



European Communities

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

SESSION DOCUMENTS

English Edition

14 November 1990

A3-0305/90

REPORT

of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, the Media
and Sport

on the European dimension at university level, with
particular reference to teacher and student mobility

Rapporteur: Mrs Anna HERMANS

DOC_EN\RR\99003

PE 143.155/fin.
Or. FR

A Series: Reports - B Series: Motions for Resolutions, Oral Questions - C Series: Documents received from other Institutions (e.g. Consultations)

*	= Consultation procedure requiring a single reading	**II	= Cooperation procedure (second reading) which requires the votes of a majority of the current Members of Parliament for rejection or amendment
I	= Cooperation procedure (first reading)	*	= Parliamentary assent which requires the votes of a majority of the current Members of Parliament

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
Procedural page	3
A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION	4
B. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	11
Annex: Petition No. 179/88	18

By letter of 5 September 1989 the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, the Media and Sport requested authorization to draw up a report on the European dimension at university level, with particular reference to teacher and student mobility.

At the sitting of 9 October 1989 the President of the European Parliament announced that the committee had been authorized to draw up a report on this subject.

At its meeting of 31 October 1989 the committee appointed Mrs Hermans rapporteur.

At its meeting of 21 September 1989 the committee had decided to incorporate in its report Petition No. 179/88 which had been referred to it.

At its meetings of 30 January, 18 April, 29 May (public hearing), 19 September and 29 October 1990 the committee considered the draft report.

At the last meeting it adopted the motion for a resolution unanimously.

The following took part in the vote: Barzanti, chairman; Simoeni, first vice-chairman; Banotti, third vice-chairman; Hermans, rapporteur; Canavarro (for Fayot), Coimbra Martins, Dührkop-Dührkop, Elliott, Estgen (for Fontaine), Galle, Gröner, Gil-Robles Gil-Delgado (for Gangoiti Llaguno), Harrison (for Buchan), Hoppenstedt (for Oostlander), Larive, Maibaum (for Gallo), Münch and Schwartzenberg (for Mebrak-Zaidi).

The report was tabled on 13 November 1990.

The deadline for tabling amendments will appear on the draft agenda for the part-session at which the report is to be considered.

The Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, the Media and Sport hereby submits to the European Parliament the following motion for a resolution, together with explanatory statement:

A

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

on the European dimension at university level, with particular reference to teacher and student mobility

The European Parliament,

- having regard to Rule 121 of its Rules of Procedure,
- having regard to Petition No. 179/88 by the INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF DOCTORATE-HOLDERS FROM THE SORBONNE on the official recognition in the countries of the European Community of doctorates in economics, law, political science and the humanities,
- having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, and in particular Articles 49, 57 and 128 thereof,
- having regard to the Single European Act,
- having regard to the resolution of the Council of Ministers of Education of 6 June 1974 on cooperation in the field of education¹ and to the resolution of 9 February 1976 on an action programme in the field of education²,
- having regard to the Council decisions of
 - * 24 July 1986, adopting the programme on cooperation between universities and enterprises regarding training in the field of technology (COMETT)³,
 - * 15 June 1987, adopting the European Community action scheme for the mobility of university students (ERASMUS)⁴,
 - * 16 December 1988, adopting the second phase of the programme on cooperation between universities and industry regarding training in the field of technology (COMETT II) (1990-1994)⁵,
 - * 28 July 1989, establishing an action programme to promote foreign language competence in the European Community (LINGUA)⁶,
 - * 14 December 1989, amending Decision 87/327/EEC adopting the European Community action scheme for the mobility of university students (ERASMUS)⁷,

