3.5.1 EECA involvement in the management of the LLP

All of the actions open to the participation of the EECA countries are centralised actions. The EACEA acts as a central body collecting and selecting the applications to be funded.

In the LLP, EECA countries are not involved in defining the programme rules, neither are they involved in the programme committees; these countries can, however, participate in stakeholders consultations (open to participants from all over the world) and promotion/information events (as regards Erasmus Mundus, including local events organised by EU Delegations or Tempus offices).

### 3.5.2 Opened actions with regards to the S&T elements of the LLP

It is important to note that LLP has opened up large-scale actions that are mostly linked to the S&T elements of the LLP, what is a positive finding. However, decentralised individual mobility actions, where majority of total LLP funds is being redistributed, remains closed. It is equally important to open both actions focusing on the institutional building and actions focusing on the bottom-up building of the knowledge society – individual mobility actions. As communicated by the EACEA, it is not foreseen to include EECA countries in individual mobility actions under the current LLP Programme.

In particular, the Erasmus University Charter is an important action - prerequisite to participate in the Erasmus student and other mobility and to coordinate Erasmus multilateral projects and networks. As such, only LLP participating countries are eligible to apply for this Charter and thus none of the EECA countries are holders of the Charter so far.

The Key Activity 1 also remains closed to the participants from the EECA.

A brief overview of the situation is stated in the table below that is based on the Table 1 - LLP sub-programme actions relevant for S&T, based on the Call for Proposals 2011. “Yes” sign designates the different S&T elements (individual mobility, institution building and research) that are contained within different sub-programmes. “Minus” sign designates sub-programmes that do not contain these elements. Light grey colour marks the sub-programme actions that have been opened up to the applicants from the EECA countries, and dark grey fields show the actions that, despite showing the S&T relevance, still remain to be opened.

	Comenius	Erasmus	Leonardo da Vinci	Grundtvig	KA 1	KA2	KA3	KA4	Jean Monnet
<b>Individual mobility</b>	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	-	-
<b>Institutional cooperation</b>	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
<b>Research aspect</b>	-	-	-	-	√	-	-	-	√

Table 2 - Overview of the S&T relevant actions open to the third countries

### 3.5.3 Statistical Overview of the EECA Participation in the LLP Call (excluding the Jean Monnet Programme)

#### Analysis of the 2010 LLP Call

In 2010, partners from third countries could participate for the first time in the call with EU funding. The results of this participation in the different programmes show that the approach was well received by the applicants. Among the 1340<sup>25</sup> applications submitted to the actions open for third country participation, 183 (14%) include the participation of 255 institutions from 43 countries. Among the 255<sup>26</sup> selected applications, 41 (16%) include the participation of third country partners.

In the call 2010, 20% of the applications with third country partners (37 out of 183) involved organisations from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Russian Federation and Ukraine. No applications involved partners from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.

<sup>25</sup> Only including eligible applications

<sup>26</sup> Only including actions open for third country participation

	Applications received 3rd countries	Applications received EECA
<b>Comenius</b>	32	6
<b>Erasmus</b>	43	10
<b>Leonardo</b>	29	3
<b>Grundtvig</b>	22	2
<b>KA2</b>	17	5
<b>KA3</b>	35	11
<b>KA4</b>	5	0
<b>Total</b>	183	37

*Table 3 - Number of applications from Third countries and EECA in LLP selection 2010 <sup>27</sup>*

	Received	Selected
<b>Armenia</b>	0	0
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	0	0
<b>Belarus</b>	2	1
<b>Georgia</b>	1	0
<b>Moldova</b>	9	0
<b>Russian Federation</b>	18	5
<b>Ukraine</b>	7	3
<b>Total</b>	37	9

*Table 4 - Participation of EECA in LLP selection 2010 <sup>28</sup>*

.....  
<sup>27</sup> Based on the information kindly provided by EACEA

<sup>28</sup> Based on the information kindly provided by the EACEA

	Received	Selected
<b>Comenius</b>	6	2
<b>Erasmus</b>	10	5
<b>Leonardo</b>	3	0
<b>Grundtvig</b>	2	1
<b>KA2</b>	5	1
<b>KA3</b>	11	0
<b>KA4</b>	0	0
<b>Total</b>	37	9

*Table 5 – Participation by EECA<sup>29</sup> in Sub-programme/Key Activity<sup>30</sup>*

.....

<sup>29</sup> Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Russian Federation and Ukraine

<sup>30</sup> Based on the information kindly provided by the EACEA

## Analysis of the 2011 LLP Call

Among the 1523<sup>31</sup> applications submitted to the actions open for third country participation, 190 (12 %) include the participation of 242 organisations from 39 different countries. Among the 253<sup>32</sup> selected applications, 38 (15%) include the participation of third country partners.

In the Call 2011, 26% of the applications with third country partners (49 out of 190), involved organisations from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Russian Federation and Ukraine. No applications were received from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.

	Applications received 3rd countries	Applications received EECA
<b>Comenius</b>	35	2
<b>Erasmus</b>	32	14
<b>Leonardo</b>	26	6
<b>Grundtvig</b>	25	5
<b>KA2</b>	18	10
<b>KA3</b>	39	8
<b>KA4</b>	15	4
<b>Total</b>	190	49

Table 6- Number of applications from Third countries and EECA in LLP selection 2011<sup>33</sup>

	Received	Selected
<b>Armenia</b>	1	0
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	1	1
<b>Belarus</b>	2	0
<b>Georgia</b>	2	0
<b>Moldova</b>	8	1
<b>Russian Federation</b>	24	4
<b>Ukraine</b>	11	4
<b>Total</b>	49	10

Table 7- Participation of EECA in LLP selection 2011<sup>34</sup>

<sup>31</sup> The number includes eligible applications only.

<sup>32</sup> Only including actions open for third country participation.

<sup>33</sup> Based on the information kindly provided by the EACEA

<sup>34</sup> Based on the information kindly provided by the EACEA

	Received	Selected
<b>Comenius</b>	2	0
<b>Erasmus</b>	14	6
<b>Leonardo</b>	6	0
<b>Grundtvig</b>	5	0
<b>KA2</b>	10	2
<b>KA3</b>	8	2
<b>KA4</b>	4	0
<b>Total</b>	49	10

Table 8– Participation by EECA<sup>35</sup> in Sub-programme/Key Activity<sup>36</sup>

### Type of organisations from the EECA countries involved in selection 2010 and 2011

Out of the partner organisations involved in applications received, a major part (56 %) belongs to the category of Education providers. This group of organisations is also the largest among those involved in selected projects. The second largest group is the non-profit sector. It is worth noting, that while 20% of the third country partner organisations at application level belonged to the non profit sector, no selected application involved partners from this sector. On the other hand, a higher proportion of partner organisation from enterprises and associations were involved in approved projects.

### Applications Received - EECA




Figure 2 - LLP Application received from the EECA Countries 2010-2011<sup>37</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Russian Federation and Ukraine

<sup>36</sup> Based on the information provided by the EACEA

<sup>37</sup> Based on the information provided by the EACEA

### Applications accepted - EECA




Figure 3 - LLP Application accepted from the EECA Countries 2010-2011<sup>38</sup>

.....  
<sup>38</sup> Based on the information provided by the EACEA



### 3.5.4 Statistical Overview EECA Participation in the Jean Monnet Programme 2010-2011

Despite the fact that HEI from all countries worldwide are eligible to set up Jean Monnet Modules, Chairs or any other Jean Monnet Action, EECA countries are generally very poorly represented in this sub-programme. Four HEI from Ukraine and two from the Russian Federation have formulated their own teaching programmes on European Integration. Armenia and Azerbaijan have both set up one module on EU integration. Next to that, one institution in Georgia has established a teaching post on EU law covered under the Jean Monnet Chair Action. These actions are rather smaller scale unilateral undertakings. Once EECA countries gain experience in organising JM Chairs, they will be also more prepared to participate in JM multilateral research groups which consist of JM Chairs from at least three countries and conduct collaborative research activities on an international scale.

Moreover, no project has been selected within the JM Information and Research Activities Action, which is strongly linked to the institution building and research aspects of the LLP.

	JM Module	JM Chair
<b>Armenia</b>	1	-
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	1	-
<b>Georgia</b>	-	1
<b>Russian Federation</b>	2	-
<b>Ukraine</b>	4	-

Table 9 - Participation of the EECA countries in Jean Monnet Programme 2008-2010<sup>39</sup>

.....  
<sup>39</sup> Jean Monnet Project Portal [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/jean\\_monnet/jean\\_monnet\\_en.php](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/jean_monnet/jean_monnet_en.php)

## Chapter 4

# International cooperation in Education and Training: External programmes with relevance for the EECA countries and S&T

With regards to the third countries, the European Commission supports wide range of external policy activities aimed at the enhanced cooperation in higher education sector between EU and third countries. The focus of these programmes lays predominantly on higher educational institutions as main contributors to the knowledge-based society. This sub-chapter gives an insight in the activities and programmes with relevance for the EECA countries: Erasmus Mundus and Tempus.

## 4.1 Erasmus Mundus

Inspired by the highly successful Erasmus programme, Erasmus Mundus<sup>40</sup> offers a framework for cooperation and mobility on a global scale and contributes to increase the international cooperation of HEIs and development of human resources. As such, the programme aims to enhance the quality of the European higher education and to promote multicultural understanding and dialogue so that EU becomes a centre of global excellence in education and training.

Eligible participants include HEI and the individuals from HEI as well as any research organisation and organisations active in this field that verifiably contribute to the programme objectives. In its second period 2009-2013, a budget of EUR 930 million has been allocated for all its actions.

The programme provides funding for the following **key actions**:

- **Action 1.** Joint master courses and doctoral programmes offered by a consortium of European and possibly third-country HEIs, scholarships (full-study scholarships for the candidates of these programmes or short-term scholarships for research or teaching assignments). Programme Guide 2009-2013 foresees to support 185 Joint Programmes and 13 270 individual scholarships and fellowships which receive funding of EUR 25 million and EUR 429 million respectively.

<sup>40</sup> The programme guide 2009-2013

[http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus\\_mundus/programme/documents/2011/em\\_programmeguide\\_1612\\_en.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/programme/documents/2011/em_programmeguide_1612_en.pdf)  
Decision No 1298/2008/EC(link) (OJ 240 19.12.2008, p.83) establishing the Erasmus Mundus Programme 2009-2013, adopted by the European Parliament and Council on 16.12.2008.  
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:340:0083:0098:EN:PDF>

- **Action 2.** Partnerships promoting institutional cooperation and mobility activities with countries covered by numerous EU external relations financial instruments. This action is budgeted with EUR 460 million and subdivided into two strands:
  - Strand 1, which deals with countries funded under ENPI, DCI, EDF and IPA instruments;
  - Strand 2, which deals with countries funded under ICI.
- **Action 3.** Promotion projects, studies and transnational initiatives aimed at enhancing the attractiveness and visibility of European education in the world. These activities may promote the international dimension of higher education, improve services for international students, enhance links between HEI and companies or promote Erasmus Mundus and its achievements. This action shall provide funding for around 50 projects with a total budget set to EUR 16 million.

The **eligibility criteria** for applying consortia are following<sup>41</sup>:

#### **Action 1: Erasmus Mundus Joint Programmes**

The minimum eligible consortium consists of full-partner HEIs from three different European countries, at least one of which must be an EU Member State. It is possible for a third-country HEIs to become a full member of these consortia, such HEIs are also free to award a degree and play an active role in designing the joint programme.

#### **Action 2: Erasmus Mundus Partnerships**

Regarding the Action 2 Erasmus Mundus Partnerships, involved EECA countries are financed from Strand 1 of this action point. The minimum partnership consists of five European HEIs from at least three European Member States and a HEI from the third-country targeted in a concrete call.

Moreover, in Action 1 and 2, associated members can join the Erasmus Mundus consortium. These organisations do not have to meet partner's and applicant's eligibility criteria, thus also can not benefit from the grant. These are for instance hosting institutions for a student mobility.

### **4.1.1 Management**

The European Commission is responsible for managing the budget and setting the priorities, whereas the implementing agency is the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA), that is responsible for the Calls for Proposals and specific programme management. EACEA is being supervised by the DG for Education and Culture (EAC) as related to Action 1 and 3; EuropeAid Development and Cooperation Office (DG DEVCO) and DG Enlargement (DG ELARG) as regards EMA2-STRAND1, and the Foreign Policy Instrument Service (FPIS) as regards EMA2-STRAND2.

.....  
<sup>41</sup> Programme Guide 2009-2013 [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus\\_mundus/programme/documents/2011/em\\_programmeguide\\_1612\\_en.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/programme/documents/2011/em_programmeguide_1612_en.pdf)

#### **4.1.2 S&T Relevant Elements of Erasmus Mundus**

Action 2 has a reasonable potential to enhance the S&T cooperation with third countries as it is orientated to strengthen the international co-operation, institution building and mobility with specified third country regions. Within this action, participating HEIs manage the student and teacher mobility within the consortia and to reach this objective, cooperate on the institutional level. The projects are organised according to the specific lots that are geographically based. Each region is allocated a given number of planned partnerships that should be implemented in the next period.

Next to that, Action 1 presents a highly competitive action where the best joint programmes are selected based on a free competition. Success in this action necessitates good international position of a HEI with developed institutional partnerships and a programme profile that is offered in minimum of two languages. Joint master and doctoral courses from Action 1 not only contribute to raise academic profile of HEIs but also provide its individual recipients with high quality degree and contain an important mobility element.

Since promotion projects (Action 3) are considered only as supportive measures to enhance attractiveness of the European HEIs and to disseminate best practices, this action is not directly relevant to this report and will not be covered further on.

#### **4.1.3 Erasmus Mundus & EECA**

The programme is open to all third countries. In the application process, the distinction is made between EU MS, other countries or potential candidates that are to be treated on the same footing as Member States; and the third countries. The countries from the second category may be considered as “European countries” supposed that they have signed an agreement establishing the participation of a country in the Erasmus Mundus programme. Third-country organisations are considered as third party-participants in the programme. Whereas third countries can benefit from all its actions, they can not submit the proposal on behalf of the consortium/partnership or network.

