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Abstract

The focus of this study is on Erasmus Mundus, a higher education initiative that was proposed to the European Commission in 2002, approved by the European Commission in 2003 and commenced by the European Commission in 2004. The basic premise of Erasmus Mundus is to increase the competitiveness of European higher education by attracting top graduate students from around the world to joint master’s courses involving study in two or more European universities in two or more European countries. This is likely the first analysis of the Erasmus Mundus programme of this length and is designed to comment more on higher education practice than on higher education theory. In support of this design, the main research question that this study attempts to answer is, in the first year of Erasmus Mundus, do the practical aspects of the programme reflect a progression towards its prescribed objectives?

A summary of four initiatives dealing with higher education in Europe in the last two decades is presented to provide a recent history of European higher education mobility, to show the higher education environment out of which Erasmus Mundus was created and to show from where the Erasmus Mundus programme objectives developed. In order to provide information for a new analysis, data was collected from two different groups involved in the first year of the Erasmus Mundus programme. The first group was the course coordinators representing the inaugural set of courses selected into the Erasmus Mundus programme in 2004. The second group was the inaugural cohort of Erasmus Mundus students involved in the “Higher Education Erasmus Mundus” course, who studied in Norway, Finland and Portugal between 2004 and 2006.

In order to understand the institutional level perspective on the Erasmus Mundus objectives, a questionnaire was completed by course coordinators with a line of questioning focusing on issues related to their course’s transition into the programme. Furthermore, in order to understand the practical ways in which the objectives of Erasmus Mundus are interpreted at the student level, students in the Higher Education Erasmus Mundus were interviewed and asked to respond to a short survey. The students were presented with the programme’s objectives and were asked to reflect on how they interpreted the objectives related to their specific course.
The nature of this study resulted in data from course coordinators and students that was extremely diverse and somewhat difficult to consolidate in a meaningful way. However, within the context of the Erasmus Mundus objectives, clear findings did emerge. At the institutional level, an analysis of the data showed a struggle by courses to find ways to implement their course in a common way within a joint degree model that includes higher education institutions and national higher education systems that still have little commonality. This is the case even a more recently convergent European higher education area. This struggle was seen most notably in relation to the role of tuition fees in Erasmus Mundus courses, the design of mobility plans and the role of new language acquisition. At the student level, an analysis of the data showed that students recognised the certain amount of uncertainty that comes with taking part in a joint degree course that is predicated on consistent mobility and intensified levels of higher education institution cooperation and that students were grappling with the advantages and disadvantages of a joint degree model versus a single institution degree model.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECTS</td>
<td>European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHEA</td>
<td>European Higher Education Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Erasmus Mundus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERA</td>
<td>European Research Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUA</td>
<td>European University Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEEM</td>
<td>Higher Education Erasmus Mundus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Higher Education Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMC</td>
<td>Open Method of Coordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Country Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Abbreviation</th>
<th>Country Name</th>
<th>Country Abbreviation</th>
<th>Country Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>JP</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
<td>KH</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>MX</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>MZ</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Serbia &amp; Montenegro</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>RU</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>YE</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction and Overview

1.1 Establishing a Context

Higher education is a sensitive area in Europe and European Union (EU) member states tend to resent involvement from Brussels. This is because, at its core, higher education has been, and still remains, a largely protected social institution designed to meet national interests and needs (de Witte, 1993; Teichler, 1998). However, higher education across Europe has entered a period of transition. Higher education systems are increasingly opening their doors to the wider world. Intra-European student mobility numbers are at an all time high with programmes such as Erasmus and Socrates, while the Bologna Declaration of 1999 has initiated a period of revolutionary convergence in European higher education. The Bologna Process continues to gain momentum in part due to recognition of the potential crippling effects of a multiplicity of differences in higher education not allowing Europe to keep pace with market-driven, competition-heavy, customer-service-centred higher education systems in other parts of the world (primarily the United States, Canada and Australia). To that end, the Lisbon Strategy of 2000 outlined an ambitious new goal to make Europe “the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion” by the year 2010 (Lisbon Strategy, 2000). Lisbon is a multi-faceted strategy which covers a broad range of areas well beyond higher education. Yet within the Lisbon Strategy is the idea that opening up European higher education to the rest of the world will be a key ingredient to the accomplishment of the supranational objective of a more dynamic European knowledge-economy. The Erasmus and Socrates programmes, the Bologna Process and the Lisbon Strategy will be discussed later in this thesis.

A new European Commission (EC) initiative, Erasmus Mundus (EM), has been borne out of this period of higher education transition. EM was proposed in 2002, approved in 2003 and commenced in 2004. The basic premise of EM is to increase the competitiveness of European higher education by attracting top graduate students from around the world to joint master’s courses involving study in two or more European universities in two or more European countries. This study will focus on the first round of joint master’s courses selected into the EM programme in 2004. The EC approved EM for an initial period of five years with an initial financial envelope of €230 million and in the fall of 2004
approximately 140 international students were awarded scholarship funding in excess of €20,000 per year to participate in joint master’s degrees throughout Europe.

The EC has outlined four specific objectives for the EM programme, and it is important that these are kept in mind throughout the reading of this analysis as they form the basis around which this study is constructed. The first objective of the programme is to promote a quality offer in higher education with a distinct European added-value, attractive both within the EU and beyond its borders. The second objective is to encourage and enable highly qualified graduates and scholars from all over the world to obtain qualifications and experience in the EU. The third objective is to develop more structured cooperation between EU and international universities and to increase EU student outgoing mobility. Finally, the fourth objective is to improve the accessibility and enhance the profile and visibility of higher education in the EU (European Commission, 2003). The first two objectives of the programme will receive the majority of attention as they are the ones that address aspects related to attracting international students to the EU, which is one of the primary concerns of this study.

A summary of the basic logistical details and the specific objectives of EM appear immediately for both practical and symbolic reasons. From a practical standpoint, EM is an extremely new programme and is not widely known, understood or analyzed. Many readers of this study will not have heard of EM, and fewer still will know any specific details of the programme. These readers need to be equipped with the basic details of the programme in order to move forward. From a symbolic standpoint, a preview of the details and objectives of the programme foreshadow an inductive approach to researching EM. Intentionally, a methodology was developed to allow the research process itself to determine a framework from which the results could be interpreted. The research questions that will be examined are not designed in a traditional, academic way. The questions have not developed based on theories from higher education literature. In fact, the questions do not actually come from a theory nor are they trying to test a theory. They have purposefully been constructed to be practical, with the aim of providing a view into the EM programme in its earliest years. This approach may be deemed too simplistic to be considered deeply academic. However, in order to create a path for future research on EM, a logical first step is to begin understanding what is actually happening in the programme.
EM is not a large initiative when considering higher education institutions (HEIs) and students involved and money spent. Less than 200 of approximately 4,500 European HEIs are involved in the programme, the number of international students in EM courses (approximately 950 in the programme’s first two years) represents less than 1% of all international students in Europe and the budget is €230 million for the programme’s initial five years. For comparison, the Erasmus programme involves over 2,000 European HEIs, has an annual budget of nearly €200 million and during the 2004-2005 academic year alone, approximately 150,000 students had a mobility period funded under the Erasmus programme (Socrates/Erasmus, 2006). Despite these apparent discrepancies in size, scope and funding, EM is an important programme to analyze because it hints at a new road in European higher education – a road with new and extreme levels of educational cooperation.

1.2 Personal Connection to the Topic

I am uniquely invested, positioned and motivated to research the topic of EM, and its focus on student mobility and HEI cooperation, for at least three reasons. First, I spent six years working in the United States as an administrator in the field of international higher education involved in study abroad, student exchanges and international programme development. Second, I am a student in the discipline of Higher Education Policy. And third, the master’s course in which I am involved was selected into the EM programme. As a result, I became one of first EM students. This was a position I found myself in by mere coincidence.

By means of explanation, I arrived at the University of Oslo from the United States in fall 2004 as a self-financing student, prepared to spend two years as a master’s student of Higher Education Policy in Norway. Two months into my first semester I was alerted that my course had gained EM status. I had little understanding of what that meant other than I would have the opportunity to study in Norway, Finland and Portugal with a scholarship from the EC. Between 2004 and 2006, I completed study periods in all three of these countries as an EM scholarship student in the Higher Education Erasmus Mundus (HEEM) course.

As a student in the discipline of higher education policy for two years, I have gained a greater understanding of the reasoning behind initiatives like EM and have the tools to examine the programme
from the outside looking in. As a participant in an EM course for two years, I have the real life experiences to examine the programme from the inside looking out. Thus, this study will have the benefit of my knowledge of higher education policy largely gained in a course of study made possible by the higher education initiative being studied here. The coincidence of this situation was too unique to not make EM the focus of this study. After all, who better to begin the process of researching EM than one of its first participants who is also a student of higher education policy and a higher education administrator? It must be recognised, however, that my deep, personal connection to this topic will have both benefits and drawbacks.

Finally, although I have lived in Europe for nearly two years while studying higher education policy, my understanding of Europe and European higher education is that of an outsider living on the inside for a short time. Thus, I lack the advantage of a personal-historical context that brings a deeper inherent understanding of the issues surrounding the treatment of higher education in Europe. Not only have my previous educational experiences been outside of Europe, but they have been in the United States and Australia, which are far more market-driven and student affairs oriented compared to the traditions of European higher education. In the end, this fact has not been a major barrier, but has had some impact on this study.

1.3 Overview of the Thesis

This study is organised into seven chapters, beginning with this introductory chapter. The practical aim of this study resulted in a decision to organise the analysis around a conceptual framework rather than a theoretical framework, and the structure of the study provides the necessary support for the conceptual framework:

Chapter 2 outlines the research aims of the study by presenting a general research question along with three sub-questions. The chapter also provides a justification for a qualitative approach that is exploratory in nature. In addition, the chapter summarizes the specific research methods undertaken, provides information on selected data sources and highlights the primary limitations of the study. Finally, a brief conceptual framework provides working definitions for “steering” and “implementation” and a definition for the term “joint degree.”
Chapter 3 provides a recent history of European higher education mobility by presenting four initiatives that have dealt either directly and indirectly with student mobility. The chapter uses an examination of the Erasmus and Socrates programmes as well as the Bologna Process and the Lisbon Strategy to track the ability of the EC to steer higher education in Europe by aligning the higher education objectives of the EC with the higher education objectives of the EU member states.

Chapter 4 presents a factual description of EM, focusing on the four main “Actions” of the programme. This chapter is heavy in detail but it is necessary to include in an initial attempt at researching EM. The basic logistical details of the programme must be understood in order to contextualise the activities of the programme.

Chapter 5 provides an examination of how the first objectives of EM are finding their way into practice at the EM course level. The chapter presents and interprets findings from a questionnaire completed by course coordinators of the first round of selected EM courses.

Chapter 6 provides the student perspective on their involvement in the EM programme. The chapter is particularly concerned with how students connect the objectives of the programme with participation in the programme and interprets the results of interviews and surveys with the inaugural EM students of the HEEM course.

Finally, Chapter 7 provides the general conclusions of the study and suggests possible topics for future research on EM.
2. Research Aims, Questions and Methods

2.1 Research Aims and Questions

The general aim of this study is to provide a broad examination of EM with a specific examination of the objectives of the programme. This is a worthwhile exercise because, as yet, there is extremely little analysis of EM. This study is at the forefront of writings on the programme, and for that reason it has been purposefully constructed to comment on higher education practice rather than higher education theory. Contextualising EM within European higher education and exploring some of its practical aspects will be my addition to the field of higher education studies.

This study is concerned with how the objectives of the EM programme are implemented at the institutional level. The implementation of the programme objectives relates specifically to the idea of accountability. Though the term accountability will not be returned to in this analysis, it is important to raise here as a way of understanding the origin of the research questions that will be addressed in this study. Accountability was highlighted in a 2001 EC White Paper on European Governance as having increasing importance. The White Paper recognized the often uneasy relationship between EU member states and the EU itself and suggested that one way to bring greater clarity to this relationship would be to understand that accountability is one principle that is necessary for good governance. Specifically, the EC called for greater precision and responsibility from its member states, and those persons and institutions acting on behalf of member states, in developing and implementing EU policy at all levels of governance (European Commission, 2001b).

Thus, related to implementation and accountability, the main research question of this study is:

- In the first year of EM, do the practical aspects of the programme reflect a progression towards its prescribed objectives?

In order to focus in on this general research question, three different levels of EM will be examined: the system level (EC), the institutional level (EM courses) and the individual level (EM students). A multi-
level approach to this topic is a complicated endeavour and as a means of providing organization and clarity, three sub-questions will be addressed in sequential order:

1. Do the objectives of EM represent a new direction in European higher education?
2. How do the practices of the inaugural set of EM courses reflect the programme’s objectives?
3. How do students connect the objectives of EM to the experience of participating in the EM programme?

Sub-question one will be addressed in Chapter 3 and focuses on the system (EC) level. The rationale for this question is that in order to understand the role the EC has in steering European higher education through programmes like EM, one must understand why the EM programme exists and what it is intended to accomplish. The analysis of this question will take place through an examination of four major European-level higher education initiatives between 1987 and 2000. It is important that this question comes first, as it will provide readers with a basic understanding of the environment from which EM came, before moving into an examination of the practical aspects of the programme.

In order to understand what is actually happening in EM, sub-questions two and three have been developed to show how EM courses and EM students are experiencing the programme. An investigation of the practical aspects of EM is an ambitious task, and the level to which these questions can be explored in this study is rather superficial. However, it is important to start understanding how EM has been put into practice in the programme’s first year.

Sub-question two will be explored in Chapter 5 and will focus on the institutional (EM course) level with analysis based on data collected from coordinators of the inaugural set of EM courses. Sub-question three will be explored in Chapter 6 and will focus on the individual (EM student) level with analysis based on data collected from students participating in the first year of the HEEM course.

---

1 Each EM course has one coordinator who is typically a faculty member at the coordinating HEI in the EM consortium. Each coordinator serves a slightly different function, but all are their course’s primary contact and the logical starting point for data collection.
2.2 Methodology

This study is qualitative in nature. The hallmark of a qualitative approach to research is its flexibility, providing a structure that enables the uncovering of unexpected results and the exploration of new ideas. A qualitative approach has been utilised that is exploratory in nature in order to keep open the possibilities of finding new paths throughout the research process without the limitations of stringent concepts and theories developed early in the research process (Marshall, 1995; Silverman, 1993). Given that this is one of the first attempts at researching the EM programme, there has been a temptation to cast a wide net across all areas of the programme. In order to limit the research focus, an exploration of the EM objectives provides a wide enough parameter for enquiry with a narrow enough focus to consolidate findings in a meaningful way.

When considering qualitative research, Marshall and Rossman advise that researchers consider three challenges: should do-ability, (can) do-ability and want-to-do-ability. Prior to embarking on any research project, one should consider whether their work will stand up to these three tests (1995):

- This project should be done because it is time that an analysis of the EM programme begins. EM is approaching its third academic year, yet there is very little written about the programme.
- The project can be done, as there is a vast array of literature on European-level higher education initiatives preceding EM. This body of research provides many contexts for an analysis of EM. Furthermore, the data collected for this study comes from persons (EM coordinators and students) whose positions inside the programme enables them to easily and honestly reflect on what it has meant to be part of the programme in its first year.
- Finally, I want to do this research project for two primary reasons. First, as a non-European living in Europe and studying higher education policy, the topic provides an opportunity to deepen my personal understanding of European higher education. Second, as one of the first EM students and a student of higher education policy, the process will help me to further understand what it has meant to participate in the programme, and will hopefully benefit the programme in the future.
On the challenges of should do-ability, do-ability and want-to-do-ability, this project squarely stands up to the necessary tests. The test that is most important to this study is my desire to undertake this project. It is now time for EM courses and the EC to have a glimpse into what is actually happening around Europe with the EM programme. Again, as an EM student and a student of higher education policy there seem to be few other people more ideally positioned to provide such a glimpse. This study should not, however, be interpreted as a subjective one. Of course, my personal experience as an EM student adds something to the study, but the use of various research methods and various data sources guarantees a level of reliability and validity of the results and provides a discussion based on questionnaires, interviews and surveys and not on my own observations about the programme.