¹ OJ No. C 98, p.2, 20.8.1974

² OJ No. C 38, p.1, 19.2.1976

³ OJ No. L 222, p.17, 8.8.1986

⁴ OJ No. L 166, p.20, 25.6.1987

⁵ OJ No. L 13, p.28, 17.1.1989

⁶ OJ No. L 239, p.24, 16.8.1989

⁷ OJ No. L 395, p.23, 30.12.1989

- * 23 April 1990, concerning the framework programme of Community activities in the field of research and technological development (1990-1994)⁸,
- having regard to the Commission decision of 16 June 1989 on the Jean Monnet programme⁹,
- having regard to the opinion on the proposal for a Council decision establishing a trans-European mobility scheme for university studies (TEMPUS)¹⁰,
- having regard to Council Directive 89/48/EEC of 21 December 1988 on a general system for the recognition of higher education diplomas awarded on completion of professional education and training of at least three years' duration¹¹ and the proposal for a directive on a second general system¹²,
- having regard to the Council directive of 28 June 1990 on the right of residence¹³,
- having regard to the conclusions of the Council and the ministers for education meeting within the Council of 6 October 1989 on cooperation and Community policy in the field of education in the run-up to 1993 (89/C277/05)¹⁴,
- having regard to the conclusions of the Council and the ministers for education meeting within the Council of 14 December 1989 on relations with Central and Eastern European countries in the field of education and training (90/C27/04)¹⁵,
- having regard to its resolutions on:
 - * a Community programme in the field of education¹⁶,
 - * recognition of diplomas (Schwencke report)¹⁷,
 - * higher education and the development of cooperation between higher education establishments (Pery report)¹⁸,
 - * encouraging teacher mobility in the European Community (Münch report)¹⁹,
 - * the mobility of university students (Coimbra Martins report)²⁰,

⁸ OJ No. L 117, 8.5.1990, p. 28

⁹ SEC(89) 1028/2 of 16 June 1989 and OJ No. C 308, 7.12.1989

¹⁰ OJ No. C 168, 10.7.1990, p. 10

¹¹ OJ No. L 19, 24.1.1989, p. 16

¹² OJ No. C 263, 16.10.1989

¹³ OJ No. L 180, 13.7.1990, p. 26

¹⁴ OJ No. C 277, 31.10.1989, p. 5

¹⁵ OJ No. C 27, 6.2.1990, p. 7

¹⁶ OJ No. C 87, 5.4.1982, p. 89

¹⁷ OJ No. C 104, 16.4.1984, p. 64

¹⁸ OJ No. C 104, 16.4.1984

¹⁹ OJ No. C 297, 24.11.1986, p. 158

²⁰ OJ No. C 148, 16.6.1986, p. 86

- * the European dimension in schools (Lemass report)²¹,
 - * the teaching of Community languages in the European Community (Garriga-Polledo report)²²,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, the Media and Sport (A3-0305/90),
- A. whereas recent economic and social changes, and the unification of Europe in particular, are presenting higher education with new challenges,
 - B. whereas, given the increasing length of time that people are spending in full-time education, higher education is playing an increasingly important role in the training of the future workforce,
 - C. whereas the measures taken by the Community are aimed at promoting economic and social cohesion and contributing to the development of a 'European dimension' in the training and education of European citizens,
 - D. whereas the Community's educational projects must be based on the principle of subsidiarity, whereas the Community must give these projects, whether developed at national or regional level, an additional European dimension, and whereas the impact of these projects is largely determined by the importance attached by individual Member States and regions to the European dimension in education,
 - E. whereas the assessment reports on programmes to encourage mobility within the Community indicate both success and a number of shortcomings and whereas the results may be used to develop an optimization strategy,
 - F. whereas participation by students and lecturers in the various mobility programmes is very uneven, with the result that particular regions, disciplines and/or social groups, and even certain universities and colleges, are represented to a greater extent than is justified by the share of their total population of students and lecturers,
 - G. whereas a knowledge of foreign languages is of great importance for productive exchanges; whereas knowledge of foreign languages is inadequate at present; whereas promoting knowledge of the minority languages should be a major Community objective,
 - H. whereas recognition by educational establishments of periods of study spent abroad is indispensable if the aims of the exchange programmes are to be realized,
 - I. whereas greater coherence and firmer organizational links between research and educational initiatives would enhance the effectiveness of European initiatives in the field of higher education,

