

アジア共同学位開発プロジェクト  
調査報告書

提出日：平成24年1月31日

報告者名：Edward Vickers

○訪問先
William Aitchison, European Commission, Brussels Academic Cooperation Association symposium, Brussels
○訪問期間
平成24年1月19日（木）20日（金）
○訪問者
Dr Shimizu, Dr Park, Dr Vickers
○訪問の目的・経緯等
To gather information relating to the European experience in running Erasmus Mundus MA programmes, and concerning the European Commission's future plans for international, collaborative degree programmes.
○日程・活動内容等
We interviewed Mr Aitchison for about two hours in his office at the EU Commission, and attended a whole-day symposium organised by the ACA: 'What's New in Brussels? Recent Developments in European policies and programmes'
○成果
Please see attached report.

**Current EU thinking on international joint MA programmes**  
*A report on two days of meetings in Brussels, 19-20 January, 2012*

On 19 January, Dr Pak, Dr Shimizu and I met Mr William Aitchison (International Policy Officer at the European Commission's Directorate General for Education and Culture), and the following day we attended a symposium, *What's new in Brussels?*, organised by the Academic Cooperation Association (ACA) to brief those attending on the latest developments affecting the EU's programmes in the field of higher education. This report summarises what we learnt over these two days that is of relevance to international exchange and joint programmes at the postgraduate level.

***Assessment of the record of the Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus schemes to date:***

The Erasmus scheme for international exchange of students within the EU, allowing for the transfer of credits gained through study at institutions other than one's home institution, has been running since 1987. There is a widespread perception that this has been one of the most successful of all the EU's programmes. One speaker at the ACA symposium celebrated the fact that 400,000 students from Germany alone had benefited from Erasmus mobility funding since 1987. However, Professor Ulrich Teichler, of Kassel University, argued that, if judged in terms of the objectives that were originally assigned to the programme in 1987, Erasmus had been a complete failure – since it was originally conceived as a 'campaign' to encourage the various EU member states to give greater support to cross-border mobility for their students. In other words, Erasmus was supposed to render itself unnecessary, as 'mobility' amongst university students became an established feature of higher education across Europe. Instead, the Erasmus scheme has become an established 'institution' dedicated to promoting such mobility.

A representative of the European Students' Union, Adam Pall, while supportive of the Erasmus programme generally, was critical of what he termed its 'elitist' nature. According to Pall, most of those who benefit from Erasmus funding come from wealthier backgrounds, and/or countries – partly because the level of financial support that the Erasmus scheme provides is seldom sufficient to cover both tuition and living costs, especially in the richer societies of Western Europe. The (German) Director of ACA, Bernd Wachter, commented that his own daughter, who had used Erasmus funding to go from Germany to spend time studying in a poorer European country, had actually saved herself money. On the other hand, a student from that poorer country who wanted to use Erasmus funding to go and study in Germany would have had to subsidise herself. Pall suggested that Erasmus funding ought to be 'means-tested', so as to encourage more participation by those from poorer socio-economic backgrounds. He also called for higher grants to be given to those in Eastern Europe who wanted to study in the West. ***This issue is one that may affect the Tohoku scheme, since the costs of travelling to and studying in Japan are considerably higher than those of any other East Asian country (except perhaps Hong Kong).***

The Erasmus Mundus scheme – providing scholarships for students studying on jointly-run, international Masters and doctoral courses – is also seen within the European Commission, and amongst many within the academic community, as having been very successful. The scheme, that started in 2004 (with the first programmes offered from 2005) has involved a very large range of universities as partners in EM programmes, including a number of highly prestigious institutions, both within Europe and overseas (UCL, Cambridge University, and many others). Mr. Aitchison acknowledged that 'brand recognition' had been a problem for the scheme early on, but, like many academics who have been involved in running EM programmes, felt that the 'Erasmus Mundus' label was now widely recognized both within Europe and internationally, and that this 'brand recognition' was something worth preserving. So, at least to some extent, the EM programme is fulfilling one of its principal aims – of promoting European higher education around the world. ***For the purposes of attracting the***

*best students and building a reputation, 'brand recognition' is important. In East Asia, the 'Campus Asia' initiative is starting to gain this sort of international recognition. Given the close similarities between this and the Tohoku University programme, perhaps it would be worth exploring (through Monkasho) whether Tohoku's project could be explicitly linked to 'Campus Asia'.*