2.3 Data Sources

The general and specific research aims of this study all relate to the prescribed objectives of the EM programme. Prior to data collection, it had not determined that the focus of analysis would be on the programme’s objectives. However, the decision had been made to collect data from a population that had the ability to comment on the impact of selection into the EM programme. This led to a decision to start data collection with EM coordinators.

Currently, there are 57 joint degree master’s courses that have EM status. However, only fourteen of these courses were granted full-status in the first round of selections in fall 2004. To date, these courses are the only ones to complete a full academic year as an EM course. The decision was made to focus attention on these fourteen courses for two reasons. First, they were the group of courses involved in EM for the longest time, and the subsequent rounds of courses had yet to complete even one semester in EM. Second, in the time period allotted for this thesis, a data set of fourteen courses was considered a manageable amount.

Concerns arose about only having data from a subset of EM coordinators and it was decided that it would be useful to gain some insight from EM students. After deciding to focus analysis on the objectives of EM, it was concluded that students who had completed all of their required mobility were the most capable of understanding, and reflecting on, the EM objectives. Realizing the inefficiencies in trying to determine which EM students met these criteria and obtaining data from a sample of these
students, a micro-level approach to student data collection was taken. Thus, data was collected only from the first EM students enrolled in the HEEM course.

Data collection will rarely expose a topic to the breadth and depth that a researcher would hope. This is particularly the case here where the first step in data collection took place not with a specific goal of what might be found, but with the aim of discovering the most resonant topics for analysis. To that end, a consistent and deliberate focus has been put on only reflecting what the data contains in order to avoid forcing results that do not otherwise exist.

2.4 Research Methods

In order to select areas of focus for analysis, two qualitative methods for data collection were utilised: a questionnaire and an interview. Questionnaires are not ideal for studies that are exploratory in nature because they are typically cross-sectional and can only reflect a situation at one point in time (Robson, 1993). Bearing these facts in mind, the questionnaire was constructed to focus specifically on the transition of the courses into the EM programme. The idea of this line of questioning was that if an understanding of what was happening at involved HEIs prior to EM could begin, than an understanding of the changes courses are making to accommodate the EM objectives could also begin.

The results of this study support the claim that the design of the questionnaire was able to accommodate the exploratory nature of the study. The fact that the results of the questionnaire are cross-sectional could not be overcome. Instead of trying to falsely expand the findings, the results only attempt to reflect the point at which the data was collected. The reality is that EM is a new and rapidly changing programme that has not been analyzed before. A simple, cross-sectional analysis of its first courses is a logical starting point.

In the end, a questionnaire was employed for two reasons. First, a questionnaire enabled a collection of responses from the entire selected data set of fourteen EM courses. Second, it was assumed that the EM coordinators would have a natural investment in this topic and that this would increase the response rate. The EM coordinators were contacted in January 2006 with an explanation of the research project and a request to participate. Of the fourteen coordinators who were contacted, a total of twelve
responded and agreed to participate. The final questionnaire was sent via e-mail in February 2006 and nine of the twelve coordinators responded with a completed questionnaire.

An interview was incorporated into this study after identifying a few particular areas of interest from the coordinator questionnaires. Primarily, these were related to integration, mobility, cooperation and quality in the EM programme. These specific topics were taken to students in the HEEM course through an interview with two of its inaugural students. The interview provided the first student perspective on these issues but did not reach a deep enough level of saturation of the HEEM student perspective on these topics. Unfortunately, there was not sufficient time at that point in the research process to interview all the inaugural HEEM students. Thus, the seven remaining students were requested to answer five specific questions related to integration, mobility, cooperation and quality within EM through an email survey, and six of the seven students responded to the survey. The HEEM students were involved in their course from August 2004 to May 2006 and had completed their required mobility plan at the time of data collection in April 2006. All attempts have been made to conceal the individual identities of the students.

As students representing only one EM course, the HEEM students can only comment on their experience within this course. However, their reflections have been included as an example of how students interpret the objectives of EM as they are put into practice within their own course. The student responses have been used to identify possible areas for further research or consideration by the EC, the EM courses and other interested stakeholders.

2.5 Limitations of the Study

It is important to recognize the numerous limitations that exist in any research project. First, the exploratory nature of this study resulted in a questionnaire that may have been too long and cumbersome for the EM coordinators to complete with great detail. This may have had some impact on the response rate and certainly had an impact on finding common patterns and trends to present in the analysis. Furthermore, the questionnaire was sent at a time (February 2006) that was particularly busy for the EM coordinators who, in addition to their normal responsibilities, were dealing with admission decisions for their 2006-2007 class of students. The thesis writing period of the HEEM course is
reserved for the final semester, thus this poor convergence in timing was largely unavoidable. In addition, many coordinators were not in a position to respond to every question, as some responses would have been better suited for a partner institution in their joint degree course. Unfortunately, it was not within my realm of organization to have the partner institutions complete the questionnaire together.

With the benefit of hindsight, it would have been useful to first visit some number of EM courses to conduct preliminary interviews with coordinators in order to identify a small number of particularly resonant topics on which to focus. However, living on the relative outskirts of Europe (Norway, Finland and Portugal), with a limited time to complete the thesis, forced a recognition early in the process that this would not be possible. Additionally, it would have been useful to draw a more complete or more random sample of EM course students, but time and ability to manage data resulted in a reliance on only the HEEM cohort of students.

A somewhat ironic obstacle to this study was the constant mobility required with participation in an EM course. In less than two years of study, I moved five times to live in three different countries – Norway, Finland and Portugal. This type of mobility plan does not lend itself to travelling with useful resources that were procured along the way. Even in the technology-laden society in which we find ourselves today, there is still a necessity for materials that can be held in one’s hand to digest and interpret. Thus, final resources were constrained to materials that could be obtained on-line and those available at the University of Tampere (Finland) library, where the majority of the writing for this study was undertaken.

Finally, the small number of coordinators and students included in this study could only respond to questions based on their experiences in first round of selected courses which is inherently a limited viewpoint. Despite the fact that the data came only from those involved in the first year of the programme, the broad issues faced during the implementation of EM may be able to be generalised to other courses currently in the programme, to those courses applying for EM status or to others involved in deeper levels of higher education cooperation. However, it is not the aim of this study to predict the specific obstacles faced by HEIs in the implementation of cooperative programmes, but instead to comment on the realities of taking part in the new EM initiative. This will allow current participants in
EM the chance to compare their situation to the situation in other courses and give future participants the opportunity to consider specific issues of implementation in advance of their participation. Thus, the extent to which this study can be generalised will be left to each individual reader and each individual context.

2.6 Conceptual Framework

In an attempt to avoid confusion, it is important to present and define a small number of key concepts and terms that form the backbone of this study. Specifically, this study is focused around the concepts of steering and implementation and the idea of joint degrees being put into practice. Some consideration was given to including governance of higher education in the conceptual framework, however this study is not as concerned with governance as this concept deals more generally with who is actually in charge of higher education (Amaral, 2002; Cloete, 2004; Maassen, 2003). Governance structures in European higher education are extremely complicated dealing with multiple levels within HEIs, as well as the national and supranational levels (Enders, 2004). A specific focus on defining who is in charge of European higher education is not the focus of this study.

This study has a focus on the idea of steering, specifically with the ability the EC has to steer European higher education. The most relevant interpretation of steering for this analysis is that it represents the actions of those who have some level of authority to influence change among individuals (Maassen, 2003). This idea of steering is very much an active process. In order to influence change, there are three basic tools available: legislation, funding and information (Enders, 2003; Stensaker, 2003). The EC has no formal authority over European higher education, and thus has no legislative power. Financial incentives and information are the primary tools the EC has at its disposal. For example, the EC can fund a new initiative in which HEIs voluntarily participate, but cannot penalize HEIs for not participating in the initiative. An example of EC steering by information would be to generate objectives for European higher education and allow EU member states to decide if those objectives match the objectives of their own higher education systems. If they do, the EC can then help member states decide how to act in the most effective and efficient ways to reach the objectives (Enders, 2004). For the purposes of this thesis, the concept of steering will be understood as the use of a combination of
financial incentives and information in order to influence change and achieve goals. The concept of steering is particularly relevant in Chapter 3.

A relatively simple interpretation of implementation is most appropriate in the context of this work: the decisions made by actors in order to transfer objectives into tangible actions. Throughout this paper it will be demonstrated that commitments to implementation are handled in drastically different ways throughout European higher education because multi-level governance structures have made traditional top-down decision making almost obsolete (Enders, 2004; Gornitzka, 2005b). Today, implementation measures are being put into practice at various levels of higher education. The level that will be most closely examined is the institutional level, particularly decisions made by HEIs in the implementation of EM. This discussion will occur primarily in Chapter 5.

Finally, it is important to establish a working definition for the term joint degree. This will help to prevent each reader from developing his or her own instinctual definition of the term. It is also important because joint degrees are the foundation on which EM is based. The European University Association (EUA) conducted a survey on joint degrees in Europe in 2002, with the aim of understanding joint degree programmes throughout Europe. At that time, the development of joint degrees was high on the political agenda in European higher education. It is not necessary to elaborate on these findings. However, two important points came out of the survey. First, the EUA had a difficult time formulating an acceptable definition of joint degrees to present to the surveyed countries. Second, the countries that were surveyed had a difficult time identifying programmes in their countries that would be considered joint degrees. This was because few had any provisions for the awarding and recognition of joint degrees (Tauch, 2002). These facts beg the question of whether the actors had some notion of what constituted a joint degree, but no specific criteria enabling a definition.

Three distinct levels of cooperation can be seen that represent increasing levels of “jointness.” Level One begins at the lowest level of “jointness” and progresses to the highest level in Level Three. Only Level Three can be considered a true joint degree and the characteristics of this level are what will be used as the working definition of joint degrees throughout this thesis.
Level One – This is the most basic level of cooperation and involves student exchanges. These are often informal in nature and consist of a period of study away from the home institution that is optional and complementary, but not required, to complete a degree. Students are unlikely to receive any certificate for their period of study abroad, and record of such time is largely confined to an academic transcript, if a record exists at all.

Level Two – This is an increased level of cooperation, which in addition to student exchanges includes the exchange of teaching staff as well as a curriculum that has been developed jointly (Reichert, 2000). Students involved at this level may receive an unofficial degree certificate that notes completion of a jointly developed programme.

Level Three – This is the highest level of cooperation and involves the issuance of a formal joint degree as one diploma under the name of all involved HEIs. The main characteristics of the joint degree are that the study must be fully integrated including the use of joint criteria for admission and examination (European Commission, 2006: p. 13) and periods of study at partner institutions of relatively comparable length (Tauch, 2002: p. 29). Most importantly, arrangements at the national level in each country involved in the issuance of the joint degree must be in place to recognize the degree awarded. There are two main tests for national recognition of a joint degree. First, the joint degree must provide the same access for further study as a degree completed fully within the country. Second, the joint degree must provide the same access to the labour market as a degree completed fully within the country.

Again, this third and highest level of cooperation is what will be considered a joint degree throughout this thesis.

Erasmus Mundus does not appear to represent something new in European higher education. Instead, EM is a logical next step in the development of a more integrated European higher education system. To support this argument, a recent history of European higher education mobility will be presented by examining four major European-level initiatives between 1987 and 2000 which dealt with higher education: the Erasmus programme, the Socrates programme, the Bologna Process and the Lisbon Strategy. The analysis will focus on two primary issues. First, the increasing ability of the EC to steer European higher education without implicit authority over national higher education systems and HEIs. And second, the increasing alignment of EC goals for higher education with the higher education goals of EU member states and HEIs.

These two issues have been chosen because they build on one another. As EC influence over European higher education increases, the goals of higher education systems and HEIs increasingly fall in line with the EC. This, in turn, gives the EC more influence. The four initiatives were selected because they represent landmarks in the evolution of modern European higher education and deal either directly or indirectly with student mobility. A deep analysis of any one of these programmes would require its own study, thus this examination is meant only to provide a superficial overview. The four initiatives have been presented as simply as possible, in order to keep focus on a progression towards the EM programme.

3.1 The Erasmus Programme – 1987

The launching of the Erasmus programme in 1987 is a logical starting point in an examination of increasing European-level influence over higher education. The programme was the EC’s first attempt at generating wide-spread intra-European student and academic staff mobility and was at the forefront of European-level involvement in higher education. Erasmus made mobility within Europe a more mainstream component of the European educational experience. As a means to stimulate student and staff mobility, the EC funded the development of HEI networks at the departmental level.
In this way, the implementation of Erasmus gave the EC new influence over departmental authority in higher education (Callan, 1998). However, the EC had no explicit authority over national higher education systems or HEIs. Any plans to integrate European higher education would not be acceptable to the EU member states. Thus, the choice of funding a programme for student and staff mobility at the European-level was a side-step towards increasing integration in higher education in order to create an increased European dimension (Reichert, 2000). Student and staff mobility was considered of great political interest in Europe in the late 1980s (Papatsiba, 2006). This interest developed from the idea that promoting internationalisation in higher education would better utilise Europe’s human resources (Wang, 2005) and that facilitating mobility at the student and staff level could be a key to European cooperation.

The EC had two overarching objectives with the Erasmus programme. First, to significantly increase the mobility of students and staff between European universities. And second, to promote broad and lasting inter-university cooperation (Brennan, 1997). Thus, the goals of Erasmus were directed to the exchange of individuals and not on the national systems between which the individuals moved (van der Wende, 2004). This kept the focus of Erasmus on academic dimensions, though there was some recognition of the social, cultural and economic advantages of intra-European exchange. The mobility of individuals was seen as the most relevant activity to stimulate cooperation in curricular, teaching and learning matters (Teichler, 1998). This was most clearly evidenced by the fact that Erasmus was more focused on relationships between academic disciplines, as opposed to relationships between entire HEIs.

It was a goal that ten percent of the overall European student population would use the Erasmus programme to spend at least one term of their higher education studies abroad. Erasmus participation rates increased from only 3,200 student exchanges in the programme’s first year to more than 100,000 student exchanges in the year 2000. By 2002, the total number of students to have participated in Erasmus exchanges eclipsed one million (van der Wende, 2004). However, the same time period saw an increase in overall HEI participation rates, which made the ten percent participation goal of Erasmus an increasingly difficult target to reach. In fact, an EC survey from the year 2000 revealed that only about one percent of students enrolled in HEIs participated in an Erasmus exchange (Papatsiba, 2006).
It must be recognized that this appears to be a significant failure to reach the Erasmus student mobility goal. Nonetheless, Erasmus can still be credited with successfully initiating a period of increased cooperation in European higher education with a focus on intra-European mobility. It can be argued, and I agree, that the increased focus on intra-European mobility negatively impacted initiatives aimed at attracting non-Europeans to participate in European higher education. During the late 1980s and early 1990s, the worldwide competitiveness of European higher education appears to have waned. Whether by coincidence or as a direct impact of an intra-European mobility focus, Europe lost its long held position as the world’s most popular study abroad destination position to the United States (van der Wende, 2004).

It is clear that student and staff mobility increased under Erasmus and that Erasmus furthered the development of a structure for European HEI cooperation. Even without any explicit authority, the EC was able to exact some influence and change on the European higher education landscape by promoting the objectives of increased student mobility and deepened HEI cooperation through the development of the Erasmus programme.

