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Preface and acknowledgements

This final report on the second phase of the Tempus programme (1994-2000) presents the results of an assignment conducted for DG EAC by a team of experts from ECORYS Netherlands BV, formerly known as the Netherlands Economic Institute, and NEI Moscow.

The opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views held by the European Commission services responsible for Tempus.

The objective of the assignment was to provide: "intellectual services (a report) that will serve the Commission in formulating a well founded judgement on the extent to which the second phase of the Tempus programme has produced the outcomes expected".

Two Council Decisions form the legal base for the second phase of the Tempus programme. Council Decision 93/246/EEC extended Tempus for the period July 1994-June 1998. During this period Tempus is referred to as Tempus II. Council Decision 96/663/EC extended Tempus for a further two years from July 1994 to June 2000. This additional period of two years is referred to as Tempus II bis.

The first chapter of the report serves as an introduction to the subject of the study. It provides an overview of the main features and evolution of the programme (Tempus II and Tempus II bis) and provides statistical data on country coverage and types of activities. The second chapter describes the approach and the methodology used in the report for data collection, analysis and for testing the conclusions arrived at by the evaluation team. It sets out the purpose of the study, the key issues addressed and covers the scope and limitations of the study and the methodology used. In chapters 3-8 the eight main expected outcomes of the second phase of the Tempus programme are analysed. In each chapter the findings of the data collection are presented as well as the analysis and the conclusions drawn, and where appropriate, information is given on the activities and intermediate results of the assignment during the period October 2002 - July 2003.

Chapter 9 looks at management aspects and in the last chapter of the study, the conclusions are presented. In addition to the above, the report contains a fairly elaborate executive summary, which is presented in the beginning of the report after the table of contents. Finally the report contains a number of appendices that provide supplementary information.

Pursuant to the guidance provided in the terms of reference, the evaluation team has designed a methodology, which does not duplicate but rather builds on the evaluation studies already carried out. In particular we are grateful to Ewa Kolanowska (ETF), who
generously shared with us her study results on the impact of the second phase of the Tempus programme in four PHARE countries. This recent study gave the team a good start in October 2002 for developing supplementary tools for collecting and analysing data for assessing the impact of Tempus II and II bis on an ex post basis.

In this context we would also like to thank the JEP co-ordinators who responded in overwhelming numbers to our on-line questionnaire and thereby gave us a powerful tool for analysis. The data covered by the on-line questionnaire cover 599 JEPs, which is equivalent net to 43.2% of all JEPs (1,386) that were approved and implemented during the second phase of the Tempus programme.

We, moreover, would like to express our thanks to the national experts in 19 eligible countries who on our behalf conducted structured interviews with participants of in total 80 JEPs (16 countries) and 26 higher education authority employees in 19 partner countries. In addition the national experts wrote concise reports that gave us new information and constituted a valuable source of non-stakeholder information, which we used for double-checking data and analysis provided by other information sources.

Furthermore, we would like to thank the organisers and participants of the three regional workshops (Moscow, Almaty and Skopje) who shared with us their experience in Tempus and their views on the merits and performance of Tempus in these case study countries. In particular we would also like to thank the participants of the lessons learned workshop in Brussels. This workshop gave us the opportunity to present our interim findings for discussion and constructive criticism. The workshop has been very successful from our point of view. It has deepened and focused our understanding of the complexity of the Tempus reality at regional and country level.

Last but not least, the evaluation team wishes to thank the staff of the Commission involved in this evaluation including the staff of DG EAC, staff from ETF and the members of the steering committee for the study. Co-operation with the Commission has at all times been very constructive, and with patience and humour the Commission has ensured that the evaluation team gradually increased its level of understanding of the Tempus programme.

28 October 2003

Max van der Sleen, Team leader
Elena Belyanova
Robert Malin
Esther van der Meer
Olga Yastrebova
ECORYS-NEI
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1 Source: ETF data base.
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## Abbreviations and acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARDS</td>
<td>Community Assistance for Reconstruction, Development and Stabilisation (Commission programme in the context of the stabilisation and association agreements with countries in the Western Balkans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>A JEP under the category of Curriculum Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEEC</td>
<td>Central and Eastern European Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Commonwealth of Independent States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CME</td>
<td>Compact Measures (Tempus PHARE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Compact Projects (Tempus Tacis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development (UK Government Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG EAC</td>
<td>Directorate General Education and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGIS</td>
<td>Directorate General for International Co-operation (Dutch Government Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>European Bank for Reconstruction and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECTS</td>
<td>European Credit Transfer System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>European Economic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETF</td>
<td>European Training Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fYR</td>
<td>the former Yugoslav Republic (of Macedonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (German Government Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEA</td>
<td>Higher Education Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Higher Education Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>Higher Education System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>A JEP under the category of Institution Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMG</td>
<td>Individual Mobility Grant (Tempus project type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEP</td>
<td>Joint European Project (Tempus project type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDA</td>
<td>Mediterranean Development Assistance (Commission programme in the context of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTMA</td>
<td>Teaching and Teaching Methods Associations of HEIs in the Russian Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>National Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP</td>
<td>National Contact Point (in the European Union)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTO</td>
<td>National Tempus Offices (in PHARE partner countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUFFIC</td>
<td>Netherlands organisation for international co-operation in higher education (Dutch Government Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHARE</td>
<td>Pologne &amp; Hongrie: Assistance à la Reconstruction Economique (Commission programme in the context of the Europe Agreements with 10 acceding and candidate countries in Central Europe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;C</td>
<td>Structural and Complementary Measures (Tempus project type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacis</td>
<td>Technical Assistance to the Commonwealth of Independent States (Commission programme in the context of the partnership and co-operation agreements with countries in Eastern European and the Asian states)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Tempus Information Point (in Tacis partner countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>A JEP under the category of university management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Balkans</td>
<td>For the purposes of the Tempus II programme evaluated by this document this term refers to Albania, Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina and fYR Macedonia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

A Introduction

The Commission launched the Tempus programme in 1990 with the aim of promoting higher education system reforms in the countries eligible for Commission support under the PHARE programme. With Tempus the Commission started a programme designed to promote staff and teacher mobility, personal network development and institutional cooperation between higher education institutions of the eligible countries and the EU Member States.

Tempus turned out to be a highly popular programme among academics and the European Union's Council of Ministers recognised its merits by adopting the Tempus II decision (1994 -1998) on 29 April 1993. Tempus II was subsequently extended in 1996 (Tempus II bis) to run up to June 2000. During this second phase of the programme (1994-2000) the number of eligible partner countries increased to 26, and funding was made available from the PHARE, Tacis and eventually the CARDS programmes. The programme was renewed again in 1999 for the partner countries in the Tacis and CARDS regions, and extended to MEDA countries in 2002. Currently, in 2003, Tempus is in its third phase (2000-2006) and covers 14 Tacis countries, 6 CARDS countries as well as 8 MEDA countries.

This report presents the results of the final evaluation of the second phase of the Tempus programme (1994-2000). The evaluation has been undertaken for the Commission (DG EAC) by an Evaluation Team from ECORYS-NEI in the period from October 2002 to June 2003.

This executive summary is set out in five sections: A-E. Section B gives a short description of the main activities of the second phase of the Tempus programme. Section C gives information on the purpose of the evaluation and the main evaluation questions, as well as on the approach and methodology used to answer those questions. The findings of the study with respect to the outcomes of the programme are presented in section D. In section E, the overall conclusions are presented.

B Programme description

Joint European Projects (JEPs) constitute the main activity of the Tempus programme. During the second phase of the programme the bulk of the funds were used to finance 1,386 JEPs. In total 26 countries were eligible for funding. The Commission supported 1,120 JEPs in PHARE countries, 184 in Tacis countries and 82 in what are now referred
to as CARDS countries. As a result Tempus reached a large proportion of its target group. The vast majority of the higher education institutions in the Tempus PHARE countries have participated in one or more Tempus projects. In the Tacis area Russia is a special case but even in that vast country more than 100 out of some 930 higher education institutions participated in Tempus.

For the successful applicants, Tempus funding has meant manna from heaven. In terms of financing Tempus PHARE equalled some 30 percent of national spending on higher education in the partner countries. In Russia (Tempus Tacis) this percentage was lowest, with less than 1 percent. However, such percentages only reveal the financial significance. For those higher education institutions that participated, the funding meant unique opportunities as it was a source of investment in upgrading skills, facilities etc. not otherwise available.

Funding levels sharply declined after 1996. When the second phase of Tempus started in 1994, the combined annual budget of Tempus amounted to some 120 million per year. At the end in 2000, this had declined to 45 million. During the six years of the second phase of Tempus (1994-2000), around 527 million were allocated overall, including 404 million from PHARE country budgets and 123 million from Tacis country budgets. These figures compare with about 324 million EUR under Tempus I (1990-1994) of which as much as 320 million was for eligible countries under PHARE.

The reduction in the annual levels of funding over the period is linked to the reform progress in the PHARE countries. In these countries the vision of accession gradually became a reality (acceding countries) or a realistic policy perspective (candidate countries). The first decade of Tempus PHARE (1990-1999) shows a sharp increase in funding levels from 23 million in 1990 to a peak of 130 million in 1993 and subsequently, declining budget levels to 84 million in 1996 and 26 million in 1999. The budget reductions reflect the fact that the national authorities who negotiate the total PHARE budget envelope, including the Tempus budget, with the Commission have over time come to give higher priority to other development issues facing them in their aspirations for integration into the European Union. Moreover, the reductions reflect the fact that the candidate countries obtained access to Socrates and other regular EU programmes in support of higher education.

In Tacis countries the priority given to Tempus has been fairly stable over time. The total allocations fluctuated around EUR 20 million per year, with a high of 23 million in 1995 and a low of 16 million in 1997. In the Tacis countries, Russia allocated on average some 11 million for Tempus, followed by the Ukraine (3 million). In the other countries, amounts have been fairly small and work out on average at around 10 percent of the global Tacis budget for each country each year.

---

2 All budget figures are in Euros.
The Council Decisions on Tempus II (1994-1998) and II bis (1998-2000) raised the ambition level for university co-operation. The Council Decisions 93/246/EEC and 96/663/EC provided not only for continuation of the basic approach and an extension of the programme to new eligible countries in the Tacis and PHARE (now CARDS) areas. In addition it provided the basis for renewal and reorientation with the introduction of national priorities, institution building, and the introduction of structural and complementary measures.

Tempus II introduced Tempus-specific national priorities and this brought a top-down (or strategic) orientation element into the programme. The national priorities provided a framework within which the higher education authorities in the eligible countries and the Commission could guide the Tempus applicants and the Tempus activities (funded from their national PHARE and Tacis budgets) more firmly towards the longer-term systemic reform needs of higher education as perceived by them. Tempus II aims thus went beyond the mobility objective and bottom-up innovation of curriculum development and university management that characterised Tempus I.

Tempus II bis introduced institution building as a new field of work alongside curriculum development and university management. This firmly embedded Tempus PHARE in the accession process of the eligible countries. Institution building projects were seen as tools for using university co-operation and university know-how to support the process of preparing national administrative, economic and legislative bodies to operate within the European Union. Institution building JEPs focussed on training a wider workforce for the adoption of the acquis communautaire, the accumulated mass of European legislation. With this tool, the Tempus programme opened up further to involve non-academic institutions in the projects.

The introduction of structural and complementary measures (compact measures (PHARE) or compact projects (Tacis) aimed to give the programme new tools to achieve meeting its more daring ambition level in terms of expected programme outcomes. This was a new type of activity (alongside Joint European Projects and International Mobility Grants). These measures were designed for targeted activities in the field of university management reforms, dissemination and institution building.

C Approach, methodology and organisation

The Council Decisions that provide the legal base for the Tempus programme oblige the Commission to regularly evaluate the programme. Pursuant to the provisions in the Council Decisions on Tempus II bis and Tempus III, the Commission (DG EAC) launched an open call for tender for the provision of two evaluation reports: a final report.

---

3 During Tempus II, these S&M measures were given form through compact projects i.e. projects which could be applied for in a shorter procedure and served to follow up on existing JEPs with the aim of improving impact e.g. dissemination projects, and policy support and legislation projects.

Council Decision 96/663/EC of 21 November 1996 - Tempus II bis;
Council Decision 99/311/EC of 29 April 1999 - Tempus III.
on the second phase of the Tempus programme (1994-2000) and a mid-term evaluation of Tempus III. This report sets out the findings of the Evaluation Team with respect to the second phase of the Tempus programme. The mid-term evaluation of Tempus III is the subject of a separate report.

The purpose of the study and the evaluation questions are set out in the terms of reference for the assignment (see Appendix 1), which have been prepared by the Commission. The terms of reference note that the evaluation is intended to assist the Commission in formulating a well founded judgement on: "the extent to which the second phase of the Tempus programme has produced the outcomes expected". In total eight such outcomes were defined:

1. Convergence of education systems in the eligible countries with those in the EC;
2. Better adaptation of education systems to the demands of market economies and multiparty political systems;
3. Transposition into national law of the acquis communautaire with respect to the regulated professions;
4. Higher education institutions openness and preparedness for international cooperation;
5. New management approaches and structures in line with independent and accountable HEIs;
6. The acquisition by staff and students of skills and qualifications necessary for the transition process and for the new socio-economic reality;
7. The training of decision-makers in eligible countries and to what extent staff with experience in Tempus have played and continues to play a role in the universities in the partner countries;
8. The formation of sustainable partnerships in higher education involving EC and other countries.

The terms of reference, furthermore, provide the guidance that: "the final report should not duplicate but rather build on the evaluation studies already carried out. The report should provide a global view on the second phase of the Tempus programme".

The evaluation approach is strongly focussed on establishing the factual programme impact in terms of the expected outcomes of the second phase of the Tempus programme. This report does neither deal explicitly with the relevance of the programme given the socio-economic needs of the eligible countries nor with the validity of the Tempus approach of multilateral co-operation between higher education institutions. Such issues were also studied, but are considered in the report on the mid-term evaluation of Tempus III, which has been prepared in parallel.

In this study the outcomes of the second phase of the Tempus programme are analysed and presented at two levels of aggregation: the programme as a whole and the three Tempus regions separately (PHARE, Tacis, CARDS). The study has not attempted to

---

5 This quotation comes from the Terms of Reference for the evaluation.
6 The Commission has the obligation; "to present to the Council a final report on the second phase of the programme by 30 June 2004 at the latest" (Council Decision 96/663/EC).
7 Mid-term evaluation on the third phase of Tempus, ECORYS-NEI, October 2003.
draw conclusions at the level of individual countries. The approach was, moreover, strongly focused on the systematic collection of comprehensive new evidence relevant for assessing the outcomes of the second phase of the Tempus programme. New evidence was needed because existing data sources were considered to be of limited value for the purpose of the study.

The main sources of data for the analysis of the programme outcomes are surveys, reports by independent experts and workshops. The three types of surveys present a unique source of systematic data, but do not provide much contextual information. For this, the analysis has relied upon reports provided by the local education experts as well as the knowledge gained during three workshops held in Russia, Kazakhstan and FYR Macedonia. A key strength of the approach is the variety and complementarity of the tools developed to collect data for analysing the outcomes of the programme at the overall and regional levels.

The literature review was important for providing the evaluators with insight in the workings of the Tempus programme and for getting a first idea of the issues that have affected the expected outcomes. The review clarified the transition context and in particular the reform processes of the higher education sector in which the second phase of Tempus has operated. The literature review moreover confirmed the contractor’s hypothesis that the existing sources of information on the Tempus programme would be insufficient to allow analysis and valid conclusions on the questions about outcomes posed in the ToR. The findings from the literature review were, furthermore, used during the process of creating the survey tools.

The Evaluation Team drew up three questionnaires with the aim of getting access to more global and structured information of a quantitative or qualitative nature. These surveys focus on ex-post assessment of project outcomes and programme impact:

- An on-line questionnaire for JEP co-ordinators;
- A questionnaire for structured interviews of JEP participants in the eligible countries;
- A questionnaire for structured interviews with higher education authorities in the eligible countries.

The on-line questionnaire for JEP co-ordinators (hereinafter also referred to as the on-line survey) has resulted in a unique and highly valuable source of information. It was sent to all 1,319 JEP co-ordinators in the database. The result was that we received a fully filled out questionnaire for 599 out of the 1,386 JEPs that were implemented during the second phase of Tempus (43%)². The high coverage and response rates enabled the evaluators to analyse the data at both the global and regional level and to draw representative conclusions at both levels. The on-line responses provided the evaluators with information on a large part of the outcomes of the JEPs as perceived by the JEP co-ordinators. The on-line survey also provided a long list of impact examples. In other words the on-line survey provides a main source of evidence on the basis of which the evaluators were able to draw solid conclusions. This on-line questionnaire was especially

---

² The on-line questionnaire was filled out by 638 respondents for 599 distinct projects. The difference is made up by multi country projects for which more than one questionnaire was filled out.
used to analyse the outcomes of Tempus related to legislative change (outcomes 1-3) and in terms of sustainable partnership development (outcome 8).

*The other two questionnaires were designed to generate data on the other programme outcomes.* However, they can be considered representative only for a global view at total programme level. The field survey of JEP participants, a sample of 80 JEPs in 16 countries (hereinafter also referred to as the JEP survey), was used to analyse outcomes 4 and 5 (university management), outcome 6 (curriculum development) and outcome 7 (training of decision-makers). The JEP survey sample was designed to be representative at the total programme level. It was too small to draw valid conclusions at regional level. Likewise the structured questionnaire of higher education authorities, (hereinafter also referred to as the HEA survey), provides relevant information on the perceptions of some key policy makers and higher education experts on the impact of the Tempus programme in their countries. But with a sample of 26 people in 19 countries one should be careful about drawing general conclusions even at the aggregate level of the total programme. The value of that HEA survey lies mostly in the fact that it enriches the analysis by giving a perspective from the education ministries in the eligible countries.

*The workshops served the purpose of deepening the understanding of Tempus impact in the wider context of education reforms in the Tacis and the CARDS region.* In addition the workshops were used to obtain feedback from a carefully selected group of knowledgeable participants on their experience with various aspects of the programme. The participants also commented on the interim results from the surveys and provided country and regional information relevant for analysing the implications of the data.

*A main methodological challenge facing the evaluators was the design of a set of complementary data collection tools, which would generate information suitable for aggregation at the two levels of analysis aimed for in this study.* For that purpose three things were done:

1. A master list of questions was drawn up which was used in the construction of the surveys, as well as in three country case study workshops (Moscow, Almaty, Skopje) and in the final lessons learned workshop held in Brussels;
2. In the structured questionnaires, the respondents were asked to select from a list of possible answers the most appropriate (when applicable); and
3. The participants in the surveys and workshops were asked to assess the extent to which the second phase of the Tempus programme achieved its outcomes using six answering options: major direct impact, minor direct impact, major indirect impact, minor direct impact, no impact, don't know/no answer.

*The strength of the approach used is that it was systematic and effective.* For most issues of the eight outcome questions, the survey data could be aggregated and/or compared relatively easily. A weakness of this approach is that the distinction between direct and indirect, and between major and minor influence, while clear in conceptual terms, was found to be sensitive to the perspective and position of the respondents in the reform.
processes that were reported on. This methodological issue was found to be of particular importance for correctly interpreting the results with respect to the three outcomes of Tempus related to legislative/ regulatory change. For those outcomes it proved necessary to make a conceptual distinction between reforms that took place at the national level and reforms that took place at university level.

To test the validity of the conclusions from the aggregate data, the contractor hosted a lessons learned workshop in the premises of the Commission in Brussels. A total of 35 people (from 12 partner countries and 5 EU member states) attended. They were invited on the basis of contacts built up during the study, and included stakeholders as well as independent experts. The first day of the workshop was devoted to the evaluation of the second phase of the Tempus programme. The key questions were outlined one by one and the evidence from the data collection process and the findings derived from the aggregation of the data were discussed. The workshop proved very useful to either confirm or contest the validity of findings from the surveys, and occasionally identify methodological problems or weaknesses in the analysis and in the aggregation of the findings at regional level. In addition, the comments of the participants provided a wealth of detail on Tempus experience, relevant for further deepening of the Evaluation Teams understanding of the Evaluation Team of the complexities of the programme.

Comments from the steering committee on the draft final report prompted refinement of the rigour of the analysis and this led to further deepening of the study. This constituted the final step towards completion of the report.

The study started on 22nd October 2002 with a briefing session from the Commission in Brussels. Information on the content of the second phase of Tempus was collected from the Tempus unit of ETF in Turin. The literature review was undertaken in the 4th quarter of 2002, and in this period also a case study on the impact of Tempus on legislative changes in the Russian Federation was completed. In January 2003 the questionnaires were designed in consultation with the Commission in Brussels. The questionnaire for the JEP co-ordinators went on-line in February and was open until the end of June 2003. The structured interviews were held in the eligible countries in February and March. In April and May, the three regional workshops were organised. At the same time supplementary information was collected and analysed and the interim report was written. On the 1st and 2nd of July, the lessons learned workshop was held. Following this workshop, the draft final report was prepared and submitted for comments to the Commission in July. The Commission provided its comments in September, and the final report was completed in October.

In methodological terms the distinction between a direct versus indirect influence in the three survey tools is that a direct influence can be observed when a JEP directly addresses the issue with activities and outputs. For example a curriculum development project may have as an outcome that a co-operation agreement is signed for running a joint MA programme with mutual recognition of degrees. In that case there is clearly a direct influence of the project on the issue of the development of sustainable partnerships. An indirect influence on sustainable partnership development could be that people who teach in the joint MA programme decide to work together on a common academic research subject.

The distinction between major and minor refers to the relative importance of the Tempus JEP. To stay with the issue of sustainable partnerships, a JEP would have a major direct influence, if the partnership had not emerged without the Tempus programme. A minor direct influence would be found in the case where a JEP builds on an existing partnership and reinforces its sustainability.
D Outcomes and impact of the second phase of the Tempus programme

Table 1 summarises the main conclusions of the evaluation with respect to the central question, which this final report aims to answer: "To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme produced the outcomes expected?" The table distinguishes between outcomes as observed at the level of the total programme, and the outcomes for each of the three main regions in which Tempus has operated in the period 1994-2000.

The level of impact of Tempus in terms of these outcomes is expressed using the methodological distinctions between direct and indirect influence and between major and minor influence (see also the legend of Table 1).

Outcome 1 Tempus had a major indirect influence on convergence through legislative changes

While the basic legislative reforms affecting higher education were completed in most eligible countries before the start of Tempus II, adjustments in the legislative and regulatory environment are an ongoing process in all eligible countries.

The starting point for the analysis has been the fact that Tempus has a bottom-up approach to reforms. Moreover, the information from previous evaluations and from the on-line survey confirms that the large majority of the JEPs in the second phase of Tempus have not directly aimed for legislative changes at national level. Given these facts, the outcome that one may expect with respect to Tempus influence on legislative changes is that the influence has been minor in a direct sense or the influence has been indirect and than it could be major or minor.

On the issue of convergence the three surveys show that more than 50 percent of the JEP co-ordinators and JEP partners (bottom-up perspective) and an even higher percentage of the higher education authorities (top-down perspective) perceive clear cause-effect relations between Tempus activities and legislative changes. These changes relate to, amongst other things, national, regional and international student mobility (e.g. accreditation and ECTS) and new management and accreditation structures. The legislative changes have taken place at the national levels as well as within the partner HEIs. With due respect for the notable differences between countries in the extent to which Tempus had this impact at the national level, the overall conclusion arrived at is that Tempus has had a major indirect impact on legislative convergence through awareness raising and networking on the issues involved.

Tempus has especially been important for sensitising policy makers and senior academics to the need for and direction of legislative and regulatory reforms. This finding is valid for both the PHARE and Tacis experience in the second phase of the Tempus programme. In the CARDS countries the consensus is that there has so far been virtually no influence beyond faculty level. This can be explained by the large autonomy that faculties traditionally have in the CARDS area. This conclusion is reflected in Table 1. (The evaluation work done on this issue and examples of the impact found are provided in chapter 3).
### Table 1  Expected outcomes and impact of the second phase of the Tempus programme (1994-2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected outcomes</th>
<th>Observed impact</th>
<th>PHARE region</th>
<th>Western Balkans region</th>
<th>Tacis region</th>
<th>Total all regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Outcome 1</strong> Greater convergence of education systems in the eligible countries with those in the EC as an outcome of Tempus impact on legislative changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The bottom-up view (source: JEP surveys)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The top-down view (source: HEA survey)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Outcome 2</strong> Better adaptation of education systems to the changing socio-economic reality of market economies and multi-party political systems as an outcome of Tempus impact on legislative changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The bottom-up view (source: JEP surveys)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The top-down view (source: HEA survey)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected outcome 3</strong> Contribution to the transposition into national law of the acquis communautaire, particularly in so far as the regulated professions are concerned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The bottom-up view (source: JEP surveys)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The top-down view (source: HEA survey)</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected outcome 4</strong> Reforms prompted in HEIs leading to institutions' openness and preparedness for international cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected outcome 5</strong> Reforms prompted in HEIs leading to new management approaches and structures in line with more independent, accountable higher institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected outcome 6</strong> Curriculum development and reforms leading to the acquisition by staff and students of skills and qualifications necessary for the transition process and for the new socio-economic reality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected outcome 7</strong> Contributions to the training of decision-makers and retention of Tempus experienced staff in universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected outcome 8</strong> The development of sustainable partnerships between HEIs in eligible countries and EU countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:  1 = Major direct impact; 2 = Minor direct impact; 3 = Major indirect impact; 4 = Minor indirect impact; 5 = No impact

---

10 Ten PHARE countries including eight acceding countries and two candidate countries (Bulgaria and Romania).
Outcome 2  Tempus had a major indirect influence on the adaptation of the higher education systems to the changing socio-economic needs in eligible countries

On the issue of the Tempus contribution to legislative changes in the field of curriculum development, mobility and ECTS, the surveys have generated results, which differ substantially. The HEA survey shows that in the eligible countries in the PHARE area 60 percent (8 out of 14) respondents chose the major direct influence option. In the Tacis area the findings varied. In Russia the top-down view was that the influence of Tempus was found to be minor and indirect. In the smaller countries of the Tacis area the influence was listed as minor direct or as major indirect. The JEP survey (bottom-up view), on the other hand, shows that in the PHARE region the majority of the JEPs (69%) have had a major direct or major indirect influence on adaptation. In the CARDS area this proportion was much lower and in Tacis countries it was even higher. These differences between the top-down and bottom-up perspectives can be explained on the basis of the fact that the type of legislative change relevant for adaptation is in line with what was later called the Bologna process and this takes place mainly at university level. It is therefore possible that the top-down perspective overestimates the influence of the Tempus programme.

Taking this difference in perspectives into account, the evaluators considered the bottom-up view to be more realistic. Aggregation of these findings to the global view thus lead to the conclusion that the second phase of the Tempus programme has had a major indirect impact on the legal/regulatory changes that promote adaptation of the higher education system to changes in socio-economic needs in the Tempus partner countries. *(The evaluation work done on this issue and examples of the impact found are provided in chapter 3).*

Outcome 3  Tempus had a major direct and indirect influence on the transposition of the acquis communautaire for the regulated professions into national law

The JEP survey shows that in the PHARE area some 42 percent of the JEPs have either directly or indirectly influenced the development of national regulations and legislation with respect to the regulated professions (doctor, pharmacists, dental practitioner, midwife, general case nurse, veterinary surgeon, architect). The literature and the JEP and HEA survey examples provided as evidence, indicate that there is not much “acquis communautaire” in this field. Therefore, the real meaning of the data may well be that some 42 percent of the JEPs in the PHARE area dealt in one way or another with introducing best practices and reforms on these subjects rather than that this concerned legislation in the strict sense of the word. In the other regions this accession issue was not on the agenda although in the CARDS area, a small percentage of the Tempus activities also dealt with these professions. *(The evaluation work done on this issue and examples of the impact found are provided in chapter 3).*
Outcome 4  Tempus had a major direct influence on the introduction of reforms in HEIs leading to institutions' openness and preparedness for international co-operation

This issue was addressed through the literature review, the JEP survey, the HEA survey, and the on-line questionnaire. The literature review generated a number of indicators for measuring openness. The JEP survey shows their relative importance during the second phase of the Tempus programme: computerisation and increased access and use of the digital highway in classroom situations (75% of the respondents listed this aspect); exchange visits of students and staff (70%); adoption of textbooks and training materials in an EU language (65%); training and teaching in an EU language (40%); and the establishment of an international relations office in the HEIs (30%).

Asked about the extent to which Tempus had influenced HEIs' openness and preparedness for international co-operation, the vast majority of the JEP respondents in the three CARDS countries and in the Tacis region (77%) selected the option: major direct impact. In the PHARE region the results also indicate that Tempus had a major direct impact of in this respect (42%). But there the qualifications minor direct, major indirect and minor direct were also used, which indicates that during Tempus II other EU programmes and bilateral university contacts have also played a role in the process towards openness.

The HEA survey does not show this nuance, and a major direct impact of Tempus is seen in all regions. In the Tacis region Russia was again the exception. There the impact of Tempus was perceived as minor indirect, with the argumentation that Tempus had reached only a small proportion of the higher education sector.

In the on-line survey several indicators were used to assess the preparedness for international co-operation in the context of sustainable partnerships. The on-line survey showed not only a strong interest of the respondents in continuing to co-operate within the Tempus context, but also the mobilisation of other funds, including university budgets, and other EU programmes (e.g. 44% mentioned that they now participated in Socrates).

The lessons learned workshop confirmed the very visible impact of Tempus on international co-operation, in an environment where the programme responded to a strong expressed need for such co-operation and was often also the only available vehicle for it. The workshop participants however drew attention to the necessity for a generic ownership within the institution for such co-operation, lest the activities remain islands instead of supporting structural preparedness for increased international co-operation. This links up to changes in university management structure further discussed in chapter five.

On the basis of these mutually supporting findings from the various data collection tools, the evaluators drew the conclusion listed above as outcome 4. (The evaluation work done on this issue and examples of the impact found are provided in chapter 4).
Outcome 5  Tempus has had a major direct impact on the first steps of management reforms, and a minor direct impact on deeper management reforms in HEIs leading to new management approaches and structures in line with more independent, accountable higher institutions.

To analyse this issue, the evaluation relied on three data collection tools: the literature review, the JEP survey and the lessons learned workshop. The literature review and the workshop showed that on the issue of university management reforms, the Tempus impact has for different countries reached different levels of depth in the reform process and these correspond roughly with four stages in university management reform:

- University management reforms linked to curriculum development reforms (stage 1);
- The establishment of international co-operation offices and equipment provisions for libraries and management information systems (stage 2);
- Co-operation with a focus on internal organisation aspects of university management: autonomy, broadening the funding base, and introducing democratic governance aspects (stage 3a); and
- Targeted activities which focus on external strategic orientation, on strategy development for universities including: management training for university rectors and deans and the introduction of objectives now included in the Bologna process in university (and national higher education) policies such as accreditation, two degree systems and education credit transfer systems (stage 3b).