Mr. Aitchison told us that around 85% of Erasmus Mundus programmes use English as the medium of instruction, although the European Commission takes no official view on which language programmes should use. However, the Commission does encourage programmes to offer students the opportunity to learn the languages of the countries in which they study (for example, the MALL consortium encourages students to take courses in Spanish while they are at Deusto University in Bilbao). ***This is certainly something that joint degree programmes in East Asia can also do.***

We discussed the issue of 'sustainability' with Mr Aitchison – i.e. the capacity of Erasmus Mundus programmes for generating alternative sources of scholarship funding, so as to enable them to continue once funding from the Commission ceases (for those EM programmes that receive a further five years of funding after their initial five-year grants, funding gradually decreases – so that in the final year, they only receive four scholarships from the Commission). The point at which the 'sustainability' of programmes will really be tested has not yet been reached, but it will come within the next two or three years. Mr Aitchison agreed with the suggestion that, while programmes in the sciences or engineering (which make up the vast majority of existing Erasmus Mundus programmes) might well secure alternative funding (because of their often close links with industry), programmes in the humanities and social sciences (including education) would find this much more difficult. However, no solution to this problem was suggested in any of the discussions we witnessed.

### ***Discussions over the future of Erasmus Mundus***

The European Commission is currently in the process of 'bidding' for its budget for the period 2014-2020. Given the economic problems affecting the EU, it has decided not to bid for any increase to its overall budget – instead bidding for exactly the same overall amount as it received for the current seven-year period (2007-13). However, within that static budget, the Commission is proposing a very large increase in spending on education – with corresponding cuts in other areas. This proposal reflects a perception – widely shared amongst Europe's political classes – that education and training are key to the future competitiveness of the EU, and its ability to respond to the economic challenge posed by the emerging economies of Asia. This perception of a link between investment in higher education and economic success is very evident from the priorities stated in the Commission's proposals for research funding ('Horizon 2020'), that talk a lot about 'science', 'technology' and the industrial and social application of research – while hardly mentioning the humanities and social sciences at all (the same emphasis is evident in the current policy discourse of a number of EU member countries, not least the UK).

However, the pattern in the past has been that the Commission rarely gets the budget it bids for, and the budgetary approval process involves negotiations amongst the member states (in the EU Council of Ministers) and debates within the European Parliament. There is therefore, particularly given the current economic climate, a high likelihood that the increase in funding for EU programmes will end up being much less than the Commission hopes for.

### ***'Erasmus for All'***

A key component of the Commission's proposals for education is what is being termed 'Erasmus for All'. This concept (or slogan) involves simplifying and streamlining the EU's many existing educational programmes (Erasmus, Erasmus Mundus, Tempus, Socrates,

Grundtvig...), and attempting to simplify and unify application procedures (which are currently extremely complicated and confusing).

The slogan 'Erasmus for All' also signifies a proposal to broaden access to funding for student mobility in higher education in two ways:

1. by increasing the scope for European students to use EU funding to study outside the EU, and for involving non-EU institutions in collaborative programmes like the Erasmus Mundus;
2. by introducing a European Student Loan scheme (while still maintaining the system of Erasmus grants), aimed at providing further support for EU students who wish to study in another country.

There is concern amongst many academics that politicians, in their desire for the appearance of novelty and 'innovation', may be tempted to abandon the 'Erasmus Mundus' 'brand' – just as that brand is gaining worldwide recognition. However, Mr. Aitchison at the Commission seemed to think it likely that, in the end, the Erasmus Mundus name would be retained. The official at the ACA conference from Germany's higher education funding council (the DAAD) also voiced concerns over the possibility that 'Erasmus for All' may threaten some of the EU's 'sector-specific' programmes that have been popular in Germany (e.g. those targeted specifically at vocational and technical courses and institutions).