3.2 The Socrates Programme – 1995

In 1995, the EC introduced the Socrates programme. Socrates did not create any new educational activities, but was designed to serve as a bureaucratic umbrella for all existing EC education programmes. Socrates gave the EC a single, systematic framework through which to influence European higher education, with the aim of increasing its impact on intra-European education activities (Wang, 2005). Erasmus was absorbed under the Socrates umbrella and became its largest higher education programme. Socrates has been included in this analysis in order to demonstrate the changes it brought about to the Erasmus programme.

Before continuing with Socrates, it is important to briefly address the EU Maastricht Treaty of 1992 and its impact on higher education. Three points of the Maastricht Treaty are relevant to this discussion. First, it included goals for further developing European dimensions in higher education. Second, it marked the first time the concept of European citizenship was given a constitutional position, embracing the notion that European integration could be carried out at the individual (i.e. –
student) level (Wang, 2005). And third, it encouraged the EC to contribute to higher education by supporting and funding cooperative actions while reiterating the EC’s lack of explicit authority over higher education (Teichler, 1998). Thus, the Socrates programme came into an environment in which the EC had to balance its ability to contribute to higher education with the continuing reality of its limited authority.

The higher education objectives of the Socrates programme largely reflected the previously established objectives of Erasmus. As such, the primary actions of the EC in Socrates were to promote European dimensions within HEIs, to help set up networks of HEIs and to continue funding student and staff mobility (Brennan, 1997). Socrates provided two focus areas to work towards these objectives. First, a more deliberate approach to the development of a European curriculum. For example, more funding was routed to the mobility of teaching staff with the goal of increasing the curricular benefits for those students who did not undertake a period of study outside their home HEI (Teichler, 1998). Second, and more important, was the introduction of the Institutional Contract (van der Wende, 2004).

The Institutional Contract in Socrates was designed to move cooperative agreements in European HEIs from the department (i.e. – disciplinary) level to the level of central administration. This was significant because it was the first time central administration involvement was required in European higher education cooperation. Though this led to a more systematic and efficient approach to European cooperation within HEIs (Reichert, 2000), there were problems with the shift of authority to the central administration. For example, the Institutional Contract limited HEIs to submitting one application which outlined all proposed cooperative agreements to the EC. This often led to cooperative agreements being arranged at the central administration level without consultation with the departmental level on how to implement those agreements.

While central administrators were working towards establishing institution-wide European cooperative agreements, the pressures of global competition were increasingly being exerted on higher education sectors throughout Europe. Distance learning was on the rise, the for-profit educational sector was growing and innovative cross-border and trans-national educational offerings were increasingly dotting the global higher education landscape. As a result, a duality of attention at the central administration level of universities had to take place, with one eye towards increasing European cooperation and the
other eye towards the realities of competition in a global educational market. Universities were facing the tension between internationalisation and Europeanisation (Callan, 1998) and were trying to determine whether these needed to be treated in mutually exclusive ways, or whether they could be integrated.

The development of Socrates was aimed at reinforcing a European dimension in higher education through an institutional strategy for cooperation, a strategic approach to curriculum development and the continued funding of student and staff mobility. While it is arguable whether the programme stimulated a significantly new frontier for European higher education cooperation it did bring about new attempts at deeper levels of cooperation. Significant barriers that existed at national levels of higher education were revealed in this process and conversation regarding the need for a convergence of higher education systems across Europe began to increase (van der Wende, 2004).

3.3 The Bologna Declaration – 1999

The Bologna Declaration, which resulted in the Bologna Process, marked a turning point in European higher education. Bologna was not a programme developed by the EC, but rather grew out of actions of EU member states. Before providing a discussion of Bologna, it is important to look briefly at the member state initiative, the Sorbonne Declaration, which led to Bologna. The Sorbonne Declaration of 1998 was an initiative of the Education Ministers of France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom, which called for Europe to commit to the “opportunity to engage in the endeavour to create a European area of higher education, where national identities and common interests can interact and strengthen each other for the benefit of Europe, of its students, and more generally of its citizens” (Sorbonne Joint Declaration, 1998). Specifically, the Ministers recommended the development of a common European higher education degree system of three-year bachelor degrees, followed by two-year master degrees and finally three-year doctorate degrees. This represented a dramatic change from the varied national degree systems that were as diverse as the European countries themselves. Previously there had been no consistency across Europe in the number of years required to complete degrees and no consistency in defining degree levels. Sorbonne generated a great deal of interest and controversy across Europe. This largely stemmed from the fact that the EC, as well as a vast number of European countries, were not included in the Sorbonne meetings (Edwards, 2004).
The Sorbonne Declaration is now recognized as the precursor to the widely analysed Bologna Declaration of 1999. It is worth noting a second time that, like the Sorbonne Declaration, the Bologna Declaration was initiated at the national level by EU member states and not by the EC itself. The EC was invited to join the Bologna meetings, but only in the capacity of an observer to the process. This decision reflected the reinforcement of the EC’s lack of explicit authority in higher education which was once again reiterated in the EU Amsterdam Treaty of 1999. As in the past, the EC had the ability to steer European higher education by facilitating cooperation between European HEIs, but authority for governance over higher education stayed at the national level (van der Wende, 2004).

The overarching aim of Bologna was to develop a “European Higher Education Area” (EHEA) that would include the entire EU, as well as the rest of Europe, by 2010. The basic goals of the process were three-fold. First, to improve the compatibility of higher education qualifications across Europe. Second, to stimulate the idea of European citizenship. And third, to increase the worldwide competitive strength of European higher education (Edwards, 2004). Realizing these goals required significant changes to national higher education systems, all Bologna signatory countries agreed to adopt a new system to standardise higher education degrees. The Bologna guidelines established a two-cycle system organized into three-year bachelor’s degrees followed by two-year masters degrees. The standardisation in the length degrees was facilitated by the establishment of a common system of credits known as the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System, or ECTS (Bologna Declaration, 1999). It is important to note that these structural changes to standardise European higher education degrees made student and staff mobility and promotion of European dimensions in higher education more attainable. Thus, the goals of Bologna largely mirrored the previously established goals of the EC’s Erasmus and Socrates programmes (Cerych, 2002).

As further evidence of its influence without explicit authority over higher education, EC involvement in the Bologna Process steadily developed beyond an observatory role. The EC became the main financial source for the Bologna Process, and it eventually gained membership in the Bologna Follow-up Group. Membership in the Follow-Up Group provided the EC with a platform for influencing the
Bologna Process. As a result, it can be seen that the objectives of the Bologna Process and the EC’s objectives for European higher education have increasingly converged (Cerych, 2002; van der Wende, 2004). Examples of this have come out of the Bologna Process biennial follow-up meetings. In particular, goals that would later be included in the EM programme began to emerge. At the Prague follow-up meeting in 2001, discussion emerged on the idea of enhancing the quality of European higher education in order to appeal to international students (Prague Communiqué, 2001). The Berlin follow-up meeting in 2003 resulted in a commitment by the Education Ministers to remove national-level legal obstacles to the development of joint degrees and a readiness to further develop scholarship programmes for international students. Additionally, a third-cycle to standardise the doctoral degree level to three years was added to the Bologna Process in order to promote a closer link between the EHEA and the European Research Area (ERA) (Berlin Communiqué, 2003). These first two follow-up meetings occurred prior to the commencement of EM. The Bergen follow-up meeting in 2005 called for increased cooperative agreements between European HEIs and non-European HEIs to stimulate a balanced student and staff exchange coming to and leaving Europe. In preparation for the 2007 follow-up meeting in London, the Follow-Up Group has been asked to investigate progress towards joint degrees at all three cycles (bachelor, master, doctorate) of Bologna (Bergen Communiqué, 2003).

Though the progress of Bologna has not taken place with equal ease and speed across Europe (Edwards, 2004), the changes made under Bologna have profoundly impacted European higher education (Papatsiba, 2006). The implementation of common degree structures across Europe contradicts the traditional resistance to convergence in European higher education, which existed to protect the longstanding traditions within national systems. It is worth noting that all 25 EU member states have signed the Bologna Declaration, as well as an additional 20 European nations. In fact, only one European country, Belarus, has not signed the Declaration. This may mark the most widely agreed convergence of national systems of any kind to a common European system. It is also important to note that all of this has happened without any legislation of the EC. Member states have designed the process themselves to be completely voluntary and not legally binding.

Though decision making and implementation under Bologna are entirely in the hands of the signatory countries, the European-wide aims of Bologna and the overarching EC aims for higher education have
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3 See Appendix A for a list of the Bologna Declaration signatory countries and year of signature
become increasingly parallel. As it was with the Erasmus and Socrates programmes, the EC is able to exercise a significant amount of influence over European higher education without any official authority. The common goals of increased cooperation, widespread student and staff mobility, boosting European higher education competitiveness and attracting non-Europeans to European higher education continue to gain prominence at the institutional, national and supranational levels in Europe.

3.4 The Lisbon Strategy – 2000

Previous discussion in this chapter has focused on initiatives dealing with education and specifically dealing with higher education. The Lisbon Strategy was developed to deal with more broad social and economic issues facing the EU, and less with specific issues like higher education. However, Lisbon brought about another evolution in European higher education towards a more cooperative and standardised system. This evolution will be discussed in relation to the EC’s increased influence on national higher education systems.

The European Council, consisting of the European Union Heads of States, met in Lisbon in the year 2000. Similar to the Bologna Process timeframe, the year 2010 was established as the target date by which Europe could “become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion” (Lisbon Strategy, 2000). The Council recognized that in order to meet this ambitious goal, education and training would have to play a more prominent role in the economic and social future of the EU (Kaiser, 2004).

The Council defined three strategic goals for European education. First, to improve quality and effectiveness. Second, to facilitate wider access. And third, to open European higher education to the wider world. In addition, the Council defined thirteen associated objectives for education, two of which were aimed specifically at higher education: increasing mobility and strengthening European cooperation (Kaiser, 2004). These objectives directly follow the trend set by Erasmus, Socrates and Bologna.
In addition to establishing objectives, the Council established indicators and benchmarks, which served to measure progress towards the established objectives. For example, the objective “strengthening European cooperation” was given three indicators relevant to higher education:

1. Mobility of Erasmus students
2. Foreign students enrolled in European higher education
3. European students enrolled outside their home country

A benchmark was predetermined to measure progress by a set date. For example, an international student enrolment increase of 15% by 2010 (Kaiser, 2004).

The European Council agreed to objectives, indicators and benchmarks, yet no body (including the EC) had explicit authority to require compliance by member states. Thus, as a means of achieving these targets, the EU turned for the first time to the Open Method of Coordination (OMC), which was introduced in the Amsterdam Treaty of 1999 (Scharpf, 2001). The following two definitions help to explain the OMC:

The OMC is an instrument for identifying best policy practices, using the diversity of policy approaches in European countries as a grand reservoir of ideas for possible policy measures to achieve agreed objectives or outcomes (Kaiser, 2004).

The OMC is a method that in principle assumes that coordination can be achieved [through incentives] without the use of “hard law” (Gornitzka, 2005a).

In practice, this meant the EC could assist member states in reaching targets by identifying best practices happening throughout the EU. In fact, member states were encouraged to look to each other for models of best practice. However, member states had complete autonomy to decide whether to adopt these practices or develop their own strategies. Regardless, the use of indicators and benchmarks pressured national governments to change policies to reach common goals as progress was measured by an EU average rather than by the achievements of individual member states. Although no explicit
economic or legislative pressures were put on member states by the EC, a significant amount of peer pressure existed between member states to be accountable to meeting targets (Kaiser, 2004).

The actual methods of the OMC are not of the utmost relevance in this discussion. The OMC has been presented, however, as yet another indication of the convergence of goals of increased cooperation across Europe. The Lisbon Strategy and OMC are complex topics. However, this superficial summary provides a final example of the EC’s evolving role in steering higher education. The Lisbon Strategy enabled goals and objectives to be generated at the EU level, while decisions regarding how to achieve targets occurred at the member state level.

3.5 Looking towards Erasmus Mundus

Four initiatives have been presented to show the higher education landscape out of which the EM programme has developed. For the purposes of this paper, EM is being viewed as a culminating programme in a series of higher education initiatives over the last two decades. In reality, EM is simply the next step in the continually evolving higher education landscape of Europe. However, the idea for a programme like EM could not have been conceived without this evolution.

As this chapter has demonstrated, the Erasmus programme stimulated widespread mobility and cooperation at the departmental level. The Socrates programme took higher education cooperation to the central administration level. Out of this environment of increased cooperation, the Bologna Declaration spearheaded the convergence of higher education structures at the national level. Finally, the Lisbon Strategy recognized the role of higher education in furthering EU knowledge-based economy goals.

Throughout these initiatives, the goals of the EC, the goals of national higher education systems and the goals of HEIs have become increasingly aligned, creating more cohesiveness in European higher education. This has not happened by any mandate, but because the goals of mobility, cooperation, quality, accessibility, competitiveness and attractiveness have remained consistent and mutually agreed upon by all parties. The next three chapters of this thesis will show how all of these basic goals are encompassed within the objectives of EM.
4. The “Actions” of the Erasmus Mundus Programme

With an understanding of the higher education environment out of which the EM programme developed and an understanding of how the objectives of EM were borne out of this environment, it is appropriate to turn attention to some of the specific details of the programme. The remainder of this study will provide an analysis of how the objectives of EM are being put into practice by EM courses and how EM students are interpreting the objectives. In order to have a context for this analysis, it is necessary to understand the actual activities of the programme.

EM is predicated on four concrete “Actions,” which will be the focus of this chapter. These actions are each geared towards achieving the specific objectives of the programme. As a result, the four EM actions are exactly aligned with the four EM objectives. This chapter includes the practical details of EM and provides various lists and figures summarizing the courses, HEIs and students involved in the programme. The chapter is intended to serve as a consolidated resource for EM, as one does not currently exist. This information will be particularly relevant for readers either unfamiliar or only vaguely familiar with EM. For readers with an understanding of EM, a detailed reading of this chapter may not be necessary. The information contained in the chapter comes primarily from a series of EC documents related to the creation and implementation of EM released between 2001 and 2004. Because the number of documents is small (four in total), the chapter includes many repetitive citations.

4.1 Action One – Erasmus Mundus Masters Courses

The EM masters courses are the “central component around which EM is built” and are linked to the programme’s first objective of promoting a European added-value in education (Erasmus Mundus, 2006). To be considered for EM status, a consortium of European HEIs must send a proposal for participation to the EC. The EC’s main considerations for selection deal with quality and are based on a long list of established variables. In order to apply, it is stipulated that courses have a fully integrated study programme. This requirement includes a systematic structure including jointly developed curriculum, joint criteria for admission and examination and the guarantee of a joint degree recognised at the national level by all countries involved in the course. A course consortium must involve at least
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4 Only courses at the masters level are eligible for the EM programme
three HEIs from at least three different European\(^5\) countries and students must have a significant period of study period at a minimum of two different HEIs in two different countries.\(^6\) Courses are selected for a period of five years and must be prepared to admit both third-country\(^7\) and European students (European Commission, 2006: p. 13).

The EC set a target number of approximately twenty new EM masters courses each year, starting with the 2004-2005 academic year, in order to build to a total of approximately 100 courses by the 2008-2009 academic year (European Commission, 2002: p. 9). Selections in the first three years have put the programme on target to meet that figure:

**Table 1: Action 1 Course Distribution, by Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Courses Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Official figures on the number of courses applying for EM status are not made public. However, information from the EC suggests that competition for selection into EM has been intense, with the actual number of courses selected in the first three years representing only ten to fifteen percent of the total number of applications. A complete list of the masters courses selected under Action 1, as well as the HEIs involved in each course consortium, is available in Appendix B.