The programme aims to be implemented in line with the objectives of academic excellence while taking into account a balanced geographical representation of beneficiaries.

#### **4.1.4 Allocated budget for the EECA in Erasmus Mundus (Action 2) 2011 and 2012 Calls for Proposals**

Compared to Call 2011, there is a significant increase in budget available for Eastern Partnership Countries. In particular in 2011, EUR 36 million has been reserved for the South Mediterranean and Eastern Europe and Russian Federation. In 2012, EUR 81.573 million has been allocated to these countries, what will result in the higher number of projects to be funded. At the same time, the expected funding for the Central Asian countries from the DCI remains the same.

The expected breakdown of the available funding in 2011 and 2012 Call is provided in the tables below. It becomes obvious that in the 2012 Call, focus shifts towards higher amount of individual mobilities to be funded and the maximum grant per partnership slightly increases at cost of the lower number of funded partnerships in some cases (Central Asian countries).

Lot	Third Countries	EU budget available (EUR in millions)	Minimum nr of mobility grants per partnership	Number of projects expected to be funded	Maximum grant per partnership (EUR in millions)
6	Russian Federation	11	110	3	3.66
7	Armenia Azerbaijan Georgia	3.3	25 25 50	1	3.3
8	Belarus Moldova Ukraine	6.7	30 30 40	2	3.35
10	Kazakhstan Kyrgyzstan Tajikistan Uzbekistan Turkmenistan	10	60	5	2

Table 10: Available budget for the EECA countries in the Erasmus Mundus 2011 Call<sup>42</sup>

<sup>42</sup> [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus\\_mundus/funding/2011/documents/call\\_41\\_10/em\\_action\\_2\\_guidelines\\_eacea41\\_10\\_en.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/funding/2011/documents/call_41_10/em_action_2_guidelines_eacea41_10_en.pdf)

Lot	Third Countries	EU budget available (EUR in millions)	Minimum nr of mobility grants per partnership	Number of projects expected to be funded	Maximum grant per partnership (EUR in millions)
4	Russian Federation	7.5	150	2	3.75
5	Armenia Azerbaijan Georgia Belarus Moldova Ukraine	35.649	150	9	3.961
10	Kazakhstan Kyrgyzstan Tajikistan Uzbekistan Turkmenistan	10	80	4	2.5

Table 11: Available budget for the EECA countries in the Erasmus Mundus 2012 Call<sup>43</sup>

#### 4.1.5 EECA involvement in the Erasmus Mundus programme definition, selection and implementation

All of the actions open to the participation of the EECA countries are centralised actions. The EACEA acts as a central body collecting and selecting the projects to be funded.

In the Erasmus Mundus Programme, EECA countries are not involved in defining the programme rules, neither are they involved in the programme committees. These countries can, however, participate in stakeholders' consultations (open to participants from all over the world) and promotion/information events (as regards Erasmus Mundus, including local events organised by EU Delegations or Tempus offices).

The EU Delegation in a particular country plays a limited role in the Erasmus Mundus programme and deals mostly with dissemination of information about the open calls for proposals, notifies successful universities, and provides visa support, if necessary. Additionally, the EU delegation is involved in the selection process. More exactly, they check and confirm to the EACEA that

.....  
<sup>43</sup> [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus\\_mundus/funding/2012/documents/a2/em\\_action2\\_guidelines\\_eacea\\_42\\_2011\\_en.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/funding/2012/documents/a2/em_action2_guidelines_eacea_42_2011_en.pdf)

candidate universities meet the eligibility criteria, and give their feedback on the relevance of the proposed project for the country<sup>44</sup>. After the selection of successful project proposals, each project is managed by the EACEA and the project coordinator. Usually, the EU Delegation is not involved in the day-to-day management of the ongoing projects funded under the Erasmus Mundus programme.

#### 4.1.6 Statistical Overview of the EECA Participation in the Erasmus Mundus Calls

##### Action 1: Erasmus Mundus Joint Programmes: Master Courses (EMMC) and Joint Doctorates (EMJM)

Action 1 consortia manage **joint Master Courses or Doctorates**, including a study period in at least two partner universities. Looking on the number of approved projects in the selection 2010, 131 Master courses were funded in this selection for the academic year 2011-2012. Within these projects, **Russian Federation** appears in four projects and **Moldova** delivered one master course on migration with EU partner universities<sup>45</sup>. In this selection round, **none** of the EECA countries succeeded to obtain an EM Master Course<sup>46</sup>.

This situation improved after the 2011 selection of Action 1 Master Courses. Two Master courses “International Masters in Russian, Central and East European Studies”<sup>47</sup> involving **Kazakh** partners (Kazakhstan Institute of Management, Economics & Strategic Research) and “Sustainable Constructions under Natural Hazards and Catastrophic events” with **Kyrgyz** institutions (as an associate university without partner status) have been approved for funding. Moreover, in this selection, **Russian** State Hydrometeorological University which was involved in the “Erasmus Mundus Master in Water and Coastal Management” managed to get the funding<sup>48</sup>. In this selection, none of the EECA countries were successful in the Call for the Joint Doctorate Programmes<sup>49</sup>.

Furthermore, Russian State Hydrometeorological University has been among the 11 selected EM Joint Doctorates with the Erasmus Mundus PhD in Marine and Coastal Management<sup>50</sup>. This is the same organisation that has been successful in the EMMC in 2011 selection.

.....

<sup>44</sup> Then, the Evaluation Committee in Brussels assesses and selects the project proposals. For instance, the latest Evaluation Committee was composed of representatives from DG ELARG, DG DEVCO, FPIS, and EACEA. EEAS and DG EAC participated as observers.

<sup>45</sup> Moldova State University, <http://www.misoco.org>

<sup>46</sup> in total there were 29 projects funded under the EMMC in 2011 [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus\\_mundus/funding/2010/selection/documents/a1\\_emmc\\_2010selection.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/funding/2010/selection/documents/a1_emmc_2010selection.pdf)

<sup>47</sup> [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus\\_mundus/results\\_compendia/documents/projects/action\\_1\\_master\\_courses/imrcees\\_mc\\_208.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/results_compendia/documents/projects/action_1_master_courses/imrcees_mc_208.pdf)

<sup>48</sup> in total there were 30 projects funded under the EMMC in 2010 [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus\\_mundus/funding/2011/selection/documents/em\\_results2011\\_a1emmc.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/funding/2011/selection/documents/em_results2011_a1emmc.pdf)

<sup>49</sup> [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus\\_mundus/funding/2011/selection/documents/em\\_results2011\\_a1emjd.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/funding/2011/selection/documents/em_results2011_a1emjd.pdf)

<sup>50</sup> [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus\\_mundus/funding/2010/selection/documents/a1\\_emjd\\_2010selection-v3.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/funding/2010/selection/documents/a1_emjd_2010selection-v3.pdf)

Joint Master and Doctorate courses are highly competitive calls which have the reputation of the fierce threshold rate. In the 2011 selection, even the high quality proposals were not selected due to significant budgetary restrictions. The competition is fiercer in the joint doctorates and the quality is, based on the statements from the EACEA representatives, exceeding the expectations. As an illustration, in the last Call 2011 joint Doctorates, there were more than 180 proposals with 10 selected projects what equals to the success rate of 5.6%.

### **Action 1: Erasmus Mundus Joint Programmes: Scholarships**

The situation concerning the number of **individual mobility scholarships** in Action 1 is depicted in the following tables, particularly the performance of EECA nationals. The following tables show the number of awarded scholarships/fellowships for EECA students (Table 12) and doctoral candidates (Table 13) that follow the Erasmus Mundus joint masters' (EMJM) courses and doctoral programmes.

### **Situation in 2012 with regards to the EECA countries**

Even though in general, EM Action 1 offers highly competitive calls without possibility for favouritism to include HEIs from specific regions within EMMC and EMJD consortia, additional external relations budget is sometimes used to fund additional scholarships under specific regional windows. This is the case for the Western Balkans over recent years, and was being planned for the 2012 scholarship selection for ENPI countries.

During the 2012 scholarship selection, an additional amount of ENPI budget was channelled into Action 1, in order to fund additional scholarships for students from the six Eastern Partnership countries who had applied to Erasmus Mundus Masters Courses. This EUR 2.5 million allowed for 57 additional scholarships to be awarded to nationals of these countries, so over 40% of the 130 Masters courses will feature an additional 'Eastern Partnership' student starting in September 2012.

The total awarded scholarships in Action 1 range from 409 for the Russian Federation to 3 in Turkmenistan during 2004-2011. In comparison, the Central Asian countries exhibit the smaller amounts of awarded scholarships in this category. Moldova stands out with 50 awarded scholarships in total. Overall, the total number of awarded scholarships is experiencing slight fluctuation over the last five years.

This report does not strive to assess the performance of the EECA countries compared to the rest of the world. However, we list the global statistics to get a rough feeling on the robustness of the programme relevance and benchmark for the EECA. In total, third country nationals have received 12,034 scholarships in the period 2004-2011.



	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total
Armenia	0	3	6	3	6	13	6	5	42
Azerbaijan	0	2	0	1	5	3	1	0	12
Belarus	3	5	2	5	9	5	6	4	39
Georgia	2	3	3	5	10	9	7	3	42
Kazakhstan	0	1	0	3	3	3	6	3	19
Kyrgyzstan	0	3	3	3	2	1	3	0	15
Moldova	0	9	5	5	6	10	6	9	50
Russian Federation	9	31	36	50	81	64	75	63	409
Tajikistan	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
Turkmenistan	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Ukraine	4	23	18	24	34	29	30	28	190
Uzbekistan	0	1	9	5	6	10	3	1	35
EECA Total	19	83	83	105	163	148	144	117	862
<b>Total</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>808</b>	<b>1,377</b>	<b>1,825</b>	<b>2,031</b>	<b>1,795</b>	<b>2,141</b>	<b>1,917</b>	<b>12,034</b>

*Table 12 - Erasmus Mundus master courses: Number of awarded scholarships, students selected per year<sup>51</sup>*

In 2010, third country candidates were for the first time awarded doctorate fellowships. The first phase 2004-2008 of EM did not contain Action 1 with joint doctorates. As from the beginning of the second phase in 2009, the first selection of EM joint doctorates has been made, which started operation in 2010. From the EECA countries, the awarded scholars come from Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine and Russian Federation. No scholar from Azerbaijan, Belarus or Moldova was selected for a doctorate scholarship so far.

<sup>51</sup> [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus\\_mundus/results\\_compendia/documents/statistics/emmscol\\_country\\_2004to2011.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/results_compendia/documents/statistics/emmscol_country_2004to2011.pdf)

	2010	2011	Total
Armenia	0	2	2
Georgia	1	0	1
Russian Federation	1	6	7
Ukraine	1	4	5
Total EECA	3	12	15
Total	130	216	346

*Table 13 - Erasmus Mundus joint doctorates – Number of awarded scholarships, candidates selected per year<sup>52</sup>*

Table 14 shows the number of awarded short-term scholarships for EECA academics to carry out research or teaching assignments as part of the joint master's programmes.

The total number of awarded scholarships is increasing over time. It can be mentioned, that the representation of EECA countries is rather small with the exception of the Russian Federation and Ukraine. Nationals from Tajikistan, as from the only country from the region, have not succeeded in obtaining any scholarships so far.

As short term exchange is of key importance for the integration in international research networks and for extending institutional cooperation in all research domains, the short term scholarships are one of the S&T relevant parts of the Erasmus Mundus. A strong participation of all EECA countries in the strand would be a chance to deepen the cooperation with other universities and academics.

.....  
<sup>52</sup> [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus\\_mundus/results\\_compendia/documents/statistics/emjdschol\\_country\\_2010to2011.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/results_compendia/documents/statistics/emjdschol_country_2010to2011.pdf)

	1 <sup>st</sup> time participated in year	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
Armenia	2008	-	-	-	1	2	1	4
Azerbaijan	2010	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Belarus	2009	-	-	-	-	2	2	4
Georgia	2005	1	1	0	0	1	2	5
Kazakhstan	2008	-	-	-	1	0	0	1
Kyrgyzstan	2008	-	-	-	1	0	1	2
Moldova	2010	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Russian Federation	2005	3	9	13	16	18	21	80
Tajikistan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Turkmenistan	2010	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Ukraine	2005	2	1	5	2	9	8	27
Uzbekistan	2008	-	-	-	1	-	2	3
EECA Total		6	11	18	22	32	40	129
Total		28	133	231	273	460	489	1,614

Table 14 - Erasmus Mundus Scholars, Number of awarded scholarships, scholars selected per academic year from 2004/05 to 2009/10 <sup>53</sup>

<sup>53</sup> [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus\\_mundus/results\\_compendia/documents/statistics/emscholars\\_country\\_2004to2009.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/results_compendia/documents/statistics/emscholars_country_2004to2009.pdf)

## Action 2: Erasmus Mundus Partnerships

Action 2 provides support for higher education partnerships between European institutions and those in specific countries or regions. While Action 2 partnerships are focused on mobility, by their nature they tackle a number of operational challenges that develop capacities required for internationalisation such as diploma recognition and the capacity building of international offices. This cooperation also helps institutions to build their international presence and visibility. Participating organisations also benefit from staff mobility.

EM Partnerships are implemented in line with the balanced geographical representation of beneficiary countries. Potential applicants can apply in a special region-specific Lot with a pre-defined number of projects to be selected.

Out of 46 partnerships selected in 2011, three are involving Russian Federation, one project Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia, four projects Belarus, Ukraine and Moldova and five projects focus on Central Asian countries. We may notice a slight deviation from the planned activities in the Call for Proposals 2011, namely in favour to the Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine whose HEI were awarded four instead of two planned partnerships in the value of EUR 13 million (instead of EUR 6.7 million). The Commission was able to fund more partnerships for the Neighbourhood region (East and South) following its decision for the Southern region which was one of the first EU funding responses to the Arab Spring events<sup>54</sup>. For comparison, in 2010 selection; all other EECA regions had the same amount of funded partnerships; only Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova were awarded one funded partnership only.