²¹ OJ No. C 345, 21.12.1987, p. 212

²² OJ No. C 309, 5.12.1988, p. 427

- J. whereas the strained accommodation situation in many university towns is a serious obstacle to the exchange of students and lecturers, and the EC and Member States should make a concerted effort to find ways and means of remedying this situation,
1. Welcomes the success of current Community programmes aimed at promoting the European dimension and, above all, the mobility of students and teachers/lecturers in higher education (ERASMUS, COMETT, LINGUA, TEMPUS), as these
 - represent a Community-wide effort to provide the best possible training for the future European workforce;
 - prepare students in higher education directly for the completion of the internal market and enable them to experience some of the effects (economic, social and cultural) of European unification;
 - make an active contribution to the development of a sense of European citizenship, through the education and training and the life experience gained in the student's country of origin and the host country;
 2. Rejects the use of the term 'university' as a general term for all establishments at post-secondary level and advocates the use of the term 'higher education establishments', to include both universities and other higher education establishments;
 3. Stresses the importance of more research in preparation for policy concerning the various systems of higher education, their comparability and possible changes in function, and the related systems of primary and secondary education, whose purpose is to give young people the best possible preparation - and that includes a European outlook - for further education and training;
 4. Proposes that the Commission draw up an optimization strategy to eliminate the shortcomings of current programmes and include them in a multiannual general framework programme for the European dimension in higher education, consisting of various programmes and specific actions administered by a single consultative committee;
 5. Proposes that the additional social measures should include a study of the scope for the future financial involvement of the ESF with a view to overcoming the shortage of student accommodation and, in this way, improving practical mobility;
 6. Considers that a strategy for the optimization of the mobility programmes must give priority to measures designed to:
 - increase the available budget to enable the programmes to match the interest and needs expressed and to achieve the planned 10% exchange level within a short period of time;
 - even out imbalances in participation in terms of regions, disciplines, male and female students and social background;

- step up consultation with the Member States and regions to reach a greater degree of consensus as regards the size of the grants awarded to students;
 - adopt additional social measures to encourage participation by students from lower social classes, e.g. new experimental initiatives such as the provision of free meals;
 - simplify administration and policy management at the various levels of planning and implementation of the programmes (institutions, Member States, EC) to improve coordination and integration and to bring forward the timetable for the approval of the programmes so that their administration can be dovetailed more effectively with the structure of the academic year;
 - monitor the quality of the programmes and the degree of participation;
7. Draws particular attention to establishments and courses which, by tradition, have hitherto had few international contacts, if any (generally short-term higher education courses), yet which, in view of the free movement of persons and the consequences of the international market in general, are faced with the task of preparing their students for international contacts; advocates special policy measures and assistance for these establishments;
 8. Stresses how important knowledge of foreign languages is if students are to benefit from participation in mobility programmes; calls on the Commission, therefore, to expand the LINGUA programme and take appropriate measures to encourage the Member States to improve the teaching of foreign languages at secondary school level and foster the study of minority official Community languages, which would promote mobility whenever the Member States where these languages are spoken are concerned;
 9. Calls on the Commission to introduce, along the lines of the European youth passport, a European students' passport which would enable students to participate in cultural life and have access, with no bureaucratic barriers, to higher education grants under the same conditions as students from the host country;
 10. Argues that recognition by educational establishments of curricular components studied in the host country is essential if programmes involving cooperation agreements are to work, and advocates that such recognition be given in the near future and that obstacles in this field be eliminated (differences in the content and structure of the programme components, differences in systems of assessment and in the conditions applying to the course);
 11. Advocates providing all institutions involved with appropriate information concerning the mobility programmes, by stepping up this effort in the outlying and least-favoured regions of the European Community, and is convinced that training policy experts in the programmes and the international dimension of higher education in general will help to ensure the smooth long-term running of the policymaking process at Member State, regional and European institutional level;