The EC has sought to achieve a balanced representation of HEIs from across Europe involved in EM (European Commission, 2002). Through the first three years selection, twenty-one EU member states have at least one HEI represented in EM. However, distribution leans towards the larger member states of Western Europe with larger and more established higher education systems. The countries involved in EM are listed in the table below, starting from the most and progressing to the least number of combined coordinating and partner HEIs involved in EM courses.\(^8\)

---

\(^5\) For the purposes of EM, European countries are defined as those in the EU, the European Economic Area/European Free Trade Association (Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein) and EU candidate countries (Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Romania and Turkey).

\(^6\) A maximum of 70% of earned credits can be derived from one HEI

\(^7\) With the exception of EU member states, EEA-EFTA states, and candidate countries for accession to the EU, all countries of the world are considered third-countries

\(^8\) Each EM course has one coordinating HEI and between two and seven partner HEIs
Table 2: Action 1 Course Distribution, by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Coordinating</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Coordinating</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the Commission has reserved the right to give priority to certain academic disciplines in its yearly selection process in order to ensure a balanced representation of different fields of study over the duration of the programme (European Commission, 2006). Courses selected in the first three years of the programme fall into the following discipline categories:

Table 3: Action 1 Course Distribution, by Academic Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography and Environmental Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Informatics</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and Forestry Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Studies and Management Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Information Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Teacher Training</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages and Philological Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Action Two – Erasmus Mundus Scholarships

The second action of EM provides for a scholarship scheme, designed to encourage top students and scholars from around the world to enter European higher education. This action supports the second EM objective. Specifically, the action supplies each EM course with scholarships to fund a specific number of third-country students and scholars each academic year.

---

9 A small number of HEIs are involved in more than one EM course (i.e., University of Aveiro, Portugal is involved in two courses). These HEIs are counted for each EM course in which they are involved in order to show the total number of HEI relationships in EM.

10 The total number of represented disciplines is larger than the total number of EM courses as the EC has categorised some programmes into more than one discipline category.
Each individual course has complete autonomy over their admission and scholarship decisions. However, courses must submit a list of preferred scholarship recipients to the EC for final approval. This step has been established to help ensure a balanced student population across geographic regions and to encourage the participation of women and less-advantaged students in EM courses (European Commission, 2002).

Students selected for scholarships in courses lasting two academic years\(^\text{11}\) receive a total of €42,000 in scholarship funding (20 monthly grants of €1,600, €2,000 in travel grants and €8,000 designated as “block payments to the master’s course”). Students in courses shorter than two academic years receive scholarships that are pro-rated based on the two-year scholarship amount. The EC planned for a modest number of scholarships in the early years of the program with a steady increase over the initial approval period of the program (European Commission, 2002: pp. 46-47):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Estimated General Student Scholarships per Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using this progression, the EC has targeted funding for over 4,000 third-country student scholarships in the initial five-year approval period of EM.

An additional scholarship scheme called “Asian Windows within Erasmus Mundus” was introduced in the 2005-2006 academic year. This project was made possible by additional funds injected into EM from the EU’s external relations budget. The Asian Windows scheme earmarks scholarships for students from specific Asian countries (European Commission, 2005). Thus, in addition to general scholarships for third-country students, scholarship funding became available for students from designated countries:

\(^{11}\) 38 EM courses are two academic years in length, 12 are between one and two academic years in length and 7 are one academic year in length
Table 5: Asian Windows Scholarships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Initial Period</th>
<th>Student Scholarships per Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>€33,000,000</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>approximately 6 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>€9,000,000</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>approximately 2 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>€3,200,000</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>approximately 1 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>€2,100,000</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>approximately 1 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Other Asian Countries”</td>
<td>€10,000,000</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>approximately 3 per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asian Windows scholarships do not replace any general scholarships for third-country students, but provide courses with additional scholarship funding for students from specific countries. The ten third-countries with the most scholarship students in EM courses during the programme’s first two academic years are listed below and a complete summary of the 95 third-countries with scholarship students involved in EM courses appears in Appendix C. The impact of the Asian Windows scheme is reflected in the significant increase in the number of students from the targeted countries in the 2005-2006 academic year (Erasmus Mundus, 2006):

Table 6: Action 2 Scholarships, by Student Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. China 13</td>
<td>1. India 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brazil 11</td>
<td>2. China 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indonesia 9</td>
<td>3. Pakistan 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Russia 9</td>
<td>4. Brazil 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Argentina 5</td>
<td>5. Thailand 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India 5</td>
<td>6. Russia 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan 5</td>
<td>7. Bangladesh 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mexico 4</td>
<td>8. Malaysia 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine 4</td>
<td>Ukraine 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela 4</td>
<td>10. United States 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 140</td>
<td>Total: 808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that final approval for EM occurred in January 2004. Thus, the first “Call for Proposals” for joint masters courses did not occur until after this point, and the first round of courses did not receive final notification of selection until October 2004. Due to this time frame, the inaugural courses could not use their new EM status as a means to recruit students for the 2004-2005 academic year. These courses had to select their first scholarship recipients from the third-country students already enrolled in their courses. With time to prepare for the 2005-2006 academic year, courses had the potential to use their EM status to target students from particular geographic regions, attract applicants and make use of Asian Windows scholarships.

12 Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, East Timor, Indonesia, Laos, Maldives, Mongolia, Nepal, North Korea, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka and Vietnam
13 Due to withdrawals, exact student numbers for both the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 academic years may be different
As a means to further reinforce the international dimensions of EM, courses have been asked to involve world-class scholars in teaching and research activities. Under Action 2 each course is allotted up to three general visiting scholar positions and one Chinese visiting scholar position (under Asian Windows) each academic year. The EC provides funding for a period of up to three months at €4,000 per month plus €1,000 for travel expenses. The EC has set a target of over 1,000 visiting scholars in the initial five-year window of the programme (European Commission, 2002: p. 46). A summary of the 38 third-countries with scholars involved in EM courses appears in Appendix D.

4.3 Action Three – Partnerships

In Chapter 3 of this thesis, it was noted that the 2005 Bergen follow-up meeting to the Bologna Process highlighted the goal of balancing the number of student and staff exchanges for persons coming to European HEIs against the number of exchanges for persons leaving European HEIs for activities outside Europe. This very goal was addressed in Action 3 of EM. Action 3 was created to develop more structured partnerships between European and third-country HEIs in order to encourage greater outgoing mobility of European students and scholars (Erasmus Mundus, 2005).

The basic concept of Action 3 is to provide a framework for such activities to take place. Courses selected under Action 1 are eligible, though not required, to apply to the EC for selection into Action 3. If a course is accepted into Action 3, European students and scholars involved in an EM course become eligible for a period of funded study, teaching or research outside Europe. Outgoing European student study periods last from between one and six months and are funded with monthly grants of €700 plus a €1,000 travel grant. Outgoing European scholars can spend up to three months abroad and are funded €4,000 per month plus a €1,000 travel grant (European Commission, 2002: p. 47).

The EC envisioned that each European HEI involved in an Action 3 partnership could send a maximum of five students abroad each year. For example, an EM course consortium with four HEIs could each send five students per year for a total of twenty outgoing EU students. In addition, each EM course could send three scholars to third-country partner HEIs each year (European Commission, 2002: p. 12).
Partnerships under Action 3 commenced in the 2005-2006 academic year and an emphasis has been placed on developing partnerships with non-European HEIs that are highly developed and are prepared to cooperate “on equal footing” with their European counterparts (European Commission, 2002: p. 11). A total of 70 third-country HEIs from 27 different countries are represented in partnerships with 19 EM courses involved in Action 3. The wide geographic distribution can be seen in the list below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>HEIs in Action 3</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>HEIs in Action 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Serbia and Montenegro</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The EC has set a target for approximately 90 Action 3 partnerships. By the end of the initial five-year window of EM, these partnerships would allow funding for nearly 4,000 EU students to undertake a period of study abroad and funding for nearly 800 EU scholars to undertake a period of teaching and/or research abroad (European Commission, 2002: p. 46). A complete list of the partnerships selected into Action 3, as well as the third-country HEIs involved in each partnership, is available in Appendix E.

4.4 Action Four – Enhancing Attractiveness

The most difficult action to summarize is Action 4, which aims quite generally to enhance the attractiveness of European higher education. This fourth action works towards the objectives of improving accessibility, enhancing the profile and increasing the visibility of higher education in the EU through EM.

With Action 4, the EC aims to support consortiums of public and private organisations that deal with the provision of higher education at the international level. In the initial five years of EM, the EC has
set a target of supporting 100 cooperative projects. The projects must involve organisations from at least three EU member states and can also involve organisations from third countries. With the establishment of EM, the EC envisions projects that promote European higher education abroad, projects that seek to establish links between higher education and research, as well as projects aimed at providing quality assurance and curriculum development (European Commission, 2002).

Remembering that the primary focus of this study is on the courses and students involved in Actions 1 and 2 during the inaugural year of EM, a more detailed description of Action 4 is not necessary here. It is sufficient to note that in the first two years of the programme fourteen projects have been selected, dealing with everything from virtual/distance education to professional music training. A complete list of the projects selected under Action 4 is available in Appendix F.
5. The Erasmus Mundus Course Perspective

5.1 Outline of the Chapter

In order to gain a greater understanding of some of the practical aspects of EM, a questionnaire to be completed by EM course coordinators was developed. As described in Chapter 2, the questionnaire was general in nature so that a wide range of questions could be included and particular topics of relevance could emerge through an analysis of the responses. The basic aim of the questionnaire was to understand the courses prior to selection into EM, the process of transition into EM and the impact of selection into EM. It was concluded that only the fourteen courses that gained full EM status in the first selection round in 2004 were equipped to respond to this line of questioning. Only these courses had experienced the complete process of gaining EM status and had completed a year as fully operating EM courses. The questionnaire was distributed in February 2006 and nine courses responded with a completed questionnaire.

While waiting for the questionnaires to be returned, the task of researching the higher education environment out of which EM grew was undertaken. During this research process, it was discovered that the basic objectives of the EM programme mirror the objectives of European-level higher education over the last two decades (as discussed in Chapter 3). This led to the conclusion that an examination of the objectives of EM, and how they are reflected within EM course practices, could provide one way of beginning to understand EM in its earliest years.

In hindsight, a questionnaire designed to focus specifically on the implementation of the EM objectives by courses selected into the EM programme would have been more enlightening for this study. However, due to time limitations, only the data gathered from the original questionnaire could be utilised. Thus, the study had to progress with the results obtained. Even in its original form, responses to the questionnaire provide some relevant and useful information, which form the basis of discussion in this chapter.

The responses to the questionnaire are analysed in relation to the framework of the prescribed objectives of the EM programme, within the context of Action 1 (EM Masters Courses) and Action 2
(Third-Country Student Scholarships). As described in Chapter 4, objective one directly relates to Action 1 and objective two directly relates to Action 2. Once again, the first two objectives are:

1. To promote a quality offer in higher education with a distinct European added value, attractive both within the EU and beyond its borders (EM Masters Courses)
2. To encourage and enable highly qualified graduates and scholars from all over the world, to obtain qualifications and/or experience in the EU (Third-Country Student Scholarships)

An analysis of three specific areas of EM will provide some insight into how the programme’s first two objectives are reflected in the practices of EM courses:

- Student tuition fees and student scholarships
- Student mobility
- Linguistic aspects

Following an analysis of these three areas, data on student applications to EM courses is presented in order to begin to understand student interest in EM courses. Finally, information regarding marketing and promotional activities of EM courses is presented to understand the measures being taken to develop interest in EM courses.

This study is qualitative in nature and includes a small number of EM courses. Thus, the data shows how the objectives of the programme are finding their way into practice within the courses, but cannot reflect how well the objectives are being put into practice. While the data is not sufficient to draw strong conclusions, it provides a useful first glimpse into the practices of EM courses. Being mindful not to force out results from the questionnaire, the analysis focuses on the questionnaire responses that enable a meaningful comparison between courses and that are applicable to the overall research question of this study. A complete list of the questionnaire results is available in Appendix G.

5.2 Student Scholarships and Student Tuition Fees
In the first year of the EM programme, the EC granted fourteen joint masters degree courses full EM status and provided general funding for each course consortium and specific funding for the first third-country student scholarships. The total 2004-2005 academic year funding for the inaugural EM courses was distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus Mundus Course Consortium Funding</td>
<td>€ 210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-Country Student Scholarships</td>
<td>€ 6,234,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The course consortium funding provided each EM course with €15,000 to use at their discretion for expenses related to administering the course. The €15,000 was to be split amongst the HEIs of each consortium, and the number of HEIs (which ranged from three to eight) in each consortium had no bearing on the amount of funding they received from the EC.\(^\text{15}\)

Each EM course was allotted a specific number of third-country scholarships (approximately ten), at €21,000 per student, per academic year, pro-rated by the length of the course. Thus, every third-country scholarship student received more funding per year than their entire EM course, and nearly 97% of course funding in the inaugural year was earmarked for third-country student scholarships.

The EC is using sizable scholarships to attract third-country students to EM courses, but it also hoping to attract students through new and unique joint degree courses. The decision to focus on joint degrees was not a matter of the EC taking advantage of an existing strength in European higher education. Instead, the EC seems to be steering the development of joint degrees to fit a common EM course model. Since the questionnaire was initially developed to explore issues of courses transitioning into the EM joint degree model it included questions regarding the transition and related costs:

- Prior to fall 2004, was there a master’s course offered at your university in the discipline covered by the EM course in which you are involved?
- Was the structure of the course a single institution degree or dual/multiple/joint degree?

\(^{14}\) Total funding calculated from course profiles on the EM website (Erasmus Mundus, 2006)

\(^{15}\) Eight of the nine courses involved in this survey are longer than one academic year. After the first year of EM, courses have two classes of students enrolled at the same time. However, the annual consortium grant does not increase from €15,000 to accommodate two classes of students.
As seen above, two of the inaugural EM courses did not exist as masters degrees prior to EM, and only one-third of the courses operated cooperative degrees. In addition, the following question was asked with the motivation of understanding the financial adjustment to a new structure:

- Do you incur many additional costs administering your Erasmus Mundus course?

The results to this question were 100% affirmative that additional costs are incurred in order to administer an EM course. The unanimity of this response is striking, but not surprising. The logical next question is how courses are covering the additional costs of operating a joint degree. While this question was not asked directly in the questionnaire, there were several questions regarding tuition fees that provide insight into issues surrounding the costs of operating an EM course.

Before continuing, it is important to note how the EC anticipated student scholarships would be used, as well as its specific language on EM tuition fees. In its proposal for the programme, the EC broke down the annual €21,000 student scholarship as follows:

- €16,000 for living costs
- €1,000 for travel expenses
- €4,000 for “block payments to the masters course” (European Commission, 2002)

---

**Table 8: Course Structures Prior to Erasmus Mundus Selection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Existing Master’s Course</th>
<th>Course Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dual/multiple/joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dual/multiple/joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dual/multiple/joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 In order to provide anonymity, each course is referred to by a randomly assigned number that remains consistent throughout the chapter.
Based on this breakdown, it seems that the EC expected that courses would need to charge a fee to students in order to cover some of the expenses of operating a joint degree course. Despite an apparent guideline of a €4,000 tuition fee, the EC did not (and could not) establish a common tuition fee for all EM courses. Therefore, each course has been left to determine its own tuition fee based on its own costs. The EC statement on tuition fees in EM is as follows:

Erasmus Mundus Masters consortia are free to charge students as they wish according to their national legislation and according to the agreement reached within each consortium. There can be different tuition fees for European students on the one hand, and third-country students on other. However, all third-country students must be treated in the same way regardless of whether or not they receive an Erasmus Mundus grant. In other words, third-country students receiving an Erasmus Mundus grant must not be charged more than third-country students without a scholarship. Similarly, tuition fees must not depend on where the students start, continue or finish the Masters course (European Commission, 2006).