Selected projects are large scale projects that aim to foster institutional cooperation, and also include a component covering individual mobility of students, teachers and other HEI professionals. Student mobility is a central component of every supported project. Thus, when scrutinizing the total numbers of foreseen grants to undergraduate, master, doctorate and post-doctorate students in the projects selected in 2010 and 2011, we notice an increase in almost all regions. The only exception is the Russian Federation where planned grants to Russian applicants decrease compared to the previous year from 581 to 447. This consideration does not, however take into account, the mobilities planned within the ongoing projects selected before 2010.

	2010	2011
<b>Belarus, Moldova, Ukraine</b>	232	390
<b>Caucasus</b>	126	144
<b>Central Asia</b>	483	492
<b>Russian Federation</b>	581	447

*Table 15 – planned mobilities to the nationals from the selected regions to be awarded within the co-operation and mobility scheme Erasmus Mundus Action<sup>55</sup>*

<sup>54</sup> <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/11/918&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

<sup>55</sup> based on own calculations

As good practice examples, a short description for one partnership per lot region is provided.

### Good practice 1: Belarus, Moldova, and Ukraine

**EMERGE Project** is a 3-year project with consortium consisting of seven partners from EU Member States, nine partners from the target region as well as four project associates. Its main mission is to strengthen the links between EU partners and partners from the target region as well as to transfer good practices and to foster implementation of the Bologna process in Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine. Within this project, 277 mobilities are proposed to take place for undergraduate, master, doctoral and post-doctoral students, as well as for academic and administrative staff. The project has been allocated a funding of EUR 3,349,975.

### Good practice 2: Caucasus Countries

**ALRAKIS** is a 4-year project with total funding of EUR 3,300,000. This project strives to foster research and innovation in the Caucasus, implementation of individual mobilities with special emphasis to research initiatives as well as introduction of a practice-based approach to education by linking HEIs with the world of work.

### Good practice 3: Central Asian Countries

**TARGET** is a scholarship project that provides mobility scholarships for students and staff from Central Asia to European partner universities. This is a 4-year project with allocated funding of EUR 1,997,775. Its objective is to promote the exchange of persons, knowledge and skills at higher education level and aims at undergraduate, master and doctorate students, as well as post-doc researchers and academic staff.

### Good practice 4: Russian Federation

**ERANET-MUNDUS** is a 4-year project with total funding of EUR 2,121,500. The project aims to establish stronger ties for cooperation and increase mobility flows between Russian and European universities. The principal objectives are to bring Russian HEIs closer to the European Higher Education Area, addressing Russian institutions, academics, researchers and students with experience of the European model and guidance on how to develop standards as well as how to create a stable and ongoing mobility scheme between Europe and Russia.

#### 4.1.7. National perspective in Erasmus Mundus

In the following chapter, Tajikistan and Moldova perspective in the Erasmus Mundus are presented as examples for the national perspective.

##### Tajikistan

Tajikistan participates in the EM since 2007. It achieves relatively low participation rates in **Action 1 Individual Mobilities**. This can be partially explained with following factors<sup>56</sup>:

- Language requirements (knowledge of at least 2 EU languages) which is a significant barrier for the Tajik nationals;
- Relatively high cost for submission of applications under mobility grants which many Tajik nationals can not afford (TOEFL, IELTS test & DHL costs);
- Relatively limited access to Internet for many students who have to apply on line for the scholarships.

No Tajik institutions are participating in the **Action 1 Consortia**, what can be partially explained by the fact that the third country participation in the form of full partnership is a recent development (since the first selection under the second phase took place in 2009 only). In addition, it is also not compulsory for European partner organisations to involve a third country organisation; so many consortia operate with European partner institutions only. With regards to the Action 1, the question for many third countries is whether they are in a position to be able to organize a joint programme and host students at their institution.<sup>57</sup> This being said, **the 2011 selection of Action 1 Masters Courses saw the first two courses that include partners from Central Asia** (though not Tajikistan specifically). “International Masters in Russian, Central and East European Studies” and “Sustainable Constructions under Natural Hazards and Catastrophic Events” involve Kazakh and Kyrgyz institutions respectively.

**Action 2** provides support for higher education partnerships between European institutions and those in specific countries or regions that are the focus of EU cooperation. For five years, Central Asian countries have featured within the calls for proposals under Action 2 and its predecessor External Cooperation Window, implementing or planning mobility for over 60 students and staff from Tajikistan. There have been 28 cases of participation in these partnerships by the Tajik HEIs.

As for both actions, Tajik partner organisations are eligible as full partners, yet can not coordinate the consortia as a whole. Since only a European institution can submit a proposal, Tajik partners play a rather reactive role when it comes to project initiation. However, by strengthening their international institutional and academic cooperation, Tajik HEIs are able to increase their visibility and increase a chance to be invited in a project proposal.

**At country level**, a stronger political support from both the Ministry of Education and university management would ensure the strengthening and promotion of the partnership development and international academic cooperation.

.....

<sup>56</sup> Input kindly provided by Mr. Mic, EU Delegation to Tajikistan

<sup>57</sup> Experience has shown that a joint programme model can operate successfully with third country partners, though these have, perhaps predictably, tended to be from industrialised countries and the emerging economies.

**At university level**, the key success factor in the Call for Proposals is the significance and strength of the consortia. In particular, for Action 1 courses, an ongoing cooperation in specific academic disciplines and links between Tajik and European HEIs might provide the basis for a project proposal. For Action 2, the cooperation might be more focused on institutional cooperation, based on existing exchange agreements.

**At individual level**, the active participation of undergraduate students under EM Action 2 (which supports students in acquiring foreign languages among others) can improve their language skills and enhance their chances to participate in mobility actions under Action 1.

There are also other factors that facilitate the participation of Tajik organisations in the programmes:

- Ensure that study periods abroad are automatically recognized in line with Bologna principles;
- There are still obstacles for joint degrees. Through Tempus projects, the development of new study programmes on languages and quality assurance standards can be achieved;
- Strengthen information campaigns between Tajik and EU universities calling for a deeper involvement of international relations offices of the universities participating in Tempus projects. This could ensure more visibility of the programme;
- Widen dissemination of programme results across Tajik universities and local authorities that include publications such as bulletins or brochures, by sharing experience; build and promote a dedicated website.

## Moldova

In Moldova<sup>58</sup>, Erasmus Mundus is considered to be an important instrument fostering Moldovan ET policy. The main recommendation with regards to the management side is to establish a body/secretariat similar to Tempus National Offices that would be coordinating Erasmus Mundus in Moldova and would disseminate the information among potential candidates and monitor the ongoing projects.

Additional recommendations were stated as follows:

- On the part of educational institutions - detailed knowledge of the programme guide, application process, strong research profiles, partnerships with the EU universities;
- On country level - promotion of the Erasmus Mundus and LLP among the education institutions, capacity building for the education institutions (regarding the programme guide, application process);
- On EU level - establishment and support of the national body/secretariat coordinating Erasmus Mundus in Moldova and other countries (similarly to Tempus National Offices).

Even though the EC considers that relevant national organisations are sufficiently informed about the LLP and Erasmus Mundus, it is recommendable for these institutions to be pro-active and check the EU web pages and other sources of information, to share experience among them and to establish strategic partnerships with the EU universities.

.....

<sup>58</sup> Input kindly provided by Mr. Riscanu, EU Delegation to Moldova

#### 4.1.8 Final Remarks to the points raised by national Erasmus Mundus representatives

The most frequently occurring points that have been raised by the Erasmus Mundus practitioners from the EECA have been addressed during our interview with the Erasmus Mundus representatives from the EACEA. Below, the feedback to these points is shortly presented.

##### 1) Making the third country participation an obligatory part of the Action 1 consortia building would facilitate their participation level and enrich the consortia as a whole.

Action 1 is based on the overarching principle of openness and free competition what ensures that only the best programmes and candidates are selected in the end. Any rules placing restrictions on the national composition of consortia would curtail this principle. For this reason, the EACEA does not foresee to introduce the third country participation as an obligatory part of the consortium.

##### 2) Establishing a National Erasmus Mundus Office in the EECA countries would facilitate dissemination of the programme information and increase national capacities in this regards.

Unfortunately, the EECA countries are having only a very little success rate in the Action 1 Joint programmes and the effectiveness of this step is questionable. On the other hand, Action 2 is running very well on an institutional level. Technically, it would be close to impossible to set up specific National Erasmus Mundus Offices as EM is active in all parts of the world.

## 4.2 Tempus

Tempus is a programme that aims at modernisation of the higher education and promotes cooperation between EU and partner countries.

The overall objective<sup>59</sup> of the programme is to contribute to an area of cooperation in the field of higher education and to promote voluntary convergence in line with the Europe 2020 strategy, ET 2020 and the Bologna process.

In particular, the Tempus programme targets internationalisation of higher education, institutional cooperation and institution building as so as to solve challenges linked to dramatic demographic changes, increasing global competition, challenges of societies in transition and shift from purely technological innovations towards societal and organisational innovations. HEI are considered of crucial importance when tackling these societal challenges.

Since its inception in 1990, the Tempus programme is considered as an important part of EU co-operation activities with the neighbouring countries and the countries within its wider neighbourhood. In year 2009, Tempus reallocated EUR 60 million, while in 2010 the number slightly decreased to EUR 54.2 million. Interesting finding is that whereas the number of approved joint European projects is expected to be much lower at the end of the Tempus IV 2007-2013 com-

.....

<sup>59</sup> Call for Proposals 25/2011 (2011): Tempus IV Reform of Higher Education through International University Cooperation: Fifth Call Application Guidelines. EACEA (2011/C 321/09).

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2011:321:0011:0014:EN:PDF>



pared to the Tempus III 2000-2006 (Tempus III 2000-2006 with 794 supported projects in total, Tempus IV 2007-2013 with 163 supported projects so far<sup>60</sup>), the average project grant grew manifold per programming period (Tempus III average funding was EUR 310,000, whereas Tempus IV EUR 850,000). There is a clear tendency to focus rather on large-scale projects that are expected to have substantial effects.

The impact of the Tempus programme is significant. Since its inception, Tempus has funded the development of new curricula in line with the principles of the Bologna process, supported introduction of quality assurance standards and provided a legal basis for the quality assessment systems at universities. Tempus also helped participating universities to strengthen their ties with the labour market that is being increasingly involved in the curricula definition. Moreover, Tempus partnerships tend to show overarching and sustainable effects that go beyond the lifetime of the project.

The programme is complementary to the Erasmus Mundus programme which promotes the third country student mobility to the EU and to this end, funds also institution building. From the other end, Tempus targets institution building in higher education and sustainable university partnerships. Primarily, Tempus does not target to foster individual mobility. The role of Tempus mobility grants has diminished with the development of the Erasmus Mundus. However, Tempus IV still contains a mobility element linked to management or training purposes which needs to be directly instrumental to the project.

Tempus is also strongly linked to the Bologna Process and has common goals. As stated by the EACEA representative during our interview, Tempus Higher Education Reform Experts (HEREs) are not advocates of Bologna process, yet with their activities they also support Bologna process objectives due to strong links between the objectives of both initiatives.

Eligible participants are mainly higher education institutions as well as business units, administrative bodies as ministries, NGOs and other relevant organisations both from EU and 27 countries located in the Western Balkans, Eastern Europe, Central Asia, Northern Africa and the Middle East. A full list of the countries is provided in the Calls for Proposal on an annual basis.

The participants can submit two types of projects:

- National project – targets 1 single partner country;
- Multi-country project – targets more than 1 partner country.

### Types of supported actions in Tempus:

1. **Joint projects** pursue a “bottom-up” approach and promote development and knowledge exchange at the university level (e.g. new curricula, modernisation of higher education management and teaching methods, promotion of quality assurance). Joint projects involve HEI from one (national projects) or from more (multi-country projects) partner countries.
2. **Structural measures** support modernisation, introduction of legal framework at national level and reform of higher education systems in partner countries so as to ensure their continual convergence with the EU.

.....

<sup>60</sup> Calculations for Tempus IV only covers three selection rounds (2008, 2009,2010)

EC Tempus: Tempus @20. A Retrospective of the Tempus Programme over the past twenty years, 1990-2010  
[http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/tools/documents/tempus\\_en\\_110308.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/tools/documents/tempus_en_110308.pdf)

In addition, Tempus also finances the activities of the Tempus Offices located in the partner countries and networks of experts, the so-called HEREs – Higher Education Reform Experts who play a major role in raising awareness and disseminating information on Higher Education reforms in the countries concerned.

The **themes for cooperation** to support the modernisation of the higher education systems are structured around the three building blocks. Priorities are subdivided into sub-priorities, all relevant for the S&T system and society:

### 1. Curricular Reform

- Modernisation of curricula: ECTS, 3 cycles, recognition of degrees

### 2. Governance Reform

- University management and services for students;
- Introduction of quality assurance;
- Institutional and financial autonomy and accountability;
- Equal and transparent access to higher education;
- Development of international relations.

### 3. Higher Education and Society

- Training of non-university teachers;
- Development of partnerships with enterprises;
- Knowledge triangle education-research-innovation;
- Training courses for public services (ministries, regional/local authorities);
- Development of lifelong learning in society at large;
- Qualifications frameworks.

Each Tempus Partner Country needs to identify themes listed in the themes for cooperation that will become its **national priorities**. National priorities need to be adhered to in national projects. The **regional priorities** are based on the EU policy for cooperation with the Partner Country regions as identified in the strategic documents concerning the ENPI and those in Central Asia<sup>61</sup>.

As for multi-country projects from one region, either the regional priority must be defined as the theme of the project, or the theme of the project must be listed as a national priority for each of the participating countries. Regarding the cross regional cooperation projects, the theme of the proposal must be included in the regional or national priorities for each of the partner countries involved<sup>62</sup>.