Several speakers from the European Commission emphasized that higher education in the contemporary world needed to operate 'globally' rather than focusing simply on the European context – and that this needed to be reflected in policies and programmes promoting student mobility. The Commission's 'Erasmus for All' proposals therefore envisage Erasmus grants and loans becoming 'portable' beyond Europe, potentially enabling European students to use this funding to study in Japan, North America, Australia, etc., while also making Erasmus funding available to non-European students. However, such a move would need to be based on relationships of 'reciprocity' with non-EU countries. For example, Japanese students would only be eligible to apply for Erasmus grants or European Student Loans if similar facilities were made available by the Japanese government to European students wanting to study in Japan. (How this would work in practice remains rather vague at this point.) ***Should the Tohoku programme and 'Campus Asia' be looking to include institutions (and students) beyond East Asia?***

The proposal for a European student loan is potentially controversial, because of the considerable resistance in many European countries to the idea that students should pay for higher education – something that has often been linked with the introduction or extension of student loan schemes (e.g. in England). The Commission has therefore been at pains to emphasise that the proposed loans could be used either for paying for tuition, or for living expenses, or both. Officials also stress that the loan scheme proposal is not intended to push member states towards an (English-style) approach to funding higher education based on user fees, although one official at the ACA event commented that, given the economic crisis affecting Europe, widespread moves towards the introduction of tuition fees were inevitable.

The proposals for the European student loan scheme are largely derived from a report that was commissioned by the European Commission from the London School of Economics in 2009 (reporting in 2011). This recommended that the scheme incorporate some features of the student loan scheme in England – i.e. that graduates only begin to repay the loan once they are earning over a certain amount, and that they pay a relatively low rate of interest. However, it also recommended that repayments should be arranged through the national taxation systems of member states – something that the Commission rejected as impractical. The Commission also decided against proposing the establishment of a new European body charged with administering the loans, because it reckoned that any attempt to establish new pan-European agencies in the current EU political climate would be rejected by the EU

member states. Instead, it is envisaged that the loans will be administered through established banks, student loan agencies and other relevant organizations within each member state. The Commission itself will provide about 5 billion Euros in funding each year, which will then be 'leveraged' through refinancing by the European Investment Bank so as to deliver about 13 billion Euros annually in actual lending to students.

The new loan scheme is intended to address two significant 'gaps' in existing student loan schemes within the EU. Firstly, most national loan or grant schemes do not enable students to draw on funding if they are studying outside their home country (though those of Denmark and Norway, for example, do allow this). Secondly, very few existing loan schemes provide funding to postgraduate (PhD, MA) students – most are targeted at undergraduates. The European Student Loans will be offered primarily (or solely?) to Masters-level students.

### ***Student misgivings about this loan scheme.***

The representative of the European Students Union said that many students were sceptical about the European Student Loan proposal, which they see as promoting debt. He observed that a proposal that envisaged an increase in student debt was particularly concerning given way in which European and other developed country governments have recently ramped up their levels of national debt. In addition to paying off any personal loans they take out, today's students are the ones who will have to service and repay these national debts, through their taxes, for years to come. Students are therefore insistent, among other things, that loans should be limited to a maximum amount, that lenders should not be allowed to require students to provide collateral, and that repayments should be related to earnings. Many other questions will no doubt arise, because so far details of the proposed scheme are unclear.

The ESU representative also noted that the Commission was putting forward this loan scheme proposal because the EU member states have not made good on their own promises to provide funding to support mobility. Indeed, there are signs that some member states may be moving actually to discourage mobility. For example, a junior minister in Holland recently said that the German government should pay for German students studying in Holland. This sort of issue is cropping up in many countries (especially those where the government heavily subsidises students in higher education) – and the question of how to deal with it has not been resolved.

### ***Reflections on the Bologna Process, and its relationship with the promotion of student 'mobility' (e.g. through the Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus programmes)***

Student mobility has often been cited – by the EU Commission and by European governments – as a key lever for bringing about greater 'harmonization' amongst Europe's higher education systems. This harmonization has, in turn, been portrayed as essential to making possible greater 'mobility' of students and scholars. However, Professor Teichler of Kassel University voiced a perception particularly common amongst German academics when he claimed that the real purpose of Bologna was in fact the introduction across Europe (and elsewhere) of short-cycle (3-year) Bachelors degrees on the English model. This move, which in Germany has involved the introduction of separate 'Bachelors' and 'Masters' degree courses in place of the original five-year first degrees (equivalent to a UK Masters), was in Teichler's view primarily a cost-cutting measure on the part of the governments. He claimed that no clear rationale had yet been provided, and no convincing evidence forthcoming, to show how the introduction of Bachelors degrees contributed to the employability of graduates or the overall effectiveness of higher education systems.