The EC’s statement alludes to the fact that there is not a uniform philosophy or system regarding tuition fees throughout Europe. However, the HEIs involved in each EM course consortium must agree to a standard tuition fee, regardless of each consortium institution’s tuition fee policy. In the questionnaire, the course coordinators were asked to provide information on their annual tuition fees before and after EM selection. The results are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Pre-EM Tuition Fees</th>
<th>Post-EM Tuition Fees</th>
<th>Tuition Differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>€ 1,200</td>
<td>+ € 1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>€ 7,500 - € 9,800</td>
<td>€ 9,800</td>
<td>+ € 0 - € 2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>€ 510</td>
<td>€ 4,000</td>
<td>+ € 3,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>€ 8,000</td>
<td>+ € 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No course</td>
<td>€ 6,000</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>€ 4,000</td>
<td>€ 10,000</td>
<td>+ € 6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No course</td>
<td>€ 1,000</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>€ 0 - € 10,000</td>
<td>€ 10,000</td>
<td>+ € 0 - € 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>€ 3,500</td>
<td>+ € 3,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 Tuition fees are for third-country students only. EU and EEA/EFTA students may be charged a different tuition fee.
The results clearly show the vast difference between tuition fees in courses prior to EM versus after EM selection. Regardless of the amount, tuition fees for all courses have increased since gaining EM status.

Qualitative responses within the questionnaire indicated that increases in tuition fees have been necessary to help cover the additional costs of operating a joint degree course. One EM course coordinator summarised the situation as follows:

    We are obliged to ask higher tuition fees than non-joint degree courses because the €15,000 lump sum is not sufficient. The extra costs are really underestimated by the EC because courses need to permanently hire a person to solve visa problems, organise mobility, select students, and deal with the huge EC bureaucracy. We finance these activities by withholding part of the scholarship from students for the administration of our course. If you compare the huge amount of money paid to the staff of the EU that is running EM (if I am well informed, it includes 17 people) with the amount of money available for EM course staff, than the difference is really huge.

The EM course coordinators have all said it costs more to operate as a joint degree course. The results of the questionnaire show that the EM courses feel they do not receive adequate funding from the EC to cover the additional costs. Thus, they must charge some amount of tuition fee despite the fact that charging tuition fees may not be in the tradition of the countries involved in each consortium. The EC requirement that all HEIs in a consortium agree to a single tuition fee for their EM course may limit, or increase, the tuition fee charged to third-country students because of legal regulations or national traditions in countries involved in an EM consortium.\(^\text{18}\)

If the objectives of attractiveness and European added-value in EM are considered, the idea was to attract third-country students to Europe by offering joint degree courses involving intra-European mobility, and a sizeable scholarship to cover the costs of mobility. While a portion of the scholarship was intended to cover course tuition fees, in many courses the tuition fee is higher than the €4,000 the EC factored into its scholarship break down. For example, a student that is paying €10,000 in tuition

\(^\text{18}\) For readers unfamiliar with European higher education, the treatment of tuition fees for international students is handled in many different ways ranging from no tuition fees in the Nordic countries to high tuition fees in the United Kingdom and Ireland.
fees out of a €21,000 scholarship has only €11,000 left to cover living and travel expenses. The reality is that this is still a significant scholarship. However, the question becomes at what point is the tuition fee too high that there are insufficient funds left for students to cover mobility. If the situation comes to the point that the scholarship is not enough to cover mobility, than the final question becomes whether a joint degree model will still be attractive to students.

5.3 Student Mobility

In addition to questions regarding tuition fees, the questionnaire also addressed some details of mobility plans in the inaugural EM courses. In order to qualify for participation in EM, the EC stated that EM courses must “involve a minimum of three HEIs from three different EU member states and students must have a period of study in at least two of the three HEIs” (European Commission, 2002). Information provided by course coordinators about their course mobility plans is included in the chart below. The chart is intended to show what is happening both collectively and individually in the mobility plans of the courses and includes the following categories:

- Duration of the master’s course (Duration)
- Number of HEIs involved in the course consortium (# of HEIs)
- Average number of HEIs students attend during the course (Avg. Attended)
- Average number of times students have to move between HEIs during the course (Avg. Moves)
- Whether all students start the course at the same HEI (Same Start)
- Whether all students attend the same HEIs at the same time throughout the mobility plan (Same Mobility)

Table 10: Course Mobility Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th># of HEIs</th>
<th>Avg. Attended</th>
<th>Avg. Moves</th>
<th>Same Start</th>
<th>Same Mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on this small sample, we begin to see a general picture of mobility in EM. The typical EM student is involved in a two-year course offered by a consortium of approximately five HEIs. The student attends an average of three HEIs and moves between HEIs an average of three times during the two years. In addition, the student is unlikely to begin their course as part of one cohort at one HEI, and is also unlikely to move through the mobility plan as part of a consistent cohort. Courses are obviously meeting the minimum mobility requirements set by the EC, and in most cases are exceeding the requirements. Even with this vague picture of mobility in hand, the reality of mobility in EM courses can begin to be related to the objectives of attractiveness and European added-value. It can be presumed that mobility, which includes study periods at HEIs in different European countries, is part of the European added-value that the EC set as an EM objective. What cannot be understood from this data is whether mobility that, on average, requires attendance at three different HEIs in three different countries in the span of two academic years is attractive to prospective third-country students in theory and attractive to current EM students in practice.

5.4 Linguistic Aspects

Given the mobility dimension of EM, the EC expects EM courses to have a linguistic component which presumably enhances the mobility experience:

Study periods must provide students with the possibility of using at least two European languages spoken in the Member States where the institutions participating in the Erasmus Mundus Masters Courses are located. However, the use of at least two languages does not imply the use of two different languages of instruction. Also, there is no obligation that the institutions use the national language as the language of instruction. Institutions should have a clear language policy to promote a national language. This could include language training or other induction courses (e.g. ‘survival language,’ cultural induction, specific courses before mobility, etc.), regardless of the language of instruction (European Commission, 2006).

The questionnaire asked only two brief questions about the linguistic aspects of EM courses. However, the results give some insight into the topic. First, courses were asked to indicate the language(s) of instruction and whether each language(s) of instruction was required or optional:
Table 11: Course Language(s) of Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th># of Languages</th>
<th>English Req.</th>
<th>English Optional</th>
<th>Additional Req.</th>
<th>Additional Optional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is no surprise that English is the most common language of instruction, required in eight of the nine courses. Furthermore, in five of the eight courses English is the sole language of instruction. Thus, only four of the courses have the possibility of providing the linguistic aspect anticipated by the EC through course language of instruction. The other five courses must find some other means of adding a linguistic dimension to the student experience. To this point, the questionnaire asked the following question:

- What measures are in place to assist students in learning the local language in each country of study?

The questionnaire provided four options for response, which are reflected in the chart below based on the following list:

- Language classes designed specifically for EM students (EM Specific)
- Normal HEI language classes (HEI Class)
- Private language lessons (Private Class)
- Other (Other)

Table 12: Course Language Training Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>EM Specific</th>
<th>HEI Class</th>
<th>Private Class</th>
<th>Other Tutors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data shows that all courses are providing some means for studying the national languages of the countries included in their mobility. In eight of the nine courses students have the option of attending language classes offered at the HEIs which they attend, and four of those eight courses offer this option as the only means for language training. These are the only comments that can be made based on the data obtained. However, based on this information there are a few points that may merit further consideration:

- The nationalities of the third-country students involved in EM courses indicate that many students are studying in a second language, regardless of whether the course instruction is in English or another European language (see complete list of third-country student nationalities in Appendix C).
- EM students are studying in an average of three different European countries, and based on course profiles are likely to encounter three different national languages. In many cases, these are additional languages to the language of instruction.
- The timing of student mobility plans may not coincide with standard semester start and end dates at HEIs attended. Thus, students may not be able to attend language classes offered by the HEIs, which the EM courses heavily depend on for EM student language training.
- If students are able to attend language classes offered by HEIs, the traditional non-intensive, semester long class structure may not provide students with language skills most appropriate to meeting their short-term needs (i.e. – relevant survival-level language skills).

The diversity of European languages combined with intra-European mobility, can provide a unique European added-value to the student experience. However, within a target market of third-country students who may have no previous knowledge of a European language other than the language in which they will study, the challenges of living within multiple languages has the potential of detracting value if adequate language training/support is not provided. For example, consider the challenges faced by a Chinese student studying in English in three European countries where English is not the national language. It is easy to imagine how the linguistic aspects could potentially detract value from this experience.
5.5 Third-Country Student Applications

The EC outlined in its programme proposal that the number of applications received by EM courses should be used as an indicator to measure interest in EM courses (European Commission, 2002). Application data from EM course coordinators is presented here as a beginning to the process of understanding the extent of student interest in EM courses. Thus, this section of the chapter is included to take the discussion beyond what is happening within EM courses, and provide initial information on how EM courses are perceived from the outside.

With limited amount of information on applications, coupled with the fact that the EM programme is still in its early stages, conclusive and detailed application trends cannot be developed here. Nonetheless, the questionnaire asked EM coordinators to provide application figures for the 2003-2004, 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 academic years as a way to start understanding the impact of EM selection on student applications. It is important to note that application information is incomplete because some EM coordinators did not have past application figures available. It is also important to note that the data for the 2003-2004 academic years (pre-EM) reflects application figures for the HEI that now coordinates the EM course. Additionally, courses did not have EM status at the time that students applied for the 2004-2005 academic year, which was the first year course’s gained EM status. Thus, the 2005-2006 application figures are the only ones that can truly reflect students applying for admission to EM courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>25 (n/a)</td>
<td>52 (+ 108%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>103 (+ 8%)</td>
<td>250 (+ 143%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>25 (n/a)</td>
<td>300 (+ 1.100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22 (- 37%)</td>
<td>70 (+ 218%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>78 (n/a)</td>
<td>152 (+ 95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50 (+ 67%)</td>
<td>100 (+ 100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>20 (n/a)</td>
<td>27 (+ 35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80 (+ 33%)</td>
<td>200 (+ 150%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It cannot be concluded that application increases in 2005-2006 are the result of courses having gained EM status. Nonetheless, the consistent and drastic increases in application numbers across the sampled EM courses cannot be denied. Application statistics should be collected and compared in future years.
before they can be used as a meaningful measure of the student interest in, and attractiveness of, EM courses.

5.6 Marketing and Promotion

The data presented shows that application numbers increased when courses gained EM status. As stated above, it cannot be concluded that this increase is a trend or that the increase was caused by courses gaining EM status. In order to understand application rates in the future, it will be important to understand how prospective students are finding out about EM and the courses involved. Marketing and promotion activities are one way of making information widely available. The EC expected that EM courses have “mechanisms to reach out to potentially interested third-country students,” by including this in its criteria for selecting EM courses (European Commission, 2006).

The questionnaire asked courses whether they conduct promotional or marketing activities aimed at increasing awareness about their course and in order to recruit students. Eight of the nine courses responded that they conduct some form of promotional or marketing activity. However, over half of the courses indicated that their activities were extremely limited due to lack of available funding for such activities. It is also relevant to consider how capable, knowledgeable and willing courses are about marketing and promotional activities given the traditional lack of focus on these activities in European higher education. However, no data was collected related to this issue, thus it can only be raised here but not analysed further.

The EC has developed an EM website which was created to serve as a central information point for all aspects of the programme. The website includes everything from the history of the programme to the most recently selected courses and everything in between. It attempts to be an all-encompassing resource for the programme, which results in a website that is difficult to navigate for the uninitiated user. Because this is the only central resource on the EM programme, which targets multiple user groups seeking multiple types of information about the programme, it may not be providing information effectively to any one group. This is particularly the case for prospective students searching for information on EM courses. As just one example, the URL for the website is extremely cumbersome. (http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/mundus/index_en.html). From a practical
standpoint, if the EC has only one central mechanism for information about EM and that mechanism cannot be easily found or remembered than this is unlikely to be an effective marketing tool. Thus, it may be important that EM courses have their own marketing and promotional activities to make information about their course directly available to students. Relying on the central EM website in its current form is unlikely to be an effective way of attracting attention, and students, to their course.

In an age when higher educational activities abound, it is not enough to develop a programme of masters courses that offer a European added-value and sizable scholarships. Attention must be given to promoting and marketing these dimensions in order to alert students. Additionally, further consideration should be given to whether this can be more effectively and efficiently accomplished through central activities by the EC, by each EM course individually or by finding an appropriate balance between the two.
6. The Erasmus Mundus Student Perspective

In this chapter, the objectives of EM and how they are being put into practice are considered from the perspective of EM students. Insufficient time and concerns over efficiency precluded a survey of a wide sample of EM students. Instead, an interview was conducted with two students enrolled in the HEEM course. The student interview focused on two specific areas – the stated objectives of EM and the criteria used by the EC to select EM courses. The students were asked to critically analyse the objectives and criteria within the context of the course in which they were participating. The interview revealed topics of particular relevance to the analysis in this study. As a means of gathering a slightly wider student perspective, the seven remaining HEEM students were asked to answer a five-question email survey. The survey questions addressed the most relevant topics from the student interview. Six of the seven students responded to the survey, and the qualitative results of the interview and survey are presented in this chapter.

The student responses in this chapter are not presented as a critique of the HEEM course or of the EM programme, but are intended to provide a real view of how students have experienced one course within EM. The issues discussed here seem to be generally applicable to discussions of higher education cooperation, joint degrees and student mobility within EM and beyond and readers should consider how the issues discussed in this chapter may apply within their own academic and/or professional context.

6.1 Overview of the Higher Education Erasmus Mundus (HEEM) Course: Context for Discussion

Third-country students are the largest group involved in EM and are the group that receive the largest amount of funding. Thus, it was essential to include the third-country student perspective in an analysis of the EM programme in its first year. The analysis presented in this chapter can be useful to the EC and the EM courses as they evaluate the further development of the programme and individual courses. The inaugural students of the HEEM course were not only convenient to survey but also offered a unique perspective as students of the only course currently in EM which focuses on higher education policy. Thus, the student responses are grounded in an academic understanding of higher education
theory, policy, history, economics and management and the role of higher education in national and international development, particularly in the European context.

The first cohort of HEEM students included ten third-country scholarship students from seven different countries. The students ranged in age from 23 to 32 years. Nine of the students were female and one was male. The students came to the programme from various educational and professional backgrounds and many had previous work experience in HEIs in their home countries.

It will be helpful for readers to understand the mobility plan followed by the inaugural HEEM students as it will provide context for understanding the student responses presented in this chapter. The HEEM course is two years in length with a requirement to complete 120 ECTS. The details of the mobility plan for the inaugural HEEM students are summarised below:

- **August 2004 – May 2005, University of Oslo (Norway)**
  - This period included an Introductory Semester Course on Higher Education Policy and Theory, Research Methods and Statistics, and History and Primary Processes of Higher Education. Students earned approximately 50 ECTS during this period.
  - All teaching faculty came from the University of Oslo.
  - The ten EM students attended classes with six EU/EEA students, one of whom was Norwegian.

- **May 2005 – June 2005, University of Tampere (Finland)**
  - This period included the Organisation, Governance and Management of Higher Education. Students earned approximately 15 ECTS during this period.
  - The teaching faculty consisted of two faculty members from the University of Tampere, plus two visiting professors from the University of Oslo.
  - With the exception of one non-Finnish guest student, classes were attended only by the ten EM students.

- **August 2005, University of Oslo (Norway)**
  - This period included the Advanced Course in Research Methods. Students earned approximately 10 ECTS during this period.