.....  
<sup>61</sup> Call for Proposals 25/2011 (2011): Tempus IV Reform of Higher Education through International University Cooperation: Fifth Call Application Guidelines. EACEA (2011/C 321/09).  
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2011:321:0011:0014:EN:PDF>

<sup>62</sup> Full list of the national as well as regional priorities is to be found in Annex 7,8,9&10 in TEMPUS IV: Fifth Call Application Guidelines. EACEA 2011.  
[http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/funding/2011/documents/5th\\_call\\_application\\_guidelines\\_en.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/funding/2011/documents/5th_call_application_guidelines_en.pdf)

## Eligibility Criteria

Eligible applicant institutions must be legal persons in the EU or Tempus Partner Countries. Applicants for Joint Projects must be state-recognised, public or private HEI or associations, organizations and networks of HEI; rector, teacher, student organisations, NGOs, social partners, research institutions, chambers of commerce. In addition to this ruling that applies to Joint Projects Action, the Ministry responsible for higher education of each participating Partner Country is required to be involved as a partner in a Structural Measures project.

For national projects, a minimum of three HEIs from a partner country and at least three HEIs from the EU, each from a different MS, have to apply. Multi-country projects need to include at least two HEI from at least two partner countries and at least three HEI from the EU, each from a different MS.

It is worth noting that within Tempus IV, institutions from the partner countries have the possibility to coordinate the projects and take full responsibility for their administrative and financial management. Under Tempus III, this responsibility was only given to the EU institutions.

### 4.2.1 Management

The formal responsibility for Tempus lies with the EuropeAid Development and Cooperation Office (DG DEVCO) and the DG Enlargement (DG ELARG) which allocate funds to the main implementing body – the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). The European External Action Service contributes on a strategic level and DG for Education and Culture (DG EAC) contributes with sectoral expertise and supervises internal cohesion with EU internal higher education reform policies. Moreover, in each Tempus partner country, a National Tempus Office<sup>63</sup> is in place that aims to assist applicants in their endeavours and provide general information, consultation services on the programme as well as monitoring of the ongoing projects.

### 4.2.2 S&T relevant elements of the Tempus programme

Since Tempus primarily attempts to foster modernisation efforts of the HEI by strengthening institution building, modernisation efforts and introduction of quality standards as well as knowledge transfer within the consortia, S&T elements are clearly recognizable in both of its actions. Every Tempus project contains an S&T element by focusing to larger or smaller extent on the above mentioned objectives.

Moreover, even though Tempus does not intentionally promote training and mobility, once they are purposefully applied to reach programme objectives, mobility is supported as well. Summing up, Tempus contributes to both individual and institutional capacity building and both its actions are relevant for enhancing institution building, teacher training and knowledge transfer in the education sector. Some of its projects involved research elements to achieve their goals as well.

.....

<sup>63</sup> [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/tools/contacts\\_national\\_tempus\\_offices\\_en.php](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/tools/contacts_national_tempus_offices_en.php)

### 4.2.3 Tempus and EECA

Whereas Tempus started in 1990 in Central Europe, the Eastern European countries joined the programme a few years later, in 1993 (Belarus, Ukraine), 1994 (Moldova) and 1995 followed the three Caucasus Countries. Central Asian countries joined the programme in 1995 (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan), 1997 (Turkmenistan) and 2004 (Tajikistan).

Since then, a total budget amounting to EUR 136 million was attributed to Eastern European countries to finance altogether (1993-2011) more than 250 Joint Projects and 50 Structural Measures and some hundreds of Individual Mobility Grants (until 2006 only).

Central Asia benefited altogether (1995-2011) from EUR 78 million to support more than 120 Joint Projects and 60 Structural Measures and some 230 Individual Mobility Grants (until 2006 only).

All EECA countries are eligible to become coordinators/partners in the Tempus programme.

### 4.2.4 Allocated Budget for the EECA in the Tempus 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals

Tempus projects in EECA are being funded on an annual basis from following regional instruments:

- European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI). ENPI is used for partner countries from the Southern and Eastern EU Neighbouring area. The Russian Federation is included in the ENPI until the 2011. As of 2012, the Russian Federation will receive funding allocation based on bilateral agreements;
- Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI). DCI is used for partner countries from Central Asia.

Due to the positive evaluation of the projects' results and impact overall, the Tempus funding has been increased for the Tempus IV 5<sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals. Whereas the 2010 Tempus IV 4<sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals<sup>64</sup> had an overall budget of EUR 48.7 million, the total indicative budget for the Tempus IV 5<sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals<sup>65</sup> is set to EUR 78.1 million (plus additional EUR 12.5 million for Southern and Eastern Neighbouring area). Both calls are based on a co-financing principle (10% co-financing precondition).

**In the 4<sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals 2011**, budget of EUR 11.4 million was indicatively allocated to Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine, and the Russian Federation from ENPI sources. Russian Federation also receives an additional EUR 4.5 million allocated for bilateral activities. Central Asian countries were budgeted with EUR 9 million in total.

The minimum grant for both actions is EUR 500,000, maximum being EUR 1,500,000.

Due to the positive evaluation of the programme impact and outputs of the Tempus projects, it has been decided that the budget allocation for the ENPI countries will be topped up in **the 5<sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals 2012** by more than double compared to the 4<sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals. ENPI

.....  
<sup>64</sup> Call for Proposals 25/2011 (2011): Tempus IV Reform of Higher Education through International University Cooperation: Fifth Call Application Guidelines. EACEA (2011/C 321/09).  
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2011:321:0011:0014:EN:PDF>

<sup>65</sup> EACEA N° 25/2011 (2011): Tempus IV Reform of Higher Education through International University Cooperation: Fifth Call Application Guidelines. EACEA 2010.  
[http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/funding/2011/documents/5th\\_call\\_application\\_guidelines\\_en.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/funding/2011/documents/5th_call_application_guidelines_en.pdf)

countries without Russian Federation shall indicatively receive the funding of EUR 29.05 million compared to the previous year when they have been allocated EUR 11.4 million that already factored in the funding for the Russian Federation. Since from this call on, the Russian Federation will receive budget on a bilateral basis, this brings in additional benefit for the organisations from the ENPI countries. Overall, the EACEA expects to have around 90-95 projects funded in this call what presents an increase of the projects to be funded overall.

The grant indication for both actions remains the same as in the 4<sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals: minimum EUR 500,000, maximum being EUR 1,500,000.

This budgetary novelty allows those high-quality proposals, which were not recommended for funding in the last call due to budgetary constraints, to have better chances to succeed. This is positive news for all applying institutions from the region that have been voicing their concern about the highly competitive and partially off-putting situation in the application process from the last calls.

For the countries financed under the DCI instrument, budget will remain more or less stable.

The overview of the financial situation under the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals is illustrated below.

Financial Instrument	4 <sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals (2011)	5 <sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals (2012)
<b>Eastern Neighbouring Area (under ENPI)</b> (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine)	EUR 11.4 million (including the Russian Federation)	EUR 22.8 million Additional amount of EUR 6.25 million under the condition that the relevant decision is adopted by EC
<b>Bilateral allocation for the Russian Federation</b>	EUR 4.5 million	EUR 8.5 million
<b>Central Asia (under DCI)</b> (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)	EUR 9 million	EUR 9.5 million

Table 16 - Budget under Tempus IV 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals<sup>66</sup>

.....

<sup>66</sup> EACEA N° 32/2010 (2010): Tempus IV Reform of Higher Education through International University Cooperation: Fourth Call Application Guidelines. EACEA 2010. [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/funding/2010/documents/4th\\_call\\_application\\_guideline-v2\\_en.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/funding/2010/documents/4th_call_application_guideline-v2_en.pdf)  
EACEA N° 25/2011 (2011): Tempus IV Reform of Higher Education through International University Cooperation: Fifth Call Application Guidelines. EACEA 2010. [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/funding/2011/documents/5th\\_call\\_application\\_guidelines\\_en.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/funding/2011/documents/5th_call_application_guidelines_en.pdf)

#### **4.2.5 EECA involvement in the Tempus programme definition, selection and implementation**

EECA countries are involved in the definition of national priorities in Tempus. EACEA seeks advice from the ministries, which in conjunction with the EU Delegations propose the national priorities for the respective Partner Country.

Moreover, partner countries are involved in the selection process of the programme. Next to the evaluation carried out by academic experts (including experts from the partner countries); EACEA also consults a short-list of projects with the Ministries of Education, the EU Delegations and the National Tempus Offices of the Partner Countries.

Moreover, the National Tempus Offices located in the countries are involved in the implementation and monitoring of the programme. The NTO provides methodological support, disseminates the project outcomes and actively provides information to prospective participants. NTO is also in charge of monitoring the on-going projects and participates in studies / analyses about the impact and management of the programme. The management of the programme remains with the EACEA.

In addition, a group of Higher Education Reform Experts (HEREs) is active in each EECA country. HEREs are selected and appointed by the national authorities in consultation with the National Tempus Offices, EU Delegations and EACEA. Their main task is to promote higher education reforms in their own countries and to provide guidance to higher education institutions. They benefit from training opportunities provided by EACEA and work closely in collaboration with the ministries.

#### **4.2.6 Statistical Overview of the EECA Participation in Tempus IV**

The figures in the Table 17 summarise projects funded in the Tempus IV Joint Projects and Structural Measures actions in the period 2008-2011. The Russian Federation and Ukraine are countries with the most selected projects. These countries are strongly represented in the Tempus programme that is to be linked to the size of their country and number of HEIs, quality and quantity of established inter-institutional links and international contacts.

Concerning Central Asian countries it can be observed that institutions from Kazakhstan are the most selected in absolute terms. On the opposite, Turkmenistan has the smallest number of selected projects in the programme. From the group of smaller countries, Moldova shows relatively high level of participation in the calls with all 31 universities having submitted a proposal in the programme.

Country	2008			2009			2010			2011			Total Tempus IV
	JP	SM	Total	JP	SM	Total	JP	SM	Total	JP	SM	Total	
Armenia	4	0	4	2	1	3	2	2	4	2	0	2	13
Azerbaijan	3	0	3	2	0	2	2	0	2	4	1	5	12
Georgia	3	0	3	3	1	4	4	1	5	4	1	5	17
Belarus	4	0	4	3	1	4	2	0	2	2	1	3	13
Moldova	9	0	9	0	2	2	5	0	5	1	0	1	17
Ukraine	12	0	12	9	3	12	5	0	5	8	1	9	38
Kazakhstan	7	3	10	3	0	3	3	0	3	7	2	9	25
Kyrgyzstan	1	3	4	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	1	4	14
Tajikistan	0	2	2	3	0	3	2	1	3	4	2	6	14
Turkmenistan	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	3	1	0	1	6
Uzbekistan	1	2	3	3	1	4	3	0	3	3	1	4	14
Russian Federation	17	3	20	12	2	14	7	1	8	9	2	11	53
<b>Total CA</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Total EE</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Total EECA</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>136</b>

*Table 17– Number of accepted Tempus IV Projects under Tempus IV calls from 2008-2011  
Please note: Total number of accepted projects is not a sum of accepted projects in individual countries. Individual country figures cannot be added as several countries can be involved in a same project<sup>67</sup>*

### Results of the Tempus IV 4<sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals

The 4<sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals has been the most competitive call ever, with the smallest budget and many high quality proposals, the success rate reached only 12% and with very good proposals failing to receive funding (see Table 18).

In 4<sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals, 525 proposals have been received by the EACEA. Compared to the selection in 2010, more applications have been submitted both for Central Asia region (52 compared to 35 in 2010) and Eastern Europe Region (217 versus 178 in 2010). As it becomes obvious from

<sup>67</sup> own calculations based on statistics provided from EACEA

the statistics provided by the EACEA during our interviews, the competition became fiercer as in 2010. In 2010, 64 out of 450 submitted proposals have been recommended for funding whereas in 2011, 63 out of 525 submitted proposals have been recommended for funding. It can be concluded that on average, 12% from total submitted proposals have been funded. The average budget size for all selected proposals has amounted to EUR 818,000.

Based on this statistics, proposals involving Central Asian institutions have had relatively better success rate - with 8 from 52 submitted proposals that were recommended for funding, 15.4% of proposals have been successful. Proposals involving the Eastern Neighbouring Area institutions had a lower success rate than the average equalling 7.5% (16 from 212 submitted proposals were recommended for funding in the end).

REGION	Received applications	Eligible proposals	Above the 50% proposals threshold	Proposed for consultation	Recommended for funding
Western Balkans	86	82	61	41	18
South Neighbouring area	105	92	68	33	15
Eastern Neighbouring Area + Russian Federation	212	133+61	103+46	33+14	10+6
Central Asia	52	46	29	20	8
Multiregional	70	63	46	33	6
<b>Selection Total 2011</b>	525	477 (91% from total received)	353 (70% from eligible applications)	174 (49% from above 50% threshold; 36,48% from total eligible)	63 (12% from total)
<b>Selection Total 2010</b>	450	400	318	204	64

Table 18: Overview on the selection process Tempus IV 4<sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals<sup>68</sup>

<sup>68</sup> [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/events/documents/pp1\\_tempus\\_general\\_presentation\\_5th\\_call.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/events/documents/pp1_tempus_general_presentation_5th_call.pdf)



In these proposals, 1 Georgian organisation, 1 Kazakh and 1 Russian organisation was acting as a project coordinator. Moreover, 7 Armenian, 20 Azerbaijan, 14 Georgian, 13 Moldovan, 86 Russian, 49 Ukrainian, 17 Kyrgyz, 62 Kazakh, 24 Tajik, 5 Turkmenistan and 20 Uzbek organisations participated in the 4th Call for Proposals projects.

### Case Study: Tempus in Kazakhstan

Kazakhstan has been selected as an example showcasing the possible impact of Tempus programme on the HE system at national level.

The Tempus programme started in Kazakhstan in 1994 and ever since then; Tempus supported 51 projects, including 23 national and 36 multi-country ones. Out of this number, 44 Joint Projects and 15 Structural Measures projects have been implemented so far.