The attempts by the German government and others to shorten university degree courses, and hence reduce costs in an era of rising enrolments in higher education, has been controversial in many European countries. Teichler claimed that the highlighting in official circles of

'mobility' as an aim of the Bologna Process was a smokescreen – a tactic for distracting attention from the more fundamental aim of cutting costs. He argued that student mobility, facilitated by the Erasmus scheme, was already rising rapidly in Europe in the years before the 'Bologna Process' was initiated – suggesting that the differences between European higher education systems did not constitute insuperable barriers to credit transfer and the movement of students between systems.

**Teichler's comments suggest that 'harmonization' of the education systems of East Asia should not necessarily be seen as a precondition for the establishment of workable systems of credit transfer and student mobility. However, the creation of a fully-joint degree programme will require considerable harmonization of practices across institutions in different countries.**

**Comments such as Teichler's also needed to be regarded with a certain degree of caution, given that they may reflect a certain resentment amongst German academics at what they see as recent challenges to their longstanding tradition of five-year degrees.**

## *Notes on Brussels meeting and symposium*

Meeting with William Aitchison, European Commission, Brussels – 19/01/12

Erasmus Mundus programmes and other related programmes (Tempus, etc.) under the umbrella of the ‘Lifelong Learning Programme’ are in the process of being reviewed – the Commission has put forward a proposal (‘policy document’) for an **‘Erasmus for All’** programme in the HE field, to be implemented from 2014 (subject to approval by the Council and EU Parliament). Aim is to rationalise existing programmes, and focus ‘Erasmus Mundus’ on MA programmes (funding for PhD and postdoc research to be continued under auspices of Marie Curie).

About 85% of EM programmes operate in English, but the Commission encourages consortia to offer students the opportunity to study the languages of the countries involved.

Aitchison and colleagues feel that the EM has helped in the process of encouraging EU universities to ‘harmonize’.

The vast majority of EM programmes have been in the ‘hard’ sciences

‘Sustainability’ issue – it is those programmes in the sciences, engineering, etc. with a clearer commercial application that have been most successful in raising their own scholarship funding. (And a number of EM programmes built on already-existing programmes, so weren’t dependent on EM funding for their existence.)

Jordi Currell, EU Commission DG Head

Current aims – as reflected in policy paper:

‘Quantity, quality and money’

- despite some concerns about graduate unemployment/under-employment, they believe that it is important for the EU countries to raise participation in HE
- ‘quality’ – want HE institutions to be ‘open to society’ and ‘responsive to the needs of society’ – curricula ‘adapted to the needs of students/society’ – ‘concentrate on the excellence of teaching’ – ‘mobility’: not an end in itself, but a means... (cites the success of Erasmus, established in 1987), linguistic, communication and ‘inter-cultural’ skills, important in today’s ‘changing world’; mobility also influences the openness of institutions; also influences systems – mobility has been key to the establishment of a European HE Area. (he concedes that not all research should be dictated by the ‘needs of industry’)
- money – it is a ‘matter of reality’ in current circumstances that HE needs sources of funding other than public funding
  
- Intend to establish a working group on HE (academics, businessmen, etc.) to look at specific issues – firstly ‘excellence in teaching’
  
- They want to establish a ‘transparent’ system of university rankings
  
- Strengthening of ECTS system

EU Commission budget is set every 7 years. This time, the Commission is not proposing to increase the overall level of the EU budget. Only two areas of expenditure will see an increase: research (40% increase) and education (70%).

To justify this proposed increase, they are taking steps to simplify and streamline education programmes – i.e. bringing together EM, Tempus and the various other HE programmes that currently exist.

Three actions:

- mobility
- partnerships for innovation and quality
- policy reform (international discussion, exchange of best practices)

Because they believe HE needs to be looked at globally, all these 3 ‘actions’ are to be available to partners from all over the world.

Mobility – strengthen the requirements for credit transfer, and open it up to the world (not just the EU)

Degree mobility – what we have today in EM – i.e. joint masters, but again not confined to EU institutions

EU student loan (managed by EIB) – the Commission feels that loans should not replace grants, but they can play an important role, especially in encouraging EU students who have a BA in one member state to pursue an MA in another member state.