---

19 Albania, Belarus, Canada, China, Indonesia, United States and Vietnam
The teaching faculty came from the University of Oslo.

The ten EM students attended classes with students of varying nationalities from a peer masters course at the University of Oslo.

- September 2005 – December 2005, University of Aveiro (Portugal)
  - This period included the Economic and International Global Dimensions of Higher Education. Students earned approximately 15 ECTS during this period.
  - The teaching faculty consisted of visiting professors from HEIs in the Netherlands, Australia and Portugal. The period did not include teaching faculty from the University of Aveiro.
  - With the exception of one non-Portuguese guest student, classes were attended only by the ten EM students.

  - The final semester was devoted entirely to work on the masters thesis. The ten EM students were divided between the University of Tampere and the University of Aveiro, with each university working with five students. Students earned approximately 30 ECTS during this period.

6.2 Reflections from HEEM Course Students

Three major themes came out of the student interview and were pursued to a greater extent in the student email survey. The student reflections have been organised into the following topic areas: mobility, integration and European added-value. One response during the student interviews and surveys is important to mention at the outset of the student reflections as it perfectly and succinctly encapsulates the first-year student experience in the EM programme: “Sometimes you are part of something that you don’t really know what it is.”

6.2.1 Student Reflections on Mobility

In Chapter 4, the EC guidelines for student mobility in EM courses were presented and in Chapter 5 data on how mobility plans are actually organised by the inaugural EM courses was summarised. Above, the specific mobility plan of the HEEM course in its first year has been outlined. This
background allows the discussion to move to the HEEM student experience within the context of the mobility plan. The two students who participated in the interview expressed that the required mobility of the course shaped their experience more than anything else. In particular, the students talked at length about how the mobility impacted their academic and non-academic experience in the HEEM course in positive and negative ways. Both students expressed that the required mobility significantly compromised their academic experience. However, the students strongly expressed the positive impact the mobility had in relation to their non-academic (i.e. – personal, social and cultural) experience.

Given that EM is an academic programme, based on mobility through joint degrees, this is a significant finding. Thus, it was important to ask all of the HEEM students to reflect on how the mobility component of the course had impacted their academic and non-academic experience. Without exception, they expressed the same sentiments in their responses as the students who were interviewed. The following are some of responses from students regarding the impact of mobility on their academic and non-academic experience.  

Impact of Mobility on the Academic Experience

- I thought the mobility had more of a negative than a positive impact on my academics. I could not concentrate on my studies, as I had to think about other matters dealing with the movement of one country to another.

- Moving from one country to another is not as simple as buying a ticket and then the next minute you are in an exotic world. There are tons of logistical things to deal with, which I think took too much of my time that should have been allocated to reading. For example, I needed to buy a ticket, calculate expenses, pack, settle into a new place, get used to new things – just to name a few. Plus, the frustration one can experience in a foreign country could really be disturbing. It influenced my ability to study.

---

20 Throughout this chapter, slight changes have been made to some student responses in order to clarify language.
• Our mobility plan required almost constant movement between countries with completely different languages and a course structure that did not allow enough time in one place to learn any of the languages. I was already studying in a second language, which made the work difficult enough. Furthermore, I rarely knew who to ask about what academic resources were available in each location. These difficulties with mobility had a significant impact on the quality of my academic experience.

• At times I felt that my academic experience was compromised by the required mobility. There were occasions when I should have been concentrating on research, studying or writing papers, but instead, I was applying for residence permits, trying to organise transportation, book tickets, obtain housing information, etc. On an individual basis, these didn’t take much time. However, when you take into account that mobility-related activities occur in both the city and institution of departure and in the city and institution of arrival (through finding housing, unpacking, settling in, navigating oneself around the campus/library/city, doing banking, obtaining transport passes, buying essentials, etc.) – it actually takes up a huge chunk of time. In addition, unexpected problems took up many hours because we had not had the opportunity to become familiar with the system or the city – or the language. I describe my experience in the HEEM course as “Extreme Mobility.”

Impact of Mobility on the Non-Academic Experience

• The impact of mobility on my non-academic experience was utterly positive. It seems this would have been quite predictable, but it does not make it any less significant. I experienced a blend of internationalism and multiculturalism. I had to exercise personal flexibility, tolerance, decisiveness and curiosity. The nicest part of it all was the blend, the tempo and the intensity – it all felt quite natural.

• The travelling study (which is how I referred to our mobility) opened my eyes. I met many different people and my interactions with them progressed from passive to active to natural. I sensed that I was gradually transforming my previous mental model, stepping out of some previous boundaries and refreshing myself.
• I have gained more experiences by meeting new people and new cultures. This has really helped me as I rarely travelled abroad before. It has opened my view about many things that are happening in the world.

• I learned many things from the mobility. I have become quite flexible to new environments, know how to deal with my daily life, have made new friends, have seen more places and have gained more knowledge. Having the chance to live in so many new places helped my personal growth in dealing with personal life, broadening my horizons and opening up my mind.

• I always welcome and value the opportunity to see and learn and, as much as possible, to experience another country and culture, regardless of the hurdles and headaches that may occur in the process of getting and being there.

• There were definitely frustrations with the mobility, but there were also great experiences. What I learned from the mobility was more than academic and I feel as if I have become more patient, independent and adaptable.

The comments of these students show that mobility in this EM course is of great value, but not primarily in an academic way. If this is of concern to the EC and EM courses, than greater support to students to mitigate the distractions of the mobility process needs to begin or the structure of mobility within the EM joint degree model may need serious consideration.

6.2.2 Student Reflections on Integration

The EC set a broad requirement for integrated study programmes in EM, but did not give a clear definition of what was meant by the term integration. In the interview and survey, students were asked to reflect on what integration in an EM course meant to them. In discussing the idea of integration, the students identified two separate types. The first can be called “Curricular Integration.” The students discussed curricular integration as being achieved when course subjects and topics build on and relate to each other in a coherent way. The second type of integration that was identified by students can be
called “Student Academic Integration.” This type of integration would be achieved when students feel they have an active and inclusive relationship with an academic peer group, professors, a department at the HEI attended and the HEI at-large.

The degree to which the students felt they experienced these two types of integration are reflected in their comments:

**Curricular Integration**

- From a curricular point of view, our course was very well integrated. The subjects fit together and related to one another.

- In general, we had a consistent curriculum, evaluation method and teaching method among all the partner institutions. When it came to the integration of our studies, I give credit to our course.

- We had the opportunity to learn about various higher education systems while participating as learners in different higher education systems.

- Our course was integrated in the sense that it involved a number of different universities and brought together the varying study programmes of those universities.

- My logic suggests that in our context integrated means “the joint efforts and contributions of the universities involved in educating students and providing services.” Thus, when it comes to whether there were many people involved from the various universities, our course was integrated.

**Student Academic Integration**

- If you are enrolled at a Finnish or Portuguese university, attending classes in Finnish and Portuguese classrooms and are using a Finnish or Portuguese library, but are taking classes with
only the same people we’d taken classes with in Norway, and occasionally with the same professors, it feels more like passive integration or integration in theory.

- There were times that I felt that the partner universities involved in our course were included without the thought of what persons or resources would be available in those locations.

- The integration was very hazy because we were studying with so many visiting scholars from places other than the current location of study. If it is important how well each part of our course fit with the whole, then it is probably not the most integrated course.

- Because we were not integrated with students from Finland and Portugal, I felt that we missed out on the prospect of having valuable academic interaction and fruitful class discussions relevant to the country where we were.

- At the master’s level, it is important to establish good working relationships with professors and to become familiar with the library and its resources. This was not my experience in the HEEM course. While we had the opportunity to hear lectures from a wide range of experts, I don’t feel that I was actually able to “connect” with professors because they weren’t able to get to know “who” I was. Therefore, it was a rather “surface” academic integration.

- Our course was not truly integrated. Almost no host country students were involved in our subjects which eliminated the possibility for comparative projects on the countries where we were. For example, I spent four months of my life in Portugal, but I don’t feel that I learned much about Portuguese higher education specifically and Portugal in general. In this sense, I felt that my integration was quite superficial.

As these quotes illustrate, students did not have great concerns about the curricular integration of the HEEM course. However, students had great difficulty with academic integration into the various HEIs they attended. Student academic integration is an area that single institution courses do not have to give as much consideration. Students who complete an entire degree in one location have teaching staff,
departmental resources and a peer group of students within the same discipline consistently available to them and academic integration can develop naturally over the duration the course.

The HEEM student comments reflect that their sense of academic belonging decreased with each new HEI they attended. The more HEIs students attended, the less connected they felt to any of the HEIs they attended. If the EC and EM courses feel that student academic integration is an important part of the EM experience, they should consider measures for facilitating student academic integration during the short time period students spend at each HEI. In addition, it is worth noting that these students expressed a desire to study with host country students and professors at each HEI. If the purpose of the EM programme is to place students as participants in various European higher education systems, this seems like a reasonable expectation in the EM joint degree model. If students are not integrated into each HEI, then consideration must be given as to whether the components of integration and mobility combine to complement or compromise the value and quality of the academic experience.

6.2.3 Student Reflections on European Added-Value

The student perspective on European added-value was pursued because the EC is using this term to distinguish the EM programme from other higher education offerings. Of the three areas addressed in this chapter, European added-value is the least defined. This is evident in the way students referred to European added-value in their responses. Some of the students referred to European values that relate more to a world outlook or a way of life and other students referred to the academic value of studying European issues from within Europe:

- I think our course gave us the chance to grab European dimensions if any of them appealed to us. What I would say may survive the transfer are value-based attitudes – some alternative visions of prioritising – while the ready-made ideas and practices do not seem to be so easily “cut and pasted” into rather different contexts.

- The so-called European added-value that is transferable for me is most in the social experience. The experience of studying in more than one country added more personal value. Plus, the title
European Master Degree will help me a great deal because my home country puts much more emphasis on the degree you gained rather than the actual ability you have.

- The value I have gained is to become familiar with the rules and procedures of the European higher education system.

- The European dimensions of the course at least slightly changed my way of thinking – which had been very limited. I have been able to view things in a broader way than before studying in three different European countries.

- The course provided me with a European dimension and gave me a solid theoretical grounding in European policies and practices. These will be of use to me in the field of higher education, wherever I end up working. This background will be helpful in a comparative context regardless of where I go.

- I think I had a European experience, but did not gain a European added-value. Values can only develop over time. Perhaps the term European added-value is used to make EM sound more important.

- The EM programme is promoted to international students, but it does not seem that the EC wants students to stay in Europe after completing their studies. Thus, the added-value can only be transferred to my home country by relating the European practices to my home country. However, I did not gain a lot of practical knowledge and I am not sure that a theoretical course, such as mine, has much transferability to my situation. All this being said, there was a great deal of added-value because of the mobility.

As stated above and exemplified in the student responses, the concept of European added-value has many different interpretations. Nonetheless, students are recognizing a European value in the experience they have had in their EM course even if they do not agree on what that value is and how that value will be of use in the future.
It should not be overlooked that while all students found a European value in their experience, some did express concerns about the applicability and transferability of the European focus in their academic work. This concern is two-fold. First, participation in EM does not necessarily open the door for further study or work within Europe. At present, this does not seem to be a goal of the EC within the EM programme and as such few and inconsistent practices have been put into place to assist students towards these opportunities. Second, how to make study that is focused on the European context useful in a non-European context. These are individual student concerns that may not be represented in all EM courses, but they cannot be overlooked because even in a highly globalised and interconnected world, students will seek educational opportunities that are the most relevant for both their current and future situations.

21 The EM course coordinators responded to questions about career services and assistance with Ph.D. placements in their questionnaires. The results were not included in Chapter 5, but are summarised in Appendix G.
7. Conclusion

At the outset of this study, the main research question for analysis was presented as, in the first year of EM, do the practical aspects of the programme reflect a progression towards its prescribed objectives? The body of this study contextualised this question by providing an analysis of data collected on how the practices of the inaugural set of EM courses reflect the programme’s objectives and how students connect the objectives of EM to the experience of participating in the EM programme.

At the end of this study, it is important to reflect on the main research question in both an objective and subjective way. From an objective, almost numerical perspective, the objectives of the EM programme are being reached both steadily and significantly. This can be witnessed in at least four obvious ways. First, more European joint masters degree courses have been added into EM each year (now 57 in total), and the number of course consortiums applying for EM status is increasing with selection into the programme becoming increasingly competitive. Second, more third country students are receiving scholarships to enter EM courses each year and data from EM course coordinators shows that, since gaining EM status, there has been rise in student application numbers. In the courses sampled for this study, the application increase has been from as little as 35% to more than 1,000%, which suggests an increased interest by third country students in the EM programme. Third, more cooperative partnerships have been arranged between European and third country HEIs allowing increasing numbers of European students and scholars to have the opportunity for an academic experience outside Europe through the EM programme. And fourth, more projects have been added each year with the aim of enhancing the attractiveness and visibility of European higher education. These facts, though not unimportant, only convey a basic snapshot of the progress of the EM programme from the outside looking in.

The data collected from the EM course coordinators and students provides a more subjective, qualitative and meaningful perspective on the research question from the inside looking out. In large part, the course coordinator and student responses have been allowed to speak for themselves in previous chapters in this study in order to show the realities of participation in EM on an institutional and individual level. The collective results indicate that despite the common EM joint degree model, no single EM experience is the same. This is in large part due to the diversity of disciplines, students,
HEIs and national systems represented in the programme. Thus, it has become evident that courses and students have varying interpretations of the EM objectives and varying interpretations on how to implement the objectives.

The results suggest that the inaugural EM courses have struggled with the implementation of the programme in its first year because they have struggled with an environment requiring immediate levels of intensified cooperation. After gaining EM status from the EC, the courses were largely left to their own devises to determine how to implement a new EM joint degree structure. This new structure, with only a vague framework and limited guidelines from the EC, required common practices and rules to be implemented within and across the various HEIs and national higher education systems involved in each course consortium. This is within a European higher education environment that is still in its very beginning stages of widespread commonality of practices and rules, even with the continued progression of the Bologna Process. This struggle with implementation was exemplified in an analysis of the varying approaches and decisions courses have taken on such matters as the role tuition fees, the appropriate amount of student mobility, the provision of new language training and the ability to conduct marketing and promotional activities. At its very root, the struggle is not a new one in higher education – making use of limited financial resources in a competitive higher education environment in order to provide the best quality educational experience. The new story for EM courses is dealing with this struggle, while also dealing with an environment requiring intensified levels cooperation at the same time.

The responses from EM students reflect a duality in their interpretations of the EM objectives. The results can be interpreted as students thinking about the value of the joint degree model, and specifically the value gained from, reasons for, and impacts of the EM joint degree model, which is predicated on almost constant mobility. The student comments on their experience within the EM programme reflect the struggle courses have had in implementing the programme. In general, students have summarised their experience within the EM programme as a valuable one. However, students expressed specific and tangible concerns about the impacts of the joint degree model. Students felt the consistent mobility required of them had a significant negative impact on the academic dimensions of their course due to a vast amount of time consumed by attention that had to be given to the array of details required to execute the mobility plan. Alternatively, students felt that their non-academic
(personal, social, cultural) experience was significantly enhanced because of their mobility throughout various regions of Europe. The results also showed that students saw a necessity for a distinction between the curricular integration of EM courses (where course subjects and topics build on and relate to one another in a coherent way) and the student academic integration of EM courses (where students feel as if they have an active and inclusive relationship with an academic peer group, professors, a department at the HEI attended and the HEI at-large). The students seemed to agree that a joint degree curriculum could appear to be well integrated on paper, but a reality to consider is that the more HEIs students attend during a joint degree, the more their sense of academic belonging decreased, and the less academically connected they felt to any of the HEIs. Finally, the data reflected that students were thinking about the European added-value that is supposed to have such prominence in the EM programme, and in what ways an academic experience that is being promoted as uniquely European could be beneficial for application in their home countries versus the ways it could be beneficial for application within Europe.