The impact of Tempus has been strong in terms of **curriculum modernization** (about 60% of the overall number of Tempus projects). At many universities, lack of information, training and learning material and external expertise in the economical, business and technical disciplines has dominated the scene. Tempus projects such as “Engineering Curricula for a New Degree Structure at KazNTU”, “KAZTOUR”, “and Restructuring Business Education Teaching with Innovative Curricula Development in Kazakhstan” (2004) and New Curricula in trade theory and econometrics (2005) have brought expertise in restructuring curricula and modernising teaching and learning approaches in order to meet the changing economic needs of the business environment in Kazakhstan.

Tempus has started a pioneering task in the development of a **national quality management and assessment system** in the Kazakh Higher Education system in the university governance sector. Here, at least six projects have supported the introduction of such a system. For example the Kazakh National Agrarian University has introduced a system of quality assurance (both internal and external) which was disseminated amongst all universities of the country. The project remains sustainable with well established and functioning structures.

A Tempus project aiming to develop a quality management system based on international standards and total quality management (TQM) principles started in 2005 at the International Business Academy. A general concept of quality accompanied by a *Manual for Education Quality Evaluation* was developed together with a coherent system of staff development. A key achievement of the project was the development of two scientific laboratories for quality enhancement, one for students and one for faculty staff. These two laboratories continue to operate under a new Centre for Innovation in Education.

Tempus projects contribute to the expansion of the internationalization of universities, strengthening links with universities of former USSR and other countries. It is important that universities in Kazakhstan now can be grant-holders and project coordinators, and play a more significant role in defining and implementing activities.

There is an increased interest to participate in Tempus amongst Kazakh universities: out of 76 projects selected under the First Tempus IV Call, 10 projects involved Kazakh universities. What is also very positive finding is the fact that all the universities which have recently received international accreditation have been involved in Tempus.

An important milestone in developing higher education in Kazakhstan marked the signing the Bologna Declaration in March 2010. In line with the Law “On Education” Kazakhstan adopted the three-cycle degree system which is now at stage of implementation across the country. Work has also started on implementing a national qualification framework compatible with the overarching European Qualifications Framework.

### **Good practice projects**

#### **Salis Project, Georgia & Moldova<sup>69</sup>**

SALiS– Student Active Learning in Science is a project coordinated by Ilia State University in Georgia. The project aims to promote science teaching through inquiry-based and student-centred experimental learning in science classes.

The project directly supports enhancement of S&T in the society as trained teachers will implement SALiS methods at schools, which helps to increase the level of S&T in the society. Project also intends to develop low cost experiments that can be widely used in SALiS laboratories and beyond.

Within this project, a curriculum for the contemporary science education is created by designing inquiry-based and student-centred science teaching and learning in participating countries. In addition, participating universities will equip the special training laboratories and establish the clear procedures for usage and maintenance of the labs. For the successful implementation of SALiS into pre- and in-service teacher training, the supporting staff of the universities has to be trained. To support project objectives, the SALiS website will present project results and guidelines in different languages, enabling the access of the materials for the wide international audience.

#### **Postgraduate Training Network in Biotechnology of Neurosciences (BioN)<sup>70</sup>, Russian Federation**

BioN is a network of leading centres in different fields of neuroscience from Russia and EU. It is the first Russian network of postgraduate schools in natural sciences and an intellectual innovation initiative to develop biotechnology applications in Russian life sciences. The network aims to introduce common standards and practices and improves the quality of postgraduate education in the Russian Federation.

.....  
<sup>69</sup> Input kindly provided by Ms Marika Kapanadze, Ilia State University (Georgia)

<sup>70</sup> Input kindly provided by Dr. Victoria Moiseeva, Senior scientist, Lomonosov MSU

The project is the first initiative to upgrade post-graduate education in Russia in the field of neuroscience and neurotechnologies. It targets post-graduate students, who can take part in advanced special courses held by teachers coming not only from home university but also from the other project universities including practical placements.

The project significantly contributes to enhance S&T as it provides high quality education for future specialists in neurosciences by offering interdisciplinary courses in the field of up-to-date neurotechnologies (BCI, neuroanimates, artificial intelligence, neuroimplants, neuro-feedback). Project trains not only teachers, but also researchers. These trainings may result in scientific collaborations as it was the case in the scientific collaboration between BioN project partners from University of Nizhniy Novgorod and Italian Institute of Technology. This team managed to win the biggest grant in Russia for organisation of new laboratory under supervision of world leading scientists.

Project partners are very satisfied with the level of support from the NTO. When writing the project proposal, consortium took Russian NTO recommendation into account and stressed the relevance of the project towards the regional priorities of the call.

#### 4.2.7 National perspective in TEMPUS

Within this deliverable, national Tempus offices and Higher Education Reform Experts from the EECA countries have been contacted with the aim to receive input on the strengths and weaknesses in the performance of the particular country together with the suggestions for the improvement of current state. Even though the input from contacted stakeholders represents subjective opinion, it provides valuable insights into the national sphere and thus significantly enriches the value of this report.

##### Armenia

Tempus is basically the only project of this magnitude operating in the country; despite this it achieves a peripheral impact due to the small number of funded projects. Despite sufficient information on the programme in Armenia, it seems that HEIs lack the understanding on how they could benefit from Tempus projects and from the overall modernization agenda.

Following factors have effect on low rates of participation from the side of Armenian HEIs<sup>71</sup>:

- The initial stage of internationalization of the HEIs, which are yet in the process of forging partnerships both locally and internationally. The studies have shown that 87% of universities do not have an internationalization strategy, ECTS is not yet fully functional and joint programs are quite rare, not to speak of internationalized study courses study that are dismal, except for Yerevan State University's PhD level that offers 18 study programs with a potential to attract foreign students;

.....  
<sup>71</sup> Input kindly provided by Nvard V. Manasian, HERE Local Expert

- Armenian HEIs have no track record in project administration<sup>72</sup>;
- Weak potential of writing applications at HEIs, which do not have a necessary capacity to apply: without offices working on strengthening of international relations/cooperation, without language ability, without promotion of internationalisation policy, they would never succeed in promoting themselves. They should consolidate their efforts in writing proposals with other universities;
- High level of competition in the Program. Armenia has participated in numerous proposals in each annual competition; universities were part of big and small consortia, yet the number of funded projects gradually diminished. Obviously, this had a negative impact on universities perception on their capability to win in these tough and competitive calls. Many universities do not believe in the success knowing how difficult the whole procedure of application is, even if they wish to renew their curricula and re-design a structure of the management.

Year	Submitted proposals with Armenian participation	Short listed projects after the selection	funded
2009	30	10	3
2010	32	18	4
2011	46	11	2

*Table 19: Number of submitted and funded proposals for Armenia 2009-2011<sup>73</sup>*

On the other hand, the country could in the future more exploit that it has already adopted the National Qualifications Framework and that it has long standing tradition in a number of disciplines, such as physics, applied mathematics, ICT, cultural studies with an accent on Armenian studies, Medieval studies, etc. Moreover, Armenian Diaspora seems to be a good carrier of knowledge and Armenian graduates from abroad would be a useful means for working on proposals and implementing the project. However, this is only a potential strength as this group should be approached coherently so as to achieve some synergies in cooperation.

Following steps are suggested to improve the position of Armenian HEIs in Tempus:

**At country level**, the policy formulation and dialogue with HEIs on the need to develop internationalisation strategies should be strengthened. The advantages of working towards the receipt of ECTS/Diploma Supplement Labels shall be clearly communicated, and tracks and information

.....  
<sup>72</sup> Armenian HEIs are entering a stage of transformation that was typical of the European counterparts around 2005 with the internationalization of quality tools and compatible process of recognition at national and international levels.

<sup>73</sup> Input kindly provided by Nvard V. Manasian, HERE Local Expert

campaigns concerning mobility should be promoted.

Moreover, the growing influence of HERE experts should be exploited by semi-institutionalizing the provision of expertise of these experts both to the state and HEIs. This is a step that could contribute to the higher visibility of Tempus projects. This could also include HERE counselling to HEIs that are getting ready for the development of projects.

**At HEI level**, internationalisation strategies shall be developed which are realistically build on the already existing partnerships or signed memoranda of understanding with other universities.

**At EU level**, creating an open portal for universities based on national priorities could provide a meeting place for those who are interested in forging partnerships within Tempus project. In addition, conferences and workshops both at international and national level would further develop the expertise capacities of those who have successfully written or participated in the development of Tempus projects along with HERE experts. Thirdly, the database of agents of change could be enlarged (including Erasmus Mundus alumni) and these could organise, among others, communication campaigns and others.

## Georgia

In Georgia<sup>74</sup>, Tempus is considered of a great value and claimed to be the most successful programme in the higher education field and the only one assuring broad regional and European involvement. While there are different programmes supporting reform and development of higher education, they usually focus on the only one field and/or on the experience of only one country (such as DAAD – Germany, British Council – UK, USAID – USA, IREX – USA, etc). Advantage of Tempus is a multi-country consortium and broad field of priorities.

With regards to what are believed to be the strengths of Georgian higher education sector, following have been identified:

- Successful implementation of Bologna principles, thus availability of a good basis for further development;
- Current reform of higher education system with focus on quality enhancement and internationalization;
- Existing experience in international cooperation: established contacts and availability of academic and administrative staff of universities with international experience;
- Political will and support of European integration.

In Georgian HE system, all higher educational programmes are based on learning outcomes and ECTS. It is obligatory for all HE institutions to issue Diploma Supplement automatically and free of charge in Georgian and English. All above mentioned international instruments facilitate transparency and are very important for joint degrees, student mobility and recognition.

The most important factors that boost the participation rate of the HEIs in Tempus is amongst others the “soft” pressure of the accreditation standards: international collaboration is considered as a plus point during accreditation. Participation in an international consortium also fosters

.....

<sup>74</sup> Input kindly provided by Lika Glonti, National Tempus Office and Lali Bakradze, HERE Expert, Georgia

the attractiveness of educational institution and fosters the quality of the HEI internally. What proves to be of crucial importance for the success of applications is following:

- International experience of academic and administrative staff, which is very important for communication, project writing and consortium development;
- Internal management at the university level;
- Support from NTO (National Tempus Office) – information, guidance, partner search, etc.

On the other hand, place for the improvement is seen in the following areas:

- On the part of educational institutions – improvement of internal supportive mechanisms: establishment of special units or appointment of supporting personal for project-writing, partner search, project management, etc. Although such structures already exist, the quality of performance is not always satisfactory. During the project proposal writing, it is important to involve not only relevant academics, yet all appropriate departments (international, Quality Assurance). These should be fully involved in the project definition and should fully support it. The good coordination and agreement between different departments and academic staff is necessary;
- On country level – facilitation of grant management and financial reporting rules. Moreover, The Georgian national Science Foundation (GNSF) could support universities in the development of doctoral programmes or joint doctoral programmes so as to promote joint PhD programmes and enhance the participation in EU programmes;
- On EU level – increase of funding.

According to the National Tempus Office (NTO), the involvement of this institution in programme management is limited to providing the information, consulting, monitoring, and participation in the selection procedure. At the moment, NTOs, local ministries of education and EU delegations can only recommend projects for funding and final decision is made in Brussels. The national involvement could be further increased in this respect in the future. NTO uses, in addition to the official channels of information dissemination, personal meetings with representatives of both governmental and non-governmental organizations to inform them about Tempus and other relevant EU programmes.

Ilia State University<sup>75</sup> can be presented as the best practice example due to improved internal management (brilliant performance of the Office of Development and International Relations), university drastically increased its participation in different international projects, specifically in Tempus and Erasmus Mundus, resulting in four successful projects in one call. Ilia State University is the first Georgian university coordinating a Tempus project.

## Ukraine

In the new Tempus IV (2007-2013) calls for proposals, Ukraine's national priorities have placed a strong emphasis on implementing the Bologna Principles.

At the period of Tempus IV four calls, (see Table 17) 38 projects with participation of Ukrainian partners have been approved and started their implementation (34 Joint Projects and 4 Structural Measures; 32 Multi-National and 6 National Projects are among them).

.....

<sup>75</sup> [www.iliauni.edu.ge](http://www.iliauni.edu.ge)

Following projects approved in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011<sup>76</sup> with participation of Ukrainian partners serve as an example on how Tempus projects enhance different parts of S&T in the society: modernisation of higher education in tourism, foodstuff expertise and quality control, land governance, the three-cycle system in social work education, Doctoral Programme in Renewable Energy and Environmental Technology, a new Master curriculum for intellectual property law, medical education, E-Commerce Energy and Environmental Law Studies, automation / mechatronics, industrial ecology, communication and information technology, curricular reform in space technology, engineering, geographic information technology for sustainable development in Eastern neighbouring countries; university and enterprise partnership, university governance, the knowledge triangle: education, research, innovation.

In particular, new courses and curricula have been developed that meet the current requirements of the Ukrainian labour market. Many projects focused on use of ICT and involved purchase of equipment and software and implementation of courses in e-learning format. They contributed to the universities' capacity building as well as to the establishment of a distance education culture in Ukraine. Tempus projects have also helped to strengthen the cooperation between universities and enterprises, e.g. by establishing career development centres for students.

On the whole, the Tempus programme facilitated the internationalization of Ukrainian universities and contributed to the initiation of new research projects or exchange programmes. On some occasions, Tempus projects helped to set up a dialogue between HEIs and the Ministry of Education and Science or its regional branches; between faculty and administration and between employers, teachers and students.

Not all Ukrainian universities have implemented the Bologna principles and transferred to a three-cycle education system. However, those universities where changes have taken place and whose curricula fully meet the Bologna requirements link their progress and success to Tempus projects participation.

Tempus is highly relevant for Ukrainian universities; there are no other educational programmes similar in scope and impact. Tempus programme provides an excellent opportunity for universities to facilitate reforms: under current economic conditions, universities are funded to the minimum, which does not allow them to start and implement transformations.