In the Tacis region, curriculum development was the main focus for the JEPs and in the majority of the JEPs university management reforms issues were dealt with from this perspective. On this level (stage 1 and stage 2), the JEP surveys show that Tempus II had a major direct impact for the partner HEIs. With respect to deeper reforms (steps 3a and 3b), the second phase of the Tempus programme has achieved less. Still, the case study for the Russian Federation shows that there is ample evidence that Tempus succeeded in reaching the key decision makers and has made them aware of the needs for further reforms in line with best practice developments in the EU and the concepts now included in the Bologna process (stage 3b).

In the CARDS area also the focus was mainly on curriculum development. Separate university management JEPs were started up but have not gone far beyond stage 1 and stage 2. Nevertheless, for these countries the importance of Tempus can hardly be overestimated. For the higher education institutions in these countries, Tempus has provided a crucial lifeline for science and education in a period of sharply declining national resources for the sector. Furthermore, towards the end of the second phase of the Tempus programme the ideas of Bologna were perceived as the framework for the future direction of higher education reforms.

For the PHARE area, the awareness of university management needs has proceeded to the third stage mentioned above. The PHARE experience shows, however, how difficult it is to bring about real management reforms in universities. In this context, the JEP survey clearly shows how little has so far been achieved with respect to third stage reforms. Only a very small percentage of the JEPs (15%) were credited with having a major or minor direct impact on university management changes. The lessons learned workshops and
literature review confirm that Tempus has had little impact in this field. Despite the fact that university management projects represented over 10 percent of all JEPs implemented during Tempus II, the Lithuanian impact study - amongst others - can find only a few “fragmented examples of implementation of modern practices in institutional management through Tempus.” In particular the perseverance of an academic culture instead of a management culture is observed. Hence the conclusion drawn by the Evaluation Team, presented above as outcome 5. (The evaluation work done on this issue and examples of the impact found are provided in chapter 5).

**Outcome 6** Tempus had a major direct impact on curriculum development and reforms leading to the acquisition by staff and students of skills and qualifications necessary for the transition process and for the new socio-economic reality

In the second phase of the Tempus programme about 80 percent of all JEPs aimed for curriculum development (source: ETF data and on-line survey). To assess the impact this has had on meeting the training needs of staff and students in the face of the new socio-economic conditions in the eligible countries, the literature review, the JEP survey and the workshops were used in a complementary way.

The literature review shows that broadly speaking three types of reforms can be distinguished: (a) modernisation of existing courses; (b) restructuring of existing curricula; and (c) the introduction of new curricula and diplomas on new subjects. The JEP survey data supplemented by views from national experts indicate that modernisation and restructuring was the dominant form of curriculum development in the Tacis area. In the PHARE area and also in the CARDS area the curriculum development JEPs were more focused on new curricula and new subjects. Moreover in the Tacis area, the national accreditation and quality standard systems have in many cases stopped the innovations from reaching out beyond the faculty level where they were introduced. This is also one of the factors that explain why, despite the apparent potential for disseminating Tempus innovations beyond the partner HEIs in the Russian language area, dissemination has not received much attention and only a limited number of projects have been successful in disseminating curricula, textbooks and teaching materials. In smaller countries, e.g. in the CARDS area, and in countries with a closer-knit academic network such as in PHARE, dissemination through teachers and graduates has been easier. On this issue the JEP survey and the workshops provide evidence that most JEP participants consider that more could have been done in terms of disseminating outputs.

The JEP survey was also used to study the effects of curriculum development on the training needs of teaching staff and students. The results show that JEP participants are convinced that their JEPs have had a direct positive impact on the university's reputation, and that the curricula reforms have helped the HEIs market their courses and attract students. Likewise a positive impact was perceived on the employability of students.

Tempus has provided the 'inputs' (resources), 'activities' (JEPs and IMGs) and 'outputs' (curricula reform and institution building courses) that are needed to make it a logical
proposition to expect that the scheme has achieved its expected outcome of meeting the training needs of large numbers teachers and students.

The data, moreover, indicate that this outcome has been significant in terms of the overall numbers of trainers and students reached. In terms of coverage of the target group, the second phase of Tempus has had its biggest direct impact in the PHARE countries, in the Tacis region, and especially in the larger countries of that region, only a fraction of the potential target groups were reached.

On the basis of the above and despite the limited Tempus programme activities promoting dissemination of curriculum development results, the Evaluation Team has come to the conclusion presented above as outcome 6.

The reality behind this conclusion is that more than ten thousand university teachers of the eligible countries have in partnership with their colleagues from the EU benefited from the activities and outputs of the curriculum development JEPs. Moreover, at least several hundred thousands of students have acquired qualifications and diplomas from attending courses which were modernised, restructured and/or introduced as new subjects in more than 1100 Joint European Projects (CD JEPS) that were implemented during the second phase of the Tempus programme (1994-2000). *(The evaluation work done on this issue and examples of the impact found are provided in chapter 6).*

**Outcome 7**  
**Tempus has made major direct contributions to the training of decision-makers and retention of Tempus experienced staff in universities**

This issue has been assessed on the basis of the literature survey, the JEP survey, the HEA survey, and the workshops. In the literature little information was found on this issue except for studies on the link between international university co-operation and the attraction of top talent for research and a 'Tempus country impact study' for Latvia (2001). The latter study showed that in Latvia all senior university staff as well as people manning key functions in the competent higher education authorities have Tempus experience. The participants in the three workshops in Moscow, Almaty and Skopje also indicated that in their countries many relevant decision-makers had been involved in Tempus activities. The HEA and JEP surveys confirmed this finding. In this context not only the JEPs but especially the CME and CP (compact measures and projects) have played a major role. The majority or the HEA respondents in the PHARE and CARDS areas chose the “major direct” option for assessing the impact of Tempus on the training of decision-makers. In the Tacis area, the impact of Tempus on training has also been noticeable, but on the whole, the lower intensity of Tempus projects is reflected in a more diversified pattern of impact ranging from 'major direct' to 'minor indirect'.

The issue of staff retention was addressed in the JEP and HEA surveys with a question covering career development of staff that had participated in Tempus. The answers were unambiguous. The respondents predominantly ticked the options of promotion and career improvement. Only some six percent of the participants were reported as having taken up jobs outside the education sector. The evaluation did not find evidence that Tempus had
a brain drain effect. This finding may be explained by the observation that Tempus does not directly support mobility of researchers.

Taking the global view, the evaluators concluded that Tempus had a ”major direct impact” on the issues covered by outcome 7. Table 7.1 shows this global conclusion, and gives a further breakdown per region. However, the database is fairly weak on this issue and does not allow methodologically sound conclusions at regional level. *(The evaluation work done on this issue and examples of the impact found are provided in chapter 7).*

---

**Outcome 8**

**Tempus had a major direct impact on the development of sustainable partnerships between HEIs in eligible countries and EU countries**

To assess the extent of this impact, the on-line questionnaire was designed. In addition the JEP survey and the lessons learned workshop proved useful for better understanding of the issues involved. The on-line questionnaire showed that Tempus had a major direct impact on the formation of sustainable partnerships in the higher education sector. This conclusion is valid at the global programme level as well as for each of the three regions covered. Overall 69 percent of the respondents indicated this. A further 25 percent listed the Tempus impact as minor direct, major indirect and minor indirect. Four percent did not answer the question and this was taken as an indicator that no sustainable partnerships were formed. For analysis on the level of the three regions separately, the on-line data show that in PHARE, CARDS and Tacis a major direct impact was perceived by respectively 67, 72 and 79 percent of the participants. These differences are not very large but do confirm the information from other sources that in the PHARE area there have been more options (i.e. other programmes apart from Tempus) for building academic partnerships than in the other regions.

To explain why Tempus had this outcome, the evaluation looked at the following dimensions of sustainable partnerships: the motivations for co-operation in Tempus, the type of relations that had remained after the completion of the Tempus activities and the funding sources for the partnerships after the completion of the Tempus activities.

Asked about their motivation to participate in Tempus the respondents ranked the main options as follows in order of priority:

- Tempus is a source of funding, which complements the international development co-operation aspirations of the HEIs in the EU and in the eligible countries;
- Joint curriculum development and the accompanying teacher mobility is considered important for the standing of the university in the market for higher education and for attracting top talent;
- Tempus provides the opportunity to experience at first hand and make a positive contribution to the historical transition process in the partner countries;
- Tempus participation was an opportunity to develop an existing professional acquaintance into a practical academic partnership;
- Tempus provides a funding source, which lowers the costs of setting up academic research programmes.

The on-line survey, furthermore, shows what forms the sustainable partnerships had taken after the completion of Tempus JEPs. Academic networking and participation in
conferences was mentioned by 75 percent of the respondents. More than half of the JEP co-ordinators further mentioned the exchange of academic staff (59%), joint research and publications (53%); and the regular exchange of students (51%). Moreover a quarter of the respondents indicated that they continued to operate a joint curriculum based on diplomas and accreditation. These findings confirm that Tempus has generated sustainable outcomes and moreover that Tempus not only works in the field of higher education reforms, but also provides a first step towards follow up with research co-operation.

As for funding of the partnership activities, the higher education sector relies heavily on university budgets and EU programmes. Other sources are small compared to these. The main sources indicated were the university budgets from the co-ordinating university (54%) or partner university (30%), The EU Socrates programmes (44%), Other EU programmes and/or EU Member States bilateral funding (31%). Moreover, 20 percent of the respondents mentioned new Tempus projects as a source for follow up funding. Sixteen percent of the participants mentioned other sources including multilateral organisations and private foundations. The main ones mentioned were DAAD from Germany (2%), the World Bank (1%) and the Soros Foundation (1%).

During the workshop it was pointed out that in the candidate countries the vast majority of higher education institutions has directly or indirectly been affected by the programme and an extensive network of contacts with EU institutions has been built up. Tempus has had a major direct impact on preparing the HEIs in the ten acceding countries, for participation in other EU higher education programmes: e.g. Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci.

The overall conclusion on this issue is that the bottom-up, multilateral university co-operation approach of Tempus is successful. It promotes not only education system reform in the eligible countries but also the forging of longer-lasting sustainable partnerships at personal and professional level between teaching staff and faculties/ universities in the eligible countries and the EU. This can be considered as an added value of the scheme. A value (or outcome), moreover, which is not produced by higher education support schemes based on a ‘technical assistance approach’ or by ‘structural investment in education’.

On the basis of these findings the evaluators came to the conclusion presented above as outcome 8. (The evaluation work done on this issue and examples of the impact found are provided in chapter 8).

E Concluding remarks

1. **Tempus has successfully addressed important issues of higher education reform within the wider framework of the EU programmes** that aim to support the socio-economic reform processes in Central and Eastern Europe (PHARE and Tacis) and in the Western Balkans (CARDS, the Stability Pact and the Graz process).
2. *With the second phase of Tempus (1994-2000), the Commission has funded and implemented a scheme, which has made major contributions to the development of the higher education systems in the eligible countries.* The programme can be considered as highly successful in bringing about, on a large scale, co-operation and sustainable partnerships between higher education institutions in the EU member states and their partners in the eligible countries. These have contributed to a bottom-up process of higher education sector reform at faculty, university and national levels.

3. *The reorientation initiated by the Council Decisions on the second phase of Tempus has succeeded in increasing the reform impact of the programme.* The introduction of new elements in the scheme i.e. national priorities, compacts, and institution building has guided the programme towards outcomes in terms of university management reforms and national education reforms in line with best practices in Europe and in terms of engaging higher education institutions in joint training activities for non-academic target groups in society.

4. *The mobility dimension of Tempus has matched very well with the concept of the common European education area,* which gradually developed inside Europe and which culminated with the signing of the Bologna declaration by the Education Ministers of the Member States of the EU in 1999. In this respect an important impact of Tempus has been that in its eligible countries a consensus has emerged for integrating elements of what is now the Bologna process (e.g. the two cycle programmes bachelor and master degrees and the European Credit Transfer System) in the education reform priorities for faculties, universities and national higher education reform programmes.
1 Overview of the second phase of the Tempus programme

1.1 Introduction

This report presents the results of the evaluation of the second phase of the Tempus programme (1994-2000). The evaluation has been undertaken for the Commission (DG EAC) by an Evaluation Team from ECORYS-NEI in the period from October 2002 to October 2003.

The report is set out as follows. Chapter 1 provides a description of the second phase of the Tempus programme. Chapter 2 describes the purpose of the evaluation, the key questions and the methodology used for data collection, analysis and arriving at the conclusions. In the chapters 3-8 the data collection, analysis and main findings on programme outcomes are presented for each of the key evaluation questions separately. Chapter 9 looks at some management issues and chapter 10 provides a summary of the main conclusions. An executive summary is presented as a separate section in the beginning of the report.

The report is written as a stand-alone report. The appendices provided are of a non-technical nature. Details of the work done are available in the form of a Technical Annex submitted to the Commission separately. The Technical Annex includes amongst other things, the survey formats, statistics of the surveys and the workshop reports as well as a list of all people involved/interviewed in the study.

Chapter 1 provides an overview of the second phase of the Tempus programme. The purpose of the chapter is to provide the historical and socio-economic setting, which one needs to be aware of in order to understand the ambition level and objectives set by the Council of Ministers for the programme. This background is, moreover, needed to understand what the outcome expectations were of the main stakeholders in the programme. These stakeholders are the Commission, the education authorities in the eligible countries and the Tempus applicants i.e. the academics in the higher education institutions in the Member States of the European Union and in the eligible countries.

The chapter starts with the historical setting and the changes in the socio-economic and political environment that shaped and changed the second phase of Tempus. This is followed by a review of the changes over time in the objectives and focus of the programme and by a brief description of its academic content. In the last section of the chapter some features of programme management are mentioned.
1.2 The historical setting

The idea for the Tempus programme emerged in the late nineteen eighties, shortly after the fall of the Berlin Wall. At that time the Soviet Union still existed but German unification became a realistic policy option and other east block countries opened up to the west. The Commission of the European Union responded to this momentous historic opportunity for a peaceful Europe, free of the nuclear threat of the cold war by creating the PHARE and Tacis programmes in 1989. These two programmes aimed at assisting the countries of Central and Eastern Europe in their transition towards democracy and market economies and aimed at ensuring political stability in the region. The EU and its Member States considered PHARE and Tacis as the key for building up new relations with its Eastern neighbours at political, commercial and civil society level.

In this context the Commission launched the Tempus programme in 1990. The main concept of the scheme was that mobility in the form of university co-operation could be an effective means for establishing personal networks, building new institutional partnerships. These were perceived as the basis for starting in the transition countries the reform processes in the education sector which were: "perceived as necessary to prepare citizens for the challenges of a competitive economy and for a multi-party system where civil society should play and ever greater role".11

The system of higher education in Central and Eastern Europe, which became visible after the fall of the Berlin Wall, featured: high participation rates and high academic standards in theoretical and applied sciences; little funding for humanities; high specialisation and often an institutional separation between academic education and science/research; strong central management; weak links amongst universities and between higher education institutions and society; rapidly declining levels of funding and a virtual lack of links with the emerging ICT revolution that was happening in the West.

Tempus I (1990-1994) addressed these issues with a bottom-up approach to higher education reform. This first phase of Tempus ran for four years from 1990 to June 1994. During this period thirteen countries became eligible under Tempus PHARE. In total around EUR 320 million were committed from PHARE funds for academic co-operation projects initiated at department levels and linking departments of universities in the partner countries with departments of universities in the European Union. In this way an immense network of personal relationships between tens of thousands of academics was formed, and hundreds of departments benefited from mobility grants, student exchanges, curriculum development, new computers and Internet linkages.

Tempus turned out to be a highly popular programme under academics and the European Union's Council of Ministers recognised its merits by adopting the Tempus II decision (1994-1998) on 29 April 1993. Tempus II was subsequently extended in 1996 (Tempus II bis) to run up to June 2000. During this second phase of the programme (1994-2000) the number of eligible partner countries increased to 26, and funding was made available from the PHARE, Tacis and eventually the CARDS programmes. The programme was

11 Quotation from the Terms of Reference.
renewed again in 1999 for the partner countries in the Tacis and CARDS region, and extended to MEDA countries in 2002. The current, third phase of Tempus (2000-2006), covers fourteen Tacis countries, six CARDS countries as well as eight MEDA countries.

During the decade of the 1990s momentous changes took place in Europe and in its neighbouring countries/regions. The European Union embarked on a course of enlargement, and this has shaped the aspirations of its neighbouring states and citizens. The majority of the countries eligible under Tempus PHARE have since been accepted as candidate members and the dates for acceding to the EU have been set. Others still have candidate status. For a third group in the western Balkans, the CARDS programme has come on stream, and further integration with Europe is envisaged in due course. With countries in the Tacis and MEDA regions, Europe has concluded PCA (partnership and co-operation agreements) or EPAs (Economic Partnership Agreements), which form the basis for working towards closer economic and cultural ties and mobility.

In this context, it is relevant to mention that the European Ministers of Education took the initiative for working towards a common European education space. Their declaration (Bologna, June 1999) has accelerated a process of higher education reform based on (voluntary) mutual recognition by universities of bachelor's and master's degree programmes, and a European Credit Transfer System. The importance of this for regional and international mobility has been recognised in the wider Europe; and in many of the neighbouring countries the higher education authorities and higher education institutions have started to set in motion policies aimed at reforms in line with the ideas of Bologna.

The second phase of Tempus has been the main assistance programme available to the higher education institutions in the PHARE, Tacis and what is now called the CARDS areas to prepare and participate in these momentous changes. In the third phase of Tempus (2000-2006) the acceding and two candidate countries are no longer eligible for Tempus funding, instead they will have access to the higher education programmes of EU: Socrates, Leonard da Vinci and others. The second phase of Tempus has been instrumental in preparing the higher education sector in those countries for participating in the European Union on an equal footing, and for that purpose the vast majority of the Tempus II and Tempus II (bis) funds have been used.

1.3 Content and design of Tempus II and Tempus II bis

1.3.1 Objectives and focus

The first evaluation of the Tempus programme looked at the experience during the first 18 months (pilot phase) of Tempus I. The report confirmed that:

- Tempus was perceived in the eligible countries as an appropriate scheme for the transformation of their higher education systems. This, in the context of the economic reform and recovery processes that were ongoing in the wake of the radical political changes that had taken place in the Central and Eastern European Countries in the late eighties; and
For each country concerned, the objectives of Tempus should be more clearly targeted whether on the long-term reform of higher education or on the shorter term needs of economic restructuring.

These findings contributed to the decision of the Council of Ministers to continue the programme with a second phase, and they were instrumental for the introduction of the national priorities, and activities, which later under Tempus II bis, were referred to as institution building projects.

The national priorities were conceived as a tool for guiding the Tempus applicants and selection process towards joint education projects, individual mobility grants and structural and complementary measures, which targeted more clearly the longer term systemic reform needs of higher education in the eligible countries.

The institution building projects were conceived as tools for engaging universities in the short-term needs of economic restructuring. In particular institution-building projects aimed at training of the workforce, which the eligible countries would need to implement the "acquis communautaire" as part of the preparations for acceding to the European Union.

**Council Decision 93/246/EEC**

**Tempus II wider and specific objectives**

The objectives of Tempus II are to promote, as part of the overall objectives and guidelines of the PHARE and Tacis programmes in the context of economic and social reform, the development of the higher education systems in the eligible countries, through as balanced a co-operation as possible with partners from all Member States of the Community. Specifically, Tempus II seeks to help the higher education systems of the eligible countries to address:

- Issues of curriculum development and overhaul in priority areas;
- The reform of higher education structures and institutions and their management;
- The development of skill-related training to address specific higher and advanced level skill shortages during economic reform, in particular through improved and extended links with industry.

The objectives and focus of the second phase of the Tempus programme are provided by two Council Decisions:

Tempus II activities and grant types

The European Community will provide support for joint European projects (JEPs) of a maximum duration of three years. Joint European projects will comprise at least one university from a partner country, one university of a Member State and one partner institution (university or enterprise) from another Member State.

Joint European Project grants may be awarded for activities according to the specific needs of the institutions concerned and according to the priorities laid down including:

I. Joint education and training measures, notably for the establishment of new curricula, the development and overhaul of existing curricula, the development of universities’ capacity to provide continuing education and retraining, the provision of short intensive courses and the development of systems of distance learning;

II. Measures for the reform and development of the higher education system and its capacities, notably by means of the restructuring of the management of higher education institutions and systems; the upgrading of existing facilities by the acquisition of equipment needed to implement a JEP and where appropriate, the provision of technical and financial assistance to the competent authorities;

III. The promotion of co-operation between universities and the socio-economic players, including industry through joint projects;

IV. The development of the mobility of teachers, university administrative staff and students within the framework of JEPs;

V. Activities to ensure the success of a JEP involving two or more partner countries.

Structural and complementary measures grants may be awarded to

I. Develop and strengthen the capacities of strategic planning and institutional development of institutes of higher education at university of faculty level;

II. Support the multiplication of co-operation measures designed to achieve the objectives of Tempus and to ensure its duration;

III. Draw up a national strategy in a particular partner country for the development of a specific aspect of higher education.

Individual Mobility Grants may be used to support visits by teachers, instructors, university administrators, senior Ministry officials, education planners and other training experts from partner countries or the Community for:

I. The development of courses and teaching material;

II. The development of staff, notably for periods of retraining and industrial placements;

III. Teaching assignments; and

IV. Other activities supporting the development of higher education.

Council Decision 96/663/EC extended the programme to last six years till June 2000. It brought new focus to the activities with references to the new association agreements and pre-accession strategy for these associated countries (Essen European Council, December 1994) and partnership agreements (independent states of the former Soviet Union). With this decision the Commission also opened the programme for participation by enterprises.
1.3.2 Programme description

The following four figures describe the chronology, funding, types of grants and content of the programme.

**Figure 1.1 Tempus allocations between 1990 and 1999 (EUR M)**

Under Tempus I (1990-1994), about EUR 324 million were allocated including 320 million for eligible countries under PHARE. During the six years of the second phase of Tempus (1994-2000), around EUR 527 million were allocated, including 404 million from PHARE country budgets and 123 from Tacis country budgets. When the second phase of Tempus started, the combined annual budget of Tempus amounted to some 120 million per year. At the end in 1999, this has declined to 45 million.

**Source: Tempus (PHARE and Tacis) Annual Report 1999**

**Figure 1.2 Budget evolution of Tempus II & III (EUR MM)\(^\text{12}\) in all regions**

---

\(^{12}\) Source: European Training Foundation, Turin (n.b. figures relate to JEP funding only).
The reduction in the annual level of funding over the period is linked to the evolution of policy priorities in the PHARE countries, for which the vision of accession gradually became a reality (acceding countries) or a realistic policy perspective (candidate countries). The first decade of operations of Tempus PHARE (1990-1999) shows a sharp increase in funding levels from 23 million in 1990 to a peak of 130 million in 1993 and subsequently, declining budget levels to 84 million in 1996 and 26 million in 1999. The budget decline reflects that the national authorities that negotiate the total PHARE budget envelope, including the Tempus budget with the Commission have over time given higher priority to other development priorities facing them in their aspirations for integration into the European Union. The decline, moreover, reflects that the candidate countries got access to Socrates and other regular EU programmes in support of higher education.

In the CARDS region the allocations have increased somewhat, and in the eligible countries of the Tacis area, the annual allocations have remained more or less stable.

Table 1.1  Chronology and overall country allocations (1994-1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former GDR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Tempus (PHARE and Tacis) Annual Report 1999, fig 1

Table 1.1 shows the chronology of the programme in terms of the evolution in the eligibility partner countries. It also provides data on the total funding levels per country during the period 1994-1999. Poland, Hungary, Rumania and Russia feature large in the Tempus grant portfolio.

In terms of financing, Tempus PHARE is estimated to equal some 30 percent of national spending on higher education in the partner countries. In Tempus Tacis this was less than one percent. However, these percentages do not reveal the full financial significance. For those departments who participated, the funding meant an enormous source of investment in upgrading skills, facilities etc. not other wise available.
The vast majority of these funds were used to finance a total of some 1386 JEPs, including 1202 in PHARE countries, 82 in what is now the CARDS area and 184 in Tacis countries. With this number of JEPs, the Tempus programme reached an estimate of some 80 percent of all universities in the acceding countries (PHARE), 85 percent of the higher education institutions in the CARDS area, and 12 percent in Russia.
Figure 1.3 illustrates the differences in thematic content between the programmes.

In the PHARE area (excluding CARDS countries), curriculum development was the main focus in the first four years. The main subject areas were: applied sciences and technologies (38%); business and management (14%); and social sciences (10), the remainder focused on a wide range of new subject areas. Tempus II bis brought about a sharp shift in focus away from curriculum development to university management and especially to institution building. In 1999, the last year that the PHARE countries were eligible under Tempus, 125 JEPs were approved. This number included 95 JEPs for institution building (76%); 22 for university management (17%) and only eight for curriculum development (6%).

In the Tacis area all JEPs were focused on curriculum development. university management issues were covered as side issues within curriculum development or with compact projects (see Table 2.2). Within the field of Curriculum development, the main focus was on social sciences (see the red areas in Figure 2.2), including economics (40%), management and business (21%), (the black and grey areas) and applied sciences and technology (19%), (the green areas).

In the CARDS area (Albania, Bosnia Herzegovina and FYR Macedonia) curriculum development also dominates in the first years, and the distribution of subjects was similar to the one in the PHARE area. Under Tempus II bis, university management came into focus with 20% of the JEPs.

Table 1.4 provides details on the above.
1.4 Management of the programme

"At the outset Tempus was managed by the former Task Force for Human Resources, which later became DG XII and is known today as the Directorate-General for Education and Culture. Between 1990 and 1994, the day-to-day administration of the programme (referred to as technical assistance) was in the hands of the EC Tempus office in Brussels. In 1995, the EC Tempus office ceased to function and a Tempus Department was created in a new European Union agency, the European Training Foundation located in Turin." 13

Within the Commission, DG EAC is responsible for the Tempus Programme. The description of the management architecture of the second phase of Tempus (1994-2000) provided below is taken from the Tempus (PHARE and Tacis) Annual Report 199914.

For implementation of the scheme, the Commission is assisted by a management committee composed of two representatives appointed by each Member State and chaired by a Commission representative. The management Committee is referred to as the Tempus Committee. Technical assistance for the implementation of the scheme is provided by the Tempus Department of the European Training Foundation in Turin following the guidelines of the European Commission Directorate-General for Education and Culture in Brussels.

---

13 Quotation from Tempus@10
In the PHARE countries the National Tempus Offices (NTOs) are the programme's main links to the national authorities of Central and Eastern Europe and perform parts of the day-to-day administration of the Programme.

In the Tacis partner countries a network of Tempus Information Points (TIPs) has been established in order to ensure appropriate support on the spot. They assist with the implementation of the Tempus Programme by disseminating information about the Programme, providing information on the status of higher education in the partner countries and giving practical support to project operators.

In the EU Member States, designated National Contact Points (NCPs) assist with the dissemination of programme information, project submission guidelines and forms, and general support through, amongst others, the organisation of workshops and co-ordinators meetings.

1.5 Summary

With its Decisions on the second phase of Tempus (1994-2000), the Council aimed for continuity, flexibility and more ambitious objectives, in line with the changing socio-economic circumstances in the geo-political sphere of EU influence.

The Council Decision of April 1993 extended the geographical coverage and funding base of Tempus from PHARE, to Tacis and later to CARDS. Moreover, national priorities and academic quality of the co-operation became important selection criteria, and the focus switched gradually from curriculum development to more horizontal issues including internationalisation, university management, financing and training of manpower for the implementation of newly adopted legislation i.e. institution building.

The second Council Decision, which extended the second phase of Tempus (November 1996, Tempus II bis) for two years also brought a reorientation by emphasising the role of Tempus for the institution building process in support of the adoption of the "acquis communautaire" in the acceding countries.

The Funding for Tempus PHARE declined sharply during the second phase of the Tempus programme, Funding for Tempus under the Tacis programme remained more or less stable an in the CARDS countries funding slowly increased.

In total the Commission funded some 1,386 JEPs during the second phase of the Tempus programme. The majority of the funding went to the acceding and candidate countries.
2 Approach and methodology

2.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the approach and methodology used in this evaluation. The chapter is organised in six sections:

- Section 2.2 describes the purpose of the evaluation and the key questions formulated in the Terms of Reference;
- Section 2.3 elaborates on the approach and discusses its weaknesses and strengths;
- Sections 2.4 and 2.5 give an overview of the evaluation tools that were used and of the methods for analysing the data and the drawing of the conclusions;
- Section 2.6 gives information on the organisation of the study.

2.2 The purpose of the evaluation and key questions

2.2.1 Background

The Council Decisions, which provide the legal base for the Tempus programme, oblige the Commission to regularly evaluate the programme. In the history of the programme four evaluations have taken place so far. The Council Decisions make a distinction between, what are in effect, mid term evaluations and final reports. The mid-term evaluations serve feedback and programming purposes. The final reports appear later and its findings mainly serve accountability and justification purposes, the final evaluations help the Commission in drawing up the final report on the programme for the Council.

The first mid-term evaluation looked at the initial 18 months pilot phase of the programme. Its findings served the Commission in preparing and adjusting the second phase of the Tempus programme. The second mid-term evaluation report (March 1998) covered the first years of second phase 1994-1996. The report was partly based on an Evaluation of the Tempus programme in the countries eligible under Tacis (January 1988). A number of the findings of this report were reflected in the Council Decisions on the third phase of the programme. On the third phase the Commission is required to submit a mid term evaluation by 30 April 200415.

So far one final evaluation was prepared; this was on the first phase of Tempus (1990-1994) and the Commission submitted its report to the Council in 1994. On the second

phase of the Tempus programme (1994-2000), the final evaluation report needs to be submitted by the Commission by 30 June 2004 at the latest\textsuperscript{16}.

Against this background, The Commission launched an open call for tender for two reports:
Lot 1: Final report on the second phase of the Tempus programme, and
Lot 2: Mid-term evaluation report of the third phase of the Tempus programme.

On the basis of the bids and the potential for synergy between the two studies, the Commission subsequently contracted ECORYS-NEI in October 2002, for both reports.