At its core, the EM programme was created with the objectives of promoting and encouraging cooperation, attractiveness, competitiveness and mobility in a more convergent European higher education area. A selection process was designed by the EC to attract top quality masters courses to the EM programme, which in turn would attract top quality graduate students to study in Europe. This study investigated the European higher education environment out of which EM developed and found that the objectives that have such prominence in EM (cooperation, attractiveness, competitiveness and mobility) are not new to European higher education, but have been gaining increasing importance to HEIs, national higher education systems and the EC for more than two decades.

Despite its restricted influence over European higher education, the EC has been able to use its ability to support HEI cooperation and fund mobility to steer European higher education along a path that has become more deeply interconnected. The steering mechanisms the EC has used are financial incentives and information by funding attractive programmes such as EM and allowing HEIs to voluntarily participate. Once involved in such programmes, the EC largely allows HEIs the autonomy to implement the programme in the most appropriate way, because of a recognition of the unique differences that exist between various HEIs, courses and national higher education systems.
Although EM does not represent an entirely new direction in European higher education, the programme hints at a slightly different direction because of the significantly deeper levels of cooperation that must exist between HEIs and national higher education systems in the provision and awarding joint degrees. It was not a goal of this study to determine if the European higher education environment was prepared for a programme that promotes and funds a more widespread offer of joint degrees, and it is not entirely clear if the European higher education environment is indeed convergent enough to quickly build up joint degrees. However, the EM programme is moving forward and the EC, national higher education systems and HEIs must be prepared to act in an environment of hyper-cooperation for the programme to be effective and successful.

The practical aspects of EM, the work of EM courses, and the experiences of EM students reflect a progression towards the programme’s objectives. However, the findings of this study cannot accurately measure how well these objectives are being met. This becomes the logical next question for research on EM. Specifically, further research into the quality of EM joint degree courses, particularly in relation to issues of mobility and integration, should be conducted. More specifically, research into determining the most appropriate amount of mobility to meet the objectives of EM should take place. Mobility plans that require students to travel between three, four, five or even six different countries in a span of two years are attractive on paper, but the results of this study suggest that in reality “less may be more” in terms of mobility. In fact, less mobility may actually be better for the EM student experience and may enable EM courses to provide a higher level of academic quality overall, and in each specific location of study. In addition, more manageable mobility plans could allow students to become more deeply familiar with a smaller number of European languages, and allow courses to better utilise the rich linguistic diversity that is so unique to Europe and that cannot be replicated elsewhere in the world. There are lessons to be learned from the experiences of those involved in the first year of EM, and the specific issues in this study should be considered by current EM courses, course consortiums applying for EM status and should also be considered by the EC in its selection and evaluation of EM courses.

It does not seem logical, or even attainable, that there would be one model for how an EM course should operate. The diversity of the courses, disciplines, HEIs, and students make EM unique, and will be important to the success of programme. However, models of best practices within EM courses
should be identified to assist new and existing courses to work more efficiently and effectively towards the EM objectives, while still allowing courses to retain their individuality and uniqueness. Additionally, this could encourage increased cooperation within courses, between courses, as well as between the EC and the EM courses. After all, the rationality of a joint degree course is that the quality should be better than taking an entire degree at one university. If this is not happening then the situation needs to improve. Otherwise, the purpose of a joint degree programme comes into question.

From the perspective of a participant in an EM course, a professional in the field of higher education and a student of higher education policy, it seems that the joint degree model established with the EM programme presents great potential and value beyond the traditional single institution degree. Additionally, the objectives that the EC has set for EM have potential not only in the evolution of European higher education, but also to assist in further understanding and cooperation within Europe, as well as between Europe and the wider world. However, it is not enough for the EC to collect EM courses, EM students, EM partnerships and EM projects and assume that the EM objectives are being met with quality. Ideally, this first examination of the EM programme can serve as useful resource and starting point for those involved in EM, those pursuing involvement in EM and those who wish to undertake research into the EM joint degree model.
## Appendices
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### Appendix A – Bologna Declaration Signatory Countries and Year of Signing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy See</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and Montenegro</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B – Master’s Courses Selected under Erasmus Mundus Action 1 and Higher Education Institutions Involved

Courses Selected in 2004

**ALGANT - Algebra, Geometry and Number Theory**
- Université Bordeaux I (FR), Leiden University (NL), University of Padova (IT)

**CoMundus - European Master of Arts in Media, Communication and Cultural Studies**
- University of Kassel (DE), Roskilde University (DK), University of Aarhus (DK), University of Burgundy (FR), Stendahl University (FR), University of Florence (IT), Institute of Education - University of London (UK)

**EMCL - European Masters Clinical Linguistics**
- Universität Potsdam (DE), Rijksuniversiteit Groningen (NL), Joensuun Yliopisto (FI), Università degli Studi di Milano Bicocca (IT)

**EMMS - Joint European Masters Programme in Materials Science**
- Universidade de Aveiro (PT), Technische Universität Hamburg-Harburg (DE), Aalborg Universitet (DK)

**EuMI - European Master in Informatics**
- University of Trento (IT), RWTH University Aachen (DE), University of Edinburgh (UK)

**EURO-AQUAE - Euro Hydro-Informatics & Water Management**
- University of Nice – Sophia Antipolis (FR), Braendenburg Technical University Cottbus DE), University of Newcastle upon Tyne (UK), Budapest University of Technology & Economics (HU), Polytechnic University of Catalonia (ES)

**European Joint Master in Water and Coastal Management**
- University of the Algarve (PT), University of Bergen (NO), University of Cadiz (ES), University of Plymouth (UK)

**Master of European Legal Practice - LL.M. Eur**
- University of Hanover (DE), Universidade Catolica Portuguesa (PT), University of Havre (FR), University of Rouen (FR)

**European Master in Law and Economics**
- Erasmus University Rotterdam (NL), Ghent University (BE), University of Hamburg (DE), University Paul Cézanne Aix-Marseille 3 (FR), University of Bologna (IT), University of Vienna (AT), Victoria University of Manchester (UK)

**European Masters Program in Computational Logic**
- Dresden University of Technology (DE), Free University of Bozen-Bolzano (IT), Vienna University of Technology (AT), New University of Lisbon (PT), Technical University of Madrid (ES)

**HEEM - European Masters Degree in Higher Education**
- University of Oslo (NO), University of Aveiro (PT), University of Tampere (FI)

**IMRD: Erasmus Mundus International Master of Science in Rural Development**
- Universiteit Gent (BE), Humboldt University of Berlin (DE), Universidad de Córdoba (ES), Institut National D’Enseignement Supérieur et de Recherche Agronomique et Agroalimentaire de Rennes (FR), Università degli Studi di Pisa (IT), Wageningen Universiteit (NL), Solvenská Polnôhospodárska Univerzita v Nitre (SK)

**International Master in Quaternary and Prehistory**
• University of Ferrara (IT), National Museum of National History (FR), Polytechnic Institute of Tomar (PT), Rovira I Virgili University (ES), University of Tras-os-Montes and Alto Douro (PT)

MEEES - Masters in Earthquake Engineering & Engineering Seismology
• University of Pavia (IT), Imperial College London (UK), University of Patras (GR), Joseph Fourier University (FR)

MEEM - Mechanical Engineering Erasmus Mundus Masters Course
• Institut National des Sciences Appliquées de Lyon, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, The College of the Holy and Undivided Trinity of Queen Elizabeth

MERIT - European Master of Research on Information and Communication Technologies
• Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (ES), Politecnico di Torino (IT), Université Catholique de Louvain (BE), Universität Karlsruhe (DE)

MSc EF Master of Science in European Forestry
• University of Joensuu (FI), Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SE), University of Lleida (ES), Wageningen University (NL), BOKU – University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences (AT), Albert Ludwigs University Freiburg (DE)

NOHA MUNDUS - European Masters Degree in International Humanitarian Aid
• University of Deusto (ES), Catholic University of Louvain (BE), RUB University of Bochum (DE), University of Aix-Marseille (FR), University College Dublin (IE), University of Groningen (NL), Uppsala Universitat (SE)

tropEd - European Master of Science Programme in International Health
• Charité University Medical School Berlin (DE), University of Copenhagen (DK), University of Bordeaux 2 Victor Segalen (FR), Royal Tropical Institute at Free University Amsterdam (NL), Karolinska Institute (SE), Institute of Child Health – University College London (UK), Queen Margaret University College Edinburgh (UK), University of Bergen (NO)

Courses Selected in 2005

AMASE: Joint European Master Programme in Advanced Materials Science and Engineering
• Universität des Saarlandes (DE), Institut National Polytechnique de Lorraine (FR), Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (ES), Lulea Tekniske Universitet (SE)

EMMAPA: Erasmus Mundus Master in Adapted Physical Activity
• Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (BE), Norges Idrettshogskole (NO), Universita Palacheho v Olomouci (CZ), University of Limerick (IE)

EMM-Nano: Erasmus Mundus Master of Nanoscience and Nanotechnology
• Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (BE), Chalmers University of Technology (SE), Technische Universiteit Delft (NL), Universiteit Leiden (NL), Technische Universität Dresden (DE)

Erasmus Mundus Masters - Journalism and Media within Globalization: The European Perspective
• Aarhus Universitet (DK), University of Wales – Swansea (UK), Amsterdam University (NL), City University London (UK), Hamburg University (DE)

EuMAS - European Masters Course in Aeronautics and Space Technology
• Universität degli Studi di Pisa (IT), Technische Universität München (DE), Universidad Politécnica de Madrid (ES), Ecole Nationale Supérieure de l’Aéronautique et ed l’Espace (FR), Cranfield University (UK)

EUROMIME: Master Européen en Ingénierie des Médias pour l’Education
• Université de Poitiers (FR), Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (ES), Universidade Técnica de Lisboa – Faculdade de Motricidade Humana (PT)

European Master in Global Studies
• Universität Leipzig (DE), London School of Economics and Political Science (UK), Universität Wien (AT), Universität Wroclaw (PL)

GEM: Geo-information Science & Earth Observation for Environmental Modelling and Management
• International Institute for Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation (NL), University of Southampton (UK), Lunds Universitet (SE), Universytet Warszawski (PL)

MA SEN, Special Education Needs
• Roehampton University (UK), Fontys Hogescholen (NL), Univerzita Karlova v Praze (CZ)

Master International "Vintage," Vine, Wine and Terroir Management
• Ecole Supérieure d’Agriculture d’Angers (FR), Technologika Ekpedeitiko Idrima Athinas (GR), Universidad Politécnica de Valencia (ES), Università di Bologna-Facoltà di Agraria (IT), Università Cattolica del Sacro Coure (IT), Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro (PT), Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem (HU)

Master Mundus: Crossways in European Humanities
• Université de Perpignan (FR), Università degli Studi di Bergamo (IT), Universidade Nova de Lisboa (PT), University of Saint Andrews (UK), University of Sheffield (UK)

Master of Applied Ethics
• Linköpings Universitet (SE), Ethiek Instituut – Universiteit Utrecht (NL), Norges Teknisk – Naturvitenskapelige Universitet (NO)

Master of Industrial Mathematics
• Technische Universität Eindhoven (NL), Technische Universität Kaiserslautern (DE), Johannes Kepler Universität Linz (AT)

MESPOM: Environmental Sciences, Policy and Management
• Lund Universitet – Internationella Miljöinstitutet (SE), Közép-Europai Egyetem Alapítvány (HU), University of Manchester (UK), Panepistimio Aigaiou (GR)

MSc in Network and e-Business Centred Computing
• University of Reading (UK), Aristote University of Thessalonikis (GR), Universidad Carlos III (SE), Trinity College Dublin (IE)

SEFOTECH.nut: European MSc Degree in Food Science, Technology and Nutrition
• Katholieke Hogeschool Sint-Lieven (BE), Dublin Institute of Technology (IE), Hochschule Anhalt (DE), Universidade Catolica Portuguesa (PT)

SpaceMaster - Joint European Master in Space Science and Technology
• Luleå Tekniska Universitet (SE), Cranfield University (UK), Czech Technical University (CZ), Helsinki University of Technology (FI), Bavarian Julius-Maximilians Universität Wurzburg (DE), Université Paul Sabatier Toulouse III (FR)

Courses Selected in 2006

AGRIS MUNDUS - Sustainable Development in Agriculture Masters Course
• Centre National d’Etudes Agronomiques des Régions Chaudes (FR), Wageningen Universiteit (NL), Den Kgl. Veterinær og Landbohøjskole (DK), University College Cork (IE), Università degli Studi di Catania (IT), Universidad Politécnica de Madrid (ES)

ATOSIM: Atomic Scale Modelling of Physical, Chemical and Biomolecular Systems
• Ecole Normale Superieure de Lyon (FR), Universiteit van Amsterdam (NL), Università di Roma (IT)

CoDe - Joint European Master in Comparative Local Development
• Università degli Studi di Trento (IT), Corvinus University of Budapest (HU), Univerza a Ljubljani (SI), Universität Regensburg (DE)

EMIN - Economics and Management of Network Industries
• Universidad Pontificada Comillas de Madrid (ES), Université Paris II (FR), Technische Universität Delft (NL)

Erasmus Mundus Masters in Photonics
• Universiteit Gent (BE), Vrije Universiteit Brussel (BE), University of St. Andrews (UK), Heriot-Watt University (UK), Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan (SE)

EUROCULTURE
• Rijksuniversiteit Groningen (NL), Uppsala Universitet (SE), Universidad de Deusto-San Sebastián (ES), Georg-August-Universität Göttingen (DE), Universytet Jagiellonski w Krakowie (PL), Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci (CZ)

Europubhealth - European Public Health Master
• Ecole Nationale de la Sante Publique (FR), Københavns Universitet (DK), Université de Rennes I (FR), Universytet Jagiellonski Collegium Medicum (PL), Escuela Andaluza de Salud Publica (ES), University of Sheffield (UK)

FUSION-EP European Master in Nuclear Fusion Science and Engineering Physics
• Universiteit Gent (BE), Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan (SE), Universidad Complutense de Madrid (ES), Universidad Politécnica de Madrid (ES), Universidad Carlos III de Madrid (ES), Université Henri Poincaré – Nancy I (FR), Universität Stuttgart (DE)

IMIM: International Master in Industrial Management
• Universidad Politécnica de Madrid (ES), Politecnico di Milano (IT), Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan (SE)

M.A. Degree in Economics of International Trade and European Integration
• Universiteit Antwerpen (BE), Vrije Universiteit Brussel (BE), Staffordshire University (UK), Universidad de Cantabria (ES), Università degli Studi di Bari (IT), Université des Sciences et Technologies de Lille (FR), Vysokà škola Ekonomická Praha (CZ)

MA LLL - European Master in Lifelong Learning: Policy and Management
• Danmarks Pedagogiske Universitet (DK), Institute of Education – University of London (UK), Universidad de Deusto (ES)

Master of Bioethics
• Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (BE), Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen (NL), Università degli Studi di Padova (IT)

M.E.S.C.: Materials for Energy Storage and Conversion
• Université Picardie Jules Verne (FR), Université Paul Sabatier Toulouse (FR), Université de Provence – Aix-Marseille I (FR), Politechnika Warszawska (PL), Universidad de Cordoba (ES)

Molecular Nano- and Bio-Photonics for Telecommunications and Biotechnologies
• Ecole Normale Superieure de Cachan (FR), Universidad Complutense de Madrid (ES), Politechnika Wroclawska (PL), Universytet Wrocławski (PL)

MSPME, Masters in Strategic Project Management (European)
• Heriot-Watt University (UK), Politecnico di Milano (IT), Umeå Universitet (SE)