The advantage of the Tempus is that it is comprehensive in nature, while being independent from the influence of national authorities (a good alternative to the slow or lingering national reforms). It provides a balanced combination of donor assistance, expertise of EU experts and self – study, self – work aimed at universities' modernization

Following points were identified as key aspects for improvements on different level of management:

**At EU level,** certain aspects of the programme could be improved to allow countries like Ukraine to benefit more. For instance, international technical assistance should be demand driven. The demand for the Tempus programme in Ukraine is much higher than in most other Eastern partnership countries, first of all due to its size and the number of universities (about 400 HE institutions of different size and ownership).

.....

<sup>76</sup> Input kindly provided by Svitlana Shytikova, NTO Ukraine

**At country level,** europeanisation should be supported as this is necessary for successful running of the Tempus programme. For instance, current HE legislation makes it next to impossible for Ukrainian universities to be grant holders of the Tempus projects, while the EU encourages beneficiary universities to build capacity for financial management, in addition to project management and education management. Europeanization requires more commitment from the national government, review of legislation and more coordination among government agencies.

**At HEI level,** universities should master/upgrade their project management skills, intercultural communication skills in general (e.g. persuading, providing arguments, leader discussion etc), developing project proposals, taking responsibility for project implementation (ownership of the project) as well as be more open to international cooperation, be ready to work in partnership, practice knowledge sharing and mutual learning.

In Ukraine, HEIs show substantial interest in the Tempus programme and there is significant number of applications submitted by Ukrainian universities in each call. Yet, there are justified concerns that the interest may decrease if the number of projects with participation of Ukrainian universities does not increase, universities invest a lot of time and effort in the preparation of the project proposal, and the quality of proposals is good, but competition is very tough and not many may win. The increase in funding or an alternative programme for modernization of HE may provide an additional stimuli for the reform at university level.

There are few best practices when it comes to Tempus projects with Ukrainian partners:

- Broad representation of universities from different regions in one project;
- Inclusion of novices (universities without Tempus experience) into the consortium of old partners;
- Strong ownership of the project, quite often initiators of project ideas, coordinators of activities and moderators of intercultural communication;
- Tempus projects have valuable support from University management;
- Tempus projects are part of University strategy.

### **Russian Federation**

Based on the information received from the NTO in the Russian Federation<sup>77</sup>, Tempus is very important for the HEIs in the Russian Federation. There are no other programmes of similar purpose in the country, apart from the 7th Framework Programme.

In order to enhance the participation rate of Russian applicants, the Tempus budgets should further grow, as the demand for Tempus (e.g. the number of applications submitted) is very high. Also, skills of writing applications should be improved.

At state level, the Ministry of Education and Science sets the framework for higher education standards and provides funding to public universities. The new HE standards are competence-based what is in line with the modernisation agenda. In addition, there are different federal programmes that support higher education institutions in calls for funding also from Tempus. Currently, joint

.....

<sup>77</sup> Input kindly provided by Ms Oleynikova, Director, NTO Russia



programmes leading to double/multiple degrees are a priority. However, the Ministry of Education and Science could be more active in helping to disseminate project outputs and in adopting regulations to accredit mobility periods and to legitimize double degree courses.

Overall, the level of national involvement in the programme management is satisfactory. Probably, one area which could be further improved is the involvement of the NTO in criteria definition for the project selection.

## Uzbekistan

Based on the input from NTO<sup>78</sup> in Uzbekistan, Tempus has had a considerable impact on the overall internationalisation process of higher education in Uzbekistan, being the only programme providing resources for long-term intensive interuniversity cooperation and for improving the universities' technical infrastructure and computer facilities.

The attractiveness of the programme for EU and Uzbek universities has increased in the framework of Tempus IV thanks to simplified procedures of application submission and reporting and clear guidance on project management.

Tempus priorities in Uzbekistan are relevant and well linked to the national policy of HE development. The programme activities are becoming more relevant due to direct link to the updated HE strategy of 2011 on reconsidering number of Bachelor and Master programmes according to the local labour needs. The programme continues to provide a considerable input to development and enhancement of training of highly qualified engineers in close dialogue with industrial partners.

Success rate of the programme in Uzbekistan is ensured by good reputation of the programme based on sustainable results and recognition of programme's input to the overall modernisation process of HE system in Uzbekistan.

In order to improve the participation rate of Uzbek applicants, the following factors have been identified by the Uzbek NTO:

- On the part of educational institutions: increased number of university staff in charge of project development and communication skills; strengthening level of ownership over the project outcomes by the local project partners, their active involvement in project design and management, continuous adapting the initial project plan to the local situation and needs;
- On country level: proper information and dissemination strategy, promotion of best practice defined and recognised by national authorities;
- On EU level: considering quite strong competition in Tempus call and high absorption capacity of Uzbek universities (not less than 35 applications with involvement of Uzbek universities per call) there is a need to increase budget and select more national projects (13 out of 14 Tempus IV projects are multi-country projects).

NTO in Uzbekistan raised the concerns with the level of national involvement in the programme. Due to problems with usage of university bank account and bank transfer from abroad the local universities have never played grant holder's role although it is envisaged by the programme.

For visibility, successful implementation and sustainability of on-going and completed projects

.....

<sup>78</sup> Input kindly provided by Ms. Abdurakhmanova, NTO, Uzbekistan

it is utmost important to have short study (not only monitoring) visits of representatives of the EU Delegation, EACEA and other EC services planned to Tempus projects developed facilities of Uzbek universities frequently or at least once in a year. It is particularly important for Uzbekistan and other partner countries as well. It raises the level of project ownership and provides a great support to local partners in overall project implementation and sustainable continuation of the project outcomes. This type of support is very highly appreciated by project team members at universities and enhances impact level of their Tempus projects and partnerships with their EU peers.

Accession to the Bologna process would pose a huge opportunity for Uzbekistan which would bring HEI system closer to the European standards. Uzbekistan currently did not introduce the ECTS system, a key for the mobility. This could enhance participation in LLP, Erasmus Mundus and Tempus<sup>79</sup>.

From the perspective of the Uzbek HEI<sup>80</sup>, the identified steps for improvement are as follows:

- On the part of educational institutions - to inform more actively staff and students on the results and achievements of already existing programs. Better illustrate what actual improvement has taken place inside Uzbek HEIs and what successful cooperation happened in science, educational management, curriculums, administration etc. These should be reflected in the quality standards settings as well as new curricula etc. Support language teaching at the university level which is instrumental in succeeding in Tempus;
- On country level - to participate in Bologna Process and Lisbon Convention;
- On EU level - to support Uzbekistan in becoming a member of Bologna Community.

Moreover, information campaign about Tempus should extensively involve university staff, students, Ministry of Education staff as well as business if needed.

#### 4.2.8 Project level perspective in TEMPUS

##### University of Georgia (Tbilisi, Georgia)

University of Georgia is a private university which is involved in Tempus project “Master Programs in Public Health and Social Services<sup>81</sup>”.

One of the strengths of the proposal in the application phase was the topic - Education in Health care/Public Health and social science is aims to educate qualified medical personal and is a priority in most EU partner countries. Furthermore, decisive also proved consortia and good coordinator who was experienced in Public Health sector, as well as in Tempus projects and had good institutional contacts in EU countries.

The project addresses main societal challenges by creating new and modern master education in Public Health and social sciences while applying modern learning methods and digital media in the

.....

<sup>79</sup> Input kindly provided by Dmitry Bystrov, Head of International Relations Office, Tashkent State Technical University, Uzbekistan

<sup>80</sup> Input kindly provided by Dmitry Bystrov, Head of International Relations Office, Tashkent State Technical University, Uzbekistan

<sup>81</sup> <http://tempus.ug.edu.ge:81/>, Input kindly provided by Natia Skhvitardze, MD, MBA, University of Georgia (Tbilisi, Georgia)

study process. The new program would help Georgian Medical Society to improve institutional education in this field and thus, in end effect to improve the quality of health and health care for Georgian population.

The project aims to increase the S&T level in the society by equipping all participating universities with modern technology and computers, to train staff on how to use the interactive study methods and how to apply it in the study process. Learning centre which is open to all students and academic staff will include online library with materials necessary for study and research in public health field. The centre and equipment will facilitate work of the universities in the state-of-the-art research about public health and social services.

### **Kyrgyz State Technical University (KSTU)**

The Kyrgyz State Technical University (KSTU)<sup>82</sup> is involved in 4 projects from the TEMPUS programme, and in 5 projects from the Erasmus Mundus (Action 2).

The key factors to succeed are believed to be following:

1. “Strong” coordinator;
2. The main objective of the project, which is in the interests of both the EU and partner countries;
3. The consortium and content of the application to meet the requirements of each call.

The projects have a direct impact at the university by increasing the capacity of teachers, students and by strengthening the external relations of the university. The results of these projects were however overlooked by the Ministry of Education that could further exploit them and introduce a framework based on the project experience at national level.

In addition, projects contribute to increase the level of S&T in the society. For instance, the Tempus projects “Higher Education Initiative for Informatics in Central Asia” and “Reseau Europe-Russie-Asie Centrale de Masters Informatique Seconde Compétence” raise the level of competence of Master graduates. Moreover, projects “Towards Sustainable Water Resources Management in Central Asia” and “Curriculum Invoking Bologna-aligned Education Leading to reform in Environmental Studies” enhance the interaction with businesses and government agencies.

Relevant research was conducted in the framework of the projects “Towards Sustainable Water Resources Management in Central Asia” and “Curriculum Invoking Bologna-aligned Education Leading to reform in Environmental Studies”, which investigated the problem of rational use of water resources and protection of water, soil, forests of Central Asia with regard to the interests of the region. It is noteworthy, that projects are innovative rather in terms of innovation in education in the partner countries than in the terms of science.

What might be beneficial for the participating HEIs is a transparent communication of all short-listed projects to the HEIs as well as involving national HEIs in formulation of the national Tempus priorities. Kyrgyz ministry could learn from the example of Georgia, where HEIs are involved in the identification of the national priorities.

.....

<sup>82</sup> Input kindly provided by Mr Checheibaev, Chief Specialist of International Relations, KSTU.

### **Ferghana State University (Uzbekistan)**

Ferghana State University (FSU) in Uzbekistan has successfully implemented one Institution Building Joint European Project (IB JEP) under Tempus III and is currently in the process of implementing another Tempus Joint project (JP HES) “Enhancement of role of universities in transfer of innovations into enterprise”<sup>83</sup>.

Based on the experience of this institution, the main factors that determine the success of the project are superb project management skills (actual aims, clear objectives, original ideas, well prepared logical framework matrix and joint work within the national and international team.

During the application process, the consortium has experienced some challenges with meeting the deadlines. For the future, it is advisable for the national Ministry to announce the national priorities for programmes earlier so as to allow more time for preparation of proposal. Moreover, a suggestion has been made that the deadlines at EU level could be prolonged as well.

In addition, it would be useful to create a database of the EU universities wishing to participate in Joint Tempus projects with the profile of the projects they are interested. This could facilitate search for EU partners.

As for the impact of the project, the project has managed to activate the scientific work at the university level, strengthen the links between university and enterprises as well as optimised the structure of scientific departments of university (creation of special innovation centres under the science departments of HEI, which are aimed to creating links between the university departments and enterprises). In the end, the project contributes to the economic and social development of the country.

The aim of the currently running project is to enhance university-enterprise cooperation through technology transfer. This is being done by providing support to scientific researchers. In the frame of this project, it is further considered to conduct targeted seminars and trainings for entrepreneurs what is expected to increase the intellectual capacity of the society in general. At the moment, a concept for training seminars is being elaborated. The concept of Innovation Centers at universities as such is fully innovative approach for the HE system in Uzbekistan.

While the level of support and assistance from EC/NTO/EC Delegation is evaluated as extraordinary, information dissemination at the university could be further improved.

.....  
<sup>83</sup> Input kindly provided by Prof. Alisher Yunusov, professor of Economic Theory Department of FSU

#### 4.2.9 Final Remarks to the points raised by national Tempus representatives

Among others, the following points raised by the Tempus experts from the EECA region, have been discussed during the interview with Giulia Moro, Tempus Project Officer from the EACEA. The answers to the questions are provided below.

##### 1) Database of Partner search similar to the databases created in the framework of LLP and EM<sup>84</sup> would be helpful for partner search.

EACEA has no centralised partner search database. There is an excel sheet providing an overview of the selected projects in the Tempus IV generation: [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/results\\_compendia/projects\\_description\\_en.php](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/results_compendia/projects_description_en.php). This excel sheet can be sorted and filtered according to the countries. This sheet provides a limited overview of the funded projects and it is not possible to filter e.g. based on the national/regional priorities or participants that have yet not participated in the calls. For now, the creation of a more complex database is not foreseen due to the resource constraints on the side of the EACEA.

Potential applicants can consult with the National Tempus Offices in each Tempus Partner Country for partner search. Some of them have developed some tools, but EACEA has no centralised partner search database.

##### 2) National priorities should be defined well before the Call deadline so that there is enough time to consider them in the application writing

National authorities in the Tempus Partner Countries are consulted on the next call national priorities usually before the summer break. National priorities are integral part of the call for proposals and they are published together with the text of the call each year. From the publication of the call to the deadline for submission there are usually 4 months which is a reasonable and sufficient time for applicants to consider all the novelties related to the call, national and regional priorities included.

##### 3) HEIs should be more involved in the definition of the national priorities.

In theory, national Ministries for Education should involve HEIs and all interested organisations in defining national priorities. However, it is not up to EACEA to decide on this process, which should be set based on the dialogue between the responsible parties.

.....

<sup>84</sup> [http://llp.teamwork.fr/partner\\_search/home.php](http://llp.teamwork.fr/partner_search/home.php)

## Chapter 5

# Future perspective: Erasmus for All

In order to provide a reader with the comprehensive view of the topic, the last chapter will deal with the future perspective of the Lifelong Learning Programmes that is currently in the negotiation phase and will mostly likely bring less fragmented and more integrated programme.