2.2.2 The purpose of the final report on the second phase of the Tempus programme

The Terms of Reference (hereinafter referred to as the ToR) for the assignment has been prepared by the Directorate-General for Education and Culture (DG EAC). The ToR specify that: "The evaluation aims to serve the Commission in formulating a well founded judgement on the extent to which the second phase of the Tempus programme has produced the outcomes expected"\textsuperscript{17}

In the ToR a total of eight such outcomes are defined. The ToR furthermore provides the guidance that: "The final report should not duplicate but rather build on the evaluation studies already carried out. The report should provide a global view on the second phase of the Tempus programme".

2.2.3 The evaluation questions

The terms of reference specify that the evaluation report should address five main issues and in total eight outcomes. These are listed in Table 2.1 as the issues and the evaluation questions. The first three questions deal with the contribution of the programme to changes in legislation in the eligible countries (ToR issue 1). Questions four and five relate to reforms in higher education institutions prompted by the programme (ToR issue 2), Questions six (curriculum reform), seven (training) and eight (sustainable partnerships) are the same as ToR issues three, four and five.

If one looks at the two Council Decisions that shaped the second phase of Tempus (see the text boxes in section 1.3.1 on Tempus II and Tempus II bis), than it becomes clear that these five main issues reflect the expected outcomes of the second phase of Tempus. The first issue relates to the wider objective of the second phase of Tempus. The second, third and fourth issue correspond to the specific objectives of Tempus with respect to curriculum development, reform of higher education institutions, and the development of skill related training.

\textsuperscript{16} The Commission has the obligation; "to present to the Council a final report on the second phase of the programme by 30 June 2004 at the latest" (Council Decision 96/663/EC).

\textsuperscript{17} Quotation from the Terms of Reference for the evaluation.
The fifth issue addresses the sustainability of the outcomes from the perspective of co-operation and partnership building function of Tempus.

Table 2.1  Terms of Reference - Five evaluation issues, and eight questions on expected outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 1: Questions number 1-3</th>
<th>To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme contributed to changes in legislation leading to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Greater convergence of education systems in the eligible countries with those in the EC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Education systems better adapted to the changing socio-economic reality, in particular market economies and multiparty political systems? and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (Specifically for pre-accession countries) the transposition into national law of the acquis communautaire, particularly in so far as the regulated professions are concerned?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 2: Questions number 4 -5</th>
<th>To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme prompted reforms in higher education institutions (including polytechnics and technical schools) leading to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Institutions' openness and preparedness for international co-operation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New management approaches and structures in line with more independent, accountable higher institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 3: Question number 6</th>
<th>To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme brought about curriculum development and reforms leading to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The acquisition by staff and students of skills and qualifications necessary for the transition process and for the new socio-economic reality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 4: Question number 7</th>
<th>To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme contributed to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The training of decision makers in eligible countries and to what extent has staff with experience in Tempus played and continues to play a role in the universities in the partner countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 5: Question number 8</th>
<th>To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme contributed to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The formation of sustainable partnerships in higher education involving EC and other countries?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 The approach, its scope, limitations, strengths and weaknesses

The report should provide a global view on the second phase of the Tempus programme”.

This statement in the terms of reference was the starting point for the approach and further methodology development. The main characteristics of the approach and their limitations are discussed below.

1. The outcomes of the second phase of the Tempus programme are analysed and presented in this study at two levels of aggregation: the programme as a whole and the three Tempus regions separately (PHARE, Tacis, CARDS). The study has not attempted to draw conclusions at level of the individual countries, let alone at the level of individual projects. This limitation has one obvious disadvantage and that is that the analysis of the outcomes cannot do justice to the complexities and substantial differences in the transition setting of the individual countries in which the programme has operated. From the perspective of the “global view” on the second phase of Tempus, this limitation was not perceived as very weighty for the PHARE region, because the transition context of the ten individual countries converged over time towards EU accession. In the CARDS region, however, only three countries were eligible, with substantial differences in the length and intensity of their Tempus experience and this made aggregation of outcomes at region level less satisfactory. In the Tacis region, the variety in country size, direction of the reforms and experience with Tempus has also been substantial and this limits for some questions, (especially those on issue 1, legislative change) the validity of the approach to aggregate the outcomes at regional level. To compensate for these limitations, the approach included country case studies in Russia, Kazakhstan and fYR Macedonia.

2. The main sources of the data for the analysis of the programme outcomes are three types of surveys. These surveys present a unique source of systematic data, but do not provide much contextual information. For this, the analysis has relied upon reports provided by the local education experts as well as the knowledge gained during the regional workshops. But the fact that this information is less comprehensive and of a non-statistical nature limits the suitability of the data for deepening the analysis and for explaining in a satisfactory way the differences found between the results of the different survey tools. Nevertheless, the analysis is based upon a comprehensive understanding derived from a range of reliable and accurate sources.

"The final report should not duplicate but rather build on the evaluation studies already carried out".

3. The approach was strongly focused on the collection of new evidence relevant for assessing the outcomes of the second phase of Tempus programme, listed above in Table 2.1. New evidence was needed because existing data sources were considered to be of limited value for the purpose of the study. The last evaluation report (February 1998), a copy of which was attached to the Term of Reference described this as follows: “Authoritative conclusions on the longer term impact of the
*TEMPUS Tacis Programme cannot be drawn. The programme is too young to be able to determine its impact on higher education reform in the partner states*” This observation strongly influenced the approach chosen by the Evaluation Team for data collection. Faced with the implication of the quotation that a review of previous evaluations and the literature review would provide little information to build on, ECORYS-NEI proposed to the Commission to develop a series of tools for generating new information relevant for answering the key questions in the ToR\(^8\).

4. The main data sources used for the analysis and for drawing the conclusions on the realised outcomes are thus the tools developed specifically for this evaluation i.e. an on-line questionnaire, fieldwork based on two structured questionnaires, interviews and participatory workshops. These tools all share one feature and that is that the data reflect how people in 2003 perceive the outcomes of the programme, which ran between 1994-2000. There is only very limited other information, from for example the literature review and previous evaluations that can be used to validate or qualify this ex-post perspective. For example the Bologna process is today widely perceived as a policy framework that guides the reforms in the higher education sectors in the eligible countries in the direction of convergence with EU systems of higher education. Yet over the period of the implementation of Tempus II, the Bologna process evolved from a conceptual ideal to a declaration but only later became a genuine source of strategic direction (now incorporated into the Tempus III programme). Or – for the purposes of this evaluation – it evolved from an idea incorporated into JEPs only by the most far-sighted individuals to a natural component of project proposals. One of the implications of this example is that the information available is not suitable for correctly analysing the evolution of the programme over time, and therefore this time dimension is touched upon only occasionally in the analysis.

5. The approach comprised a sequence of data collection, analysis of the data and drawing conclusions on the outcomes of the second phase of Tempus. Table 2.2 lists the main steps.

\(^8\) The technical annex on the evaluation contains a copy of the methodology proposed in the ECORYS-NEI proposal.
Table 2.2  Steps in the evaluation approach

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Interviews with the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Initial literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Collection of data on Tempus projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Construction and implementation of an on-line survey for JEP co-ordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Construction of two structured questionnaires for JEP participants and for Higher Education authorities and experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Field work in 20 eligible countries based on two structured questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Analysis of survey and field work results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Follow up literature review and interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Preparation of country case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Organisation and implementation of three participatory workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Supplementary interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Analysis of the results of the activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Formulation of the conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Organisation and implementation of the lessons learned workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Fine tuning of conclusions and report writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. A main strength of the approach is the variety and complementarity of the tools developed to collect data for analysing the outcomes of the programme at the overall and regional levels. In this context it should be said that especially the on-line questionnaire has resulted in a unique, and highly valuable source of information. It was send to all JEP co-ordinators in the database (1,319). The result was that out of the 1,386 JEPs that were implemented during the second phase of Tempus, we received a fully filled out questionnaire for 599 of them (43%). This very high coverage and high response rate (45%) enabled the evaluators to analyse the data at both the global and regional level and to draw representative conclusions at both levels. In addition the on-line responses provided the evaluators with easy access to a large part of the outputs and outcomes of the JEPs as perceived by the JEP co-ordinators. The on-line questionnaire also provided a long list of impact examples. In other words the on-line questionnaire provides a main source of evidence on the basis of which the evaluators were able to draw solid conclusions. This on-line questionnaire was especially used to analyse the issue of Tempus influence on legislative change and the issue of sustainable partnerships.

7. The two other surveys are also important in the approach. They, however, can be considered representative only for the global view at total programme level. The field survey of JEP participants (a sample of 80 JEPs in 16 countries) was use to analyse issue two (curriculum development) issue three (university management) and issue four (training of decision makers). The sample was designed to be representative at the total programme level, it was too small to draw valid conclusions at regional level. Likewise the structured questionnaire of higher education authorities provides interesting and relevant information on the

---

19 The findings of the on-line questionnaire also allow analysis of outcomes at national level for issues one and six but this was not needed for this study.
perceptions of some key policy makers and higher expert on the impact of the Tempus programme in their countries. But with a sample of 26 people in 19 countries, one should be careful to draw general conclusions even at the aggregate level of the total programme. The value of that HEA survey lies mostly in the fact that it enriches the analysis by giving the perspective from the various ministries in the individual countries.

8. In the approach, the workshops served the purpose of deepening the understanding of the Evaluation Team of the outcomes of Tempus in the wider context of education reforms in the Tacis and the CARDS region. In particular the workshops were used to obtain feedback from a carefully selected group of knowledgeable participants on the conclusions drawn by the evaluators from the survey results. For the eligible countries in the PHARE region, it was not considered necessary to supplement the information from the surveys with a similar workshop because other relevant sources of information were believed to be available20. Moreover, a workshop in the PHARE region was considered less relevant from a lessons learned point of view because the countries are not eligible for participating in the third phase of the Tempus programme.

9. A limitation of a different order is that the Terms of Reference focused the evaluation mainly on the JEPs. Individual Mobility Grants and structural and complementary measures (compact measures and projects) have not explicitly been covered by the survey tools used in the study. This may have limited the insight of the evaluators in the full impact of the scheme, especially with respect to the issue of Tempus influence on specific examples of legislative changes at national level (issue 1).

10. The analysis is clearly focussed on Tempus stakeholders. This is intentional, as these groups have the most comprehensive understanding of the programme’s impact, yet it may lead to a positive bias in the conclusions. To avoid this, local experts outside the framework of the Tempus programme were recruited, for undertaking the surveys. They were asked to report back to the Evaluation Team in a frank and objective manner.

2.4 The methodology, its strengths and weaknesses

2.4.1 The data collection tools: the literature and document review

The bibliography annexed to this report provides a list of the publications and documents that were found most relevant for the study. The sources for publications and newspaper articles used in this study included:

- The Commission and ETF;
- Bilateral donor web-sites (DFID, GTZ, DGIS);
- Ministries of Education in the eligible countries;

20 For example the work done by Ewa Kolanowska on assessing Tempus impact in four PHARE countries, and various Tempus PHARE country impact studies (for references see the bibliography).
• The library of the Erasmus University in Rotterdam;
• The main sites on higher education accessible via internet including the OECD, UNESCO, WorldBank, EBRD, Nuffic, Soros Foundation, Eurasia Foundation;
• The higher education section in the library of the Netherlands Economic Institute (ECORYS-NEI);
• The archives of some major newspapers in the Netherlands, Russia, Kazakhstan and FYR Macedonia.

In addition the final reports of in total 80 sampled JEP project files were reviewed.

The value of the literature review for the evaluation

The literature review was important for providing the evaluators with insight in the workings of the Tempus programme and getting a first idea of the issues effecting the expected outcomes of the Tempus programme. The review clarified the transition setting and in particular the reform processes of higher education in which the second phase of Tempus has operated. Moreover, the review contributed to understanding in which fields Tempus provided value added relative to other grant and loan funded higher education programmes available for the eligible countries.

These insights were used in this evaluation of the second phase of Tempus as well as in the mid-term evaluation of the third phase of Tempus. In particular the literature and documents review was useful for: (1) formulating the Tempus intervention logic; (2) categorisation of the various types reform changes and outputs aimed for by the JEP activities of Tempus; and (3) for drawing up a number of hypothesis as to the causal relations between Tempus activities, outputs and the expected outcomes, which were testing during the evaluations.

In this evaluation of the second phase of the Tempus programme, these findings from the literature review were used to formulate the questions in the survey tools. In this respect, the Tempus country impact studies for PHARE countries (prepared on the initiative of the Commission), the recent inventory study (as yet unpublished) by Ewa Kolanowska on the results of Tempus in four PHARE countries, and the file review of the 80 sampled JEPs proved most useful. The literature, furthermore, was used as input for the country background papers that were prepared for the three workshops in Moscow, Almaty and Skopje.

Strengths and weaknesses of the literature review

Apart from its role in the evaluation process, a strength of the review has been that it provided a comprehensive picture of what has been achieved by Tempus in terms of curriculum reform (issue one) and university management (issue 2), especially in the PHARE region. The literature search has failed, however in identifying independent academic publications from researchers on the role of Tempus in the higher education reform process. The evaluators assume that Tempus will have been the subject of a number of PhD theses, but such research was not systematically looked for. The literature review has in general generated little information, which could be used directly for
answering the key questions raised in the terms of reference, and this prompted the evaluators to design a number of new data collection tools.

2.4.2 The data collection tools: the on-line questionnaire

The ToR question on sustainable partnerships prompted the development of the on-line questionnaire. The idea was that the issue: to what extent Tempus had contributed to the establishment of sustainable partnerships between higher education institutions in the eligible countries and the EU, could best be answered by asking all involved parties directly. To do this a source of address data was needed, and this was provided by ETF. The JEP database that existed contained JEP contractors and JEP co-ordinators. This ETF database proved to be in reasonable condition. In the end the Evaluation Team send e-mails to 2,000 addresses to reach a total of 1,319 JEPs out of a total of 1,386 JEPs which ETF data showed were implemented during the second phase of the Tempus programme (see Table 1.4). In the period that the on-line questionnaire was accessible, 638 JEP co-ordinators people responded and this resulted in questionnaires completely filled out for 599 different JEPs. This gave a response rate of 45.4 percent and a total JEP coverage of 43.2 percent.

The on-line questionnaire (see the technical annex for the format and full results) focused on the sustainable partnership issue but also contained a number of other questions related to the issue of Tempus project level impact on legislative changes.

Strengths and weaknesses of the on-line questionnaire

The strength of the questionnaire is that it provides a systematic and comprehensive source of information on two types of outcomes (sustainable partnerships and JEP impact on legislative reforms in the field of higher education and in other fields). Moreover the very high response rate (every second JEP co-ordinator responded) allows analysis of the data at four levels: the global total programme level, the regional level, the national level and the level of the individual JEPs. For the first two levels of analysis representative conclusions can be drawn, and even for analysis at national level, the data is suitable for countries with a fairly large portfolio. Thus the data source can be called unique and highly relevant for this evaluation.

The on-line questionnaire has, however, several weaknesses

1. First of all the respondents are the JEP co-ordinators, i.e. the persons directly involved in the projects and responsible for the academic content. Thus one may expect some positive bias in the answers, especially with respect to the legislative impact questions (see also section 2.5).
2. Secondly the rules and regulations of Tempus determine who can be the co-ordinator in a JEP consortium. For the PHARE and CARDS countries, the co-ordinator may come form either the eligible countries or the EU. In the case of Tacis the rules prescribe that co-ordinators must be based in the higher education institutions of the EU. This difference in origin was considered a factor in explaining some of the

21 The on-line questionnaire can be found under www.ecorys.com/cgi-bin/fresults.cgi. It was operational i.e. accessible for respondents in the period February-June, 2003.
differences found in the response patterns between EU based and region based JEP co-ordinators. For example for EU based co-ordinators ranked the incentives for co-operation in JEPs differently than the region-based co-ordinators.

Table 2.3 The on-line questionnaire - response rates and origin of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>No. of JEPs</th>
<th>On-line JEPs</th>
<th>On-line response rate</th>
<th>Origin of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHARE</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>41,3%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacis</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>54,9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Balkans</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43,9%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1386</strong></td>
<td><strong>599</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. A third weakness is that the survey questions were not specific enough to avoid that respondents interpreted them in different ways. This was noted during the analysis of the answers, and especially from the impact examples provided in the questionnaire. For example, the question regarding Tempus project impact on legislative reforms in the field of higher education drew a range of examples including changes in rules and regulations at faculty, university level and at national level. Likewise, the question on Tempus project impact on legislative reforms in other fields generated answers that covered both higher education related reforms as well as reforms related to environmental regulations, health standards.

Most of these weaknesses were recognised from the start and were considered unavoidable given the limits of what one can do in terms of explaining the meaning of terms and questions in an on-line questionnaire. To compensate for these weaknesses, the evaluators have been careful in drawing conclusions from the data presented in this study and in that respect the impact examples provided by the respondents to substantiate their answers proved useful.

The formats and the full results of the on-line questionnaire and of the two other survey tools discussed below are presented in the Technical Annex prepared for the Commission.

2.4.3 The data collection tools: the JEP partner survey in the regions

In the methodology proposed by ECORYS-NEI to the Commission, the JEP partner survey was presented as the main tool for the fieldwork. It was proposed that at least fifty interviews would be held with JEP partners in the eligible countries using a structured questionnaire. This number was considered sufficient to draw valid and representative conclusions at the global view level of the programme. Given that the second phase of Tempus covered three regions and some 26 eligible countries, it was not considered feasible to analyse sufficient numbers of JEPs to allow valid conclusions at the level of the three regions. In order to compensate for this weakness, it was proposed to supplement the data with a number of country case studies to give more body to the analysis at regional level (see section 2.4.5 below).
Taking into account that our previous survey experience shows that a response rate of 60 percent can be expected from structured questionnaires, and given the methodological requirement that at least 50 completed questionnaires would be generated, a total of 80 JEPs were selected, using a sampling grid. The grid reflected that the main information gap was on Tacis and CARDS regions rather than on the PHARE region. To collect the basic data on the JEPs, and to prepare the experts for the fieldwork, the Evaluation Team visited ETF in Turin, and with help of ETF staff compiled the relevant documentation. One or two experts conducted the fieldwork in each country. The experts, mostly nationals were contracted and provided with guidelines to provide the following services:

- Organisation of interviews with the identified representative of the higher education institution responsible for each of the JEPs on behalf of the partner organisations in the country;
- Ensuring completion of the structured questionnaire by the respondents;
- Organisation of a meeting with a senior official of the Ministry of Education (e.g. minister, deputy minister, senior civil servant or senior policy advisor) to complete the HEA questionnaire;
- A paper summarising the perceptions of the local evaluation expert on Tempus impact in his country to be written after completion of the interviews.

**Strengths and weaknesses of the JEP participants’ survey**

This approach proved successful, with coaching and monitoring from the contractor's office in Rotterdam and from NEI Moscow, all 80 JEPs were contacted and the questionnaires were filled out by the respondents (100% response rate). Important for this high survey success rate was the combination of sending of the questionnaire in advance to the identified respondents and follow up visits by the local experts and/or follow up by telephone. The list of experts used for the fieldwork is provided in an appendix.

The main weakness or limitation of the tool is that most of the respondents are lecturers working at faculty level in the partner institutions. As such the answers to those questions that lift the perspective beyond the level of the faculty and/or university may well be biased by the direct experience of the respondent in his own JEP. Comparison of the answers and cross checking with other sources of information seem to indicate that this bias has not been a main factor in the answers, but the fact remains that also this source of information relies on participants and beneficiaries of the programme.

**2.4.4 The data collection tools: the survey of higher education authorities**

In order to get a different perspective in the merits of the Tempus programme, a third survey tools was designed: the questionnaire for higher education authorities (HEA) and higher education experts/advisors to the Ministry of Education. The aim of the tool was to obtain the perceptions of the HEA on the achievements of Tempus and on each of the issues addressed in the evaluation. In total 26 people were interviewed in 19 countries.

---

22 Details on the sampling grid are provided in the Technical Annex.
The interviewees include deputy ministers of education and heads of higher education departments in the Ministry of Education.

**Strengths and weaknesses of the HEA survey**

The survey covers all ten PHARE countries, all three CARDS countries and six of the 13 Tacis countries. In many but not all countries senior officials, with relevant knowledge of Tempus were reached for this study. The results show that the perceptions of the interviewees with respect to the impact of Tempus on legislative changes vary considerably per country. Furthermore, taking a global view, the HEA results show that there are significant differences on this issue between the perceptions of the HEAs and the JEP co-ordinators and JEP participants. This matches the expectation of the evaluators that the HEAs would look at legislative reforms at national level, while JEP co-ordinators look at legislative reforms/regulations at university and faculty level.

An obvious weakness is that the HEA sample is very small and that statistical aggregation may well lead to a loss of information rather a gain. The value of the tool therefore lies mainly in qualifying the results of the other surveys and putting them in the wider perspective of higher education reforms in the eligible countries.

**2.4.5 The data collection tools: country studies and regional workshops**

In the approach, the regional workshops serve a dual purpose. Firstly, they aim to clarify the wider transition context and higher education reform process in which the second phase of Tempus has taken place (see also section 2.3, item eight above). Secondly, they aim to obtain the views of a well informed and qualified audience of Tempus stakeholders on this issues raised in the terms of reference for the final evaluation of the second phase of Tempus and for the mid-term evaluation of the third phase of the Tempus programme.

The selection of countries for the three workshops was determined by a number of considerations. The Russian Federation was chosen because of its dominance in the Tacis region, with 50 percent of the Tempus Tacis JEP portfolio. Likewise fYR Macedonia was chosen because it has the largest portfolio of JEPs in the CARDS region. The idea of the third country was to select an area were Tempus has not yet done very much and to assess the validity of the Tempus model of multilateral for the future. In the end the choice for Almaty in Kazakhstan was made and people from Kyrgyzstan were invited to participate as well.

The preparation of the workshops involved the drafting of background information on the process and milestones in the higher education reform process in the country, an issues paper for the workshop, and an assessment of literature and articles about Tempus in the local journals and newspapers. Special attention was paid to the list of people invited. For this a guideline was given to the universities who hosted the workshops. The lists of participants included faculty staff who initiated and participated in JEPs during the second and third phase of the Tempus, university deans and students, industry representatives, higher education experts, representatives from the Ministry of education.
and the local TIPs or NTO office. In addition representatives from other organisations and projects active in the field of higher education were invited. Moreover, in each country a representative of the Delegation of the European Commission was invited. Furthermore three members of the Evaluation Team participated in each of the workshops, and one representative of the Tempus unit of DG EAC was available in an observer status and as a resource person.

All three workshops took one full day in which the key questions formulated in the issues paper were discussed. The debates in the workshops were lively, and at the end of each workshop the main conclusions on which consensus had emerged were highlighted and likewise if an issue led to diverging views than these were recorded. As follow up to each workshop, a workshop report was written and this was circulated for comments to the participants. On the basis of the comments the workshop reports were finalised. These three reports are included in full in the Technical Annex.

The strengths and weaknesses of the country case study/workshop approach

The workshops were carefully prepared, with involvement of local universities, and this contributed to a high level of the discussions. In Moscow and in Almaty almost all of the invited participants who had confirmed their participation showed up. The workshops were especially relevant for the discussion on the wider higher education reform setting of Tempus in Russia, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan and on some of the key questions related to the validity of the Tempus approach in the current transition conditions in those countries. In Skopje, the workshop coincided with a graduation event in the economics faculty and this reduced somewhat the number of academic participants. This workshop was relevant for the evaluation because it highlighted amongst other things the Stabilisation and Association processes ongoing in the CARDS area, the importance of regional Tempus projects as well as the relevance of the ideas of the Bologna process and its links with Tempus.

What can be considered a weakness of the approach is that the discussions have mainly served the purpose of increasing the contractor’s understanding of the complexity of the issues raised in the ToRs. The comments from the individual participants recorded in the reports on the workshops are evidence of course but have limited general value for the evaluation. A number of the comments have been used in the final analysis and in the writing of the final reports as quotations for illustrating the more general findings. In this respect, the general conclusions drawn at the end of each workshop have been given ample weight in the final analysis of the key issues addressed in the evaluation.

2.4.6 The data collection tools: interviews

In addition to the interviews held in the context of the surveys, the tool of the interview has only been used to clarify specific issues that arose during the evaluation. Of each interview minutes were made and these are available in the project files of the contractor. Interviews were used amongst others things:

- To clarify the assignment with the Commission and for better understanding the management challenges of the second and third phase of the Tempus programme;
To understand how employers look at the relations between universities and industry and at the relation between labour market demand and the skills of students graduating from the higher education systems;

To receive information on the centre of excellence concept promoted by top universities in countries like Russia and Kazakhstan;

To get information on the role of other donors in the field of higher education;

To clarify the role of the academic assessment in the Tempus project selection process.

2.4.7 The methodology for analysis of the collected data

To be able to compare and analyse the data from the different survey tools, a master list of questions was drawn up for the construction of the surveys, and standard methods for data aggregation were used. The result is that for most issues the survey data can be aggregated and/or compared easily.

In the majority of questions, the respondents were asked to select the most appropriate option from the list (alternative answers) or several appropriate options. Most questions included an open other option, although it was rarely used by respondents. The importance of an option was estimated by the percentage of those who marked it to the total number of respondents. For alternative questions, the sum of percentages gives 100%.

This method was also used to obtain answers on the key questions in the evaluation. Take for example the question on issue 5: To what extent has the second phase of Tempus contributed to the formation of sustainable partnerships in higher education involving EC and other countries?

The respondents could choose between:

Major direct influence; Minor direct influence, Major indirect influence, Minor indirect influence, No influence, Don't know and no answer (default).

This set of opposing options i.e. Influence, no influence; direct influence, versus indirect influence; major versus minor levels of influence; and the escape option of no answers or don't know, has been used throughout the report for classifying the extent to which Tempus has achieved its expected outcomes.

The methodology for the distinction between direct versus indirect influence in the three survey tools, is that a direct influence can be observed when a JEP directly addresses the issue with activities and outputs. For example a curriculum development project may have as an outcome that a co-operation agreement is signed for running a joined MA programme with mutual recognition of degrees. In that case there is clearly a direct influence of the project on the issue of the development of sustainable partnerships. An indirect influence on sustainable partnership development could be that people who teach in the joined MA programme decide to work together on a common academic research subject.
The distinction major and minor refers to the relative importance of the Tempus JEP. To stay with the issue of sustainable partnerships, a JEP would have a major direct influence, if the partnership had not emerged without the Tempus programme. A minor direct influence would be found in the case where a JEP builds on an existing partnership and reinforces its sustainability.

The strengths of this distinction between direct, indirect and major, minor is its simplicity and its intuitive guidance, which is an important quality for questionnaires. At the same time this intuitive feeling which respondents depend on to select the appropriate answer, is the weakness of the approach. One can think of many examples where it would not be easy to draw a sharp line between these categories of influence.

The second type of questions used in the three surveys required the ranking of options in order of importance (4-6 options). These questions appeared to be harder to answer. A fairly common mistake was marking two or more options with the same rank, or even all important options with the same rank. This weakness in the surveys has limited the usefulness of some of the ranking questions for rigorous aggregation. In some cases the mean ranking value was chosen as the most correct estimate of the importance of options. In other questions further analyses of the individual answers proved necessary to aggregate the findings.

### 2.4.8 From analysis to conclusions

For each of the main issues addressed by the evaluation, a different mix of data collection tools was used, and in order to arrive at the overall conclusions the relative importance of the various data sources was established.

In this context four principles were used in the process of aggregating data, analysis of the aggregated data and for drawing the conclusions:

1. **Two levels of aggregation** i.e. the global view of the total programme, and the aggregation at regional level;
2. **Rigour in the analysis** i.e. were methodological limits prevents aggregation to regional level on the basis of one tool, aggregation requires supporting evidence from all other tools;
3. **Precaution** i.e. it is better to underestimate than overestimate Tempus impact. In case the data tools provide conflicting information on the extent of programme outcomes and one source is not clearly more credible, than the others, then the conclusion should reflect the lower level of impact found;
4. **Testing conclusions** i.e. to test the validity of the analysis and the conclusions drawn, the results of the study are presented for scrutiny and debate to a group of well informed independent experts and committed stakeholders.

---

23 Some Tacis respondents ranked the options in decreasing order instead of increasing because for this region it is a common way of estimating. When treating the survey data the project experts accordingly adjusted such "adverse" answers.
This last element has taken the form of a lessons learned workshop in Brussels, hosted by the contractor in the premises of the Commission. The participants had been carefully invited on the basis of the contacts built up by the contractor during the study. The first day of the workshop was devoted to the evaluation of the second phase of the Tempus programme. The key questions were outlined one by one and the evidence form the data collection process and the findings derived from the aggregation of the data were discussed. The workshop proved very useful to identify methodological problems and weaknesses in the rigour of the analysis and in the aggregation of the findings at regional level. In addition the comments of the participants provided a wealth of detail on Tempus experience, relevant for further deepening the understanding of the Evaluation Team in the complexities of the programme.

A full report on the results of this workshop is included in the Technical Annex.

The final steps in the completion of the report, and in further refining the rigour of the analysis and deepening the analysis was prompted by the comments of the steering committee for the study. Amongst other things this has resulted in this chapter on the approach and methodology that forms the backbone of the findings and conclusions presented in this report.

2.5 The methodologies for the expected outcomes

For outcome 1 i.e. *legislative change leading to convergence*, the HEA survey was used as the most authoritative source for aggregation to the global level and regional level. The on-line survey and the JEP survey were used to check the validity of the findings.

For outcome 2 i.e. *legislative change leading to better adaptation to socio-economic reality*, the JEP survey was the most relevant source. The on-line survey and the literature review were used to check the relevance of the findings.

For outcome 3 i.e. *legislative change on the regulated professions*, the JEP survey was the main source. The findings were checked against the findings of the HEA survey and the examples on legislative impact provided by the on-line questionnaire.

For outcome 4 i.e. *institutions openness and preparedness for international co-operation*, the JEP survey was considered the main source, to extent the validity of the findings to the regional level of aggregation, the literature review and the on-line survey data on the types of sustainable partnerships were used.

For outcome 5 i.e. *new management approaches and structures*, the JEP survey provided the basic information. The workshops and especially the lessons learned workshop in Brussels was important to provide sufficient information for breaking down the conclusions from global to regional level.

For outcome 6 i.e. *curriculum development and acquisition of skills*, the literature review and the JEP survey were the main sources of information. Analysis of the Tempus intervention logic served to clarify the issues. The feedback from the lessons learned
workshop was used to further refine the analysis. In this context the interviews with employers and students during the regional workshops were also relevant.

For outcome 7 i.e. training of decision makers and career development, the literature review was used to assess the expected outcomes. The findings of the information collection tools show that the HEA survey was the main information source for answering the question related to the training of decision makers. The JEP survey was the best source on the question related to career development and retention of staff.