12. Considers that the insight into the content and structure of educational courses gained from the mobility programmes constitutes an excellent basis for further consultation and planning with regard to higher education in Europe, and hopes that all the groups concerned (policymakers, teachers and students) will have a say when future policies are planned;
13. Calls on the Commission to set up a committee of experts on which both students and lecturers would be represented with a view to optimizing the mobility programmes;
14. Stresses that a framework programme relating to the European dimension in higher education must not be restricted to those taking part in mobility programmes, nor must it aim for a 10% participation rate, as planned; rather, preparation for European citizenship and a European-oriented education must be a right for all European citizens, including all students in higher education;
15. Stresses that Community training and exchange programmes must have a European dimension and must offer students and teachers from third countries the opportunity to undergo training;
16. Proposes, therefore, in line with the Jean Monnet action programme, that more opportunities be opened up for introducing European themes into the curriculum, and that educational establishments be encouraged to make this European orientation a permanent feature of their courses;
17. Regrets the present fragmentation of
 - higher education programmes,
 - programmes geared directly to higher education and programmes such as FORCE and EUROTECHNET in which higher education can participate,
 - educational and research programmes with virtually identical objectives and target groups (e.g. postgraduates - ERASMUS, young researchers - COMETT, young researchers - DELTA);
18. Calls on the Commission to draw up proposals aimed at establishing consultation and coordination between the various policy units concerned with policy initiatives in the field of education, and urges, in particular, that structural links in the organization of teaching and research programmes in higher education be developed;
19. Considers it important that the European dimension, as a facet of the internationalization of higher education, be promoted as a permanent component of higher education policy, and in this connection welcomes the exchange programmes with the EFTA member states and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe;
20. Proposes that the European dimension be incorporated both in conventional curricula and in a number of new higher education initiatives (retraining, in-service training, open universities, 'summer universities' and distance learning);

21. Points out that many European higher education establishments have played an important role in relations with the ACP countries and in development aid to Asia and Latin America, and hopes that these establishments can continue to play this role, perhaps by determining the appropriate tasks for primary, vocational and higher education in aid projects, as proposed in Lomé IV, inter alia, and by supporting the measures taken, for example, by the Coimbra group;
22. Agrees with the application of the subsidiarity principle to the education sector, but specifically stresses that this principle may not be interpreted as a formal obstacle which makes a European approach to education impossible; urges, therefore, that the division of powers be further analysed in order to arrive at a clear definition of the phrase 'far-reaching competences will remain with the Member States' (para. 9 of the Giscard d'Estaing resolution), and stresses the right of the Commission to launch initiatives in this area;
23. Underlines the importance of an adaptation of the Treaty of Rome - respecting the subsidiarity rule - in order to provide a legal basis for the development of a European dimension in the education field, and for a reinforcement of Community competence in the field of vocational training;
24. Calls on the Member States to pursue a more active policy on the European dimension in higher education and reminds the competent authorities of their responsibility to prepare their citizens for European unification through education and training, and in particular through adequate vocational qualifications and extensive sociocultural education as European citizens;
25. Calls on the Commission, in consultation with the Member States, to draw up proposals for convergent innovation processes to introduce a permanent European element into higher education and to improve the quality and organization of higher education at international level;
26. Calls on the universities, while recognizing their autonomy, to offer all students general studies courses in European history and cultural history, to make European law compulsory in law faculties, and to offer a wider range of languages;
27. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission and the Member State governments.

B
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The European dimension at university level, with particular reference to teacher and student mobility

I. INTRODUCTION

Although education is not, strictly speaking, the responsibility of the Community, but rather of the Member States and, in certain countries, their constituent states, the European Parliament has taken a number of initiatives in this field. As early as 1969 Parliament adopted a resolution on the Europeanization of the universities²³. Since the first direct elections in 1979, above all, it has not only concerned itself with education and vocational training, but also made attempts to foster a European dimension at Community level. Parliament has regularly voiced its concern at the fact that the Member States are now some way behind the US and Japan in scientific and economic terms, and declared that the only remedy is for scientists, academics and students to improve their performance in research and education through cooperation at Community level. In its resolutions on this subject, Parliament has also stressed the need for more extensive cooperation to facilitate the exchange of students, academics and scientists between the Member States.

The Commission has now set up a number of projects and taken measures which should fulfil Parliament's wishes.

Radical changes in our society are confronting education with new challenges. Though European unification is only one of these, it represents a highly significant perspective with which education - particularly higher education - is coming to terms.

II.1. The distinction between universities and higher education establishments

The EC currently has some 3500 higher education establishments, providing educational facilities for some 6 500 000 students. There are huge differences in the type, duration and quality of education, the organizational structure of the establishments, the administration and the degree of government control. All the Member States have universities and other higher educational establishments; all of them offer longer course leading to high, theory-oriented qualifications on the one hand, and shorter courses leading to a more practical qualification on the other. However, the distinction between 'short' and 'long' course and the role played by 'theory' and 'practice' in the various courses no longer coincides - if it ever did - with the distinction between universities and other higher education establishments.