Partnerships:

- ‘strategic partnerships’ (current Erasmus partnerships but reinforced)
- ‘enterprise partnerships’
- combine capacity-building (i.e. Tempus) partnerships with moves to encourage mobility within such partnerships (targeted at southern and Eastern EU member states)
- stronger partnerships with non-EU countries

Questions:

- ‘knowledge alliances’ and ‘strategic partnerships’ – sp refer to partnerships *between HE institutions*, whereas ka means long-term partnerships aimed at ‘innovation’, e.g. between HE institutions and industry (he concedes the distinction is not clear-cut)
- university rankings – the Commission wants to develop a more ‘multi-dimensional’ and ‘user-driven’ system, that enables users to generate their own rankings by giving more weight to some dimensions than others; this move reflects a perception that ‘rankings may not reflect reality, but they definitely shape reality’, and that it is in the EU’s interests to play an active role in this ‘shaping’ enterprise; he says that the Commission’s declaration that it intends to do this has already had an impact on the way in which the THE conducts its rankings.
- Although they will be streamlining the administration, applications process etc. for Erasmus, Erasmus Mundus etc. (rolling them up and having one application form, for example), they will maintain separate ‘strands’ of funding – some still targeted specifically at EU students/institutions.
- Some of the complexity in running the EM programme has arisen out of the sources of funding for it – some of which has come out of the EU’s development aid budget. One of the reasons why programmes (e.g. Atlantis, the EU-Canada programme – now cancelled) come and go, or change rapidly with little notice, relates to the way in which some funding comes from other bodies within the EU and is subject to changing priorities in the EU’s external relations; this complexity won’t be entirely eliminated, but they hope to achieve more streamlining by, for example, promoting joint calls
- They want mobility and credit transfer (EU and non-EU) managed through national agencies – though this depends on discussions with those agencies – in order to make things simpler for students and universities (another way of minimizing the multiplicity of application forms).

Siegbert Wuttig, National Agency for EU HE Cooperation (DAAD) (Germany) – *Erasmus for All*

New record levels for mobility in Germany in 2010-11 (more than 30,000 students, the majority under the new BA/MA degree scheme)

2012, 25<sup>th</sup> ann. of Erasmus, will see the 400,000<sup>th</sup> German Erasmus student.

New record level for mobility budget in 2012-13 (58m Euros)

LLL budget – 15.2 billion proposed by the Commission for education and training budget, though they will not get all this. Over 3 billion earmarked for Erasmus. (He seems to be talking about Erasmus rather than Erasmus Mundus.)

(DAAD was set up in 1925)

DAAD is responsible for international HE collaboration by German universities as well as for EU-related programmes. 'DAAD creates synergies between national and EU programmes.'

For the new Erasmus budget, DAAD recommended keeping sectoral programmes, widening the geographical scope, widening it and making it compatible with Bologna, increase mobility of doctoral candidates, take steps to motivating/ 'mobilise' teachers (in order to motivate students), intensify HE-business cooperation, increase quality of mobility (through the Erasmus university charter?), increase flexibility and reduce bureaucracy (easier said than done), strengthen decentralisation, double Erasmus budget...

Germans want to 'keep the sector specificity and the successful brand names!' – we need continuity and evolution...

He notes that the final budget is always much less than the 'bid'. e.g. in 2006, they applied for 13.6 billion, but received 6.97 billion (for 2007-13).

Current debate over whether 'Erasmus for All' is the best name for the new structure.

Erasmus for All proposal – HE is priority (53% of proposed budget), learning mobility = priority (65%)

Questions over extent of funding for programmes in vocational and technical education, schools, etc. (i.e. over whether extent of skew towards HE is justified).

His interpretation of the proposal is that the 'international' dimension is not entirely open – it is targeted at particular countries/groups of countries (e.g. neighbouring countries and selected other regions). This is a result of pressure from the EU Parliament.

Things that will disappear:

- preparatory visits (?)
- intensive programmes
- joint doctoral programmes → Marie Curie
- Scholar mobility (ex-Erasmus Mundus)? (the term 'staff' is used in the proposal, but not clearly defined)

The Commission wants to designate a single national agency in each country to manage these programmes, but the Germans feel that this decision should be left up to the individual member states (Germany currently has four agencies dealing with different aspects of HE, or different sectors – *is this one reason why they are so keen on maintaining 'sector-specificity'?*).