For outcome 8 i.e. the formation of sustainable partnerships, the on-line survey provided the relevant information. The JEP survey was used to cross check the findings. The lessons learned workshop was used to better understand the incentives and disincentives of co-operation in JEPs for the higher education institutions in the eligible countries and in the EU Member States.

2.6 The organisation of the study

The study started 22nd October 2002 with a briefing session from the Commission in Brussels. Information on the content of the second phase of Tempus was collected from the Tempus unit of ETF in Turin. The literature review was undertaken in the 4th quarter of 2002, and in this period also a case study on the impact of Tempus on legislative changes in the Russian Federation was completed. In January 2003 the questionnaires were designed in consultation with the Commission in Brussels. The questionnaire for the JEP co-ordinators went on-line in February and was open until the end of June 2003. The structured interviews were held in the eligible countries in February and March. The three workshops were organised in April and May. At the same time supplementary information was collected and analysed and the interim report was written. On the 1st and 2nd of July, the lessons learned workshop was organised. Following this workshop, the draft final report was prepared and submitted for comments to the Commission on 23 July 2003. The comments of the Commission were received by 25 September and the final report was submitted to the Commission on 28 October 2003.
3 Outcomes 1-3 Contributions to changes in legislation

3.1 Introduction to the issue

This chapter sets out the analysis and findings of the evaluation with respect to the first set of questions formulated by DG EAC in the Terms of Reference for the final evaluation of the second phase of the Tempus programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation questions number 1-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme contributed to changes in legislation leading to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater convergence of education systems in the eligible countries with those in the EC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education systems better adapted to the changing socio-economic reality, in particular market economies and multiparty political systems? and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Specifically for pre-accession countries) the transposition into national law of the acquis communautaire, particularly in so far as the regulated professions are concerned?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In section 3.2 the role of Tempus in the process of legislative reforms in the eligible countries is described. In section 3.3, the evaluation approach and methodology for assessing the legislative impact of Tempus is introduced. Section 3.4 provides the main data collected on these issues. The analysis of the data and conclusions that can be drawn from the data are presented in section 3.5. Finally the main outcomes found by this evaluation of the second phase of the Tempus programme with respect to its contribution to legislative changes are summarised in section 3.6.

3.2 The expected outcome of Tempus with respect to legislative change

Legislative reform is an ongoing process in the eligible countries of the second phase of the Tempus programme. In most of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the basic legislation on higher education was put into place in the first two years after the break up of the communist regimes. These reforms therefore preceded the first and the second phase of the Tempus programme. Since those days, the higher education institutions in the eligible countries have adjusted to this new framework and have developed in accordance with the incentives and disincentives created by the new legislation. As a result many amendments and revisions have been introduced in an ongoing process, and the question raised in the ToR is to what extent Tempus has contributed to these changes, and in what directions Tempus has influenced the changes.
The starting point for the analysis of this question is the observation that Tempus has a bottom-up approach to bringing about reforms. The entry point for the JEPs are faculties rather than universities as such, and only in very few cases has the Tempus programme directly addressed the national education authorities as partners for JEPs. In those cases when Tempus has reached decision makers at national level directly, this has happened mainly through the IMGs and or compact projects and measures.

The main reason why the Commission has not attempted to use its co-operation programmes: PHARE, Tacis, Tempus to promote the initial wave of basic reforms in education either directly or indirectly can be found in Article 149 of the Treaty of Rome. There, the European Union, while recognising the crucial role education plays in the construction and operation of a properly functioning single labour market, is unambiguous in its assertion that education is not its competence. For this reason, the Commission has at no point in its history attempted to intervene in the slow moving harmonisation of Member States’ legislation in the field of higher education. The Bologna process is a case in point. It was inspired by the need to eliminate within the European Union the vast obstacles to teacher, student and labour mobility that arise above all from non-recognition of study periods spent abroad or qualifications gained in another Member State. Yet this Europe-wide initiative is being de facto championed by Education Ministers across the continent, since any such strategic direction emanating from Brussels would be considered a step too far by many in the Union both in and outside higher education.

Tempus I experience showed the need and opportunity for further legislative changes

During Tempus I, JEP co-ordinators and JEP partners in the eligible countries, encountered many inadequacies in the eligible countries’ legislative frameworks, which provided barriers for the JEP outcomes to have sustainable effects and impact beyond the department or faculty level where Tempus I activities were mainly focused. In particular opportunities for reforms were identified in the following areas:

- Quality control procedure;
- Accreditation for new curricula;
- Issue specific regulations;
- The introduction of “Anglo-Saxon” three tier degree structure (bachelors, masters, PhD);
- Credit transfer systems;
- Budgetary regulations; and
- The degree of autonomy of faculties and universities in developing new courses and setting fee levels.

24 The Community shall contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging co-operation between Member States and, if necessary, by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organisation of education systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity.
Tempus I showed the need for embedding outcomes in legislative changes. Evaluation findings and progress reports from JEP co-ordinators during the period 1990-1993, confirmed that sustainable outcomes in the field of curriculum development, mobility and university management required follow up with new legislation and/or with setting up mechanisms and procedures to start implementing reforms within the context of new legislation.

Legislative change became an expected outcome in the second phase of Tempus. The Commission, when preparing for the second phase of Tempus duly recognised that a properly functioning legislative framework is a vital component of the comprehensive reform of a country’s higher education system. It realised that without it the partnership and co-operation offered by the Tempus programme might well be frustrated or its sustainability placed under threat. In the text of the Council Decision on Tempus II, this is reflected by the statement the objectives of Tempus should be more clearly targeted whether on the long-term reform of higher education or on the shorter-term needs of economic restructuring.

Tempus II provides tools for promoting legislative change. The insight that Tempus, despite its bottom-up nature, could be an tool for identifying needs & opportunities for promoting legislative changes and at the same time could be targeted more on promoting such changes was important for the formulation of the Council Decision on the second phase of Tempus. It led to the introduction of the national priorities, structural and complementary measures and institution building projects. These were conceived as the new tools for promoting that impact of the bottom-up nature of Tempus projects would go beyond department and faculty level and also address issues requiring legislative changes and university and national levels.

In this context, it is logical that the first three evaluation questions pertain to the influence that Tempus has had in its second phase on legislative changes. This context also indicates that the term legislative change as used in the terms of reference has a wide meaning. It covers legislation on education at national level, as well as rules, regulations and procedures adopted at university and faculty levels.

3.3 Approach and expected outcomes

Section 3.2 has shown why the issue of legislative changes has become an expected outcome of the second phase of the Tempus programme, and in what areas this outcome is expected. To assess this question the evaluation used the following tools for data collection and analysis.

The on-line survey was used to get an overall global view on the extent to which the second phase of Tempus has influenced legislative changes. The tool was used, moreover to make a distinction between legislative change related to the education sector and legislative change in other sectors e.g. environmental legislation, health standards etc. For the three specific questions on convergence, adaptation and regulated professions, the JEP survey and the HEA survey were used to collect and aggregate data. Moreover, in order to get more insight in the regional differences of Tempus influence on legislative
change, supplementary information was collected through the literature review, country case studies and by putting this issue as a central question in the three regional workshops in Moscow, Almaty and Skopje.
The various tools for data collection and feedback on the findings are listed below:

- A review of existing studies and publications;
- Case Study Russian Federation legislative reforms;
- An on-line questionnaire for JEP co-ordinators;
- Structured interviews with JEP participants in the eligible countries;
- Structured interviews with competent authorities in the field of higher education in the eligible countries;
- Three regional workshops in Moscow, Almaty and Skopje;
- A participatory workshop with 35 representatives of the various stakeholders involved in the second phase of Tempus.

The evaluation process started with the literature review and on that basis the following indicators were selected for the data collection process on the three expected outcomes.

**Expected outcome 1**  
*Tempus II is expected to have promoted changes in legislation leading to: greater convergence of education systems in the eligible countries with those in the EC.*

Relevant outcome indicators:
- Introduction of the two cycle degree system (bachelors, masters, PhD studies);
- Accreditation systems based on the principles of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS).

**Expected outcome 2**  
*Tempus II is expected to have promoted changes in legislation leading to: education systems better adapted to the changing socio-economic reality, in particular market economies and multiparty political systems.*

Relevant outcome indicators:
- New diplomas and specialisation's including European languages;
- New university-industry linkages;
- New regulations on life long learning and/or distance education;
- Increased autonomy/establishment of private accredited HEIs/new departments;
- New budgetary regulations supporting curriculum development/new diplomas;
- New fee structures reflecting student fees/student financing arrangements.

**Expected outcome 3**  
*Tempus II is expected to have promoted changes in legislation leading to: specifically for pre-accession countries) the transposition into national law of the acquis communautaire, particularly in so far as the regulated professions are concerned.*

Relevant outcome indicators on acquis communautaire:
- JEPs devoted to new diplomas for regulated professions.

On the basis of the above formulations on expected outcomes and indicators for measuring the outcomes at JEP level and the impact at programme level, the various information collection tools were given content.
3.4 Findings from the evaluation tools

3.4.1 Findings from the literature review

*Source 1: Tempus country impact studies*

The various national Tempus offices in the PHARE region published in 1998 a series of country impact booklets. These documented in varying degrees of detail the legislative changes in their respective countries and commented on the extent to which Tempus played a role in the elaboration and content of these laws. Examples include the Romanian “Statute of the [Higher Education] Teaching Staff,” passed in 1997, and the establishment by the Lithuanian Ministry of Education and Science of a “Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education” in 1995. In both these cases, a strong influence of the Tempus programme “could be detected”. Although interesting reading, the impact studies do not give much insight in the overall level of influence of Tempus on these issues. The studies document the outputs of the JEPs and Compacts, but lack the time perspective needed for a more global view on this issue. What does emerges clearly from these documents is that the mentioned legislative reforms were addressed as the outputs of only a very small number of the total JEP portfolio of Tempus II and II bis.

*Source 2: Conference presentations*

The issue of Tempus JEP impact on legislative changes was on the agenda of two annual conferences of Tempus in Portoroz (1998) and Kiev (1999). The documentation indicates that individual JEPs did have a direct impact, but that this was not a main outcome of the programme. The following textbox gives an example of a direct influence of Tempus Activities on legislative changes.

**Text box 3.1 An example of direct impact on legislative change**

In 1994-1997 a Tempus project T-JEP –08561-94 "Strengthening Economic Education in Moscow and related universities" was implemented at the Economic faculty of Moscow State University (MSU). The project resulted in upgrading teachers qualification and students knowledge, curricula development, elaborating and introducing a number of basic up-to-date courses. In 1997 Tempus results were presented to the TTMA on economics led by MSU and comprising also economic faculties of ‘classic universities’ such as St. Petersburg, Novosibirsk, Ural, Perm, Kazan, Saratov and other universities, a majority of which had also participated in Tempus. The new curricula and the new courses presented by MSU were approved. In 2000, when old state standards in economics were revised, new standards suggested by this TTMA were approved by the Ministry of Education. In comparison with standards for other specialties, these are much more up-to date and in line with those of the EU.

(Source: Portoroz conference documentation)

*Source 3: Previous evaluation studies*

The following quotations from the evaluation study on Tempus in the NIS illustrate the direction of findings of previous evaluations with respect to Tempus influence of legislative changes.
"The link between individual projects at individual institutes and issues of overall higher education reform and restructuring, was often not made. This is also evident from inter alia: (i) the insufficiencies of current project identification and formulation, which often fail to include e.g. a proper problem analysis, an analysis of the training institute and its role and position in the country’s education system, etc. and (ii) the lack of contacts with the NIS national educational authorities that has been observed for many of the projects. Moreover, mechanisms to accumulate and analyse the experiences and results at country level are not in place.”

and

"So far, the TEMPUS Tacis programme has had no visible impact on the national higher education policies of the individual partner countries, nor on education legislation. A key observation to be made here is that in virtually all NIS the process of higher education policy making is still not completed. This makes it virtually impossible to assess what impact a programme such as TEMPUS Tacis may have (had). At the same time it can be observed that the likeliness of such an impact may be reduced by some of the key characteristics of the current approach followed by the Programme. First of all, there is the principle of the so-called "bottom-up" approach and its focus on projects with individual NIS institutes in specific academic areas. The increasing autonomy of these universities potentially diminishes their influence on the education policies pursued in the different NIS. Secondly, although the national educational authorities in the NIS often use so-called 'academic support groups' for the development of education policies, the TEMPUS Tacis projects did not particularly address nor involve these groups, nor the Ministries of Education”.

Source 4: ETF evaluation study

The report assessing the contribution of the Tempus programme to the EU accession process in Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria and Romania (Ewa Kolanovska, 2003) also looks at the Tempus impact in the field of legislative reform. The report concludes that because of its nature as a bottom-up programme for universities, Tempus seems to have influenced legislation, policies and strategy at national level more as a spin-off effect (of its priorities for and projects implemented by universities) than through its direct support. Some direct support was provided through Compact Measures (CME). The potential role of the CME seems to have been underestimated in view of the fact that national legislation and policies were only gradually being developed between 1994 and 2001 in all four countries. In particular between 1994 and 1997 the opportunities offered through Compact Measures could have been better used. Reasons for limited use include the fact that policy development at national level was only one if the options available within the CME strand, limited allocated resources and inertia of national bodies.

In summary, the report describes contributions of the Tempus programme as “islands”. Identified contributions are listed by the report.

Some issues were first promoted in Tempus and later emerged at national level: institutional development plans, ECTS-based credit systems, internal quality assurance systems.

Expertise developed by academic teachers participating in Tempus was used through their involvement in working groups set up by national authorities to design, for example, accreditation.

---

25  Tempus Tacis evaluation study, February 1998, section 7.1
26  Tempus Tacis evaluation study, February 1998, section 7.2
There are examples of direct contributions from JEPs: Tempus consortia developed proposals for amendments in higher education law in Bulgaria, national strategies for higher education funding in Romania and Hungary and concepts of accreditation and credit systems in Hungary. Single universities in Bulgaria and Poland prepared proposals for model curricula, curricular requirements and standards in one or two areas of study. Some specific Tempus outcomes were integrated, for example, in the concepts of quality assurance or accreditation systems developed by national authorities in Romania and Poland.

Source 5: Other ETF documents

A review of various other publications indicates the education reforms not only provided new opportunities but also created a number of barriers for the potential legislative influence of Tempus programme activities.

Existing education acts have created barriers for further reforms. In Slovakia, for example, the system of accreditation is based upon a Higher Education Act passed by the (former) Czechoslovak parliament in 1990. The Accreditation Committee that it established is able to operate with an acceptable degree of independence from the government, making changes to curricular content relatively straightforward. Yet any further changes beyond this, such as reform at institutional level - perhaps because they are considered to have political implications - incur a more lengthy and highly politicised procedure that cannot realistically be affronted directly by a Tempus project, with its limited time span.

The large degree of autonomy at faculty level is a barrier for reforms in the CARDS countries. This is a legacy of the former Yugoslav decentralised system, under which each faculty had a direct relationship with the State authorities and negotiated its budget with the relevant Ministry. Various publications mention that in this situation changes were slowly and reluctantly implemented, which is understandable given that the status quo suited those in charge at faculty level. In the literature there is no indication of any expectations that Tempus II would be able to directly address this most important of all legal issues.

Lessons from the literature review

On the basis of the above, the evaluators gained four related insights:
1. The Tempus programme is not designed for having a major direct impact on legislation as an outcome of the programme;
2. Individual JEPs may effect legislation directly, but taking a global view this impact is at best minor, and more often the impact is indirect rather than direct;
3. The existing legislative and regulatory frameworks in the various eligible countries have had a direct effect on the extent to which the Tempus bottom-up initiatives for legislative and regulatory change have succeeded in trickling upwards beyond faculty and or university levels;

4. The bottom-up approach has resulted in initiating change concepts at faculty levels, which were not always in line with the evolving legislative framework in the eligible countries, and in those cases the sustainability of the Tempus activities has been negatively affected.

3.4.2 Findings from the Russian Federation case study

To get more insight in the legislative change processes, and current needs/opportunities, and the possible relations with the Tempus programme, five separate case studies were prepared in the context of this evaluation for the Russian Federation, Kazakhstan, FYR Macedonia, Poland and Albania. In this final evaluation report on the second phase of Tempus the findings of the case study for the Russian Federation are summarised. This report was chosen because it is the most elaborate cases study and because it shows most clearly how and to what extent Tempus has in an indirect way influenced changes in higher education policy changes.

The case study on the Russian Federation 28 study focused on the principles embedded in the basic education laws passed in 1990's and in a number of more recent strategy papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text box 3.2</th>
<th>Basic laws and strategy papers in the Russian federation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Laws passed in the 1990s, which put into force educational reform in Russia are the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since 2000 a number of strategic papers concerning education were adopted since 2000:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Doctrine of education in the Russian Federation for the period till 2025 (2000);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal Programme on the development of education for the period 2000 –2005 (2000);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Programme of the Socio-economic Development of the Russian Federation for 2002 – 2004 years (2001), the paragraph 2.3. Educational policy;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The President Programme “Russian Universities”;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conception of the Modernisation of Russian Education for the period till 2010 (2002).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study makes the following observation:

"The Law and the reforms of 1990-s have played a crucial role in creating fundamental principles of education system that are also common in developed countries such as: the democratic, societal and state character of education, the autonomy of education institutions and introduction of a multi-level education system. In this respect the Law facilitates convergence of Russian education system with those in the EU. However, its general provisions refer to traditions prevailing in Russia rather than targeted at EU or international best practices".

28 The Russian Federation case study is presented in the Technical Annex.
The study, moreover looks at key policy intentions set out in the recent strategy papers, with respect to the objectives of education policy, curriculum development and standard setting, autonomy and budget regulations, standard setting and internationalisation aspects.

As part of the case study, a review was made of media coverage on Tempus, and interviews were held with senior policy makers. The following findings are noteworthy.

Senior policy makers see a link between Tempus impact on regulatory reforms and dissemination and transparency of Tempus results. On this aspect one of the interview partners made the following comment:

---

**Text box 3.3 New elements in Russian strategy papers for modernising Russian education**

The national Doctrine of Education stipulates principles which are in line with contemporary developments in education in the world such as: individualisation of education, interaction between levels and grades of education, development of distant education, and working out programmes for the realisation of IT in education.

The Conception of the Modernisation of Russian Education for the period till 2010 states that:

"The central goal of higher and additional and professional education is to train qualified specialists of an appropriate level and profile, competitive on the labour market, having a full mastery of their profession and knowledgeable in neighbouring spheres of activities, capable of effective performance in the specialisation of training on the level of world standards, ready for professional growth, social and professional mobility". The key words of Russia’s education policy, at the current stage of its social and economic development are stipulated in the Conception document as: access, quality and efficiency.

The new system for the development of education standards is based on a bottom-up approach. The quality and the progressiveness of the standards, curricula and contents of the courses depend on professional qualification of the universities involved. According to experts’ observations, TTMAs comprising or led by universities who participated in the international programmes and in Tempus II in the first instance, produce and approve standards and teaching curricular which are much more advanced than those of TTMA led by universities not upgraded by Tempus.

On university autonomy the Conception paper notes that to ensure a new quality of higher and additional professional education, it is necessary to:

- provide a legal framework for the economic autonomy, e.g. by promoting a diversity of organisational and legal forms of educational institutions and organisations (by introducing amendments to the Civil and Budget Codes and other norm-setting documents);
- consistently implement the principle of economic autonomy of educational institutions, including their freedom of price-setting and dispensing of their funds; ensure transparency of financial activities of educational institutions and enhance their financial and economic responsibility;
- permit the free creation of professional associations that would be involved in the governance of education, development of principles and directions of the education policy.

---

29 Based on the interview with Irina Teleshova, Deputy Head of the Teaching and Teaching Methods Associations of "Classic Universities" on economics held on 26.12.02.
“A serious drawback of the programme is insufficient focus on its dissemination. It’s fully up to the universities how and with whom to share the results. The Ministry has no access to any information on Tempus projects’ results. After a project is awarded to a university, there are no information channels to inform the Ministry and other institutions concerned about project performance and outputs. A year ago the Ministry approached the EU Delegation with regard to setting up a Tempus project database and developing a project on the dissemination of Tempus results, but both ideas were not supported”.

Senior policy makers see convergence occurring between Higher education systems in the Russian Federation and Europe, and credit Tempus with having an indirect influence on this.

Russia should be integrated in the system of European education, though Russian education system has its own distinguishing features if compared with other national education systems. In my opinion Russia should become actively involved in the Bologna process and the state should facilitate the integration of Russian higher education in the common European space of higher education that has been created today. Russian students will gain here, and this will enhance the competitiveness of Russia’s higher education.”

(Mr. Shislov, the Chairman of the State Duma Committee for Education and Science).

During the current decade Russia will be integrated into the unified system of higher education in Europe

(Mr. Philippov, Russian Minister of Education).

Lessons learned from the Russian Federation case study

- It is evident that the Tempus programme that started in 1994, did not have any direct impact on basic Russian legislative documents on education of 1990’s.
- A small part of the individual JEPs in curriculum reform has resulted in new regulations on teaching standards. This influence can be classified as a direct influence on specific regulations. Taking a global view however, this influence can be classified as a minor direct influence at the most.
- There is ample evidence that the Tempus II programme, together with the other assistance programmes, has indirectly contributed to the positive developments towards modernisation of the higher education in Russia that have taken place and are taking place in Russia. Evidence for this can be found in the strategic documents of 2000s and also in the fact that senior education officials have recognised the need for convergence with the EU education system.

In this context it is interesting to note that case study findings differ from those of the Tempus Tacis evaluation report (1998) referred to in the section on the literature review. In the 1998 evaluation, the conclusion was drawn that: "So far, the TEMPUS Tacis programme has had no visible impact on the national higher education policies of the individual partner countries, nor on education legislation”. As a key observation explaining this finding, the evaluation study of 1998 puts forward that Tempus projects did not particularly address the academic support groups through which influence could have

---

30 Interview held on 10.12.02.
31 RIA Novosty, 09 September 2002.
been achieved. Apparently things have changed over time for the better. Current information confirms that at least a part of the Russian academics and experts, who have participated in Tempus programmes, have participated in the academic support groups, and the ideas contained in the new strategy papers clearly reflect a strong European influence and orientation.

3.4.3 Findings from the on-line survey on general impact on legislation

The on-line survey was used to get an overall global view on the extent to which the second phase of Tempus has influenced legislative changes. The tool was used to answer the following three questions:

1. What percentage of the JEPs implemented during the second phase of the Tempus programme produced outputs relevant for legislative reforms and at what level were the outputs directed? The options given to chose from were the national level, the university level, the faculty level, department level and chair level;

2. How do JEP co-ordinators with an ex-post perspective assess the impact of their JEPs on legislative change in the field of higher education. The options given were major direct, minor direct, major indirect, minor indirect, no influence, don't know and no answer;

3. How do JEP co-ordinators with an ex-post perspective assess the impact of their JEPs on legislative change in other fields than education reform.

The answer to the first question was that some 30 per cent of all JEPs produced outputs, which addressed issues relevant for legislative changes/regulations at national level. Combining university and national level than the survey shows that some 40 percent focussed its activities on these two levels. The remainder (60 %) produced outputs at lower levels of the university pyramid only i.e. at chair level, department level and faculty level. These data imply that the majority of the JEPs made no attempt to promote change beyond the faculty level. The answers to the second question are presented in Figure 3.1.

Figure 3.1 On-line survey on legislative change in the field of higher education

Taking the global view, i.e. for the programme in total, some 26 percent of the JEP co-ordinators chose the major direct impact option to qualify the influence of their JEPs on legislative reforms. Ten percent saw a minor direct influence and a further 21 percent
considered the impact to be major but indirect. Thirteen percent opted for minor indirect and the remaining 30 percent chose the answer don't know or no impact.

Desegregation of the data to the regional level, Figure 3.1 indicates that the JEP co-ordinators in the CARDS area see the largest direct influence. The explanation for this may well be that the autonomy of faculties is relatively high in countries that have been established on the basis of the former Yugoslav republic, and that this has facilitated curriculum reform related changes. By contrast, accreditation of new courses and diploma studies is more centralised in the Tacis countries and that provides a barrier for firmly embedding curriculum development innovations in regulatory changes.

The JEP co-ordinators were asked to give relevant examples as evidence for the perceived impact. The resulting list contains hundreds of references related to education policy statements the adoption of new diplomas, the establishment of new departments in universities, accreditation systems, bachelor and masters courses etc., and especially in the PHARE and CARDS areas, examples of the adoption of ECTS.

Figure 3.2 shows how the JEP co-ordinators answered the question to what extent Tempus had influenced legislative changes in other fields than education. In total some 18 percent of the respondents indicated that their JEPs had had a major or minor direct influence on legislative changes outside the competence of university management and higher education authorities. Again, this influence was perceived to have been most marked in the CARDS area, where 26 percent of the respondents confirmed a major direct impact. In the Tacis area this was the lowest.

---

**Text box 3.4  How to read the figures on Tempus impact**

The horizontal axis provides information on the location of the JEP effect. 'Overall' stands for all eligible countries. This total picture is further broken down into the main country groupings in which Tempus II has operated i.e. PHARE, Tacis and Western Balkans (now part of CARDS). The vertical axis gives the percentage of the JEPs in the total portfolio (100%) that was found to have an effect on the relevant question. For analytical purposes effectiveness was measured in terms of direct effects and indirect (i.e. side-effects) or no effect. In addition the effects measured are qualified with the terms major or minor. In this way five categories of effects are distinguished. In the table the zero effect category is shown with a blank. Thus taking figure 3.1 as an example, the overall column shows that in total some 70% of the JEPs had a direct or indirect effect on regulatory/legislative change. The 70% is built up by 26% major direct, 10 percent minor direct, 21 percent major indirect and 13 percent minor indirect, the remaining 30 percent had zero effect on regulatory/legislative change. The other columns show the regional variations in the findings.
The examples given for this type of influence ranged widely from the adoption of ISO standards, to environmental impact assessment procedures, and draft legislation related to crime prevention.

**Lessons learned from the on-line survey**

- Some 40 percent of the JEPs generated outputs relevant for legislative changes at national and or university levels. The remainder of the JEPs during the second phase of Tempus had a more limited ambition level, and produced outputs at chair, department of faculty level only;
- Roughly one third (36%) of the JEPs implemented in the second phase of Tempus has brought about reforms, which directly resulted in legislative and regulatory adjustments in the field of higher education reforms. Another third (34%) has an indirect influence on legislative and regulatory changes, and 30 per cent did not result in new regulations;
- The JEPs have also contributed to legislative and regulatory changes in other fields than education. In total some 18 percent of the JEP co-ordinators marked a direct influence.

### 3.4.4 Findings from the JEP and HEA surveys on legislative convergence

The on-line questionnaire was used to get an overall view of the extent to which Tempus activities had promoted legislative and regulatory change at the various levels on which the JEPs had focused their interventions and outputs. The JEP and HEA surveys were used for a different purpose. They served to collect data on the three specific outcome questions related to convergence, adaptation and regulated professions. This section 3.4.4 provides the data collected with respect to the convergence aspect of legislative changes. The results from the data collection on the other two issues are described in sections 3.4.5 and 3.4.6.

**Expected outcome 1**  
Tempus II is expected to have promoted changes in legislation leading to: greater convergence of education systems in the eligible countries with those in the EC.
As indicated above in section 3.3 the Evaluation Team interpreted the issue of convergence as the extent to which key aspects, which are now in the Bologna Declaration, were introduced in the eligible countries during the second phase of the Tempus programme. In this respect two outcome indicators were considered relevant:

- Introduction of the two cycle degree system (bachelors, masters, PhD studies);
- Accreditation systems based on the principles of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS).

The national experts who were used to interview the Higher Education Authorities and JEP participants for the HEA and JEP survey were using two questionnaires, which contained the following questions with respect to the issue of convergence:

**Question to JEP participants:** If applicable, which of the following statements best describes the impact of your Tempus project on reforms in legislation, which have lead to greater convergence of your national higher education system with those in the EU?

**Question to HEA employees:** The extent to which the Tempus programme has, in the eligible partner countries, promoted changes in legislation which lead to greater convergence of education systems with those in the EU, can be best described as?

The results are summarised below in Figures 3.3 and 3.4. The global view is given in the last column. The JEP participants give a somewhat higher assessment of the impact of Tempus than the HEAs. However, the overall view is the similar. Only a minor part of the JEPs has had a direct impact on convergence. The HEA survey shows that the majority of the respondents assessed the impact of Tempus on convergence as a major indirect impact.

![Figure 3.3 JEP survey on legislative convergence](image-url)
Closer analysis of the answers to the HEA questionnaire shows the following. In total 19 countries were covered, and the results were as follows. In three countries (two PHARE and one Tacis) the person(s) interviewed chose the qualification major direct impact. In two countries (one PHARE and one Tacis) a minor direct impact was indicated. The option a major indirect impact was chosen in twelve countries (six PHARE, three CARDS and three Tacis). In two further countries (one PHARE and on Tacis) a minor indirect impact was the considered the right assessment.

3.4.5 Findings from the JEP and HEA surveys on adaptation

| Expected outcome 2 | Tempus II is expected to have promoted changes in legislation leading to: education systems better adapted to the changing socio-economic reality, in particular market economies and multiparty political systems. |

As indicated in section 2.2 the evaluators chose as relevant outcome indicators the following:
- New diplomas and specialisation's including European languages;
- New university-industry linkages;
- New regulations on life long learning and/or distance education;
- Increased autonomy/establishment of private accredited HEIs/new departments;
- New budgetary regulations supporting curriculum development/new diplomas;
- New fee structures reflecting student fees/student financing arrangements.

To deal with this issue two sets of questions were put in the JEP and HEA surveys.

1. **JEP survey:** Which of the following statements describes the impact of your Tempus project on the adaptation of your national education system to the changing socio-economic conditions (e.g. market economy and multiple party political system) (Figure 3.5);

2. **HEA survey:** Which of the following statements describes the impact of the Tempus programme on the adaptation of your national education system to the changing socio-economic conditions (e.g. market economy and multiple party political system)? (Figure 3.6);

For these two questions the respondents were asked to use the following qualifications: major direct, minor direct, major indirect, minor indirect, no impact, don't know.
3. **JEP survey**: If you consider that your Tempus project had an impact in this area, which of the following specific outcomes were generated as a result? (Figure 3.7).

On this question the respondents were given the following answers to choose from:
- More autonomous structures at university, faculty or department level (i.e. decentralisation);
- Introduction of subjects related to the free market economy (economics, accounting, marketing, etc);
- Capacity for more responsive higher education institutions (quality assurance, private sector links, etc.);
- Reforms of previously politicised subject areas (history, philosophy, etc.);
- Other.