The dividing line between the universities, the result of historical development, with their specific characteristics in the field of education and research, and the other higher education establishments, whose main task it to

²³ OJ No. C 139, 28.10.1969, p. 14

provide vocational training courses, often of a technical nature, is no longer a clear one.

The term 'higher education establishment' will therefore be used throughout this report to refer to both universities and other educational establishments at post-secondary level.

2. Falling student numbers?

A few years ago it was predicted that the number of students in higher education would fall dramatically as a result of the decrease in the birth rate. Current analyses, however, show the difficulty of making such predictions. Higher education is still attracting new groups of potential students. This is due largely to the increase in the length of compulsory schooling and the democratization of education, which are still having an impact, though to a limited extent only. While numbers of male students have stagnated, the number of female students in higher education continues to increase. In 1985-1986, 40% of young people in the 19-24 age group were in full-time higher education; of this percentage, 21% were male and 19% female (source: Eurostat). It should, however, be noted that the total percentage varied considerably from one Member State to another, and that there were large discrepancies in the disciplines chosen by male and female students. In addition to the age group coming into higher education straight from secondary school, there has been an increase in numbers of mature students: adults who decide to interrupt or break off their career to give their education a 'second chance'. It would seem, then, that higher education is not an immediate cause for concern as regards future student numbers.

3. New tasks and problems

Traditionally, higher education has had the following tasks:

- educating students for the professions;
- providing future senior executives with an all-round socio-cultural education;
- conducting scientific and academic research, and using this as an immediate basis for passing on knowledge and skills (mainly in the universities);
- illuminating, interpreting and influencing - directly or indirectly- social currents in research and education.

Over the next few years the student population will probably be larger than ever before. The students will be heterogeneous as regards their age and social and cultural background. This mixed body of students, along with the recent economic, socio-cultural and political changes, will confront higher education with new challenges, including the following:

- maintaining the quality of education;
- improving teacher training and the status of the teaching profession;
- adjusting the organizational structure of education to take account of new European factors;
- internationalization.

III. EC higher education policy

Community higher education policy is founded on respect for the diversity of education systems in the various Member States. EC educational policy aims to avoid unnecessary differences which would hinder the free movement of individuals, by bringing the various education systems into contact with one another and encouraging cooperation between them. This does not imply, however, that the aim is to achieve uniformity in educational structures or programmes. The motto is not harmonization, but convergence (SEC(89) 2051 final, 13 December 1989).

The word 'education' does not appear as such in the European Treaties. It will remain largely the responsibility of the individual Member States, as recently stressed by Parliament in the Giscard d'Estaing report on subsidiarity (Doc. A3-163/90, paragraph 9). The subsidiarity principle, then, must be interpreted in a dynamic and positive fashion (A3-63/90). Under the legal terms of the EC Treaty, education policy can only be economic in nature: promotion of the internal market policy is used as the justification for programmes such as ERASMUS, LINGUA and COMETT. However, there are policy documents which set out a broader vision of education. One of the aims mentioned in Guidelines for the Medium Term: 1989-1992 (COM(89) 236 final) is to develop a Europe of quality and solidarity where people's skills, creativity and dynamism are fostered and equal opportunities promoted. An explicit priority is the development of European citizenship and common democratic values. Achieving these aims calls for an outlook which goes beyond purely economic considerations.

This report will first consider the programmes to promote teacher and student mobility.

1. ERASMUS

The ERASMUS programme is currently the most important facet of Community activity in the field of higher education. One of its aims is to encourage student mobility, through four main activities. Initially the sum of 85 m ECU was earmarked for ERASMUS, which was approved on 15 June 1987 after long and difficult negotiations.

On 13 December 1989 the Commission published a report on the experience acquired during the implementation of ERASMUS over the period 1987-1989 (SEC(89) 2051 final). The report states that the programme has had a considerable impact on higher education in Europe and that it has been greeted with enthusiasm, as evidenced by the fact that interest in each of its activities far exceeded the funds available. Cooperation between higher education establishments has been improved, and one of ERASMUS's main achievements has been to reveal shortcomings in national policy and in the policy of the educational establishments concerned. In addition, the programme has done much to foster contacts and to facilitate comparison between the different systems and establishments.

The Commission's report also refers to the main problems which arose in the implementation of the programme.