The European Commission has issued proposals for Erasmus for All (2014-2020)<sup>85</sup>, an overarching programme for education, culture, youth and sport that will have a strong international emphasis running through all the activity areas. Key to this international focus will be particular priority given to the Neighbourhood region. The proposal for the regulation establishing Erasmus For All<sup>86</sup> is based on the impact assessment and evaluation reports of all four main sub-programmes and reflects the efforts to introduce a more integrated approach both between different educational sectors as well as on intra-European, global or regional level. The proposal for single streamlined programme promises coherence and cost-effectiveness and emphasises actions that have had the largest impact so far. To this end, number of activities will be reduced from 75 to 11 so as to achieve the simplification of the delivery and management processes and higher synergy effects from the integration.

The new architecture will introduce three main actions that are mutually reinforcing and complementary:

- **Action 1: Learning mobility of individuals** including mobilities of students, teachers and other academic staff including to and from the third countries;
- **Action 2: Cooperation for innovation and good practices** with a stronger focus on strengthening innovative partnerships between educational institutions and business. For higher education, the emphasis will be on capacity building, concentrating on neighbourhood countries as well as strategic partnerships with developed and emerging economies;
- **Action 3: Support for policy reform:** with regards to the EECA the most important keywords are implementing the Europe 2020 strategy and promoting the policy dialogue with third countries and international organisations.

The Lifelong Learning **Programmes for cooperation with third countries in higher education** will be streamlined into the three key actions of the Programme, again with a strong emphasis on mobility:

- Support for high-quality joint degrees and scholarships for students and staff worldwide will be extended. It is foreseen that within the 7-year period, around 150.000 scholarships will be granted to the mobility to and from the third countries. To this end, EUR 1.812 billion from the ENPI, DCI, IPA, EDF and PI has been allocated;
- The management of international mobility will be based on the current Erasmus system, where-

.....

<sup>85</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus-for-all/doc/com\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus-for-all/doc/com_en.pdf)

<sup>86</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus-for-all/doc/legal\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus-for-all/doc/legal_en.pdf)

by scholarships are planned to be awarded on the basis of inter-institutional agreements;

- Funds will be allocated according to the thematic and geographical priorities of EU external action;
- Action 2 Capacity-building measures for the modernisation of higher education systems will also be streamlined; cooperation with neighbourhood countries will be reinforced by merging capacity building and mobility actions to ensure a systemic impact. The international cooperation element of the Action 2 will be building on the experience of the 2007-2013 programmes, particularly Tempus and Erasmus Mundus. It will aim at improving the quality, relevance and governance of higher education, through bottom-up projects implemented by international consortia. In response to the strong political call to reinforce support to the EU's neighbourhood countries, the Programme will support the capacity building of institutions and the modernisation of higher education systems through cooperation and structural measures. It will closely link these activities to student and staff mobility;
- Action 3 Policy Reform and Policy Dialogue will aim at the completion of the Bologna process as well as Policy dialogue will be intensified with third countries as well as with neighbouring countries in line with EU external policy priorities.

In addition, Jean Monnet activity will continue as a separate activity within the integrated programme with a bigger focus on a more balanced geographical scope.

With regards to the S&T, the complementarity with Horizon 2020 will be of high relevance for Higher Education, including its international dimension where excellence and research in universities will be reinforced.

Erasmus For All will have a robust budget with EUR 19 billion funding what brings in the increase in all of the funding lines. The largest increase is foreseen to be allocated to the Erasmus Higher Education (including tertiary VET) with 85-89% increase, the smallest increase assigned to the Erasmus Higher Education – International dimension with 17% increase.

While this is still only a proposal and things could change in terms of focus or budget during the discussions in the European Parliament and Council of Ministers, it gives a good indication on the shape and rationale of the programme.

## Chapter 6

# Summary

This report intended to provide a brief overview about the level of involvement of the EECA countries in the S&T relevant sub-programmes of the Lifelong Learning Programme, Erasmus Mundus and Tempus programmes. The main findings can be concluded as follows.

## The Lifelong Learning Programme

### Opened actions to EECA countries

In the Lifelong Learning Programme, we notice a positive tendency in opening up of the LLP programme vis-à-vis participation of third countries, including the EECA countries. As from 2010, the EECA countries are eligible to apply in the large-scale actions of LLP sub-programmes, in particular in Multilateral Projects and Networks action<sup>87</sup>.

It is important to note, that during the application process, there is no special advantage or disadvantage for opting the possibility to include partners from third countries as the third country part of the application is being evaluated separately from the main part of the application.

The opening up of the programme has been well received by the participants and the involvement of third country partners seems to slightly increase the success rate of a project (in 2010, success rate of all selected projects was 14 % and the success rate of the projects with third country participation was 16%, in 2011 the proportion increased to 12/15%). The EECA countries have been involved in 20% of the successful proposals with third country partners in 2010 and in 26 % of the successful proposals in 2011. We may conclude that, based on crude numbers, EECA countries are relatively well performing in the opened LLP calls. Speaking in project numbers, the EECA countries took part in 9 selected projects in 2010 and in 10 selected projects in 2011.

The Russian Federation and Ukraine are the best performers in the calls. Moldovan institutions seem to be quite active in the application process, however, without a tangible result (from a total of 17 applications in 2010 and 2011, only one has been accepted). On the other hand are the Central Asian Countries that have not submitted any application in the LLP call so far. The remaining countries have submitted one or a few proposals, with mixed results. Azerbaijan and Belarus have both submitted one successful project proposal; Armenia and Georgia were not successful in the application process so far.

Despite the fact that HEI from all countries worldwide are eligible to set up Jean Monnet Modules, Chairs and any other Jean Monnet actions, it seems that the EECA countries are not strong in uti-

.....

<sup>87</sup> Multilateral Projects are aimed at the modernisation efforts in the school environment, introducing innovative approaches in student curricula and teaching methodologies. In addition, networks foster joint reflection and innovative approaches by conducting comparative analyses and case studies. Furthermore they formulate recommendations and organise working groups aiming to involve the decision-makers from the participating countries.



lizing the potential this programme offers. Only eight institutions from the region have set up JM modules on European Integration. Participation in the JMP is a basic precondition for the institutions to participate in Jean Monnet multilateral research groups, which consist of JM Chairs from at least three different countries and lead to joint research and pluri-disciplinary synergies in the field of European integration studies. This is a field of significant relevance for fostering international research cooperation between universities. So far, only Tbilisi State University in Georgia created a Jean Monnet Chair in European Law and can prospectively participate in this multilateral action. Thus, there is a so far unused potential for further involvement of other universities at this level.

### **Further opening of the LLP actions**

That being said, it is important to note that individual mobility actions of the LLP remain closed to the participants from the EECA. These actions, despite small individual funding support large amount of recipients, therefore are having large impact on the education system.

It would be recommendable to open up these actions as well, so as to foster the student and teacher exchange from different education sectors.

### **Erasmus Mundus**

Erasmus Mundus is a programme that can enhance the cooperation between EU and third country HEI by providing a mobility and institutional cooperation scheme. Stakeholders from all EECA countries are eligible participants of the projects, yet they can not submit or coordinate a project.

Both Action 1-Erasmus Mundus Joint Programmes and Action 2-Erasmus Mundus Partnerships exhibit elements that are important for the objective of this report.

Action 1- EM Joint Programmes focuses on the academic cooperation by managing joint master and doctorate programmes that are also funding individual mobility.

The number of individual mobility scholarships to master students has been volatile over time. The most scholarships were awarded in 2008 reaching 163 awarded scholarships in total for the whole region. Ever since then, the number was falling to 117 master scholarships in 2011. In addition, the EECA nationals were awarded first doctorate scholarships in 2010. This number is relatively small with 3 doctoral awards in 2010 and 12 in 2011. On the positive note, the participation of EECA academics seeking to receive a scholarship grant for teaching or research purposes has been increasing over time.

In general, it is recommended to strengthen the involvement of the EECA students and teachers in Action 1. This is especially valid for the countries from Central Asia, whose students perform very poorly in obtaining these scholarships. The Russian Federation, Ukraine; Georgia and Armenia as countries with relatively good performance given the circumstances, might serve as a model for the remaining countries.

Action 2: Erasmus Mundus Partnerships action works as a complementary measure to the Action 1, funding not jointly organised programmes, but networks of academic exchange that foster mobility and HEI cooperation at institutional level. This action is grounded on the fair geographic representation of the beneficiary countries. Project proposals may be submitted in the region-specific Lots and have to include a certain pre-defined number of different types of mobilities. These projects are large scale projects running 3-4 years which include a mobility component within.

The Erasmus Mundus programme is considered as an important programme that strengthens academic cooperation and exchange between EU and third countries. In the last call, an additional funding has been made available to the Neighbourhood region what resulted in the higher number of funded partnerships from Moldova, Belarus and Ukraine. In the upcoming Call 2012, these three countries together with Caucasus countries will be funded with 9 partnerships, what poses more than double increase of available funding that is foreseen to be made available.

## **The Tempus Programme**

The Tempus is a programme pushing forward the modernisation efforts of third countries worldwide and their alignment to the Bologna Process goals. It is worth noting that within Tempus IV, institutions from the Partner countries have the possibility to coordinate the projects and be fully responsible for their administrative and financial management. Depending on the country's national regulations, some countries are more capable of taking up this role than the others. These countries are e.g. Georgia, Russian Federation and Kazakhstan that each coordinated a Tempus project under Tempus IV. Under Tempus III, this was not possible.

The programme follows two strands which complement each other by promoting modernisation efforts from bottom-up at HEI level (Action 1-Joint projects) and by promoting modernisation and reform of higher education system based on a top-down approach involving ministries and policy-makers in Structural Measures action. Scrutinizing the participation level of the EECA HEI in the Tempus Programme over time, the situation is continually improving. The participation grew from 2009 in both actions. Traditionally, Russian Federation and Ukraine are having the highest number of funded projects, followed by Kazakhstan, Moldova and Georgia. At the same time, Tempus calls are becoming increasingly competitive and the number of selected projects is, compared to the number of short listed proposals, very small.

Tempus is a highly relevant programme for the institutional cooperation, modernisation efforts which contribute to the alignment of the EECA educational policies with the Bologna principles. Despite the fact that Tempus is claimed to be very popular in the EECA region, the major concern of all consulted experts from the region was that the threshold for the successful proposals in the calls has been utterly high. Very little high quality projects have managed to obtain actual funding what has had sometimes off-putting and de-motivational effects on the future participation in the calls. This situation will be cushioned in the upcoming Tempus V call, where the budget allocation for the ENPI countries will be topped up by more than double. Overall, the EACEA expects to have around 90-95 projects funded in this call what presents an increase of the projects to be funded overall. For the comparison in the Tempus IV, 64 projects have been funded. It is also important to say that while the starting point for the Neighbouring countries improves, the funding for the Central Asian countries remains at the same level as in the previous IV Call.

## **Programming level of the LLP, Erasmus Mundus and Tempus**

For both, the LLP and the Erasmus Mundus Programme, EECA countries are not involved in the definition of the programme rules, neither are they involved in the programme committees. These countries can, however, participate in stakeholder consultations (open to participants from all over the world) and promotion/information events (as regards Erasmus Mundus, including local events organised by EU Delegations or Tempus offices).

Under Tempus, partner countries are to some extent associated to the management of the Tempus programme. In particular, national ministries, in conjunction with the EU Delegations are involved in the definition of the national priorities of the different Calls. As a supporting measure, National Tempus Office<sup>88</sup> is in place in each Tempus partner country that aims to assist applicants in their endeavours and provide general information, consultation services on the programme as well as management of the programme and monitoring of the ongoing projects.

.....  
<sup>88</sup> [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/tools/contacts\\_national\\_tempus\\_offices\\_en.php](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/tools/contacts_national_tempus_offices_en.php)

## Chapter 7

# Recommendations on the Use of LLP, Tempus and Erasmus Mundus to S&T cooperation

The **Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP), Tempus and Erasmus Mundus Programmes** are important instruments that foster the innovation and modernisation efforts in the lifelong learning policy of the EU with regards to its closer and wider neighbouring countries. These programmes aim to create a sound, coherent and efficient framework in education and training, so as to further spread the lifelong learning paradigm. Life Long Learning programme (LLP), Erasmus Mundus and Tempus include specific components towards academic institution building, human potential development and joint training activities that are of relevance to S&T.

The LLP programme has been opening up towards the participation of the third countries since 2010. This should be fully utilized and possibly extended in the field of mobility. With regards to the Tempus and Erasmus Mundus, foreseen financial commitments with regards to the EECA countries will be increased as of the 2011 calls, what creates optimal conditions for the increased participation of the EECA countries.

Authors of this report are aware of the Commission Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of The Council establishing “Erasmus for All” and welcome this proposal as a very promising in terms of the geographical, thematic scope as well as budget. Authors are also aware that this is still only a proposal and things could change in terms of focus or budget, therefore the following recommendations are based fully on the findings of this report and disregard proposal as such. We hope that in the process of proposal negotiation, the recommendations will be transformed into future policy decisions that will benefit both European society and S&T in the EECA countries.

## Recommendations for the European Union Stakeholders

### Further opening up of the sub-programmes

R1: It is suggested that the **individual mobility actions** in all LLP sub-programmes are **opened up vis-à-vis the third countries** including the EECA countries. These actions offer the possibility for staff and participating organisations to network and develop closer research links with other academics which can further deepen institutional partnerships and international cooperation. This has a positive impact on the international profile of educational institutions. Student and teacher mobility is also an important tool to enhance multicultural understanding between the EU and the EECA region.

R2: Special emphasis is to be placed on **opening of the Erasmus mobility actions towards the EECA countries**. Young students bear a huge potential and mutual exchange can accelerate the internationalisation and modernisation efforts and contribute to the building of the knowledge society on an international scale. Moreover, certain spill-over effects are to be expected between Erasmus Mundus and Erasmus actions, which are less complex activities than the actions for third countries under Erasmus Mundus. HEIs from the EECA countries that have the experience from the Erasmus have easier starting position to participate on the structural level in the Erasmus Mundus actions.