The answers obtained are presented in Figures 3.5 to 3.7.

![Figure 3.5 JEP survey on adaptation](image_url)

Figures 3.5 shows that on average 70 percent of the JEP participants perceive that the JEPs have had a significant influence on adaptation of the education systems. A further fourteen percent assessed this impact as: minor indirect (not shown in the table). The tabulation indicates that on this aspect there might be relatively significant difference in the outcomes per region, but in statistical terms, the sample is too small to be representative at the regional level. A tentative explanation for the differences could be that the three countries in the CARDS region have suffered in the second half of the nineties from the conflicts in the area and that therefore the adaptation outcome has been smaller than in the PHARE and Tacis area. Another explanation, which was put forward by the participants in the workshop, was that this lower impact in CARDS can be attributed to the strong decentralisation legacy of the former Yugoslavia, and the wide divide between Faculties, Universities and Ministry for Education, which was also mentioned earlier.

The HEA survey results seem to confirm that Tempus has had a significant impact on legislative changes that promote adaptation of the national higher education systems to the changing socio-economic realities. In this respect it should be noted that the examples given in the surveys (including the on-line survey) relate mainly to study programmes etc., which have been adjusted to reflect the expected changes from the labour market for trained people in various sectors. The surveys have generated very few examples that
could be considered evidence of adaptation to multiparty political systems, democracy and for example strengthening civil society involvement in the policy cycle.

![Figure 3.6 HEA survey on adaptation](image)

The results for the third question are highlighted in Figure 3.7.

![Figure 3.7 JEP survey on examples of adaptation to market economies and multi-party political systems](image)

### 3.4.6 Expected outcome and findings: regulated professions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected outcome</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tempus II is expected to have promoted changes in legislation leading to: specifically for pre-accession countries) the transposition into national law of the acquis communautaire, particularly in so far as the regulated professions are concerned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assess to what extent this expected outcome has been achieved in the second phase of the Tempus programme, a similar question was included in the JEP and HEA surveys.

The findings are presented below and speak for themselves.
Around 42% of JEPs implemented in the PHARE region dealt to a greater or lesser extent with those academic subjects specified as part of the acquis communautaire for these countries. However, the impact shown in the graphs above should be considered as reflecting the transfer of experience and best practise in these areas rather than actual changes to the relevant legislation. This evaluation has found no clear evidence to substantiate the latter claim. In the Western Balkans the impact was of course much less since EU accession is not a short-term strategic goal but rather a source of direction for the reform process.

Lessons learned from the JEP and HEA surveys

- On the issue of convergence, the HEA survey gives clear answers. Taking the global view, this information source suggests that the overall outcome of Tempus can be assessed as a major indirect impact on convergence.

- On the issue of adaptation the JEP survey and the HEA survey can both be considered as useful sources of information. The answers make clear that on this outcome Tempus has achieved significant results. Whether this significance should be assessed as major direct impact or a major indirect impact is not obvious. Both classifications seem to be valid. For the overall view it is important to note that in the PHARE area the majority of the JEPs chose the option a major indirect impact.

---

32 These questions were not asked of respondents in the Tacis region as the reforms are not relevant to those countries
Therefore, given the overall significance of PHARE in the second phase of Tempus, the evaluators selected the option a "major indirect impact" to summarise the Tempus overall impact on this outcome.

- On the issue of the regulated professions, the data and the examples provided do not provide sufficient much information. The JEP survey suggests that some 40 percent of the JEPs dealt with these issues. However, as mentioned before the JEP survey is too small to draw conclusions at regional levels. As such the information generated by the survey has only limited value.

3.4.7 Findings from the lessons learned workshop in Brussels

The results of the surveys were presented for perusal and scrutiny to the participants of the lessons learned workshop in Brussels. The discussions led to a number of comments, which were taken into account during the final analysis of the issues.

_ Lessons learned on methodological issues and interpretation_

The workshop discussions led to the following conclusions:

- The term ‘legislative changes’ has a broad meaning and covers legislative and regulatory change at various levels within and outside the institutions represented by the respondents.

- Content wise the results of the on-line questionnaire are the most informative source because of the examples given by the respondents. This source confirmed that the second phase of Tempus has had impact on legislative and regulatory changes, not only at department and faculty level but also at university wide level and at the national level.

- The JEP surveys and HEA surveys provide relevant supplementary information. The differences between the response from HEAs and from JEP co-ordinators are interesting. It is probable that the HEA interview partners have a wider and more comprehensive view on the Tempus legislative impact at national and university wide level than the JEP co-ordinators have. Therefore the response from the HEAs is probably closer to the truth.

_ Lessons learned on Tempus impact on legislative reforms_

- In the CARDS area, Tempus may have had little direct influence on national legislation but definitely there has been indirect influence. Tempus served to put the ideas of the Bologna process on the agenda of faculties, universities and successfully lobbied government opinion.

- Tempus II was a turning point for the programme. During Tempus I, the basic philosophy was the bottom-up approach, but Tempus II started top-down approach as well, through politicians, introducing structural priorities, which coincided with the
passing of new legislation. Tempus II explicitly aimed at supporting authorities to implement these new laws. The PHARE acceding and candidate countries were more advanced. All the Bologna elements were already present in their legislation.

- The data on the type of change brought by Tempus show that, with respect to convergence and adaptation, the PHARE acceding and candidate countries have reached further levels of reform than the countries in the CARDS and Tacis area.

- A key constraint in terms of legislative reforms, experienced during the second phase of the Tempus programme have been the various barriers which governments and/or universities pose for accreditation of curriculum reforms. Internal barriers arise from the competition within universities between departments and faculties for prestige, money and Tempus support. External barriers come from the national accreditation authorities.

- Especially in the Tacis area the external barriers have been very important. Accreditation authorities strictly regulate the contents of curriculum and this limits degree of freedom. This practice is far off from the European practice where curriculum reform is seen as an ongoing process of reform and academics are trusted to use their knowledge and international experience to reform the curriculum.

- During the period covered by the second phase of Tempus (1994-2000) little progress was made on this in the Tacis area. One problem that so far has prevented Tacis education authorities to legislate decentralisation of curriculum reform is the poor education standards of the large number of newly established and older higher education institutions.

"They are licensed but their diplomas don’t mean anything. A policy for education quality is needed" (workshop participant).

- A second problem is indicated by the following quotation:
  “What are accreditation agencies? The structures within the Ministry responsible for it are not transparent. The personalised style of doing things is the problem. The Russian society in particular depends much more on people than on institutions. Convincing the right person is equal to changing legislation” (workshop participant).

3.5 Analysis and conclusions

3.5.1 Methodological considerations

The methodology for assessing to what extent the second phase of the Tempus programme has succeeded in achieving the three expected outcomes linked to legislative changes has been discussed in section 3.3. Moreover, the strengths and weaknesses of the different tools used for data collection, data aggregation, analysis and verification of the findings were described in chapter 2.
In this section of the report, the different sources of information have been combined to arrive at the overall conclusions with respect to the three outcome questions.

For outcome 1 i.e. legislative change leading to convergence, the HEA survey was used as the most authoritative source for aggregation to the global level and regional level. The on-line survey and the JEP survey were used to check the validity of the findings against the evidence examples provided by the respondents.

For outcome 2 i.e. legislative change leading to better adaptation to socio-economic reality, the JEP survey was the most relevant source. The on-line survey and the literature review were used to check the relevance of the findings.

For outcome 3 i.e. legislative change on the regulated professions, the JEP survey was the main source. The findings were checked against the findings of the HEA survey and the examples on legislative impact provided by the on-line questionnaire.

The different sources that were used for the analysis provide insight in the issues from different perspectives and cross checking of the results was done with the information from the on-line survey and the lessons learned workshop. Therefore the evaluators are confident that the conclusions drawn from the data for the two levels of analysis presented here are sound and relevant.

Table 3.1 summarises the conclusions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected outcomes</th>
<th>Observed impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHARE region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Outcome 1</strong> Greater convergence of education systems in the eligible countries with those in the EC as an outcome of Tempus impact on legislative changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The bottom-up view (source: JEP surveys)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The top-down view (source: HEA survey)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Outcome 2</strong> Better adaptation of education systems to the changing socio-economic reality of market economies and multi-party political systems as an outcome of Tempus impact on legislative changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The bottom-up view (source: JEP surveys)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The top-down view (source: HEA survey)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected outcome 3</strong>-Contribution to the transposition into national law of the acquis communautaire, particularly in so far as the regulated professions are concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The top-down view (source: HEA survey)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The bottom-up view (source: JEP surveys)</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 1 = Major direct impact; 2 = Minor direct impact; 3 = Major indirect impact; 4 = Minor indirect impact; 5 = No impact
3.5.2 Conclusion 1: A major indirect impact on convergence in all regions

Some ten percent of the Tempus JEPs made direct contributions to the introduction and acceptance of reforms leading to greater convergence of national higher education systems in the eligible countries with those in the EU. Taking major direct, minor direct and major indirect all together, than the on-line survey data in combination with the JEP data show that some 50% of the projects have had a positive influence on convergence. These reforms were linked with the adoption of the ideas of the Bologna Declaration. In the PHARE countries most of the relevant reforms were already adopted and Tempus focused on activities within this framework. In the CARDS area, the Tempus activities helped prepare the way for the adoption of the Bologna process. In the Tacis area, this direction of convergence has the least impact, but also there the principles promoted in the Bologna process played an important role in the Tempus activities. The overall conclusion of the analysis has been that Tempus had a major indirect impact on legislative changes promoting convergence.

Major indirect impact basically means that legislative reforms have been passed or implemented that can be partially accredited to Tempus, but which were not addressed as a key issue or explicitly intended as an outcome of one or more specific JEP.

Textbox 3.5 Two examples of major indirect impact

Tempus projects:

- Generated the thinking behind much of the legal reform necessary to transform Latvian higher education by way of the ideas of programme participants at home and from abroad; and
- Provided Latvian staff with the experience necessary to implement effectively the new legislation.

(Source: Dr Andrejs Rauhvargers. Tempus impact study - Latvia, 1998)

“Thanks to Tempus, we [the Academic Community and Ministry of Education] became fully aware of the whole Bologna process and its implications for higher education in the region. We are now waiting for the Republika Srpska government to pass the new law on higher education so we can fully implement all the envisaged changes.” (Source: HEA interviews)

The above quotations illustrate how participation in Tempus II helped to build a body of opinion, equipped with the necessary lobbying skills that has been able to wield influence in the eligible countries and greatly assisted the convergence of their higher education legislation. Secondly, it illustrates how the programme has provided the necessary human resources – either trained by Tempus projects or endowed with the knowledge acquired whilst implementing one - for government ministries and higher education institutes that are willing and able to draft and implement new legislative reforms. In the words of Dainius Jakimavičius, director of the former Lithuanian Tempus office, “Tempus contributed to the reform by providing the reformers.”
3.5.3 Conclusion 2: A major indirect impact on adaptation to socio-economic circumstances

The higher education systems reform referred to in this study as adaptation to the changing socio-economic conditions in the eligible countries covers amongst other things: (a) More autonomous structures at university, faculty or department level (i.e. decentralisation); (b) The introduction of subjects related to the free market economy (economics, accounting, marketing, etc); (c) Capacity for more responsive higher education institutions (quality assurance, private sector links, etc.); (d) Reforms of previously politicised subject areas (history, philosophy, etc.); and (e) Social learning including the transmission to teachers and students of civic values related to democracy and civil society.

The evaluation shows that in relation to these issues the second phase of Tempus has made a significant difference. Over eighty percent of the Tempus JEPs has addressed one or more of these issues. The influence of Tempus was assessed as high by all main stakeholders. A large proportion of the respondents indicated that the JEPs in which they had participated had either a direct or indirect major impact on relevant legislative and regulatory changes. The overall conclusion is that the Tempus scheme had a major indirect impact, this suggest that the reforms were initiated by Tempus, but that the full effectuation of the reforms, took place either after completion of the JEPs or as a result of a more complex set of factors, in which Tempus played a significant role. Analysis of the results does indicate that there have been significant differences between the various regions and the specific eligible countries.

3.5.4 Conclusion 3: Regulated professions -Major direct and indirect influence (PHARE only)

Some 42 percent of the JEPs have either directly or indirectly influenced the development of national regulations and legislation with respect to the regulated professions (doctor, pharmacists, dental practitioner, midwife, general case nurse, veterinary surgeon, architect). The database is insufficient to say more about this subject. In the CARDS area as smaller percentage of projects has dealt with similar issues and the competent HEA classified the influence as being minor and indirect. In the Tacis area the issue has, understandably, not been addressed.

3.6 Summary

Outcome 1  Tempus had a major indirect influence on convergence through legislative changes

While the basic legislative reforms affecting higher education were completed in most eligible countries before the start of Tempus II, adjustments in the legislative and regulatory environment are an ongoing process in all eligible countries. The starting point for the analysis has been the fact that Tempus has a bottom-up approach to reforms and the information from previous evaluations and from the on-line survey that the large majority of the JEPs in the second phase of Tempus have not directly aimed for legislative changes at national level. Given these facts, the outcome that one may expect
with respect to Tempus influence on legislative changes is that the influence has been minor in a direct sense or the influence has been indirect and than it could be major or minor.

On the issue of convergence the three surveys show that more than 50 percent of the JEP co-ordinators and JEP partners (bottom-up perspective) and an even higher percentage of the higher education authorities (top-down perspective) perceive clear cause-effect relations between Tempus activities and legislative changes. These changes relate to, amongst other things: national, regional and international student mobility (e.g. accreditation and ECTS) and new management and accreditation structures. The legislative changes have taken place at the national levels as well as within the partner HEIs. With due respect for the notable differences between countries in the extent to which Tempus had this impact at the national level, the overall conclusion arrived at is that Tempus has had a major indirect impact on legislative convergence through awareness raising and networking on the issues involved.

Tempus has especially been important for sensitising policy makers and senior academics to the need for and direction of legislative and regulatory reforms. This finding is valid for both the PHARE and Tacis experience in the second phase of the Tempus programme. In the CARDS countries the consensus is that there has so far been virtually no influence beyond faculty level. This last can be explained by the large autonomy that faculties traditionally have in the CARDS area.

**Outcome 2** Tempus had a major indirect influence on the adaptation of the higher education systems to the changing socio-economic needs in eligible countries

On the issue of the Tempus contribution to legislative changes in the field of curriculum development, mobility and ECTS, the surveys have generated results, which differ substantially. The HEA survey shows that in the eligible countries in the PHARE area 60 percent (8 out of 14) respondents chose the major direct influence option. In the Tacis area the findings varied. In Russia the top-down view was that the influence of Tempus was found to be minor and indirect. In the smaller countries of the Tacis area the influence was listed as minor direct or as major indirect. The JEP survey (bottom-up view), on the other hand, shows that in the PHARE region the majority of the JEPs (69%) have had a major direct or major indirect influence on adaptation. In the CARDS area this proportion was much lower and in Tacis countries it was even higher. These differences between the top-down and bottom-up perspectives can be explained on the basis of the fact that the type of legislative change relevant for adaptation, is in line with what was later called the Bologna process and this takes place mainly at university level. It is therefore possible that the top-down perspective overestimates the influence of the Tempus programme.

Taking this difference in perspectives into account, the evaluators considered the bottom-up view to be more realistic. Aggregation of these findings to the global view thus lead to the conclusion that the second phase of the Tempus programme has had a major indirect impact on the legal/regulatory changes that promote adaptation of the higher education system to changes in socio-economic needs in the Tempus partner countries.
Outcome 3  
Tempus had a major direct and indirect influence on the transposition of the acquis communautaire for the regulated professions into national law

The JEP survey shows that in the PHARE area some 42 percent of the JEPs have either directly or indirectly influenced the development of national regulations and legislation with respect to the regulated professions (doctor, pharmacists, dental practitioner, midwife, general case nurse, veterinary surgeon, architect). The literature and the JEP and HEA survey examples provided as evidence, indicate that there is not much “acquis communautaire” in this field. Therefore, the real meaning of the data may well be that some 42 percent of the JEPs in the PHARE area dealt in one way or another with introducing best practices and reforms on these subjects rather than that this concerned legislation in the strict sense of the word. In the other regions this accession issue was not on the agenda though in the CARDS area, a small percentage of the Tempus activities also dealt with these professions.
4 Outcome 4 HEIs' openness and preparedness for international co-operation

4.1 Introduction to the issue

The reform of higher education structures and institutions and their management was one of the specific objectives of the second phase of the Tempus programme. In this context the Terms of Reference for this evaluation indicated that the Commission was expecting two main outcomes from the programme: reforms that lead to:

1. Institutions’ openness and preparedness for international co-operation; and
2. New management approaches and structures in line with more independent, accountable higher institutions.

In this chapter the first issue is addressed. The next chapter looks at the second question. This chapter sets out the approach, data collection methods, findings and the conclusions arrived at by the Evaluation Team with respect to the following question:

**Evaluation question number 4**

*To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme prompted reforms in higher education institutions (including polytechnics and technical schools) leading to:*

- **Institutions’ openness and preparedness for international co-operation?**

Section 4.2 lines out the expected outcome of the Tempus programme in the field of institutions’ openness and preparedness for international co-operation. Section 4.3 describes the approach and indicators used by the evaluation. Findings are presented in section 4.4 and section 4.5 draws analysis and conclusions. Finally, section 4.6 presents a summary of the main outcomes found by this evaluation.

4.2 Expected outcome of Tempus with respect to HEIs’ openness and preparedness for co-operation

During the 1980s, driven by the growing understanding that a single European labour market should be supplied by a convergent higher education sector and assisted by new EC programmes such as Erasmus, EU universities began to construct ever closer and more mutually beneficial academic ties. Despite the “thawing” of the cold war, during this time in the Soviet sphere of influence academics could only look on – in the words of one Slovenian professor – “with some degree of envy” as stagnation took an ever greater
hold of academic life at home. Although the Tempus II programme became operational five years after the fall of the Berlin wall, many universities in the eligible countries (especially Tacis) were still reeling from the lack of international contacts deliberately orchestrated for political reasons by the countries’ previous regimes. It was therefore with an understandably high level of enthusiasm that higher education institutions in Central and Eastern Europe embarked upon Tempus projects as an ideal vehicle for establishing a network of European contacts in academia.

The expected outcomes of the Tempus programme are of two sorts. Overall openness to co-operation includes e.g. promotion of foreign (EU) languages, access to modern information and communication means, interest in co-operation. Active co-operation, however, involves active policy, information flows and strategic university management aspects. The outcome also links up with the issue of sustainability of formed partnerships, discussed under chapter eight.

4.3 Approach and indicators

The research on the subject question involved a literature review, the design and implementation of specific questions in the JEP and HEI questionnaires, the on-line survey, and a presentation and discussion on the interim results in a forum of Tempus II stakeholders during the lessons learned workshop in Brussels.

To give the dual concept of openness and preparedness for international co-operation sufficient content for evaluation purposes, the following six indicators were distinguished in the methodology:

1. New or strengthened international relations office or equivalent body;
2. Training courses for teaching staff in an EU language;
3. More study or teaching exchange visits from foreign students and staff;
4. New or increased teaching hours in an EU language;
5. Increased computerisation (e-mail, e-learning and internet access in the classroom);
6. Purchase of new text books in an EU language (library).

4.4 Findings

4.4.1 Findings from the literature review

Many reports and articles in mass media recognise the contribution of Tempus to consolidation of the capacity of HEIs in partner countries to enter the world community and strengthen its ties with foreign universities. For Tacis countries, our review of publications (attached as an appendix) details the many reports confirming that teacher and student exchanges, JEPs strengthening departments of foreign relations, strengthening of foreign languages, investments in information and communication means (computers and libraries) all contributed to this. For many universities, Tempus became the main gateway to international contacts and thus to awareness on alternative teaching methods and new academic and pedagogic developments. As stated in Tempus@10, “Tempus human capital is shaping tomorrow's academic environment. That
they do so from a strongly international perspective is only one example of how Tempus continues to have an impact on higher education in Central and Eastern Europe.”

The Tempus Tacis interim evaluation report from February 1998 concluded that changes in university management (democratisation, decentralisation) are slow. This affects international co-operation as well, because although external relations offices are supported by Tempus, their specific responsibilities and position within the overall university structure received less attention.

4.4.2 Findings from the HEA and JEP questionnaires

As indicators for assessing the impact of Tempus we relied on the perceptions of the respondents and used the same qualification system as for the other questions: Major direct influence, minor direct, major indirect, minor indirect, no influence. The main questions asked and the findings are presented below in the three figures.

Question to JEP and HEA participants: Which of the following statements best describes the impact of your Tempus project/the Tempus programme on reforms leading to openness and preparedness for international co-operation?

The figures speak for themselves. Figure 4.1 illustrates that an overwhelming majority in the CARDS and Tacis regions and a convincing number of parties at JEP level in the PHARE region too consider that the second phase of the Tempus programme has had a major direct influence on opening up HEIs for international co-operation. The differences between the regions are inline with expectations. In the PHARE region - for geographical, geopolitical and internal reasons - the process of internationalisation started much earlier, and in that respect the second phase of Tempus had less to offer. For example, many of the respondents in this survey were from universities in the PHARE region whose network of international contacts was at an advanced stage before the implementation of their Tempus project.
In the CARDS region, Tempus has been the key for access to Europe and this finding just confirms a well know fact. In Tacis, internationalisation remains high on the agenda. Russia illustrates the vast needs that still exist in that part of the world. Tempus has so far reached only some 15% of the universities in the country.

Question to JEP participants: If your Tempus project was focussed on this area (of openness), which of the following forms did the outputs take?

Question to HEA and Experts Where appropriate, please rank in order of their value to your national education system, the changes that can best describe the outcome of the Tempus programme

The answers of the JEPs and HEA experts are combined in Figure 4.3.

The bars in Figure 4.3 above show as a percentage the share of JEPs that produced the various outcomes distinguished in the methodology. Computerisation and study/exchange visits are most often indicated. The (red) line shows how the HEA experts perceive the
value of the contributions of Tempus to the various dimensions of university reform. The fact that in four of the six areas these two factors coincide can be taken as a positive signal that the second phase of the Tempus programme has produced well-proportioned levels of outputs considered of value to national higher education systems.

4.4.3 Findings from the on-line questionnaire

In the on-line survey several indicators were used to assess the preparedness for international co-operation in the context of sustainable partnerships. Thus 69% of respondents stated that Tempus had a major direct influence on the formation of sustainable partnerships. These partnerships are sustained principally in the form of continued networking (75%), continued exchange of academic staff (59%) or students (51%), joint research and/or publications (53%).

The on-line survey showed not only a the strong interest of the respondents in continuing to co-operate within the Tempus context, but also the mobilisation of other funds, including university budgets, and other EU programmes (e.g. 44% mentioned that they now participated in Socrates).

4.4.4 Findings from the lessons learned workshop

The lessons learned workshop emphasised the importance, for increased international co-operation, of changes in university management, and the significance of the distinction/opposition between the individual level and the institutional level. Initiative, enthusiasm and ideas, international contacts are in the hands of individuals who therefore are the agents of change. For example, on the subject of (sustainable) partnerships, the workshop participants agreed that professional contact/friendship between individuals is a key factor in the realisation of JEPs. On the other hand, the ownership of projects needs to be generic in essence if they are to be more than islands of activity. The focus on institution building is needed in order to balance individuals and managing structure and achieve a strategic dimension.

The workshop participants confirmed that Tempus impact is stronger on the individual faculty level than at the central, generic level. This relates to the still low changes in democratisation/decentralisation mentioned by the interim evaluation of 1998, which apparently are making slow progress still.

The motivation for participating in JEPs is discussed in chapter eight on sustainable partnerships.
4.5 Analysis and conclusions

The JEP survey constituted the main source of information. In order to extend the validity of the findings to the regional level of aggregation, the literature review and the on-line survey data on the types of sustainable partnerships were used. The major direct impact on eligible countries HES’ openness and preparedness for international co-operation is generated by:

- Providing a framework within which international contacts could be made at the initial stage;
- Building experience in and capacity for international co-operation;
- A significant number of valuable and relevant outcomes derived from JEPs.

JEP participants in the PHARE countries less enthusiastically endorse an otherwise strong consensus that Tempus has generated a major direct impact in this field. The reason for this lies probably less in the performance of the Tempus II programme than in the prevailing climate for international co-operation in these countries during the years in which the respondents’ JEPs were implemented. Firstly, the sheer fact of these countries’ geographic proximity, political stability, unilateral dismantling of visa regimes etc. enabled them to establish good levels of international co-operation before Tempus II became operational. Secondly, as is most notably brought to our attention by Dr Andrejs Rauhvargers, there were many other donor programmes in operation by this time. In Latvia alone, his non-exhaustive list mentions the Council of Europe, various other PHARE programmes and bilateral assistance such as the British Council. Almost by default therefore, the impact of the programme was bound to be more limited. It had already been necessary to open or strengthen international offices at many institutions, for example, and the numbers of staff and students that had taken advantage of such structures were already considerable.

In the CARDS countries, although Albania and FYR Macedonia were spared a direct involvement in the violent conflict that engulfed the region of the former socialist Yugoslavia during the early years of the 1990s, only the former was able to enter the international community in a proper sense before Tempus II came into operation. The tragic circumstances that provided the backdrop for Bosnia and Herzegovina’s emergence as a nation state go without saying - indeed, the country was still wracked by armed conflict even as Tempus II came into operation. For this reason, these countries’ exposure to international co-operation in academia was minimal, and their structures for international co-operation rudimentary, if in existence at all.

Although spared the bloodshed of the Balkans conflict, the Tacis region faced a similar situation to that described above regarding international co-operation. Not only did the democratic transition begin later but the particular problems associated with breaking up the old Soviet system meant that economic recovery was much slower to start than in the PHARE countries. This meant that many of these countries’ first taste of Tempus assistance came as late as 1995. As mentioned in other areas of this report, the Tempus programme often provided the first source of funding for the infrastructure needed for international co-operation (a fax machine, for example) and an initial strategic direction that may otherwise not have been self-evident. We can therefore assert that the found
“major direct impact” of the Tempus II programme in this field corresponds to expectations.

**Conclusion 4: The second phase of the Tempus programme has had a major direct impact on openness and international co-operation**

This conclusion holds for the programme as a whole as well as for the separate regions. However, there are differences between the regions, which are caused by the different socio-economic and political changes that have affected the eligible countries.

### Table 4.1 Expected outcomes and impact of the second phase of the Tempus programme (1994-2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected outcomes</th>
<th>PHARE region</th>
<th>W BALKANS region</th>
<th>Tacis region</th>
<th>Total all regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected outcome 4</strong> - Reforms prompted in HEIs leading to institutions' openness and preparedness for international co-operation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 1 = Major direct impact; 2 = Minor direct impact; 3 = Major indirect impact; 4 = Minor indirect impact; 5 = No impact

**4.6 Summary**

*Tempus had a major direct influence on the introduction of reforms in HEIs leading to institutions' openness and preparedness for international co-operation.*

This issue was addressed through the literature review, the JEP survey, the HEA survey, and the on-line questionnaire. The literature review generated a number of indicators for measuring openness. The JEP survey shows their relative importance during the second phase of the Tempus programme: computerisation and increased access and use of the digital highway in classroom situations (75% of the respondents listed this aspect); exchange visits of students and staff (70%); adoption of textbooks and training materials in an EU language (65%); training and teaching in an EU language (40%); and the establishment of an international relations office in the HEIs (30%).

Asked about the extent to which Tempus had influenced HEIs' openness and preparedness for international co-operation, the vast majority of the JEP respondents in the three CARDS countries and in the Tacis region (77%) selected the option: major direct impact. In the PHARE region the results also indicate that Tempus had a major direct impact in this respect (42%). But, there the qualifications minor direct, major indirect and minor direct were also used, which indicates that during Tempus II other EU programmes and bilateral university contacts have also played a role in the process towards openness.
The HEA survey does not show this nuance, and a major direct impact of Tempus is seen in all regions. In the Tacis region Russia was again the exception. There the impact of Tempus was perceived as minor indirect, with the argumentation that Tempus had reached only a small proportion of the higher education sector.

In the on-line survey several indicators were used to assess the preparedness for international co-operation in the context of sustainable partnerships. The on-line survey showed not only a the strong interest of the respondents in continuing to co-operate within the Tempus context, but also the mobilisation of other funds, including university budgets, and other EU programmes (e.g. 44% mentioned that they now participated in Socrates).

The lessons learned workshop confirmed the very visible impact of Tempus on international co-operation, in an environment where the programme responded to a strong expressed need for such co-operation and was often also the only available vehicle for it. The workshop participants however drew attention to the necessity for a generic ownership within the institution for such co-operation, lest the activities remain islands instead of supporting structural preparedness for increased international co-operation. This links up to changes in university management structure further discussed in chapter five.

On the basis of these mutually supporting findings from the various data collection tools, the evaluators draw the conclusion that Tempus had a major direct influence on the introduction of reforms in HEIs leading to institutions' openness and preparedness for international co-operation.
5 Outcome 5 New management approaches and structures in line with more independent, accountable HEIs

5.1 Introduction to the issue

The chapter sets out the approach, data collection methods, findings and the conclusions arrived at by the Evaluation Team with respect to the following question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation question number 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme prompted reforms in higher education institutions (including polytechnics and technical schools) leading to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New management approaches and structures in line with more independent, accountable higher institutions?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 The expected outcome of Tempus with respect to university management change

Under the previous socialist system, the concept of management as we now understand it, did not exist, rather a “command and control” structure was employed. This had important implications for higher education institutions - the very idea of managerial autonomy (and with it, accountability) was not only unacceptable to university deans but even politically dangerous in its potential consequences. If, in providing the funding for Tempus, the EC has considered universities as agents of social change, then this is not a new concept. The eligible countries’ previous regimes were also mindful of this and, as a result, higher education institutions were subject to highly repressive levels of control. As a result, the decision making structure within HEIs at the start of the transition period was strongly centralised and rigid.

The thinking behind Tempus university management projects is that not only were the eligible countries’ curricula outdated and the teaching methods ineffective, but also the entire framework within which universities were operating was an obstacle to sustainable changes and needed to be reformed. Yet, technical assistance in the traditional “top-down” sense was not deemed appropriate. It was widely accepted that the slow-moving nature of change in academic circles needed to be driven by a conviction of the need for reform emanating from the bottom of the university pyramid. Thus in the first phase of
the programme, university management change was approached from the angle of
bringing about Curriculum change. In the second phase of the Tempus programme, the
ambitions for university management moved beyond consolidation of the achievements
of curriculum development projects and targeted more substantial change in the
management culture in the upper echelons of the university system.