However, there are a number of disparities within the general increase in participation. Firstly, mobility is concentrated in certain Member States. In addition to the low participation in some regions, there are a number of disciplines which have been left out of the programmes to a large extent, such as art, medicine and teacher training.

Students who have taken part in one of the programmes are generally very satisfied, and also stress (to a greater extent than the teachers) the importance of learning another language and gaining life experience. However, ERASMUS is seen as a programme for a social elite in many Member States, owing to the limited grants available and the socio-cultural obstacles which hinder participation. It should, however, be noted that the size of the grants available varies widely from one Member State to another - a situation which requires urgent reform.

On 14 December 1989 the Council approved an ERASMUS II programme for the period 1990-1994; a sum exceeding 192 m ECU was earmarked for the first three years. The new programme represents a significant advance on its predecessor in that it has been expanded to include the EFTA countries and the opportunity to take part in mobility programmes has been extended to postgraduates.

2. TEMPUS

In the light of the momentous events in Eastern Europe, the Community has decided to set up an exchange programme for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe on the same lines as the ERASMUS programme (with a budget of 107 m ECU for the period 1990-1992).

3. COMETT

The aim of the COMETT programme is to strengthen technological and industrial cooperation at Community level, in order to promote cooperation between the universities and industry as regards training and education in the field of technology.

COMETT, which was approved by the Council on 24 July 1986, makes provision for traineeships/work experience in companies in other Member States; this is to be accompanied by improvements in students' basic training and in-service training for managerial staff. COMETT covers transnational in-service training projects organized jointly by higher education establishments and companies, the exchange of information and experience and the dissemination of information. On 16 December 1988 the Council approved the second stage of COMETT (COMETT II), which will run from 1990 to 1994. 200 m ECU were earmarked for this programme.

It should be noted that COMETT is also being extended to include the EFTA states, and the countries of Eastern and Central Europe (on the basis of the TEMPUS programme).

As the main purpose of COMETT is to shore up the scientific and technological foundations of industry in Europe through education, there is clearly a need for stronger structural links between COMETT and programmes for research and technology (such as ESPRIT).

4. LINGUA

Since 1976 the EC has concerned itself with foreign language teaching and the teaching of language and culture to the children of migrant workers.

The aim of the LINGUA programme is to improve knowledge of foreign languages among students and teachers in the EC at both secondary and tertiary level. LINGUA was proposed by the Commission in December 1988 and approved by the Council on 28 July 1989 for a five-year period, with a budget of 200 m ECU. It is an essential adjunct to the ERASMUS programme, as students wishing to study in another Member State are often faced with language problems.

5. Mutual recognition of qualifications and free movement

A directive adopted on 21 December 1988 provides for the recognition of vocational qualifications and training involving at least three years of higher education, for all courses not covered by a specific directive, such as medicine. A directive on the recognition of higher vocational qualifications and courses involving less than three years' study - i.e., all secondary, supplementary and technical courses and the like - was also adopted. Such recognition is based on mutual confidence in the vocational qualifications awarded in the different Member States, and presupposes a certain comparability between the courses in question. At first sight these directives would seem to be milestones on the road to the free movement of individuals and the opportunity to pursue one's career in a Member State other than the one which awarded the vocational qualification.

However, a good deal of research and consultation will no doubt be needed before such freedom of movement becomes routine. It should be noted that, in cases where there seem to be significant differences between courses, the Member States are entitled to ask candidates to provide additional evidence (competence tests, proof of professional experience). Clearly, the principle of mutual confidence can only be applied once there is more knowledge of the comparative levels of the various education systems, and, probably, once efforts are made to ensure greater comparability of courses.

It seems likely that the free movement of individuals will also crop up in another form in future - students who choose to study abroad outside the framework of the Community programmes. This implies that there is a need to examine and compare the conditions for admission to higher education in the various Member States. The protection of certain courses through restricted entry conditions must not lead to a permanent stream of students to Member States which do not use the entrance examination system. Consideration should also be given to common policies in this field.

6. The European dimension in curricula and research

On 23 April 1990 the Council adopted a framework programme in the field of research and technological development (1990-1994) with a budget of 5700 m ECU. The programme includes projects in the field of activating technologies, management of natural resources and the use of intellectual resources. The training of highly qualified staff to work in research and technology belongs to the latter category. This is preferably to be achieved through training and mobility for researchers and the development of networks of laboratories. In this way postgraduates will have the option of mobility.