R3: It is suggested to put stronger focus on the third countries **in the Jean Monnet Programme**. The **JM Programme** plays an important role in **raising the EU visibility** outside the EU and in providing reliable information and in-depth analyses on the European integration process. Therefore more JM projects in the region would be beneficial to boost attractiveness and academic as well as institutional cooperation and exchange between the EU and EECA.

R4: Provide **sufficient funding** for the third countries in the already opened programmes so as to ensure that funded projects can meet their goals and have sufficient impact.

### **Programme Management level**

R5: In order to increase the involvement of EECA countries in the Lifelong Learning Programme and Erasmus Mundus, it is recommended to **include these countries in the individual programme committees and in the process of the programme rules definition**. Current involvement is limited to the level of stakeholder consultations.

R6: Next to the EC Delegations, **special National Offices for the LLP and Erasmus Mundus** could be set up. The most feasible solution seems to be the integration of these bodies into the National Tempus Offices that are currently active in all EECA countries. These will become main contact points, capacity-building bodies and knowledge transfer platforms for the programmes. They will also monitor the ongoing projects and help implementing already running projects. The Tempus National Office system is a well established network that already offers the information on the above mentioned programmes. In order to enhance the participation of the EECA countries in the LLP sub-programmes and Erasmus Mundus, a wider scope of their competencies is expected to increase the visibility of the EU programmes and the participation of the EECA countries in the calls.

R7: In Tempus, more structured and systematic **open database of previous successful projects** and database of potential partners that can be searchable based on national priorities would greatly assist both in searching experienced partners and in preparing more qualified project proposals.

R8: **Short study visits of the EU Delegation, EACEA and other EC services to Tempus projects in the EECA** are highly advisable since they promote project visibility, ownership and with it successful implementation and sustainability of on-going and completed projects. These short study (not only monitoring) visits could take place at least once in a year. They are particularly important for the target regions since they raise the level of project ownership and provide a great support to local partners in overall project implementation, sustainable continuation of the project outcomes. This type of support is very highly appreciated by project team members at universities and enhances impact level of their Tempus projects and partnerships with their EU peers.

## Recommendations for representatives of the EECA countries

R9: It is advisable for the EECA countries **to proceed with the accession and enhanced alignment to Bologna Process<sup>89</sup>** as this flagship initiative has many common denominators with the EU education goals. Bologna process aims to introduce a unified quality assurance system in the higher education systems of participating countries that facilitates mobility, recognition of diplomas and enhances the quality of higher education. Moreover, this commitment is seen as a crucial step that enables convergence of systems in line with standards promoted by the Erasmus Mundus and Tempus programmes.

**R10: Adoption of educational policies that would stimulate the participation of higher educational institutions in international cooperation projects and individual mobility actions.** This is expected to positively affect the participation of the EECA universities in the programmes such as LLP, EM and Tempus. Furthermore, governments are also encouraged to provide additional funding and other soft measures to stimulate the involvement of their educational providers in international projects. These measures should be subject to a regular evaluation so as to ensure that they meet their objectives.

**R11: Policy formulation based on the dialogue with HEIs should become a standard practice.** Despite this being officially the case in the EECA countries, a more intensive dialogue can help to address topics most relevant for the HEIs. Policy makers should align the policy with the challenges faced by the HEI that arise from internationalisation generally, the modernisation of ECTS/ Diploma Supplement Labels – key aspects with an impact on the quality of teaching and internal management.

R12: Authorities in charge could **introduce a framework for transfer of results** and best practices achieved in the programmes. Once results are proved to be transferrable to other HEIs, the Ministry is advised to facilitate a supportive framework at national level exploiting the valuable learning outcomes from the projects. This could take form of national meetings or specific support schemes at national level. Also, the advantages of working towards the receipt of ECTS/Diploma Supplement Labels could be clearly communicated, and tracks and information campaigns concerning mobility could be promoted.

R13: It is suggested that **the growing influence of HERE experts is semi-institutionalized.** HERE Experts are currently providing assistance mostly at the HEI level. HERE experts could advocate reforms and quality standards by advising national authorities so as to achieve synergy effects between national and HEI level. The alignment of national policies with the challenges at the level of HEIs could increase the readiness of HEIs to participate in international projects and raise their chance to succeed. This could contribute to higher exploitation of the Tempus and other LLP projects in the EECA countries. Furthermore, the database of agents of change could be enlarged (including Erasmus Mundus alumni) and these could organise, among others, communication campaigns and others.

.....  
<sup>89</sup> IncoNet EECA White Paper 2011, recommendation 26

Full members of Bologna Process are Armenia (since 2005), Azerbaijan (since 2005), Georgia (since 2005), Moldova (since 2005), Ukraine (since 2005), the Russian Federation (since 2003), Kazakhstan (since 2010), Belarus, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan are not members of Bologna Process

## Recommendations for the HEI from the EECA countries

**R14: Introduce an internationalisation strategy at the level of educational institutions** building on the already existing partnerships with other institutions or signed memoranda of understanding with universities abroad. Furthermore the development of an action plan backed with sufficient resources can assist the integration in international frameworks. It is also advisable to introduce unique ECTS system in line with Bologna process and introduce joint programmes in the curricula.

**R15: Develop supporting structures for the project application phase and project management, promote internationalisation of the HEIs.** This could be reached by appointing supporting personal for proposal-writing and partner search, project management, etc. All relevant departments (International Department, Quality Assurance Department, and Board of Deans) should be involved and informed during project application to support the relevant academics in the project proposal phase i.e. for the project definition and to share the ownership. Also promotion of the HEI activities in international context (e.g. by providing comprehensive information on the HEI web page in English) is encouraged.

**R16: A systematic development of contacts and partnerships with other HEIs** and other relevant organisations at national and international level **is important** to build a strong –international- consortium and develop the requested track record of implemented projects systematically. Joint efforts with other universities are crucial to succeed in competitive calls of the LLP, Tempus etc. Through stronger links between HEIs, necessary contacts can be established and important knowledge can be shared to increase the probability of a proposal to succeed.

**R17: Promote the language learning** at your university, the command of foreign languages is a requirement for the participation in the Erasmus Mundus Action 1 where a minimum of two EU languages is required.

**Chapter 8**

# List of Contributors / Interview Partners

We would like to acknowledge and thank for the input of all contributing persons and organisations who kindly accepted to provide us with necessary feedback.

We made a huge effort to include the names of all contributing parties. If, for any reason, you are a contributor and you do not find your name in the list, we apologise for the inconvenience. In such case, please send us a short notification e-mail to [cikikyan@zsi.at](mailto:cikikyan@zsi.at).

**Cecilia Liljegren**, LLP Coordination, EACEA

**Gillian McLaughlin**, LLP Coordination, EACEA

**Ovidiu Mic**, Head of Operations Section, European Union, Delegation to Tajikistan

**Giulia Moro**, Tempus, EACEA

**Cornel Riscanu**, Project Manager, EU Delegation to Moldova

**Rita Szettele**, Erasmus Mundus, EACEA

**Heidi Ulrich**, DG Education and Culture

**Adrian Veale**, Erasmus Mundus, EACEA

**Nvard V. Manasian**, Head/TEMPUS expert (Armenia)

**Lali Bakradze**, Higher Education Reform Expert (Georgia)

**Dr. Lika Glonti**, National Tempus Office (Georgia)

**Natia Skhvitaridze**, University of Georgia (Georgia)

**Dr. Marika Kapanadze**, Ilia State University (Georgia)

**Marat Checheibaev**, Chief Specialist of International Relations Kyrgyz State Technical University (Kyrgyzstan)

**Eduard Algazinov**, Dean of Computer Science Faculty, Voronezh State University (Russian Federation)

**Dr. Victoria Moiseeva**, Senior scientist, biological faculty of Lomonosov MSU (Russian Federation)

**Olga Oleynikova**, Director of National Tempus Office (Russian Federation)

**Czarina Nuridinova**, National Tempus Office (Tajikistan)



**Svitlana Shytikova**, National Tempus Office (Ukraine)

**Olena Orzhel**, National Tempus Office (Ukraine)

**Andriy Stavtyskyy**, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine)

**Aziza Abdurakhmanova**, National Tempus Office (Uzbekistan)

**Dmitry Bystrov**, Higher Education Reform Expert (Uzbekistan)

**Prof. Alisher Yunusov**, Ferghana State University (Uzbekistan)

# Annexes

## ANNEX I

### ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**Mr. Martin Felix Gajdusek** has earned a MSc in 2001 from the University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna. He has been working since 2002 in Bulgaria heading the Austrian Science and Research Liaison Office in Sofia. He facilitated bilateral cooperation Austria-Bulgaria and with the Southeast European countries, focusing on the Western Balkan region. Since 2010 he coordinates the FP7 and regionally funded SEE-ERA.NET PLUS involving 17 partners from 14 countries, the largest instrument for joint research funding involving all WB countries and EU member countries. He is as well involved in the FP7 international cooperation projects IncoNet EECA and IncoNet CA/SC performing analysis on EU cooperation instruments, as well contributing to the improvement of policy relevant S&T indicators e.g through training activities. Since 2011 he coordinates the SEE programme project Fostering Evaluation Competencies in Research, Technology and Innovation in the SEE Region EVAL-INNO. He focuses in his work on the SEE and the Central Asian region. He has been employed by the Centre for Social Innovation as a researcher and project coordinator since 2004.

**Ms. Gabriela Cikikyan** is a research associate at the Centre for Social Innovation (ZSI) and is currently involved in the WBC-INCO. NET and IncoNet EECA projects. She has completed her Master studies in European Public Affairs and International Relations at Universities in Maastricht, the Netherlands and Bratislava, Slovakia. She has expertise in the European and national public administration as well as innovation infrastructures in the Western Balkan Countries and Lifelong Learning Programmes of the EU.

## ANNEX II

### ABBREVIATIONS

DAAD	German Academic Exchange Service
DCI	Development Co-operation Instrument
DG	Directorate-General
DG DEVCO	DG EuropeAid Development and Cooperation
DG EAC	DG for Education and Culture
DG ELARG	DG Enlargement
EACEA	The Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency
EC	European Commission
ECTS	European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System
EDF	European Development Fund
EECA	Eastern Europe and Central Asia
EHEA	European Higher Education Area
EM	Erasmus Mundus
EMJM	Erasmus Mundus Joint Masters
EMDP	Erasmus Mundus Doctorate Programmes
ENPI	European Neighbourhood Policy Instrument
ET	Education and Training
ET 2020	Education and Training 2020
EU	European Union
EU MS	EU Member States
FPIS	Foreign Policy Instrument Service
HE	Higher Education
HEI	Higher Education Institution
HERE	Higher Education Reform Expert
HRST	Human Resources in Science and Technology

ICI	Industrialised Countries Instrument
ICT	Information and Communication Technologies
IPA	Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance
IREX	International Research & Exchanges Board
IST	In-Service Training
IVT	Initial Vocational Training
JM	Jean Monnet
JP	Joint Projects (Tempus)
KA	Key Activity (in LLP)
LdV	Leonardo da Vinci
LLL	Lifelong Learning
LLP	Lifelong Learning Programme
NA	National Agency
NQF	National Qualification Framework
NTO	National Tempus Office
OMC	Open Method of Coordination
R&D	Research and Development
S&T	Science and Technology
SM	Structural Measures (Tempus)
TEMPUS	Trans-European Mobility Scheme for University Studies
USAID	The United States Agency for International Development
VET	Vocational Education and Training
VETPRO	Professionals in Vocational Training

## ICBSS Xenophon Papers

No.10	<i>Hellenic-Azeri Green Energy Forum: “Energy Cooperation and Environmental Protection in the Wider Black Sea area</i> <b>Zefi Dimadama, Gulshan Pashayeva, Gulmira Rzayeva, Charalambos Pippos, Theodoros G.R. Tsakiris, Ramiz Rahmanov, Dimitris Papastefanakis, Christos Nychtis</b>	2011-2012
No.9	<i>The Economic Development Complex in the Black Sea Area: The Impact of the Global Financial and Economic Crisis</i> <b>Vladimer Papava</b>	May 2010
No.8	<i>The Policies of the European Union and Russia towards Central Asia</i> <b>Fraser Cameron</b>	November 2009
No.7	<i>The Big Caucasus: Consequences of the “Five Day War”, Threats and Political Prospects</i> <b>Sergey Markedonov</b>	May 2009
No.6	<i>Good Governance and Public Administration Reform in the Black Sea Economic Cooperation(BSEC) Member States</i> <b>Stella Ladi</b>	December 2008
No.5	<i>Regional Cooperation in the Black Sea Area in the Context of EU-Russia Relations</i> <b>Nadia Alexandrova-Arbatova</b>	April 2008
No.4	<i>Global Trends, Regional Consequences: Wider Strategic Influences on the Black Sea</i> <b>Ian O. Lesser</b>	November 2007
No.3	<i>Energy Cooperation among the BSEC Member States: Towards an Energy Strategy for the BSEC</i> <b>John Roberts</b>	October 2007
No.2	<i>Unfolding the Black Sea Economic Cooperation: Views from the Region</i> <b>Styopa Safaryan, Elkhani Nuriyev, Marin Lessenski, Joseph Chakhvashvili, Panagiota Manoli, Igor Munteanu, Nicolae Micu, Nadia Alexandrova-Arbatova, Aleksandar Fatic, Mustafa Aydin, Omer Fazlioglu, Grigoriy Perepelytsia; edited by Panagiota Manoli</b>	July 2007
No.1	<i>Decision-Making in the BSEC: A Creative Cartography of Governance</i> <b>Ioannis Stribis</b>	July 2006





June 2012



Project funded by the European Commission under the International Cooperation activity of the Capacities Programme of the 7th European Framework Programme for RTD.

Project Number: 212226

[www.inco-eeca.net](http://www.inco-eeca.net)

[www.icbss.org](http://www.icbss.org)