Problem of lead-in time for applications – universities who wish to participate will need to apply for an Erasmus University Charter in early 2013, in order to be eligible to apply for any of the other programmes from 2014 onwards. So when will the application procedures become clear?

Allan Pall (European Students' Union) – Student Expectations (commenting on the Erasmus for All proposal)

ESU = umbrella organisation for students' unions throughout Europe. Also a consultative institution in the Bologna Process.

Highlights the political context within which these discussions are happening, and the general uncertainty that this creates – not least amongst students contemplating their future.

Any increase in the Erasmus budget would come in the context of decreases in national HE budgets throughout the EU. (Erasmus also accounts for a tiny proportion of the EU budget.)

A quarter of students in Erasmus programmes never actually get their credits recognized by their home institutions, despite the use of 'learning agreements' etc. (e.g. because one academic doesn't trust what another academic has written)

Grant amounts need to be increased in view of rising living standards (in the view of the students). Funding remains the biggest barrier for those who don't engage in mobility (i.e. who consider it but decide against it). Dire labour market conditions and the general economic situation is likely to exacerbate the barriers of this kind.

Erasmus is primarily 'accessible to an elite of students that can afford to be mobile', since the grant does not cover all living costs. Also issues of job security at home and lack of incentives for students from lower social-economic backgrounds. At present, grants for those from the East wanting to study in the West are not much bigger than those for Western students wanting to engage in mobility.

Suggest an element of *means testing* or providing top-up grants to those otherwise deterred by financial considerations. Need to incentivise and assist institutions and academics who have to deal with/teach international students.

ESU said they were 'horrified' by the EU's plans for modernizing HE – though they supported the high priority given to education in the 'EU 2020' plan. But it is still the member states that have to provide the vast majority of funding.

He suggests that HE institutions need to adopt a 'more individualised and student-centred learning process'.

Modernization agenda:

- investment too low
- attainment must be increased (benchmark of 40% participation Europe-wide)
- support systems and services (e.g. accommodation) must become more targeted to those who need them most
- more promotion of teaching excellence in the move towards learning outcomes approach
- bring down academic and bureaucratic barriers to mobility
- performance-based funding – is needed, but needs to take account of 'teaching excellence', not just research

Little thought so far on how to make sure attainment of 40% target is achieved in a socially 'equitable' way – gender (still an issue at postgrad level and in academic recruitment), migration, socio-economic context

'U-Multirank' proposal (has the right emphasis) – need to 'democratise information about higher education'. Could be complemented by Europe-wide graduate surveys.

Loans for student mobility – many students are sceptical, and see this as promoting debt. Particularly concerning given the context in which European and other developed country governments have ramped up their own debt, and the amounts that have to be paid in servicing this (and which students will have to continue paying for years to come – through their taxes).

They want loans to be limited in maximum sides, there should not be collateral, repayments should be related to earnings, etc. – a lot of questions remain, because so far details of the proposed scheme are unclear.

The Commission is putting forward this loan scheme proposal because member states have not made good on their own promises to provide funding to support mobility. Recently a junior minister in Holland said that the German government should pay for German students studying in Holland. This sort of issue is cropping up in many countries (where the government funds HE students) – and the question of how to deal with it has not been resolved. *Signs of a 'new isolationism' in Europe – with some countries trying to limit flows of students? (comment from Bernd Wachter). He also cites example of his daughter who moved from an expensive city to an unexpensive one within Europe and saved money – whereas anyone moving in the opposite direction would be disadvantaged.*

- Foreign students are often isolated within universities – often live separately from domestic students, and are not integrated in the life of the university
- Curricula remain 'stuck in the age of nationalism'
- International students are usually not involved in quality assurance processes (international students are generally 'passive' – they are not actively involved in university life/processes)

He objects to the name 'Erasmus for All', because – not least because of funding constraints – it is not going to be 'for All'. Erasmus on its own is not enough.

[www.esu-online.org](http://www.esu-online.org)

**Comments:**

Need to train academics in how to draft 'learning outcomes' (and what they are), and how to measure them – so as to create the transparency that is necessary for student mobility and credit transfer (but the practical difficulties in doing this – in terms of academics' time – are considerable).