IV. Items to be taken into account in future policy

This report focuses on the European dimension in higher education and, in particular, the mobility of students and teachers/lecturers.

It will be clear that these policy objectives have yet to be realized. Policy must be optimized in the light of the changing function of higher education, among other factors. Strategy must focus on the following areas:

1. Optimization of the mobility programmes

- Expansion of the programmes;
- Monitoring of the quality of the programmes on offer;
- Guiding the distribution of the programmes over the various regions and disciplines;
- Improving knowledge of foreign languages;
- Simplification of administration;
- Promotion of automatic recognition of academic qualifications;
- Longer-term planning of programmes;
- Counselling and training of experts;
- Socio-cultural counselling and encouragement for students from the lower social strata;
- Approximation of the grants provided in the various states;
- Extra measures to solve housing problems;
- A cost-benefit analysis of the programmes.

2. The European dimension: the outlook for education and research

Even outside the specific programmes discussed above, the European dimension must be incorporated into the courses of all educational establishments and the education of all students. Openness and international and multi-cultural communication must be firmly integrated in higher education policy. Many educational establishments are altering existing patterns of tuition and research in order flexibly to take account of the 1992 perspective and the move towards European unification. Various establishments have set up networks for cooperation and exchange on their own initiative. This is, perhaps, the best way of incorporating European themes dynamically into the education, research and training of students.

There are many more establishments which, owing to their historical background, have inhibitions about taking part in European education programmes. However, a European outlook could play an important role in motivating and dynamizing their students and lecturers as well. They, too, must become more Europe-oriented through planned processes of innovation and accompanying measures. Such a development may be encouraged in the following ways:

- Coordination between EC research and education programmes;
- European subjects on the curricula;
- Providing information and advice for establishments which have hitherto had few international contacts, if any;
- Developing the European dimension in new areas of higher education (retraining, in-service training, continuing education);
- Structuring existing programmes within a general plan for the European dimension in higher education.

3. The European dimension: a constant policy factor

Through its education programmes, the EC has confronted young people with the European dimension in their education and future professional outlook - and all this in a short space of time. Moreover, the programmes have had a considerable impact on the general public by influencing public opinion. It is partly as a result of these programmes that educational establishments have started to take a more European outlook. Policy must be maintained at European level and in the educational establishments themselves, but now requires - even more than before - an active policy on the part of the Member States. If education policy is to remain largely the responsibility of the Member States, they must - provided that they consider it important for their students to be educated with a European outlook - find ways of incorporating a European dimension in their education systems. These include:

- training and employing experts on European policy in the administration of the Member States (or in regional administration, if education policy is decided at that level);
- active counselling policy for potential participants in EC programmes;
- investigation and clarification of the education systems of the various Member States;
- a survey of the implementation of the directives on the free movement of students and the equivalence of qualifications;
- convergence for innovative processes regarding the comparability of students' educational background at secondary level and courses in higher educations;
- emphasis on the European dimension at all educational levels.

SUBJECT: Petition No. 179/88 by the International Association of Doctorate Holders from the Sorbonne (French) on official recognition in the countries of the European Communities of doctorates in economics, law, political science and the humanities.

I. Summary of the petition

The petitioners call for automatic recognition of doctorates in the above-mentioned fields and for access to the title of 'doctor' to be made identical in each country rather than being subject to the internal regulations of each university.

II. Declared admissible on 19-20 September 1988; the Commission was asked to supply information (Rule 129(3) of the Rules of Procedure).

III. The Commission's reply was received on 1 June 1989.

As an academic title that indicates the bearer's proficiency in research or his high level of scientific achievement, a doctorate is granted by establishments of higher education.

Studies leading to a doctorate are regulated at national level and vary from one Member State to another in standard, duration, nature, subject matter, etc.

In most Member States, the universities are responsible for the academic recognition of foreign academic qualifications. The universities' autonomy allows them to conclude inter-university agreements that may in fact lead to harmonization of procedures while safeguarding each institution's individuality.

The idea of putting a European label on common doctorates was discussed by the Council of Europe's Standing Conference on University Problems (CC-PU) on 22 to 24 March 1988.