5.3 Approach and indicators

The evaluation approach to this question involved the same tools as before. The
literature was important in the initial stages and was used for drawing up the
questions used in the three questionnaires used in this study. The lessons learned
workshop was used as a forum for presenting the interim results and for discussion of the
cause and effect relations.

With the questionnaires, the evaluation focussed on validation/confirmation of the impact
implied by the literature review; better understanding the various dimensions embedded
in the concept of management change, and assessing their respective value in term of
impact.

To give the concept of new management approaches and structures in line with more
independent, accountable higher institutions, sufficient content for evaluation purposes,
the following seven dimensions were distinguished in the methodology:
1. Computerised management systems (student enrolment, financial planning, etc.);
2. Formulation of a business or strategic plan;
3. New or strengthened graduate career service;
4. Formalised links with public or private employers;
5. Organisational reforms;
6. New sources of revenue (e.g. private sector);
7. New democratic decision making structures.

The synthesis workshop allowed discussion and analysis of the earlier results.
Participants offered additional information and insight into Tempus impact in this field.

5.4 Findings from the evaluation tools

5.4.1 Findings from the literature review

The Tempus-Tacis interim evaluation from 1998 recorded little change in decision
making structures and concluded that the impact was limited. As explaining factors they
mention the low involvement of EU management staff. JEPs are implemented by EU
partners at faculty or department level, who have not so much interest in or influence on
overall management issues. JEPs have little mobility of rectors and deputy rectors during
which policy formation and decision structure could be discussed. The report also
mentions the fact that university management projects are often avoiding real (strategic)
management issues, focussing instead on hardware (e.g. management information
systems), administrative issues, foreign relations offices etc.
The rest of the literature review yielded little with respect to university management change. Although they seem to indicate that Tempus impact has for different countries reached different levels of depth in the reform process, most of them record limited impact. For example the Lithuanian impact study (1998) can find only a few “fragmented examples of implementation of modern practices in institutional management through Tempus.

One does note, however, that the later studies are more positive than earlier ones. For example, the “Tempus in Latvia” impact study (2001) found that “Tempus has had a huge impact on all levels of the management of higher education institutions.”

5.4.2 Findings from the surveys

As indicators for assessing the impact of Tempus we relied on the perceptions of the respondents and used the same qualification system as for the other questions: Major direct influence, minor direct, major indirect, minor indirect, no influence.

The main questions asked and the findings are presented below in the three figures.

Question to JEP participants: Which of the following statements best describes the impact of your project on reforms in higher education leading to new management approaches and structures in line with more democratic, accountable higher education institutions?

Question to HEA experts: Tempus has contributed to reforms in higher education leading to new management approaches and structures in line with more democratic, accountable higher education institutions. In this field the impact of the Tempus programme can best be assessed as?

The results of these two questions are given in the figures below; the vertical axes are the percentages of each group of respondents who chose the various descriptions of impact given on the right.
As can be clearly seen above, the answers to these questions can at best be described as inconclusive. In the PHARE and CARDS regions especially, the two groups of Tempus stakeholders interviewed gave practically opposing viewpoints. Even accounting for the large number of curriculum development projects that were never intended to have an impact in this field, it can be stated that there appears to be little consensus on the impact of Tempus in this field.

In the light of this opinion, using the same methodology as for the JEP outputs intended to enhance international co-operation, the following two questions were asked of the two groups of Tempus stakeholders:

Question to JEP participants: If your Tempus project was focussed on this area, which of the following forms did the outputs take?

Question to HEA experts: Where appropriate, please rank in order of their value to your national higher education system the changes below that can be described as outcomes of the Tempus programme?

Sixty eight percent of the JEPs and 100% of the HEA experts responded to these questions.

The bars in Figure 5.3 below illustrate in percentages the share of JEPs that produced the various outcomes distinguished in the methodology. Computerised MIS and (internal) organisational reforms are most often indicated (30%). The generation of new funding,
e.g. resulting from co-operation with private sector parties, is the least frequent answer. The (red) line shows how the HEA experts perceive the value of the contributions of Tempus to the various dimensions of university reform. The numbers on the right-hand side represent the expressed relative importance of each outcome based on the ranking done by the respondents (computerised MIS is rated highest, internal reform lowest).

Figure 5.3  JEP & HEA survey on new management approaches and structures (project outputs)

It is interesting to see that the perceptions converge on the more material/concrete areas of impact. The HEA answers show that they have a higher regard for Tempus impact in fields in which they are themselves affected: strategic planning; and the establishment of new democratic or decision making structures within universities. Such new decision making structures, however, are mentioned to have been realised by only 15% of JEP respondents. Taking a global view, these answers are in line with the findings from other sources.

5.4.3 Findings from the synthesis workshop

Workshop participants confirmed the reluctance of universities to focus on management issues. Resistance to change is strong and most JEP applications are for curriculum development JEPs. Then the UM type projects are mostly concerned with management information systems rather than real strategic issues. The dichotomy between faculty level and central level (deans) is still very strong.

The participants agreed that finding the balance between those two levels within JEPs is a delicate issue, as change is driven by individuals. Moreover, A focus on institution building should be wary of bureaucracy.

The process is taking place in stages, as illustrated by the following comments:
“In Kazakhstan, we started not from management, but from curriculum development. Now real reform in the higher education has started, so we now start university management projects too. Understanding for the importance of management issues is growing. In Tempus III the impact will be bigger”.

“Real management issues are politically sensitive, and therefore impossible to introduce just yet. It’s a relevant problem though.” (Russian participant to the lessons learned workshop).

Participants underlined that an important factor in the process, which explains why change process are slow is the fact that the Deans who have all the power are not trained managers but professors, influential academics, who still think in the old way.

5.5 Analysis and conclusions

**Textbox 5.1 Three Stage university management Reform**

The consensus in the lessons learned workshop on this issue was that three stages can be distinguished in the reforms in university management brought about in the second phase Tempus. These three stages can be characterised as follows:

- Stage 1: Handshake issues
- Stage 2: Facility improvement and openness
- Stage 3: Management reforms (internal and external)

In stage 1, UM issues arise in connection with the start up and follow up of the first JEPs. In most HEI these have focused on curriculum development. Typical UM related outputs in this first stage are facilitated by the equipment component. This helps academics to obtain support from university deans/rectors for the JEP and for supporting the changes needed for sustainable curriculum development outcomes. In this phase the equipment is used for university wide use rather than by the faculty involved in the JEP. In the second phase UM projects are formulated, which aim at improving university management systems, libraries etc, and international co-operation offices are established to promote openness and facilitate international co-operation. The real, often painful issues of management reforms are on the agenda only in the third stage of UM projects. They address issues linked to decentralisation/or centralisation, democratisation, intensified contacts with the private sector and labour market oriented course planning.

University management reform processes have taken different shapes and have focussed on different levels within universities. This variation in experience should be taken into account when drawing conclusions on the impact of Tempus in this field.

The consensus in the lessons learned workshop on this issue was that three stages can be distinguished in the reforms in university management brought about in the second phase Tempus. These three stages can be characterised as follows:

- University management reforms linked to curriculum development reforms (stage 1);
- The establishment of international co-operation offices and equipment provisions for libraries and management information systems (stage 2);
Co-operation with a focus *internal organisation* aspects of university management: autonomy, broadening the funding base, and introducing democratic governance aspects (stage 3a); and

Targeted activities, which focus on *external strategic orientation*, on strategy development for universities including: management training for university rectors and deans and the introduction of Bologna related objectives in university (and national higher education) policies such as accreditation, two degree systems and education credit transfer systems (stage 3b).

In stage 1, university management issues arise in connection with the start-up and follow-up of the first JEPs. In most HEIs these have focused on curriculum development. Typical university management related outputs in this first stage are facilitated by the equipment component. This helps academics to obtain support from university deans/rectors for the JEP and for supporting the changes needed for sustainable curriculum development outcomes. In this phase the equipment is used university-wide rather than by the faculty involved in the JEP.

In the second phase university management projects are formulated, which aim at improving university management systems, libraries etc, and international co-operation offices are established to promote openness and facilitate international co-operation.

The real, often painful issues of management reforms are on the agenda only in the third stage of university management projects. They address, first, issues linked to internal organisation: centralisation/ decentralisation, democratisation. Second, they include activities aiming at external strategic orientation. The ideas of the Bologna process are the cornerstone of reform during this stage.

In the CARDS region, it is clear from our survey that the higher education authorities do not perceive that Tempus has had a direct influence in terms of introducing third stage new management approaches and structures. We have already mentioned that the universities in this region present a particular challenge as far as this question is concerned due to their highly decentralised structures, which give each faculty almost complete autonomy to manage itself. The result of this is that strategic planning or comprehensive reform at institution level is rendered almost impossible. As a bottom-up programme, the demand for Tempus projects generally emanates from faculty level in the eligible countries - faculties who recognise the need for reforms but are reluctant to surrender their autonomy.

At university management or national level in the CARDS area, Tempus impact on management reform has been very small in direct terms, but is recognised as having an indirect influence, which is classified as major. At faculty level, however Tempus has made a major direct contribution. (Stage 1 and stage 2 of the university management process).

For the PHARE area, the awareness of university management needs had proceeded to the third stage (management reforms) mentioned above. In this context, the evaluation survey results show that only a very small percentage of the JEPs (15%) were credited with having a *major* or *minor* direct impact on university management changes. The
lessons learned workshops and literature review confirm that Tempus has had little impact in this field. Despite the fact that university management projects represented over 10% of all JEPs implemented during Tempus II, impact studies record only limited change in practices in institutional management through Tempus. In particular the perseverance of an academic culture instead of a management culture is observed.

"We need managers, not academics at the top of our HEIs"  
(Source: Lessons learned workshop)

In the Tacis area, the second phase of Tempus has not featured any specific university management projects. The university management issues are handled within projects that focus on curriculum development issues. The JEP response indicates that university management impact of the stage one and two types have been very influential. The HEA views do credit Tempus with stage 3 type impact, but this is limited, and the evidence provided mainly refers to strategic planning.

On the basis of the above analysis, the conclusion reflected in Table 5.1 was drawn.

**Conclusion:** Tempus has had a major direct impact on the first steps of management reforms, and a minor direct impact on deeper management reforms in HEIs leading to new management approaches and structures in line with more independent, accountable higher institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected outcome 5</th>
<th>Observed impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reforms prompted in HEIs leading to new management approaches and structures in line with more independent, accountable higher institutions</td>
<td>PHARE region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected outcome 5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 1 = Major direct impact; 2 = Minor direct impact; 3 = Major indirect impact; 4 = Minor indirect impact; 5 = No impact

**5.6 Summary**

Tempus has had a major direct impact on the first steps of management reforms, and a minor direct impact on deeper management reforms in HEIs leading to new management approaches and structures in line with more independent, accountable higher institutions.

To analyse this issue, the evaluation relied on three data collection tools: the literature review, the JEP survey and the lessons learned workshop.
The literature review and the workshop showed that on the issue of university management reforms, the Tempus impact has for different countries reached different levels of depth in the reform process and these correspond roughly with four stages in university management reform:

- University management reforms linked to curriculum development reforms (stage 1);
- The establishment of international co-operation offices and equipment provisions for libraries and management information systems (stage 2);
- Co-operation with a focus *internal organisation* aspects of university management: autonomy, broadening the funding base, and introducing democratic governance aspects (stage 3a); and
- Targeted activities, which focus on *external strategic orientation*, on strategy development for universities including: management training for university rectors and deans and the introduction of Bologna related objectives in university (and national higher education) policies such as accreditation, two degree systems and education credit transfer systems (stage 3b).

In the Tacis region, curriculum development was the main focus for the JEPs and in the majority of the JEPs university management reforms issues were dealt with from this perspective. On this level (stage 1 and stage 2), the JEP surveys show that Tempus II has had a major direct impact for the partner HEIs. With respect to deeper reforms (steps 3a and 3b), the second phase of the Tempus programme has achieved less. Still, the case study for the Russian Federation shows that there is ample evidence that Tempus has succeeded in reaching the key decision makers and has made them aware of the needs for further reforms in line with best practice developments in the EU and Bologna process concepts (stage 3b).

Also in the CARDS area, the focus was mainly on curriculum development. Separate university management JEPs were started up but have not gone much beyond stage 1, and stage 2. Nevertheless, for these countries the importance of Tempus can hardly be overestimated. For the higher education institutions in these countries, Tempus has provided a crucial lifeline for science and education in a period of sharply declining national resources for the sector. And, the Bologna process was at the end of the second phase of the Tempus programme perceived as the framework for the future direction of higher education reforms.

For the PHARE area, the awareness of UM needs has proceeded to the third stage mentioned above. The PHARE experience shows, however, how difficult it is to bring about real management reforms in universities. In this context, the JEP survey clearly shows how little has so far been achieved with respect to third stage reforms. Only a very small percentage of the JEPs (15%) were credited with having a major or minor direct impact on university management changes. The lessons learned workshops and literature review confirm that Tempus has had little impact in this field. Despite the fact that UM projects represented over 10 percent of all JEPs implemented during Tempus II, the Lithuanian impact study - amongst others - can find only a few “fragmented examples of implementation of modern practices in institutional management through Tempus.” In particular the perseverance of an academic culture instead of a management culture is observed.
6 Outcome 6 Skills and qualifications for the new socio-economic reality

6.1 Introduction to the issue

This chapter sets out the data collection, analysis and findings of the evaluation with respect to issue three, question number six as formulated by the Commission in the Terms of Reference for the final evaluation of the second phase of the Tempus programme:

Evaluation question number 6

To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme brought about curriculum development and reforms leading to
- the acquisition by staff and students of skills and qualifications necessary for the transition process and for the new socio-economic reality.

This is perhaps the most important question in this evaluation. It addresses the outcome for which Tempus is established. In the end the various Tempus activities (i.e. the IMGs, the JEPs on curriculum development, institution building and university management; and the compact measures and compact projects), all serve the same purpose: "To provide teachers and students with the skills and qualifications necessary for the transition process and for the new socio-economic reality".

In section 6.2 the expected outcome of the Tempus programme with respect to training of staff and students in the eligible countries is analysed in some detail. In section 6.3 the evaluation approach and the relevant indicators for assessing this expected outcome are introduced. Section 6.4 provides the findings from the evaluation tools. The analysis of the data and conclusions drawn from the analysis are presented in section 6.5. The chapter is summarised in section 6.6.

6.2 The expected outcome of Tempus with respect to training

Following the fall of the wall, the main need in the CEEC was to leave communism behind and to build new societies. In this transition context three main socio-economic needs became visible: (1) the need for belief system changes; (2) the need for institutional changes and (3) the need for training.

33 See North (1990).
Belief system change became a fundamental need. To successfully transform their societies the populations had to overcome their communist education and experience and start believing in the merits of democratic society, private property, competition and market-based economics.

Likewise institutions needed to be changed. The new societies needed to be based on the rule of law, the separation of the legislative, administrative and executive state powers, and civil society participation in political decision-making. The new societies needed also new institutions for the development of market-based economics, in which competition between enterprises would provide the motor for innovation and economic growth and for embedding civil society participation in the policy making cycle.

Thirdly people needed training in skills and qualifications required to help them adjust to the new demands of society. It was recognised that, following the collapse of the former socialist regimes, the eligible countries were left with education systems that radically differed from EU and world standards and were ill suited for the demands of the new socio-economic reality. Thus the need was identified for meeting the skills gaps of the workers and to reform the education systems so that they could raise new generations on the basis of the civic values, professional skills and social acumen needed to function in market economy based, and hopefully democratic societies.

It is against this background that the Tempus programme was created with the purpose of building up new relations and networks of contacts between West and East and for sharing western experience and expertise with people dedicated to reform.

The evolution of the programme over the period 1990-2000 reflects the pace of reform in the PHARE countries and especially in the candidate countries for accession to the EU. During Tempus I, (1990-1994) the scheme had as a main objective the promotion of mobility of student and teacher exchanges. During Tempus II (1994-1998) 'curriculum development and reform' was formulated as one of the specific objectives of the programme, and for the period 1998-2000, known as Tempus II bis, 'institution building' became a training priority for the scheme.

Taking a global view, one can say that the expected outcome of Tempus I in terms of training was the building of commitment to the reform process. Tempus I aimed at establishing international co-operation, engaging teachers and students in cultural exchange and dialogue and thereby changing their mindsets from communism towards democracy and market economies. Tempus I provided training to prepare individuals in the eligible countries for participating in and supporting the necessary reforms in their higher education institutions and in society at large. To bring about this outcome Tempus I focused on mobility and the JEPs and IMGs were established as the main Tempus programme activities and tools.

The expected outcome of the second phase of Tempus was to provide people with the skills and expertise needed in the new socio-economic reality. The Council Decisions on the second phase of Tempus II provided for continuity as well as for a reorientation of the programme. Curriculum development and reform became a specific objective, as well as institution building and university management reforms. With curriculum development,
the scheme aims at meeting the **long-term needs** of society for people with higher education. With its new emphasis on institutional development, Tempus aims at meeting the **short-term training needs** of people outside the higher education sector e.g. training of public servants in ministries and other public sector institutions which face new tasks because of the ongoing reform processes.

*By 1994 when the second phase of the Tempus programme started, already large differences had become apparent in the socio-economic circumstances and the reform pace in eligible countries.* In the PHARE region, EU accession became a real policy prospect for ten countries. In the other PHARE countries (i.e. now CARDS) the ethnic conflicts in the wake of the break up of Yugoslavia negatively affected the reform process. In the Tacis area, the demise of the Soviet Union resulted in a severe economic and political crisis.

*In the PHARE area Tempus II provided for continuity* and it enabled many of the higher education institutions that participated in the first phase of Tempus to seek new partnerships in the second phase of the programme.

*For many of the former Soviet and Yugoslav Republics the second phase of Tempus was their first experience of international co-operation and exposure to EU best practice in curricular reform.* For these countries Tempus provided a much needed source of funding for innovation as well as access to the international and specifically European higher education institutions interested in partnerships with HEIs in the CEEC for international co-operation.

*These differences in starting positions have implications for this evaluation as they affect what one may expect as outcomes of Tempus with respect to training.* In the acceding and candidate countries of the PHARE region, one may expect outcomes related to long-term and short-term needs as indicated above. However, in the Tacis and CARDS area, where the countries only became eligible in the second phase, it is more logical to expect a mix of the Tempus I and Tempus II outcomes i.e. outcomes related to building a commitment for reform and meeting long-term training needs.

*The expected outcomes of the second phase of the Tempus programme with respect to training are directly related to the three socio-economic needs of the CEEC mentioned above.* This is an important insight and this observation has been used for setting up the approach and methodology of this study.

This link is as follows:

1. The mobility and exchange activities of JEPs and IMGs promote networking, cultural dialogue, and in general contribute to changing belief systems and to creating commitment to the reforms;
2. The institution building JEPs focus on providing short-term training to mainly civil servants working for new institutions or old institutions, which have changed and are now facing new tasks of the new socio-economic reality;
3. The curriculum development JEPs can be considered the heart of the Tempus programme and they aim to meet the long-term needs of society for people with higher education qualifications and abilities.
6.3 Approach and indicators

"To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme brought about curriculum development and reforms leading to the acquisition by staff and students of skills and qualifications necessary for the transition process and for the new socio-economic reality?"

The Evaluation Team approached this issue from two angles:
1. Firstly, the Tempus intervention logic was analysed to better understand why this outcome is expected and how this outcome is to be achieved, and what exactly is to be expected;
2. Secondly, the factual outcomes were assessed with the help of a number of data collection tools.

6.3.1 The Tempus intervention logic with respect to short-term and long-term training needs

The term "intervention logic" refers to the causal logic of events in programmes or projects. Here the concept is used to clarify the main building blocks in the design of the Tempus programme. The building blocks are the inputs, activities, outputs and desired outcomes of the programme and assumptions made about cause and effect relations, and the specification of risks that are beyond the direct control of the programme stakeholders. The following figure illustrates this concept:

```
Inputs ➔ Activities ➔ Output ➔ Outcome

Assumptions and risks  Assumptions and risks  Assumptions and risks
```

In the Tempus programme, Inputs are the Tempus grant funding and other resources made available by the partners in Tempus activities. Activities are the IMGs, JEPs, compact measures and compact projects. Outputs are the results of the activities and this includes reformed curricula, university regulations etc. Outcomes are the results of the outputs. In the terms of reference eight such outcomes are defined including the Tempus contribution to meeting the long-term and short-term training needs of society.

Using these terms the figure above can be understood as follows: IF Tempus starts up an Activity, say a JEP in curriculum reform, and IF certain assumptions (related to risks) are met, THEN one may expect that the JEP will reach its expected Output, say the modernisation of a study programme. Moreover, IF certain other conditions are met, THEN one may expect that the HEI with this modernised curriculum will train students and thus reach its expected Outcome, i.e. students having acquired skills and qualifications, which are in demand from society.
Text box 6.1 Tempus intervention logic, assumptions and risks

**Assumptions**
1. The call for applicants generates relevant projects, well designed and feasible to implement
2. The selection process is able to select the most relevant projects
3. The multilateral model of cooperation results in good quality implementation
4. The education settings in which Tempus projects operate is committed to...
5. Higher education authorities do not introduce reforms, which contradict the education reform orientation of Tempus outputs

On this basis a number of IF-THEN statements and indicators were formulated to clarify the intervention logic for the training outcome\(^\text{34}\) and to measure the results.

**The intervention logic for meeting long-term training needs**
IF Tempus is expected to promote HEIs to meet the training needs of the new generation of students who pursue tertiary degrees of education,
THEN a wide ranging reform of curricula needs to be offered at department, faculty and university levels, supported by university management change, and supported by matching reforms in the higher education policy.

**The intervention logic for meeting short-term training needs**
IF one expects the HEIs to become providers of short-term professional training for civil servants,
THEN one needs to give the HEIs special incentives and tools to develop this new field of activity.

**Indicators for Tempus impact on long-term training needs**
In order to analyse to what extent Tempus has addressed (and thereby changed) the needs for reforming the higher education curricula and main study programmes of the Universities the following indicators were used:

- **Indicator 1**: The number of JEPs that dealt with curriculum development
- **Indicator 2**: The percentage of higher education institutions that participated in JEPs in the PHARE, CARDS and Tacis area.
- **Indicator 3**: The number of students and teachers who have benefited from the renewed study programmes offered by the HEIs who have participated in Tempus JEPs.
- **Indicator 4**: The extent of enthusiasm of the Tempus participants for starting up new JEPs in curriculum development.
- **Indicator 5**: The perceptions of students, teachers and employer organisations on the extent to which HEIs have adjusted their programmes in line with or in anticipation of the demands of the labour market.
- **Indicator 6**: The perception of the workshop participants on the relative importance of Curriculum development JEPs versus university management JEPs

\(^{34}\) For details see the mid-term Evaluation Report on the third phase of Tempus, section 2.4.3.
Indicators for Tempus impact on short-term training needs.
In order to analyse to what extent has Tempus been valuable for meeting the short-term training needs of people working outside the higher education system, one indicator was used:
Indicator 7 The demand for Institutional development type JEPs in the application rounds for JEPs (1998 and 1999).

### 6.3.2 Data collection tools, survey questions and indicators

To assess the factual outcome of Tempus curriculum development and reforms on meeting the needs of staff and students for skills and qualifications they require for working during the transition process and in the new economic reality, the evaluation split the issue into four parts:

- What type of curriculum reforms has Tempus II brought about?
- What has been the value of these reforms for academic staff and students?
- Who benefited from the reforms, and how widely were the reforms disseminated?
- What was the overall impact of curriculum reform?

**What type of curriculum development reforms?**

Three types of reforms were distinguished:

- Modernisation of existing courses (text books, teaching methods, course materials);
- Restructuring of existing curricula (changing the substance and relative weight of subjects);
- Introduction of new curricula and diplomas (new subjects).

To analyse a question was put in the JEP survey, which focused on:

- The relative share of each of the three types of curriculum development in the total curriculum development reforms.

The results are presented below in Figures 6.1

**What has been the value of the reforms for university staff and students?**

To measure this aspect a question was put in the surveys to assess effects of reformed curricula on:

- Marketability, Popularity, Employability, Dissemination, Reputation.

The relevant questions and the findings are presented below in Figures 6.2 and 6.3.

**Who benefited from the reforms, and how widely were the reforms disseminated?**

Analysis of the Tempus intervention logic suggest that Tempus curriculum reform could benefit five target groups:

1. Teachers who were involved in the JEPs or IMGs (direct beneficiaries);
2. The bachelor or graduate students who attended curricula that have been reformed by the JEPs or participated in IMGs (direct beneficiaries);
3. Teachers and or students who benefit from curriculum reform through dissemination of textbooks, courses, etc. from one HEI to another (beneficiary of direct dissemination);
4. Teachers and students who are influenced by Tempus because of national accreditation and acceptance of new standards (indirect beneficiaries of national legislation);
5. Students of other education institutions who employ teachers who participated in Tempus curriculum development or institution building JEPs and now apply their new skills in their new work environment (indirect beneficiaries of trickle down dissemination by graduates).

To assess to what extent the Tempus programme reached these target groups and to estimate how many people benefited directly and indirectly from Tempus curriculum reform, a number of questions were put in the various surveys.

*What was the overall impact of curriculum reform?*
To assess the overall impact of Tempus on curriculum reform two questions were asked in the JEP and HEA surveys. The questions and results are presented in Figures 6.4 and 6.5 and in Table 6.1.

In addition to this questionnaire approach, the findings of existing studies were reviewed and the interim results of the study were presented and discussed at the participatory workshops in Moscow, Almaty and Skopje and during lessons learned workshop in Brussels.

### 6.4 Findings from the evaluation tools

#### 6.4.1 Findings from the literature and Tempus documents review

*General findings*
The Council Decision that established the Tempus II programme lists as its first specific objective to “help the higher education systems of the eligible countries to address issues of Curriculum Development and overhaul in priority areas.”

This objective is reflected in the ETF data, which show that in the period 1994-2000 nearly 75% of the JEPs were Curriculum Development projects in the PHARE region, a higher percentage still in the CARDS region and almost 100% in the Tacis area. Overall, 1,136 CD JEPs were funded in 26 eligible countries with the aim of curricular reforms across Central and Eastern Europe.

The term curriculum development as used by Tempus stands for the real substance of bottom-up higher education reform at department and faculty level. Curriculum development under Tempus is more than the modernisation of compulsory syllabi or the introduction of new economic concepts or historical perspectives. It is the incorporation – and also staff and student endorsement – of leading edge teaching methods and materials, the introduction of completely new subjects, the establishment of networks of stakeholders having input into new curricula, etc. Curriculum development JEPs deal with embedding the teaching and diploma reforms in the universities, the introduction of new concepts on university management practices, upgrading of facilities (equipment budget) and linking the partner institutions in academic research networks. Moreover, the
curriculum development JEPs are the basis for the introduction in the eligible countries of new higher education principles as endorsed by the Bologna process.

Tempus JEP outputs consist of a very wider range of long-term curricular reforms and short-term training modules/initiatives. The following randomly chosen titles may illustrate this.

Text box 6.2 Examples of JEP titles

- Transformation of the curriculum of 5 years masters degree in chemistry
- Creation of curriculum in Biotechnology
- Asthma prevention in primary health care education
- Diploma/MA in European studies
- Economics and business management curriculum development
- Training of the Polish police in the EU pillar III
- CAP training centre for local community leaders
- National training programme for forensic experts
- Integrating management, engineering and business education in Bulgarian universities

Accreditation and quality control issues

The literature review shows that the conditions for successful curriculum reform differ between the eligible countries. In the PHARE countries the accreditation practices and education standards have over time moved towards European practices, which give academics much freedom in establishing curricula. In the CARDS area the faculties are highly autonomous, and the barriers for curriculum development linked reforms are low. In the Tacis area, the opposite is true. In the Tacis area the practice of national accreditation has severely limited the depth of the curriculum reforms initiated by Tempus. The following quotes, which are taken from the Tempus Tacis evaluation conducted in 1998, illustrate the problem and its significance.

"In most partner countries of the Tempus programme, universities have been given a certain freedom in course development. Limits to this freedom are set by the respective Ministries of (Higher) Education. …The possibilities for introducing innovations generally depend on the level of higher education. In most countries, Bachelor level programmes (BA) are for 70% centrally defined by the Ministry of Education. The margins to change these programmes towards standards applied by the EU partners are limited. For the MA and Ph.D. programmes, the restrictions set centrally are less; e.g. in Ukraine 50% of the MA programmes is fixed, while this is only 30% for the programmes at Ph.D. level."

"The Tempus projects need to operate within this system of freedoms and restrictions. The question whether the TEMPUS projects have indeed taken this framework into account cannot be answered uniformly. In Ukraine, most universities appeared to consult the Ministry of Education in advance to receive a "green light" for the development of new courses. In the Russian Federation, on the other hand, few universities did so, while among the projects visited in Uzbekistan, only one actually maintained contacts with the relevant ministry. In the latter two countries, the so-called scientific committees are hardly consulted as well; one reason being that these committees are conceived as old-fashioned and incapable of judging modern, EU oriented courses. Moreover, clear assessment criteria have often not been developed for the MA and Ph.D. level while mechanisms for the participation of external (or foreign) evaluators in the accreditation process have not been
worked out yet. This latter issue may arise when the courses have gone through all the stages of testing and re-adaptation after comments of the clients of the graduates". (A three-year cycle).

"This approach may eventually lead to non-acceptance of the developed courses at central level. This could, in turn, jeopardise the sustainability of the innovations introduced; a danger which is apparently less in case central universities are involved and professors of these universities are also member of the scientific committees".

**JEP contents and the long-term and short-term training needs**

The literature review generated little information on the question whether the curricula reforms adequately reflect the needs of the economy as it is evolving in the eligible countries. Recent newspaper articles in many countries have highlighted this issue. Where in the past there was a need for the new social sciences, nowadays graduates from economics and law faculties find it harder to find employment than people with for example an engineering diploma. This demand and supply issue is complex and is linked to the overall functions of higher education in society. Universities are considered to have professional learning as well as social learning purposes. Especially in the social sciences the curricula tend to have a wide set of qualifications, which prepare people for general management positions, the public sector or various non-technical services. In the technical sciences and in research, the links with industry demand are much clearer.

**Links with the private sector**

The Commission has with its Tempus information materials (TOP handbooks) and Guide for applicants attempted to promote that private sector institutions form partnerships with higher education authorities. The ETF database on JEP partners indicates that this had some results. Notably in the PHARE countries, some private sector companies are listed as partners in the JEP consortia for management training, and for setting up career services and internship programmes for students with industries. Overall, however, one can conclude that Tempus had little success in this field. This is not for want of trying, but can be explained as follows. In the US and to a much smaller extent in Europe, the links between universities and industry are based on basic research as inputs for applied research for leading edge innovation oriented companies. Tempus does not support research activities directly and as such has little to offer as incentives.