NordSecMob - Master's Programme in Security and Mobile Computing
• Teknillinen Korkeakoulu (FI), Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan (SE), Norges Teknisk-Naturvitenskapelige Universitet (NO), Danmarks Tekniske Universitet (DK), Tartu Ülikool (EE)

PHOENIX EM Dynamics of Health and Welfare
• Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (FR), Linköping Universitet (SE), Universidade de Évora (PT), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (ES)

QEM: Models and Methods of Quantitative Economics
• Université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne (FR), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (ES), Universität Bielefeld (DE), Università Ca’ Foscari di Venezia (IT)

SUTROFOR - Sustainable Tropical Forestry Erasmus Mundus Masters Course
• Den Kgl. Veterinær og Landbohøjskole (DK), University of Wales – Bangor (UK), Technische Universität Dresden (DE), Ecole Nationale du Génie Rural des Eaux et Forêts (FR), Università degli Studi di Padova (IT)

VIBOT - European Master in Vision and Robotics
• Université de Bourgogne (FR), Heriot-Watt University (UK), Universitat de Girona (ES)

WOP-P - Master on Work, Organizational and Personnel Psychology
• Universitat de València (ES), Universitat de Barcelona (ES), Università degli Studi di Bologna (IT), Université René Descartes – Paris 5 (FR), Universidade de Coimbra (PT)
## Appendix C – Erasmus Mundus Third-Country Students per Country

### 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 Academic Years Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and Montenegro</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>948</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The number after each country name indicates the number of students from that country.*
Appendix D – Erasmus Mundus Third-Country Scholars per Country

2004-2005 and 2005-2006 Academic Years Combined

1. China 26
   United States 26
3. Brazil 18
4. Russia 12
5. Australia 9
   India 9
6. South Africa 7
7. Canada 5
8. Argentina 4
9. Chile 3
   Israel 3
   Japan 3
   Ukraine 3
10. Algeria 2
    Georgia 2
    Iran 2
    Malaysia 2
    Mexico 2
    Morocco 2
    South Korea 2
    Vietnam 2
14. Burkina Faso 1
    Colombia 1
    Ecuador 1
    Ethiopia 1
    Ghana 1
    Guatemala 1
    Indonesia 1
    Jordan 1
    Mauritania 1
    Peru 1
    Philippines 1
    Senegal 1
    Singapore 1
    Syria 1
    Thailand 1
    Zaire 1
    Zimbabwe 1

Total: 161
Appendix E – List of the Partnerships Selected under Erasmus Mundus Action 3 and Higher Education Institutions Involved

Partnerships Selected in 2005

CoMundus - European Master of Arts in Media, Communication and Cultural Studies
- Universidade de Sao Paolo (BR), St. Petersburg State University (RU), Arizona State University (US)

EMMAPA - Erasmus Mundus Master in Adapted Physical Activity Partnership
- University of Queensland (AU), University of Virginia (US), University of Stellenbosch (ZA)

Erasmus Mundus Joint Master in Water and Coastal Management
- Instituto Argentino de Oceanografía – Universidad del Sur (AR), Russian State Hydrometeorological University (RU), Universidad EAFIT (CO), Universidad Autónoma de Baja California (MX), University of Miami (US), Fundação Universidade Federal do Rio Grande (BR), Universidad Santa Cecília (BR), Universidade do Vale do Itajaí (BR)

Erasmus Mundus Joint Master in Water and Coastal Management - China
- Nanjing University (CN), Ningbo University (CN), Ocean University of China (CN)

EURO-AQUAE - Euro Hydro-Informatics & Water Management
- National University of Singapore (SG), Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (CH), Indian Institute of Technology of Madras (IN), Universidad Nacional del Litoral (AR)

Global Studies
- Dalhousie University (CA), University of Stellenbosch (ZA), University of California at Santa Barbara (US), Macquarie University (AU)

International Network for Higher Education Studies - INHES
- University of New England (AU), Obirin University (JP)

NOHA Erasmus Mundus Partnership
- York University (CA), Columbia University (US), Université Saint-Joseph de Beyrouth (LB), Universidade de Brasilia (BR), Universitas Gadjah Mada (ID), Universidad Javeriana (CO), University of the Western Cape (ZA), Monash University (AU)

tropEd - International Health Global Partnership
- Schweizerisches Tropeninstitut – Universität Basel (CH), University of Cape Town (ZA), Khon Kaen University (TH), Tongji Medical College – Huazhong University of Science and Technology (CN)

Partnerships Selected in 2006

Agris Mundus - Sustainable Development in Agriculture Masters Course
- Universidad Autonoma Chapingo (MX), Universidad Centro Americana (NI), Groupe des Ecoles EIER-ETSHER (BF), Royal University of Agriculture (KH), Universitas Lampung (ID), Yunnan Agricultural University (CN), University of Sana’a - Water and Environment Centre (YE), Institut Agronomique et Vétérinaire Hassan II (MA)

ALGANT Outbound - Worldwide Training Partnership in Algebra, Geometry & Number Theory
- Centre de Recherches Mathématiques/Institut des Sciences Mathématiques (CA)

CoDe - Joint European Master in Comparative Local Development
- Fakultet Političkih Nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu (CS), Tshwane University of Technology (ZA), Universidade São Tomás de Moçambique (MZ), Univerzitet u Sarajevu (BA)
EMLE - European Master in Law and Economics
- Universitat Haifa (IL)

Quaternaire et Préhistoire
- University of Philippines Diliman (PH)

IMRD - Partnership for Exposure to Rural Development Approaches in China
- Rural Development Institute of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CN), Nanjing Nongye Daxue (CN), Shan dong Agricultural University (CN)

ILeS - International Legal Studies
- Chulalongkorn University (TH), União Educacional do Planalto Central (BR), Symbiosis Society’s Law College (IN), Shanghai Jiao Tong University (CN), Northwest Institute for Political Science and Law (CN)

Master of Bioethics Erasmus Mundus Partnership
- Case Western Reserve University Department of Bioethics (US)

MSc EF - Global Partnership for Master of Science in European Forestry
- Universidade Federal do Paraná (BR), University of KwaZulu-Natal (ZA), Northwest Sci-Tech University of Agriculture and Forestry (CN)

PAGEM: Partnership for Geo-information Science and Earth Observation for Environmental Modelling and Management
- University of New South Wales (AU), University of Sydney (AU), Boston University (US), Tsinghua University (CN)
Appendix F – List of Projects to Enhance Attractiveness under Erasmus Mundus Action 4

Projects Selected in 2004
AMEU – Enhancing the Attractiveness of Masters Programmes at European Universities in Agriculture, the Applied Life Sciences and the Rural Environment
Aquarius - Assuring Quality in Internationalisation of Study Courses and Course Guidance
BalticStudyNet - Network for Promoting and Developing Higher Education in the Baltic Sea Region
EMNEM - European Masters New Evaluation Methodology
European Higher Education for the World - Studies and Promotion
IMN - Development of International Marketing Network to Promote Barents Region Higher Education
LATER: Language Technology Erasmus Mundus Programme

Projects Selected in 2005
EDU-Contact: European Distance Education Contact centre
EXAMPLE: Promotion of Selected Examples of Attractive European Master's Programmes to the Wider World - Interuniversity Consortium for Agriculture and Related Sciences (ICA)
GoNorth! Enhancing Attractiveness of Higher Education in the Circumpolar North
Mundus Musicalis
Network ACTIVE: AIESAD-EADTU Credit Transfer in Virtual and Distance Education
PEHE EACN- Promoting European Higher Education through Educational Advising Centres’ Network
PENTA - Promotion of European Education on Environmental Assessment (EA) for Third Country Audience
Appendix G – Erasmus Mundus Coordinator Questionnaire Results

Section 1 – Information on courses prior to Erasmus Mundus selection

1. Prior to fall 2004, was there a master’s course offered at your university in the discipline covered by the Erasmus Mundus course in which you are involved?
   Yes = 7
   No = 2
   a. Length of the course:
      2 semesters = 3
      3 semesters = 1
      4 semesters = 3
   b. Amount charged in tuition fees per academic year:
      € 0 = 3
      € 100 - € 1,000 = 1
      € 1,000 - € 3,000 = 0
      € 3,000 - € 5,000 = 1
      € 5,000 - € 7,000 = 0
      More than € 7,000 = 1
      No response = 1
      i. Was the tuition fee the same for all students?
         Yes = 5
         No = 2
      ii. Was scholarship assistance available for domestic students attending the course?
         Yes = 3
         No = 4
      iii. Was scholarship assistance available for international students attending the course?
         Yes = 3
         No = 4

2. Was this a course offered solely by your university or a dual/multiple/joint degree with partner institution(s)?
   Single Institution Course = 4
   Dual/Multiple/Joint Course = 3

3. Number of ECTS credits (or equivalent) required to complete the course:
   60 ECTS = 3
   90 ECTS = 1
   120 ECTS = 3

4. What was the role of a thesis in the course?
   Required = 7
   Optional = 0
   Not required = 0

5. What were the course language(s) of instruction?
   Only English required = 4
   English required plus additional required language = 1
   English required plus additional optional language = 2

6. Did the programme make structural use of visiting professors?
   Yes = 5
   No = 1
   No response = 1
7. Did European students in the programme have the possibility to take a period of their studies outside Europe?
   Yes = 3  
   No = 4

8. Did the course have its own website?
   Yes = 6  
   No = 1
   a. In what language(s) was the website available?
      English = 3  
      English plus one additional language(s) = 2  
      Portuguese = 1

9. Did your course conduct any promotional or marketing activities aimed at increasing awareness about the programme and/or recruiting students?
   Yes = 5  
   No = 2
   a. Did your course have a budget specifically for promotional/marketing activities?
      Yes = 3  
      No = 4

10. Did your course assist graduates in finding professional positions related to the field of study?
    Yes = 1  
    No = 6

11. Did your course assist graduates in finding placements in Ph.D. programs in related fields of study?
    Yes = 3  
    No = 4
   a. Did graduates have the possibility to continue to a Ph.D. related to this field of study at your university?
      Yes = 5  
      No = 2

Section 2 – Information on courses during transition to Erasmus Mundus

1. If a master’s course previously existed at your university, what happened to the former course?
   Course Continued = 5  
   Course Developed into the Erasmus Mundus Course = 2  
   Course Discontinued = 0

2. Does the new Erasmus Mundus course use the same admission criteria to select students as the pre-E.M. course?
   Yes = 4  
   No = 3

Section 3 – Information on courses after Erasmus Mundus selection

1. What is the structure of your EM course?
   Dual Degree = 2  
   Joint Degree = 6  
   Multiple Degree = 1
   a. Length of the course:
      2 semesters = 1  
      3 semesters = 2  
      4 semesters = 6
   b. Number of HEIs involved in your EM consortium:
      3 HEIs = 1
4 HEIs = 2
5 HEIs = 2
6 HEIs = 1
7 HEIs = 2
8 HEIs = 1
c. Amount charged in tuition fees to third-country students per academic year:
€ 0 = 0
€ 100 - € 1,000 = 1
€ 1,000 - € 3,000 = 1
€ 3,000 - € 5,000 = 2
€ 5,000 - € 7,000 = 1
More than € 7,000 = 4
i. Is the tuition fee the same for all students?
   Yes = 4
   No = 5
i. Amount charged in tuition fees to European Union students per academic year:
€ 0 = 2
€ 100 - € 1,000 = 0
€ 1,000 - € 3,000 = 3
€ 3,000 - € 5,000 = 1
€ 5,000 - € 7,000 = 1
More than € 7,000 = 1
No response = 1
ii. Is scholarship assistance available to European Union students enrolled in the course?
   Yes = 6
   No = 3
2. Number of ECTS credits (or equivalent) required to complete the course:
   60 ECTS = 1
   90 ECTS = 2
   120 ECTS = 6
3. What is the role of a thesis in the course?
   Required = 9
   Optional = 0
   Not required = 0
4. What are the course language(s) of instruction?
   Only English required = 5
   English required plus additional required language = 0
   English required plus additional optional language = 3
   English optional plus additional required language = 1
5. Do all students begin their studies at the same institution?
   Yes = 3
   No = 6
   a. What are the mobility arrangements for Erasmus Mundus students?
      Students have varying study plans = 8
      Students travel between partner institutions as part of the same cohort = 1
   b. Average number of HEIs students attend during the course:
      2 HEIs = 3
      3 HEIs = 5
      4 HEIs = 1
   c. Have there been students with a period of study at each of the partner institutions?
      Yes = 6
      No = 3
6. What measures are in place to assist students in learning the local language in each country of study?

   Normal university language classes only = 4
   Classes designed for EM students = 1
   Combination of language training options = 4

7. Does the programme make structural use of visiting professors?
   Yes = 7
   No = 1
   No response = 1

8. Does the course have its own website?
   Yes = 9
   No = 0
   a. In what language(s) is the website available?
      English = 7
      English plus one additional language(s) = 2

9. Has your course applied for funding through the Erasmus Mundus Action 3 partnership?
   Yes = 9
   No = 0
   a. Has your course been selected for an Action 3 partnership?
      Yes = 6
      No = 3
      i. Outside an Action 3 partnership, do European students in the course have the possibility to take a period of their studies outside Europe?
         Yes = 3
         No = 6

10. Does your course incur many additional costs administering this Erasmus Mundus course?
    Yes = 9
    No = 0

11. Does your course conduct any promotional or marketing activities aimed at increasing awareness about the programme and/or recruiting students?
    Yes = 8
    No = 1
    a. Does your course have a budget specifically for promotional/marketing activities?
       Yes = 5
       No = 4

12. Does your course assist graduates in finding professional positions related to the field of study?
    Yes = 3
    No = 6

13. Does your course assist graduates in finding placements in Ph.D. programs in related fields of study?
    Yes = 5
    No = 4
    a. Do graduates have the possibility to continue to a Ph.D. related to this field of study at your university?
       Yes = 7
       No = 2
    b. Do any of the other institutions in your consortium currently offer a Ph.D. in this field of study?
       Yes = 7
       No = 2
Section 4 – Student application and student enrolment statistics

1. Approximate ratio of student applications to student places
   a. 2003-2004 Academic Year
      1:1 = 1
      2:1 = 2
      3:1 = 2
      No response = 4
   b. 2004-2005 Academic Year
      2:1 = 5
      3:1 = 2
      4:1 = 1
      No response = 1
   c. 2005-2006 Academic Year
      2:1 = 2
      3:1 = 2
      4:1 = 1
      6:1 = 1
      7:1 = 1
      12:1 = 1
      No response = 1

2. Approximate percentage of female students enrolled in the course
   a. 2003-2004 Academic Year
      0%-20% = 0
      21%-40% = 0
      41%-60% = 3
      61%-80% = 1
      81%-100% = 0
      No response = 3
   b. 2004-2005 Academic Year
      0%-20% = 0
      21%-40% = 3
      41%-60% = 3
      61%-80% = 3
      81%-100% = 0
      No response = 0
   c. 2005-2006 Academic Year
      0%-20% = 0
      21%-40% = 3
      41%-60% = 3
      61%-80% = 3
      81%-100% = 0
      No response = 0

3. Approximate percentage of international students enrolled in the course
   a. 2003-2004 Academic Year
      0%-20% = 1
      21%-40% = 2
      41%-60% = 0
      61%-80% = 0
      81%-100% = 1
      No response = 3
   b. 2004-2005 Academic Year
      0%-20% = 0
      21%-40% = 2
41%-60% = 1
61%-80% = 1
81%-100% = 2
No response = 3
c. 2005-2006 Academic Year
0%-20% = 0
21%-40% = 2
41%-60% = 0
61%-80% = 2
81%-100% = 2
No response = 3
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