In this context the results of a recent survey of innovative companies conducted by the EU is interesting. This found that Universities are considered to be key sources of innovative information by only 3% of manufacturing firms and 1% of those in the service sector.

With respect to management training, the potential interest of private companies is clear. In principle Tempus can be a good vehicle to promote commercial MBA education offered by western private companies. This seems to have happened occasionally through the establishment of joint diploma courses, but in general the Commission does not support such commercial (mis)use of the scheme.

---

Given the less than optimal situation in the EU itself, the literature review suggests that one should not have too high expectations about the potential for Tempus to transfer to the eligible countries the European best practice for fostering “improved and extended links with industry”.

In this context the Evaluation Team also searched for information on the possible involvement of private sector representatives in the process of setting the Tempus national priorities, which are annually updated in the Tempus Guide for Applicants. On this issue no information was found and the issue was dealt with in the workshops.

**Dissemination and sustainability of curricula**

In the second phase of Tempus, the Commission promoted dissemination of Tempus results as part of its approach to secure sustainability of the reforms initiated by Tempus, and to widen the impact of the programme. As a tool for dissemination the TOP programme was initiated (Tempus Output Promotion) which resulted in a number of handbooks on university management, university-industry co-operation and a compendium on economic training materials. In addition dissemination of Tempus outputs became an eligible aim for compact measures and compact projects. In previous evaluation studies it is observed, however, that in the Tempus practice the JEP participants have not actively promoted the dissemination of their tangible outputs to other HEIs.

6.4.2 **Findings from the analysis of the intervention logic**

Various information sources were used to collect information on the six indicators that were identified for establishing Tempus success in meeting the long-term training needs of society for people with higher education degrees.

ETF data show that during Tempus II alone, Tempus funded the activities of some 1100 JEPs focused on curriculum development (indicator 1).

From the literature review and the on-line survey it can be estimated that in the PHARE area some 80% of the HEIs were reached directly or indirectly by the curriculum development JEPs. For the CARDS area exact figures are unknown but are substantially lower because the funding intensity has been less and the countries have participated for a shorter number of years. For FYR Macedonia the participants of the Skopje workshop estimated that over 20% of all teaching staff has participated in Tempus curriculum development activities. For the Tacis area, the Evaluation Team has no reliable data, but for Russia, by far the largest country in Tempus-Tacis, the experts working on the country case study provided data that show that some 12% (100) of the HEIs have at one time or another participated in the programme (indicator 2).

Even though the Evaluation Team did not find any reliable data on the number of students that have participated in courses modernised as a result of Tempus activities, it is highly likely that this has involved hundreds of thousands of students at least (indicator 3).
The enthusiasm of the participants in the JEPs, and the interest of their institutions in participating in JEPs also in the future was assessed through the on-line questionnaire. The results can be considered good evidence of the fact that Tempus curriculum JEPs are considered highly relevant by the participants for meeting the training needs of teachers and students (indicator 4).

The evaluation used interviews, the workshops and the JEP survey (see Figure 6.4) for collecting data on the issue to what extent Tempus curriculum development JEPs have helped HEIs to bring their courses in line with demand from employers. It is clear that employability is a main issue of concern in the broader transition context. The results show that it has been difficult for the universities to flexibly react with curricula reforms to the changing needs of the labour markets, and interviews with employer organisations conducted in the context of this evaluation confirm that there are mismatches. Encouraging in this respect is the growing transparency, dynamics and diversity in the education services offered by the HEIs, and the emergence of new funding tools for students, which increase student opportunities and give them an incentive for making an informed choice on their preferred field of study (indicator 5).

When asked the theoretical question what the funding priorities should be if the Tempus budgets were increased, the participants of the Brussels lessons learned workshop quickly found a common position. Curriculum development was selected as the priority over other options including: university management, more monitoring or more attention for dissemination. This finding also gives a broad confirmation of the importance which Tempus stakeholders attach to curriculum development (indicator 6).

To assess the success of Tempus with respect to institution building projects the evaluation did not generate much new information. ETF data show that this type of project has been in demand by the candidate countries in the application rounds of 1998 and 1999 (Tempus II bis). Moreover the reports of the Tempus annual conferences in Portoroz (1998) and especially Kiev (1999) provide positive feedback on what was, at that time, a new Tempus activity (indicator 7).

6.4.3 Findings from the JEP and HEA surveys

The type and depths of curriculum development reforms

To better understand what was done during the second phase of Tempus under the heading curriculum reform, three types of reform were distinguished:

1. The modernisation of the curriculum for an existing subject (i.e. updating of parts of the syllabus and/ or teaching methods);
2. The restructuring of the curriculum for an existing subject (e.g. revision of the teaching time allocated to specific subjects, new units introduced, new non-compulsory optional courses);
3. The introduction of a completely new curriculum covering a new subject (i.e. a totally new field of study).
The idea behind this distinction was to assess how deep the reforms went in the partner institutions. Modernisation is the easiest to reach, it can be done at chair or department level. Restructuring requires acceptance of changed curricula, by the competent level responsible for quality control and accreditation. Depending on the accreditation regulations in a country this may require approval by faculty, university or the ministry of education. Likewise the introduction of new diploma courses requires support and approval from higher levels and may have budgetary implications for others within a faculty of university.

This issue was addressed in the JEP survey. The answers can be summarised as follows: In the PHARE region the introduction of new curricula has been the main type of reform. In the CARDS and Tacis area modernisation was the main type indicated. Restructuring of existing curricula was indicated in all three regions as the least frequent type of reforms. This difference between the results for PHARE and Tacis can be explained by the finding from the literature review that in Tacis the centralised accreditation practices limit the scope for bringing about reforms, which involve new diplomas or deep restructuring of diplomas.

Who benefited from the reforms?

To better understand the effects that curriculum development projects have had on universities, faculties and students to help them acquire the skills needed for meeting the demands of the changing socio-economic conditions (market economy and democratisation) in their transition countries, five questions were included in the questionnaires. These questions aim to assess the “footprint” left by curriculum development JEPs funded under Tempus II:

Questions to JEP participants:

- **Marketability.** Has the position of your faculty in the market for attracting higher education students been improved by Tempus?
- **Popularity** Have the enrolment numbers for courses introduced or enhanced by Tempus increased as a logical consequence of the changes introduced?
- **Employability** Have the employment prospects of graduates completing courses introduced or enhanced by Tempus been improved?
- **Dissemination** Are you involved in, or aware of, the adoption of outputs funded by your Tempus project in any other institutions?
- **Reputation** Has the public perception of the quality of your faculty been improved by Tempus?

The results of this question are given in the figure below. Note that the vertical axis represents the percentage of respondents who answered in the affirmative that their JEP had produced an impact in the fields described above.
Figure 6.1 illustrates a number of very important findings of the evaluation.

In all regions, the JEP participants are convinced that their JEPs:
1. Had a direct positive impact on the university reputation;
2. Helped the HEIs to market their courses and attract students;
3. Had a positive effect on employability of students.

The tabulation further indicates that there are differences in the extent to which these positive impacts are perceived between the regions. In the PHARE acceding and candidate countries, some 60% of the respondents credit Tempus with this impact, in CARDS this is 70 percent, and in Tacis even 80-90 percent.

At first glance, this strong result for Tempus Tacis may seem surprising, given the findings presented above that in Tacis the impact beyond faculty level has been less. However, the differences in the answers again reflect that in many of the eligible countries in the Tacis area, the Tempus programme is by far the main scheme for helping universities and students to meet the challenges of the transition process, and this explains the enthusiasm of the participants. In PHARE, Tempus is apparently also very important but other factors as well play a role in curriculum reform.

How much influence did Tempus have on Curriculum reform?

To gain more insight into the question to what extent Tempus has been instrumental for curriculum reform at faculty level and at national level the following questions were introduced in the questionnaires for the JEP participants and HEA experts:

Question to JEP participants

One aim of the Tempus programme has been curriculum development and curriculum reforms. If applicable, with which of the following statements can the impact of your Tempus project be assessed in this field?
Question to HEA experts Tempus has contributed to curriculum development and curriculum reforms. In this field the extent of the impact of the Tempus programme can be assessed as?

The results of these two questions are given in the figures below; the vertical axes are the percentages of each group of respondents who chose the various descriptions of impact given on the right.

Analysis of the data shows that:

- Tempus has had a “major direct impact” on curriculum development. In the CARDS and Tacis countries, the JEP Participants clearly show that in their faculties/departments etc. the JEPs were the main cause for the impact on curriculum reform. In the PHARE region, the influence of Tempus was recognised as substantial, but clearly other factors also contributed to the reforms in curricula development.

- The representatives of the higher education authorities interviewed put the answers obtained from the JEP co-ordinators in a wider national perspective. The HEAs in the PHARE area give an even higher assessment of the Tempus impact on curriculum reform than the JEP participants themselves. Also in the CARDS and Tempus regions the interviewees all agreed that Tempus had a major direct or indirect impact on curriculum reform.

Figure 6.2 JEP survey on curriculum development

Figure 6.3 HEA survey on curriculum development
These findings confirm the indications from the literature review and illustrate once more that the existing education systems has a strong influence on the scope and depth of the curriculum reform that can be achieved with the JEP tool.

What has been the overall impact of Tempus on curriculum reforms?

To get an overall picture of the impact which Tempus JEPs have had on the overall pace of higher education reform in the eligible countries and on the specific pace of reform in the higher education institutions, the JEP survey and the HEA survey were used. The interview partners were asked about their perception of the importance of the programme. In particular they were asked to think about the question whether the changes brought about by Tempus would not have occurred without the programme, or would have come anyway but at a slower pace.

The findings are presented in Tables 6.1 and 6.2.

Table 6.1  Tempus impact on the reform process in the HEIs (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PHARE</th>
<th>W Balkans</th>
<th>Tacis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Tempus project accelerated the pace of reform, although most reforms would have taken place anyway eventually</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Tempus project allowed the reforms to take place and without it they would have been impossible</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: JEP survey

Table 6.1 shows first of all that over 96 per cent of the respondents agreed with the observation that Tempus had at least accelerated the reforms. One person (1,2%) saw no positive results of Tempus and two respondents gave another answer. Secondly the tabulation shows that the majority of the respondents in the PHARE region opted for acceleration, while in the CARDS and Tacis areas, the majority held the view that without Tempus the reform process would not have started in their universities.

Table 6.2  Tempus impact on the reform process nation wide (in percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PHARE</th>
<th>W Balkans</th>
<th>Tacis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Tempus programme has accelerated the pace of reform, although most reforms would have taken place anyway eventually</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tempus programme allowed the reforms to take place and without it they would have been impossible</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HEA survey
Table 6.2 indicates that the interview partners from the higher education authorities survey all (except one) agreed that Tempus had accelerated the pace of education reforms.

The higher education authorities from the PHARE acceding and candidate countries and Tacis countries mostly indicated that the main value of Tempus had been to speed up the reform processes but that the changes would have occurred sooner or later also without Tempus. In CARDS the minds were divided because of an interesting nuance. The consensus was that the changes would probably have occurred later but later would have been too late (to catch up).

6.4.4 Findings from the lessons learned workshop in Brussels

The lessons learned workshop did not generate many new insights on this issue, and the main findings were considered reasonable and in line with the expectations about the outcomes of Tempus with respect to its impact on training.

On the issue of dissemination the broad consensus of the workshop, (and of the other workshops) was that more could have been done with dissemination of the tangible outputs. A number of explanations for the limited efforts from the JEP partners in this field were suggested. There was consensus in the meeting that the individual JEP partners have little incentives to put efforts into dissemination of tangible outputs. Moreover, for the Tacis area, the slow accreditation process was mentioned as a barrier for dissemination. In addition the observation was made that Tempus by its nature is a dissemination programme through its education of students who later can apply their skills and qualifications for educating others.

6.4.5 Reports by national evaluation experts

Each of the local experts engaged for this evaluation as independent evaluators for the fieldwork in the eligible countries wrote, as part of their assignment, a summary report on their findings. The two comments reproduced below illustrate their view on the significance of Tempus for higher education reforms and the expected outcome of the programme with respect curriculum reform and training.
Text box 6.3  Comments by local experts

“The Tempus programme makes its main and direct influence on the higher education content by the development and implementation of new curricula and plans, introducing new specialities which, in the final analysis, bring the structure and content of university education closer to the European level.”
(Ukraine)

“Tempus continuously supported curriculum development projects which have a direct, quantifiable impact on higher education institutions and as such influence the development of the system as a whole. Due to the creation of new degree programmes the structure and content of higher education is gradually changing and converging on the European level”
(Armenia)

“An important achievement is the increased capacity of universities to develop curriculum not only for students in initial training, but also for a wider range of beneficiaries (i.e. continuous education), as a response to the needs of the labour market.”
(Romania).

Sir Walter Scott once remarked “all men who have turned out to be worth anything have had the chief hand in their own education.” The significance of this comment is that, if a Tempus curriculum development project has been no more than an isolated donor intervention reforming syllabi, then its value is far less than if it has been a truly educational experience for all those involved. In this context some of the national experts have commented in their reports that the main value added of participation in Tempus curriculum development projects for eligible country higher education institutions is the capacity that it generates for implementing future reforms.

This statement touches on a crucial point. The development of such capacity has been an important element of the Tempus projects. This has contributed to the durability of the curriculum development outcomes of the JEPs. This finding is supported by the replies given by the JEP survey participants to the question on sustainability and follow.
Table 6.3  From awareness raising to sustainability and follow-up (in percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PHARE</th>
<th>W BALKANS</th>
<th>Tacis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project generated an awareness of the need for change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project generated the capacity necessary for future change to take place</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project produced significant actual change, but during the implementation period only</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project produced significant actual change within the implementation period and has continued to do so subsequently, following the end of the funding</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of answers (80)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: JEP survey

6.5 Analysis and conclusions

6.5.1 Methodological considerations

The methodology for assessing to what extent the second phase of the Tempus programme has succeeded in achieving the expected outcome linked to meeting the training needs of the transition countries has been discussed in section 6.3. Moreover, the strengths and weaknesses of the different tools used for data collection, data aggregation, analysis and verification of the findings were described in chapter 2.

In this section of the report, the different sources of information have been combined to arrive at the overall conclusion with respect to the outcome question.

The literature review and the JEP survey were the main sources of information. Analysis of the Tempus intervention logic served to clarify the issues. The feedback from the lessons learned workshop was used to further refine the analysis. In this context the interviews with employers and students during the regional workshops were also relevant.

The different sources provided insight in the issues from different perspectives. Crosschecking of the results was done with the impact examples given by the respondents to the on-line survey. Therefore the evaluators are confident that the conclusions drawn from the data for the two levels of analysis presented here are sound and relevant.

Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that the findings are mainly relevant as an assessment of the contribution of Tempus to meeting the long-term training needs of society i.e. needs that can be addressed by the bachelor and graduate education offered by universities and other higher education institutions. The data collection methodology was not much focused on identifying the impact of Tempus activities and outputs on the short-term training needs.
6.5.2 Analysis

In the beginning of this chapter it was argued that three different expected outcomes of second phase of the Tempus programme with respect to training could be distinguished:

1. Training to creating in teachers and students a commitment for supporting higher education reforms and the general reforms in society;
2. Training to meet the short-term requirements of workers for skills and qualifications;
3. Training to meet the long-term requirements of teachers and students for skills and qualifications necessary for the transition process and the new socio-economic reality.

On all three outcomes information has been collected, but the findings of the data collection tools set out in section 6.4 pertain mainly to the third outcome. This outcome can be considered the heart of the Tempus programme as it is based on the curriculum development activities of Tempus, and the analysis shows that some 80 percent of all JEPs have dealt with curricular reform.

The literature review was important because it generated a number of important insights.

Lessons learned from the literature review

- During Tempus II (1994-1998) the vast majority of the resources were devoted to curriculum development, which aims at meeting the long-term higher education needs of society. In Tempus II bis, (1998-2000), more attention was given to meeting the short-term training needs both inside the higher education system and outside the education system (i.e. institutional development);
- The impact of Tempus II on meeting the longer-term training needs has been significant in all eligible countries but especially so in the PHARE acceding and candidate countries because of the large scale of the programme intervention in these countries;
- Dissemination of tangible outputs appears to have played only a very small role in extending this impact on the long-term training needs beyond the higher education institutions directly involved. In the Tacis area, the very limited accreditation of the courses developed with Tempus support has de facto prevented dissemination;
- With respect to the short-term training needs, the literature and especially previous evaluations voice concern over the fact that little seems to have been achieved in the period 1994-1998 in terms of strengthening the links between the higher education institutes and the economy;
- Under Tempus II bis, the institution building JEPs have done more with short-term training especially for the public sector. The links with the private sector have remained weak. A recent study on the role of EU universities in innovation suggests that perhaps the expectations for this training and for other forms of co-operation with industry were too high.

These findings were put into perspective by the results of the Tempus intervention logic analysis.
Lessons learned from the intervention logic analysis

- Tempus has provided the 'inputs' (resources), 'activities (JEPs and IMGs) and 'outputs' (curricula reform and institution building courses) that are needed to make it a logical proposition to expect that the scheme has achieved its expected outcome of meeting the training needs of large numbers teachers and students;
- The data, moreover, indicate that this outcome has been significant in terms of the overall numbers of trainers and students reached. In terms of coverage of the target group, the second phase of Tempus has had its biggest direct impact in the PHARE countries, in the Tacis region, and especially in the larger countries of that region, only a fraction of the potential target groups were reached.

The JEP survey and the HEA survey supplemented the analysis. These tools provided information on the types of curricula reform, the value of the reforms for teachers, student and universities, and on the significance of the Tempus activities for the process of curriculum reform at the level of the partner institutions and at the national level.

Lessons learned from the JEP and HEA Surveys

- In the PHARE and CARDS areas the introduction of new diploma course on new subjects were the main type of curriculum reform. In the Tacis region the reforms took mostly the form of modernisation;
- In all regions the Tempus curriculum development effort was considered highly valuable for its positive impact on university reputation, attracting students, and on the employability of students;
- In all regions the dominant opinion of the JEP and HEA interview partners was that Tempus had a major direct impact on the progress made with curriculum reforms at both HEI level and at national level. This assessment was further qualified with the finding that some 70 percent of respondents considered that the changes initiated with the JEPs were sustainable, a further twenty percent (in the PHARE region) indicated that projects had created the capacity necessary for dealing with future change needs; and only some ten percent indicated that the changes had been significant only during the implementation process of (all) the JEPs;
- The stakeholders have no doubt that Tempus has made a significant contribution to speeding up the progress of reform. Especially in the CARDS and Tacis areas, the view of the JEP participants was that the reforms would not have taken place without Tempus, or they would have been too late to enable the universities to catch up with the HEIs in the EU.

Other sources
The reports by the national evaluation experts and the discussions during the workshops provided insights on two other issues.

Lessons learned from national evaluation experts and workshops

- Little has been achieved with dissemination of tangible outputs. As a consequence the impact of the Tempus reforms is mainly limited to the teachers, students and universities, which directly benefited from participation in JEPs. In the PHARE
acceding countries this may not have mattered much because the funding for these countries was substantial and has provided access for many HEIs to participate directly in Tempus. In the CARDS countries the potential and incentives for dissemination are present, but the data are not clear on how much is done in this respect via personal contacts within the closely-knit academic community in the region. For the Tacis area, however, the absence of dissemination is a more serious issue, which has prevented the impact of the programme from spreading beyond the participating HEIs. In this region, and especially in the larger countries, it is mainly the better-known universities that have participated in Tempus.

“... the mentality of decision makers. This is why the presence of international programmes such as Tempus (which provides opportunities for training and – above all – mobility) has been of inestimable importance to Bosnia and Herzegovina” (Rector of the University of Banja Luka, quoted by the national expert of Evaluation Team, in the Republic Srpska).

On the basis of this analysis the general observations and conclusions presented in the next section were derived at.

6.5.3 Observations and Conclusions

The Joint European Projects (JEPs) for curriculum development and university management are the main Tempus tools for helping to change the existing education system. This evaluation confirms the relevance of these tools, and the importance of the programme for eligible countries.

Evaluation evidence supports the observation that Tempus has done more than any other external programme to help university departments, and faculties to modernise courses on existing subjects, to introduce new courses on new subjects or to introduce complete new curricula.

The record on sustainability of the education reforms has been more mixed. For the PHARE countries the evaluation is positive on this issue. The JEPs have assisted the HEIs in developing their capacity to educate the next generation in line with the evolving needs of society (including the labour market) for people with higher education qualifications. As such the programme has been successful in preparing the HEIs for participation on an equal footing in the regular higher education programmes of the Commission i.e. Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci.

In the Tacis area, the modernisation of teaching methods, facilities and courses has in most disciplines not passed beyond the university or even department level. This threat to sustainability was recognised in earlier evaluations and the Commission has reacted to this by changing its guidelines for applicants and for the Tempus experts who are involved in the project selection process. This issue is discussed elsewhere in this report.
Conclusion 1  Tempus has contributed to promoting a commitment to reforms
The staff exchanges and mobility programmes which are part of the IMGs and JEPs are the Tempus tools for meeting the CEEC needs for people to surpass the communist mindset and communist experience as a frame of reference for action. It is undisputed that Tempus has, more than any programme or initiative, made a significant direct contribution to meeting this socio-economic need in the transition countries. The staff exchange and mobility programmes have reached hundreds of thousands of students, teachers and lecturers from CEEC higher education institutions. This exposed the participants of Tempus I and Tempus II to new ideas, ideals, concepts and best practices on virtually every aspect of EU societies, and has shown the policy variety within EU Member States for dealing with the challenges for societal reform and education. This exposure has involved nearly all participants in extensive and wide-ranging dialogues and this has contributed to awareness raising, comparison of national values and cultures, attitude changes, and increased commitment towards supporting the social and economic reform process in their own societies and in their own HEIs’ working environment.

Conclusion 2  Tempus has a major direct impact on curriculum development and training
In the field of curriculum development, the second phase of the Tempus programme has produced the expected outcomes. The second phase of Tempus had a major direct impact on curriculum reform in all eligible countries. The depth of the reforms varies between countries, in the sense that it has been easier to bring about changes that go beyond modernisation in PHARE acceding and candidate countries than in the major countries in the Tacis region. The curriculum development JEPs are recognised by the overwhelming majority of the participants as having played a crucial role in improving the reputation of universities, as well as having increased employability prospects for students.

Conclusion 3  Tempus had a major impact on capacity building for curriculum reform
A main benefit of participation in Tempus curriculum development projects for eligible countries higher education institutions is the strengthened capacity to implement future reforms.

Conclusion 4  Tempus has had a major impact on providing universities, teachers and students with the skills and qualifications needed for the new socio-economic reality
In all regions, the JEP participants are convinced that their JEPs have had a direct positive impact on their university’s reputation. The JEPs have helped the HEIs to market their courses and attract students, and the JEPs have had a positive effect on employability of students.

Overall conclusion: Tempus had a major direct impact on curriculum development and reforms leading to the acquisition by staff and students of skills and qualifications necessary for the transition process and for the new socio-economic reality (outcome 6)

In Table 6.4 it is shown that this conclusion is reached for the programme as a whole as well as for each of the three regions covered by the second phase of the Tempus programme.
Table 6.4 Tempus outcome related to teacher and student training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected outcomes</th>
<th>Observed impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>PHARE region</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected outcome 6 Curriculum development and reforms leading to the acquisition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by staff and students of skills and qualifications necessary for the transition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process and for the new socio-economic reality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W BALKANS region</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected outcome 6 Curriculum development and reforms leading to the acquisition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by staff and students of skills and qualifications necessary for the transition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process and for the new socio-economic reality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tacis region</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected outcome 6 Curriculum development and reforms leading to the acquisition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by staff and students of skills and qualifications necessary for the transition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process and for the new socio-economic reality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Total all regions</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected outcome 6 Curriculum development and reforms leading to the acquisition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by staff and students of skills and qualifications necessary for the transition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process and for the new socio-economic reality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 1 = Major direct impact; 2 = Minor direct impact; 3 = Major indirect impact; 4 = Minor indirect impact; 5 = No impact

6.6 Summary

Outcome 6  *Tempus had a major direct impact on curriculum development and reforms leading to the acquisition by staff and students of skills and qualifications necessary for the transition process and for the new socio-economic reality*

In the second phase of the Tempus programme about 80 percent of all JEPs aimed for curriculum development (source: ETF data and on-line survey). To assess the impact this has had on meeting the training needs of staff and students in the face of the new socio-economic conditions in the eligible countries, the literature review, the JEP survey and the workshops were used in a complementary way.

The literature review shows that broadly speaking three types of reforms can be distinguished: (a) modernisation of existing courses; (b) restructuring of existing curricula; and (c) the introduction of new curricula and diplomas on new subjects. The JEP survey data supplemented by views from national experts indicate that modernisation and restructuring was the dominant form of curriculum development in the Tacis area. In the PHARE area and also in the CARDS area the curriculum development JEPs were more focused on new curricula and new subjects. Moreover in the Tacis area, the national accreditation and quality standard systems have in many cases stopped the innovations from reaching out beyond the faculty level where they were introduced. This is also one of the factors that explain why, despite the apparent potential for disseminating Tempus innovations beyond the partner HEIs in the Russian language area, dissemination has not received much attention and only a limited number of projects have been successful in disseminating curricula, textbooks and teaching materials. In smaller countries, e.g. in the CARDS area, and in countries with a closer-knit academic network such as in PHARE, dissemination through teachers and graduates has been easier. On this issue the JEP survey and the workshops provide evidence that most JEP participants consider that more could have been done in terms of disseminating outputs.
The JEP survey was also used to study the effects of curriculum development on the training needs of teaching staff and students. The results show that JEP participants are convinced that their JEPs have had a direct positive impact on the university's reputation, and that the curricula reforms have helped the HEIs market their courses and attract students. Likewise a positive impact was perceived on the employability of students.

Tempus has provided the 'inputs' (resources), 'activities' (JEPs and IMGs) and 'outputs' (curricula reform and institution building courses) that are needed to make it a logical proposition to expect that the scheme has achieved its expected outcome of meeting the training needs of large numbers teachers and students.

The data, moreover, indicate that this outcome has been significant in terms of the overall numbers of trainers and students reached. In terms of coverage of the target group, the second phase of Tempus has had its biggest direct impact in the PHARE countries, in the Tacis region, and especially in the larger countries of that region, only a fraction of the potential target groups were reached.

On the basis of the above and despite the limited Tempus programme activities promoting dissemination of curriculum development results, the Evaluation Team has come to the conclusion presented above as outcome 6.

The reality behind this conclusion is that some ten thousand universities teachers of the eligible countries have in partnership with their colleagues from the EU benefited from the activities and outputs of the curriculum development JEPs. Moreover, at least several hundred thousands of students have acquired qualifications and diplomas from courses which were modernised, restructured and/or introduced as new subjects in more than 1,100 Joint European Projects that were implemented during the second phase of the Tempus programme (1994-2000).
7  Outcome 7  Training of decision makers and retention of trained staff at HEIs

7.1  Introduction to the issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation question number 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme contributed to the training of decision makers in eligible countries and to what extent has staff with experience in Tempus played and continues to play a role in the universities in the partner countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question focuses on the longer-term effects of Tempus activities. In particular, the question asks to what extent the Tempus bottom-up approach reaches the senior decision makers responsible for leading universities into the future and the leading public servants and experts who shape higher education policy at national level.

7.2  Expected outcomes

On the basis of the literature review undertaken at the start of the assignment, the Evaluation Team considered that it would be reasonable to expect from the second phase of Tempus three significant outcomes with respect to training of decision makers, and staff retention.

*It is logical to expect that Tempus has made significant contributions to the training of decision makers.* Tempus needs the support and commitment of decision-makers at university level and national level to firmly embed its bottom-up innovations and bring about sustainable change and significant higher education reforms. The Tempus programme has the necessary tools to do this. The IMGs, JEPs and especially the CMEs (PHARE) and CPs (Tacis) are suitable for reaching and involving the decision makers of today and tomorrow in Tempus activities.

*It is also logical to expect that Tempus has contributed to the careers of Tempus participants.* Tempus provides the teachers and students with the skills and qualifications necessary for developing those careers. The extent, however, to which the education sector retained the teachers trained by Tempus remains a question. The economic conditions in the education sector have not been very good over the past decade in most
eligible countries and therefore one might expect that a fairly large percentage of the teachers have used their news skills to find work outside the education sector.

*Has Tempus contributed to the 'brain drain' from East to West?* The literature review indicates that this would be a reasonable assumption.

### 7.3 Approach and indicators

In the methodology of the study, the evaluation question is broken down in two parts:

- To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme contributed to the training of decision-makers in eligible countries?
- To what extent has staff with experience in Tempus played, and continues to play, a role in the universities in the partner countries?

The evaluation started with a review of the existing literature on this issue. Additional information was collected with issue-specific questions in the JEP and HEA surveys. For further analysis the reports of the national evaluators were used as well as the lessons learned workshop.

### 7.4 Findings from the evaluation tools

#### 7.4.1 Findings from the literature survey

The 2001 impact study on Tempus in Latvia sheds light on the first question listed above. The study tracks the careers of the "Tempus family tree" and details the personal successes of past and present participants in the Tempus programme. His list includes: the head of the higher education council, the head of the Latvian rectors’ conference, a number of university rectors, the head of the department of higher education and research at the ministry of education, the deputy head of the civil service administration, and senior employees of the ministry of finance.

Whilst such a study would be logistically unfeasible for the larger Tempus-eligible countries and is anyway beyond the scope of this report, the study provides an interesting insight into just how much can be achieved by investing in human resources.

The study shows that in Latvia, all senior university staff as well as the people manning key functions in the competent higher education authorities have Tempus experience. The study also shows the potential of the Tempus programme for reaching and training people in decision-making positions. Especially in small countries, the programme can therefore have an enormous impact on human resource development. This type of influence goes a long way to explain the finding, shown earlier in this study, that Tempus projects may have a 'major indirect impact' on education reforms at national level, even on issues which are not directly addressed by JEPs or Compacts.

Other 'Tempus country impact studies', while less specific on this issue than the Latvian one, arrive at similar conclusions.
The second question raised above is linked to the retention of trained people in the higher education system. On this issue the evaluation has found widely diverging views.

The Tempus Tacis evaluation of 1998 comments on the issue of brain drain: “the salary structure of the universities is a push factor away from the universities to other jobs. Hence, some [Tempus] mobility activities may increase the university brain drain.”

University representatives gave yet another angle on the potential brain drain effects of Tempus. During the lessons learned workshop it was pointed out that a key motivating factor for EU universities to participate in Tempus is to improve their access to top talent in the field of research, and Tempus mobility is a tool for reaching good students. This same argument is found in various recent publications on the wider European education area, and on the rationale for international co-operation.

7.4.2 Findings from the JEP and HEA surveys on decision maker training

In order to establish what the second phase of Tempus has achieved in terms of training decision makers, through JEPs and other activities, the local experts working for this assignment discussed the following questions with JEP participants and especially with HEA and/or their experts:

Question to JEP participants: Which of the following statements best describes the impact of your Tempus project on the training of decision makers in the field of higher education?

Question to HEA experts: Tempus has contributed to the training of decision makers and the retention of newly trained staff in universities. In this field the extent of the impact of the Tempus programme can be best assessed as?

The results of these two questions are given in the figures below; the vertical axes are the percentages of each group of respondents who chose the various descriptions of impact given on the right:

---

36 (Van Zuthphen, 2003).
On this issue the HEA survey is the best source. The JEP co-ordinators, with their own experience in mind, give a bottom-up perspective. The HEA survey provides a top-down view and in this case that view is more accurate because Tempus reached decision makers not only through JEPs but also, and especially, through its structural and complementary measures (i.e. the CMEs and CPs). The HEA results for the Tacis area show a result, which was also found for other questions. In the Tacis region the experience has varied and especially in the larger countries (Russia, Ukraine and Kazakhstan) the overall direct impact of Tempus has been relatively small.

7.4.3 Findings from the JEP surveys on staff retention

To get an insight into the question to what extent Tempus beneficiaries have moved on to decision-making positions or, alternately, become part of the “brain drain” statistic, a third question was asked to the stakeholders about what has happened to their colleagues or employees.
Question to JEP participants: With which of these statements would you describe what has happened to staff in (your) higher education institution(s) following their participation in Tempus?

Analysis of the answers gives the following results. Taking all the respondents together, about 27 percent indicated that they moved to positions with more decision-making authority in their own institution. For a further fifty percent, their careers had improved to a limited extent. Six percent moved on to another education institution and some four percent left higher education. This last figure was somewhat higher in the CARDS (85) and Tacis areas (6%), but these differences are not significant from a statistical point of view given the limited size of the samples per region. The figures indicate that staff retention was high and that Tempus had for most participants a positive influence on their career development.

7.5 Analysis and conclusions

7.5.1 Methodological issues

The literature review was used to assess the expected outcome. The findings of the information collection tools show that the HEA survey was the main information source for answering the question related to the training of decision makers. The JEP survey was the best source on the question related to career development and retention of staff.

7.5.2 Analysis

More than half the JEPs have indicated that they have a major direct impact on training decision-makers in education. This is confirmed by the responses from the higher education authorities interviewed for this study. In this context the response from the Tacis region is less affirmative. It is noted that the variations within the Tacis region are large, and there was no clear consensus on the type of impact.

The process by which Tempus has achieved this has previously been documented in Latvia by Dr Rauhvargers. It could be described as a cascading phenomenon, where candidates strengthened in their academic knowledge and/or interpersonal skills by Tempus experiences move onwards and upwards to other, more senior positions both in- and outside their academic institutions. The interviews with the HEAs indicate that this effect is found in the smaller countries as well as in the PHARE countries were Tempus activities have been intense. In the larger countries of the Tacis area, this cascading phenomenon has been observed to a much smaller extent.

Tempus has also reached decision makers directly with those projects that aimed to bring about changes at national level and for which senior decision makers, including university deans, national education experts, policy advisers and Ministerial staff were essential. This percentage was estimated elsewhere as 10 percent of the JEPs.
Even more important than the JEPs have been the structural and complementary measures. It was not analysed in this evaluation how many of the 335 CME (compact measures in PHARE) and 104 CP (compact projects in Tacis) have reached the decision makers group. It is, however, very likely given their numbers and more specific focus on reform issues, that these ‘Structural and complementary measures’ have played a much more important role than the JEPs, and this explains why the HEA survey results are more positive than the JEP survey on this issue. In other words the HEA interview partners had a wider view and more information on this issue, than the JEP participants.

Participation in Tempus had a positive effect on career development within the higher education. This is made clear by the JEP survey. This finding is in line with expectations given the analysis presented in the previous chapter.

Previous evaluations and European policy documents mention the possibility that Tempus might have a brain drain effect. This evaluation did not find much evidence that Tempus had such an effect. Mobility in academia is notoriously low (indeed, this is an issue that Tempus itself is trying to address) and the percentage of people reported as leaving the universities is small and comparable with EU standards. The explanation for this may well be that Tempus is not focused on research, as such the top talents in these fields may not have participated in the Tempus mobility and staff exchanges.

An issue not specifically covered in this chapter is the contribution of Tempus to the training of decision-makers outside the world of education. This has taken place within the context of the institution building JEPs.

On the basis of this analysis the following conclusions can be drawn.

7.5.3 Conclusions

**Conclusion 1** Tempus has in a major direct way contributed to the training of people who shape today's and tomorrow's academic environment

This conclusion is valid for the Tempus programme as a whole and for the PHARE and CARDS regions. For the Tacis region this impact has varied from major direct and minor direct to major indirect. Tempus has reached today's policy makers, national education experts and university deans with Joint European Projects, Compact measures and Compact projects that contributed directly to legislative and regulatory reforms linked to curriculum development and university management at national levels. Tomorrow's policymakers, i.e. teachers and students, were reached by Tempus JEPs and IMGs. Over time they made a career and 'cascaded upwards' in higher education and elsewhere. This conclusion is important as it helps to understand how Tempus affects the education reform process, and how its bottom-up approach contributes to the reforms.

**Conclusion 2** Tempus has a positive influence on career development

Participation in Tempus has increased the awareness of today's decision-makers and tomorrow's decision-makers (teachers and students) of the need for higher education reforms, and has strengthened their commitment to the reforms. In addition, Tempus participation has provided the participants with the skills, qualifications and with the
international experience and network of contacts needed to contribute to the reforms. All these factors have contributed to career development.

**Conclusion 3  Tempus does not seem to contribute much to the brain drain in the eligible countries**

The explanation for this somewhat surprising finding may well be that Tempus is not focused on research, as such the top talents in these fields may not have participated in the Tempus mobility and staff exchanges. However, the data available for this conclusion is fairly weak and this limits the validity of this conclusion.

### 7.6 Summary

**Outcome 7  Tempus has made major direct contributions to the training of decision-makers and retention of Tempus experienced staff in universities**

This issue has been assessed on the basis of the literature survey, the JEP survey, the HEA survey, and the workshops. In the literature little information was found on this issue except for studies on the link between international university co-operation and the attraction of top talent for research and a 'Tempus country impact study' for Latvia (2001). The latter study showed that in Latvia all senior university staff as well as people manning key functions in the competent higher education authorities have Tempus experience. The participants in the three workshops in Moscow, Almaty and Skopje also indicated that in their countries many relevant decision-makers had been involved in Tempus activities. The HEA and JEP surveys confirmed this finding. In this context not only the JEPs but especially the CME and CPs have played a major role. The majority of the HEA respondents in the PHARE and CARDS areas chose the 'major direct' option for assessing the impact of Tempus on the training of decision-makers. In the Tacis area, the impact of Tempus on training has also been noticeable, but on the whole the lower intensity of Tempus projects is reflected in a more diversified pattern of impact ranging from 'major direct' to 'minor indirect'.

The issue of staff retention was addressed in the JEP and HEA surveys with a question covering career development of staff that had participated in Tempus. The answers were unambiguous. The respondents predominantly ticked the options of promotion and career improvement. Only some six percent of the participants were reported as having taken up jobs outside the education sector. The evaluation did not find evidence that Tempus had a brain drain effect. This finding may be explained by the observation that Tempus does not directly support mobility of researchers.

Taking the global view, the evaluators concluded that Tempus had a 'major direct impact' on the issues covered by outcome 7. Table 7.1 shows this global conclusion, and gives a further breakdown per region. However, the database is fairly weak on this issue and does not allow methodologically sound conclusions at regional level.
Table 7.1  Tempus outcome in relation to training of decision makers and staff retention (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected outcomes</th>
<th>Observed impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected outcome 7</strong> Contributions to the training of decision-makers and retention of Tempus experienced staff in universities</td>
<td>PHARE region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:  
1 = Major direct impact; 2 = Minor direct impact; 3 = Major indirect impact; 4 = Minor indirect impact; 5 = No impact
8 Outcome 8  Sustainable partnerships in higher education involving EC and partner countries

8.1 Introduction to the issue

This chapter sets out the approach, data collection methods, findings and conclusions arrived at by the Evaluation Team with respect to the following question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation question number 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme contributed to the formation of sustainable partnerships in higher education involving EC and other countries?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 Expected outcomes

*Tempus is a partnership programme and not a technical assistance programme*

The countries that participate in the Tempus programme outside the EU Member States are referred to as eligible or partner countries, and participation in the programme is based on mutual interest. This distinguishes Tempus from many other programmes funded by donor aid, in higher education or other fields. As such it can to a large extent be described as a co-operation programme rather than as a technical assistance programme. Thus a key underlying assumption of the Tempus programme is that partnership in JEPs will be mutually beneficial. For example eligible universities receive EU best practise and (often their first) exposure to locally tailored international co-operation, whilst EU universities are able to develop valuable networks of academic contacts both within and outside the European Union. The partnership aspect is also found in the JEP budgets, which provide only minimal levels of funding relative to the time used and needed for implementing the activities and for generating the JEP outputs. This contrasts with the bulk of the technical assistance programmes, which rely more on commercial, i.e. higher level, consulting fees.

*JEPs provide a 2-3 year time frame for forging sustainable relations*

Tempus funding per JEP lasts a maximum of three years, after that time period the financial benefits it brought (new communications equipment, paid mobility, replacement staff costs for EU institutions, etc.) come to an immediate end. The issue addressed in this chapter is to what extent the partnerships (that have developed in these three years) are sustainable, that is, to what extent do they remain active and relevant following the end of project funding.
Why are sustainable partnerships important?

If sustainable partnerships are found to be an outcome of the programme, than this implies two things. Firstly the universities in the Tempus consortium have found a common ground in professional/academic overlapping interests, which makes further co-operation mutually beneficial. Such an outcome is excellent for the participants and would be the best that the European Union – as founder and budget provider of the scheme – could hope for in terms of programme impact. Secondly such an outcome would be a very strong indication that the Tempus formula of bottom-up, multilateral university co-operation is effective.

Co-operation between universities, when sustained over time adds a significant dimension to the Tempus programme. When the benefits of mutual learning gained during a JEP are transformed into longer-term partnerships, the Tempus programme can be said to really contribute to international academic co-operation. The strengthening of international academic networks potentially is of direct benefit to all partners involved. It contributes to rapprochement of cultures, and serves the continued development of the higher education systems in the eligible countries over time.

What are the expected outcomes?

The Council Decisions that provide the legal base for Tempus have from the beginning emphasised that Tempus aims to develop multilateral university co-operation and thus link universities of the eligible countries with the university networks in the European Union. In more recent terminology this implies that Tempus aims to integrate the higher education institutions of the eligible countries into the ‘wider European higher education space’. For this concept to work, sustainable partnerships would seem an important outcome of Tempus.

Sustainability of the JEP outputs is one of the selection criteria in the academic quality assessment performed by the Commission during the selection process of the JEP applications. However, this criterion is not given much weight and furthermore there is no specific demand in the guide for applicants, which states that the DG EAC expects that the JEPs aim at forming sustainable partnerships. This implies that the Commission has not stated that sustainable partnerships are an expected outcome of the programme.

At the same time it would not be surprising if sustainable partnerships were formed. After all, Tempus has enabled thousands of academics to start working together and one would expect that part of these ‘new partnerships’ in education resulted in long lasting professional relations. If the finding would be that this has not happened than this would be surprising. In that case the value added of Tempus over other support schemes that provide ‘technical assistance’ and produce ‘capacity building outcomes’ might be considered more limited. Therefore, the interesting issue is to what extent sustainable partnerships have formed. In other words, what percentage of the JEPs has resulted in sustainable partnerships and what is the type and quality of these partnerships.

One other aspect is that enthusiasm found amongst the participating academics for the Tempus programme is likely to have been an important motive for forging JEP
partnerships in the first place. However, to make the partnerships sustainable i.e. durable over time, one would expect that there are academic and/or financial benefits as well. For example the academics might be working in the same fields and further co-operation could be a win-win situation for both parties, which does not involve additional costs. Alternatively the win-win situation could be found in the continuation of joint diploma courses and student exchanges. A third option could be that what started as a joint education partnership transforms into a joint research partnership.

8.3 Approach and indicators

To assess the extent to which sustainable partnerships are an outcome of the second phase of the Tempus programme, the evaluation approach was set out to generate information on the issues outlined above. Specifically information tools were used to answer the following questions:

- What percentage of the JEPs has resulted in sustainable partnerships and has this been a systematic result of project participation?
- What types of partnership have been formed?
- How are these partnerships sustained financially?
- What were the incentives for EU universities to participate in Tempus and does this explain why sustainable partnerships did or did not come about?

With respect to the incentives for participation in Tempus, three main motives were distinguished conceptually:
1. Personal interest: individual curiosity and personal contacts from academic staff;
2. Professional interest: universities seek to improve their reputation, investigate what universities in partner countries have to offer, attract talented students from partner countries (EU universities); gain access to European knowledge networks (other universities);
3. Financial interest: Tempus as a source of funds for the international co-operation activities of the universities.

To assess these issues the on-line questionnaire, described earlier in chapter 2 of this report was designed. In addition relevant questions were included in the JEP survey. The high response rate to the on-line questionnaire (43%) lends high credibility to the findings.

Further details on the methodology and indicators are provided in section 8.3 and in the figures that present the results of the information tools.
8.4 Findings of the evaluation tools

8.4.1 Findings from the literature survey

The various country impact studies for Tempus included in the literature review were almost unanimous in their finding that sustainable partnerships had been among the most perceptible and valuable outcomes of the Tempus programme. One demonstration of the existence of these partnerships is the fact that “the vast majority of current Socrates networks and Fourth framework projects with Central and Eastern European partners build on links established under Tempus”37.

The literature survey does not provide quantitative data of the type that this evaluation tries to generate.

8.4.2 Findings from the on-line questionnaire

*What percentage of the JEPs has resulted in sustainable partnerships?*

In the on-line questionnaire the question was asked whether sustainable partnerships were formed and if so, what form the sustainable partnerships had taken. Table 8.1 summarises the results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of partnerships</th>
<th>PHARE</th>
<th>W BALKANS</th>
<th>Tacis</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No sustainable partnership was formed</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular contact through conferences, seminars or other forms of academic networking</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular exchange of academic staff</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joined research and publications</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular exchange of students</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation of a joint curriculum based on accreditation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint consulting or research assignments for private or public clients</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total response rate in percentage</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of this question in the on-line questionnaire indicate that in global terms one quarter of the JEPs co-ordinators were of the opinion that no sustainable partnerships had remained after the completion of their JEP between any of the partners. Three quarters of the JEPs have had a sustainable partnership as an outcome. However the type of partnership varies between lighter and heavier forms. The table lists the types in accordance with the increasing intensity of complexity of the partnership type.

37 This quotation is from Tempus@10
The results show that over 50 percent are engaged in joint academic research for publication purposes and/or mobility activities. Around a quarter has continued to operate joint diploma courses, and a smaller percentage have developed forms of co-operation in research assignments for public or private clients.

The table shows that there are regional differences but these are in line with expectations.

As indicated above in chapter 2, these results might be having a bias, especially for the Tacis area, because the JEP co-ordinators for JEPs in the Tacis area come from EU-based universities. To assess whether such a bias affected the results, the same issue was addressed in the JEP survey. Figure 8.4 presented later on shows that this concern was not validated. On the contrary, the assessment of the JEP participants from the Tacis region was very similar, and even slightly more positive. Just over 80 percent indicated that their JEPs had had a major direct impact on the formation of sustainable partnerships.

*What type of sustainable partnerships have been forged by JEPs?*

To better answer this question the following question was put to the respondents of the on-line questionnaire:

Question to JEP participants: Where you identified a sustainable partnership [in the question above], what form do these partnerships take?

As for all the other results, the vertical axis on Figure 8.3 represents the percentages of respondents who chose the various descriptions of sustainable partnerships given on the right:

Figure 8.1 clearly shows that a well-balanced variety of sustainable partnerships have emerged from the Tempus II programme, and that the majority of these are of a meaningful nature.

*How are the sustainable partnerships funded?*
For any of these partnerships described above, good will or an overtly mutually beneficial nature is simply not enough – funding must also be found. As mentioned above, Tempus is unable to provide such funding beyond a short-term time frame. So how then are these sustainable partnerships (formed as a result of Tempus II) maintained? The following question was asked in the on-line questionnaire:

Question to JEP participants: Through what, if any, financial means have these sustainable partnerships received funding after the end of the Tempus funding arrangements?

In the PHARE region, the prominence of the EC Socrates programme as a source of funding in the above figure is perhaps in line with expectations. But the more surprising result is that over 50% of on-line questionnaire respondents in the PHARE and Tacis regions claim that sustainable partnerships developed during Tempus II have been funded subsequently through their universities’ own budgets. Of interest are also the types of funding cited by those who answered “other.” Examples of this included (in order of frequency):

- DAAD (German Academic Exchange Service);
- Soros Foundation;
- World Bank;
- UNESCO.

What are the main incentives for participating in JEPs?

Why were they so willing to participate – more than once in the majority of cases – in the Tempus II programme? In the on-line questionnaire this issue was formulated as follows:

Question to JEP participants: Which, if any, of the following factors proved to be an incentive for participation in the Tempus programme for your institution?
The results are shown in the figure below. Each bar shows the relative importance of the various factors, based on the relative frequency with which each factor was mentioned by the respondents.

An interesting result given by the figure above is that the “desire to assist the transition process” (personal interest) was almost as much of an incentive as joint curriculum development (professional interest), which is much more in line with expectations given the priorities of Tempus II.

The financial interest is also clearly a factor, and within this factor, joint research is mentioned more often than (broader) international co-operation. This substantiates the point that motives for participation in Tempus are not only about co-operation in general but also about professional substance, such as (exploring future opportunities for) joint research.

8.4.3 Findings from the JEP and HEA survey

To crosscheck some of the findings of the on-line survey the issue of sustainable partnerships were also addressed in the JEP and HEA surveys.

The first two questions, asked by our local experts to a cross-section of 80 JEP participants and 26 HEA employees, were the following:

Question to JEP participants: With which of the following statements would you describe the impact of your Tempus project on building sustainable partnerships in higher education involving EC and partner countries?

Question to HEA employees: Tempus has contributed to sustainable partnerships in higher education involving EC and partner countries. In this respect the extent of the impact of the Tempus programme can be best assessed as?
The results are shown in the figures below; the vertical axes are the percentages of each group of respondents who chose the various descriptions of impact given on the right:

Figure 8.4: JEP survey on sustainable partnerships

Figure 8.5: HEA survey on sustainable partnerships

Figure 8.5 is in line with the findings of the on-line questionnaire and confirm in general terms that sustainable partnerships were an important outcome of the JEPs. It is relevant to note (given the bias issue in the on-line questionnaire) that in the Tacis region, the contribution of the programme was assessed the highest. There over 80 percent of the respondents indicated that the JEPs had resulted in sustainable partnerships (a major direct impact). A factor here may be the fact that in Tacis, Tempus was and is the only programme of this nature, whereas in PHARE universities have access to other programmes through which to continue international co-operation.

Figure 8.2 illustrates the fact the HEAs, who have a different perspective on the issue also recognise this as an important outcome of the Tempus programme In PHARE, HEAs clearly recognise the impact of Tempus, and its stepping-stone function towards other (European) programmes. In CARDS on the other hand, HEAs are less positive than the JEP participants about sustainability of partnerships. In this respect it can be noted that for the CARDS area the HEA assessment matches more closely than the JEP survey with the findings of the on-line questionnaire presented in Table 8.1 above.

Other findings
A selection of the motives for co-operation given by the participants of the various workshops and the on-line respondents is given below.

Benefits for EU partners, as stated by respondents to the on-line questionnaire:
• “Just helping colleagues who are in a less comfortable position”;
• “An excellent staff development opportunity”;
• “Scientific interest for teachers and researchers in EU universities”;
• “Personal interest”;
• “A large extension of international activities”;
• “Possibility to experiment in subjects, teaching and management methods”.

Benefits for all partners, as discussed at the synthesis workshop in Brussels:
• An investment in “hope for the future”, a boost for their academic network. “It is essential to be included in this network.”
• “Some practical benefits in our case. Tempus helped us to understand the unknown, i.e. Central and Eastern Europe.”
• “Certain EU universities tend to consider Tempus financing as a source of profit, to finance their own operations.”
• “EU universities recognised our universities as good partners. Tempus helps overcome prejudice.”
• ”Don’t forget that a strong motive for international co-operation in Europe is to attract top talent to our university education and research programmes”.

“Sustainability depends also on opportunities. In the former PHARE countries, Socrates and Leonardo offer this opportunity. For CARDS and Tacis this opportunity does not exist (yet)”.

This last observation does point out that despite the positive findings, it should not be taken for granted that sustainable partnerships can form without substantial support initially.

8.5 Analysis and conclusions

8.5.1 Methodological issues

For outcome 8, i.e. the formation of sustainable partnerships, the on-line survey provided the relevant information. The JEP survey was used to crosscheck the findings. The lessons learned workshop was used to better understand the incentives and disincentives of co-operation in JEPs for the higher education institutions in the eligible countries and in the EU Member States.

8.5.2 Analysis

Enthusiasm and joy in academic co-operation are a key to understanding the success of the Tempus programme. The Evaluation Team was – at various moments during the evaluation – surprised by this dimension of the programme. The Evaluation Team met a strong interest in co-operation and participation in the workshops and surveys. This interest to participate and contribute was also reflected in the unexpected high response rate to the on-line questionnaire.
In this evaluation it is found that this enthusiasm for academic co-operation is a great resource for the programme. In this respect the bottom-up approach is important because it enables people who identify and formulate a project to implement it themselves. This is a key factor explaining why Tempus has in general produced good results and why sustainable partnerships have formed. The vast majority of JEP participants do not want their consortium or its achievements to die after the JEPs are over. Of course this very positive observation does not hold for all Tempus JEPs. There is also a great deal of Tempus professionals in the EU who move as JEP co-ordinators from one JEP to another, and certainly not all JEPs have resulted in sustainable partnerships that have a serious content and significance. Nevertheless, the results of the on-line survey are a strong indication that more than half of the JEP consortia have resulted in meaningful sustainable partnerships. This is an impressive outcome by any standards.

This evaluation confirms that, as a bottom-up programme, Tempus has made a substantial contribution to building up networks between academics and between higher education institutions both at national, regional and international level. Beyond this, the answers to the evaluation survey indicate that the types of partnership formed are relevant, valuable and sustainable.

The incentives for EU universities to participate in the programme are mixed. Personal and professional interest are both important. Not only personal curiosity and motivation (desire to assist the transition process, developing personal contacts) drive the programme but also (institutional) professional interest: opportunities for (future) joint research, joint curriculum development, developing professional relationships. The financial motive also is not negligible.

8.5.3 Conclusions

**Conclusion 1** Tempus had a major direct impact on the formation of sustainable partnerships in the higher education sector

This conclusion is valid at the global programme level as well as for each of the three regions as well as for each individual country in which Tempus has operated. Different types of partnership are formed. A quarter of the respondents indicated that they continued to operate a joint curriculum based on diplomas and accreditation after the formal ending of the JEPs. Moreover, academic networking and participation in conferences was mentioned by 75 percent of the respondents. More than half of the JEP co-ordinators further mentioned the exchange of academic staff (59%), joint research and publications (53%); and the regular exchange of students (51%).

**Conclusion 2** The basis for the sustainable partnerships are academic as well as personal relationships

In many cases the initial contacts have been made through an exchange of letters between universities, and participation in conferences, which generated personal contacts. The JEPs enabled these contacts to develop into professional partnerships. The majority of these have turned out to be so valuable for the partners, that the continuation of the co-operation made professional sense. These win-win situations explain why many of the former JEP partners have allocated their own university budget sources for continuation
of joint activities and/or have actively searched for and obtained external sources. Of this latter category other EU programmes (Socrates) have been important especially for the acceding countries of the PHARE region.

Conclusion 3  The bottom-up approach of Tempus can be credited with being instrumental for the high success rate and sustainability of the partnerships

It has enable people who want to work together to do so. Thus it has promoted the matching of faculties who fit each other in academic terms and who in many cases had champions who drove the co-operation.

Conclusion 4  The bottom-up, multilateral university co-operation, approach of Tempus is successful

It promotes not only education system reforms in the eligible countries but it also promotes the forging of longer-lasting sustainable partnerships at personal and professional level between teaching staff and faculties/universities in the eligible countries and the EU. This finding can be considered as an added value of the scheme. A value (or outcome), moreover, which is not produced by higher education support schemes based on a 'technical assistance approach' or by 'structural investment in education'.

8.6 Summary

Outcome 8  Tempus had a major direct impact on the development of sustainable partnerships between HEIs in eligible countries and EU countries

To assess the extent of this impact, the on-line questionnaire was designed. In addition the JEP survey and the lessons learned workshop proved useful for better understanding of the issues involved. The on-line questionnaire showed that Tempus had a major direct impact on the formation of sustainable partnerships in the higher education sector. This conclusion is valid at the global programme level as well as for each of the three regions covered. Overall 69 percent of the respondents indicated this. A further 25 percent listed the Tempus impact as minor direct, major indirect and minor indirect. Four percent did not answer the question and this was taken as an indicator that no sustainable partnerships were formed. For analysis on the level of the three regions separately, the on-line data show that in PHARE, CARDS and Tacis a major direct impact was perceived by respectively 67, 72 and 79 percent of the participants. These differences are not very large but do confirm the information from other sources that in the PHARE area there have been more options (i.e. other programmes apart from Tempus) for building academic partnerships than in the other regions.

To explain why Tempus had this outcome, the evaluation looked at the following dimensions of sustainable partnerships: the motivations for co-operation in Tempus, the type of relations that remained after the completion of the Tempus activities and the funding sources for the partnerships after the completion of the Tempus activities.
Asked about their motivation to participate in Tempus the respondents ranked the main options as follows in order of priority:

- Tempus is a source of funding, which complements the international development co-operation aspirations of the HEIs in the EU and in the eligible countries;
- Joint curriculum development and the accompanying teacher mobility is considered important for the standing of the university in the market for higher education and for attracting top talent;
- Tempus provides the opportunity to experience at first hand and make a positive contribution to the historical transition process in the partner countries;
- Tempus participation was an opportunity to develop an existing professional acquaintance into a practical academic partnership;
- Tempus provides a funding source, which lowers the costs of setting up academic research programmes.

The on-line survey furthermore shows what forms the sustainable partnerships had taken after the completion of Tempus JEPs. Academic networking and participation in conferences was mentioned by 75 percent of the respondents. More than half of the JEP co-ordinators further mentioned the exchange of academic staff (59%), joint research and publications (53%); and the regular exchange of students (51%). Moreover a quarter of the respondents indicated that they continued to operate a joint curriculum based on diplomas and accreditation. These findings confirm that Tempus has generated sustainable outcomes and moreover that Tempus not only works in the field of higher education reforms, but also provides a first step towards follow up with research co-operation.

As for funding of the partnership activities, the higher education sector relies heavily on university budgets and EU programmes. Other sources are small compared to these. The main sources indicated were the university budgets from the co-ordinating university (54%) or partner university (30%), The EU Socrates programmes (44%), Other EU programmes and/or EU Member States bilateral funding (31%). Moreover, 20 percent of the respondents mentioned new Tempus projects as a source for follow up funding. Sixteen percent of the participants mentioned other sources including multilateral organisations and private foundations. The main ones mentioned were DAAD from Germany (2%), the World Bank (1%) and the Soros Foundation (1%).

During the workshop it was pointed out that in the candidate countries, the vast majority of higher education institutions have directly or indirectly been affected by the programme and an extensive network of contacts with EU institutions has been built up. Tempus has had a major direct impact on preparing the HEIs in the ten acceding countries, for participation in other EU higher education programmes: e.g. Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci.

The overall conclusion on this issue is that the bottom-up, multilateral university co-operation approach of Tempus is successful. It promotes not only education system reforms in the eligible countries it also promotes the forging of longer-lasting sustainable partnerships at personal and professional level between teaching staff and faculties/universities in the eligible countries and the EU. This can be considered as an added value of the scheme. A value (or outcome), moreover, which is not produced by higher
education support schemes based on a 'technical assistance approach' or by 'structural investment in education'. On the basis of these findings the evaluators came to the conclusion presented above as outcome 8.

Table 8.3 Tempus outcome in relation to sustainable partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected outcomes</th>
<th>Observed impact</th>
<th>PHARE region</th>
<th>W BALKANS region</th>
<th>Tacis region</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected outcome 8 The development of sustainable partnerships between HEIs in eligible countries and EU countries</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 1 = Major direct impact; 2 = Minor direct impact; 3 = Major indirect impact; 4 = Minor indirect impact; 5 = No impact
9 Observations on management aspects

9.1 Introduction to the issue

The terms of reference do not contain a specific question on programme management aspects. However, in the course of the evaluation some of the issues surfaced, and were subsequently analysed, inasmuch as they had a direct bearing on the outcomes of the Tempus programme. The results of the data collection are presented in this chapter.

9.2 Approach and indicators

Management issues were covered in the on-line questionnaire. Moreover, the participants in the workshops in Moscow, Almaty, Skopje and Brussels were asked for their views on ways and means to make Tempus more effective and efficient form their point of view.

With the on-line questionnaire four aspects were looked at:

1. The suitability of the project guidelines in preparing stakeholders for the task in hand;
2. The usefulness of project management reporting mechanisms in place (activity plan, statement of expenditure, etc.);
3. The appropriateness of the technical assistance mechanisms offered for projects (supply of knowledge and experience, logical assistance, etc.)
4. The usefulness of support, advice and monitoring provided by the National Tempus Office or Tempus Information Point.

The respondents were asked to use a scale from 1 to 5 for qualifying their views (1 = excellent; 2 = good; 3 = satisfactory; 4 = unsatisfactory; 5 = highly unsatisfactory/poor).

9.3 Findings from the evaluation tools

9.3.1 Findings form the on-line questionnaire

Excellent or good was the broad consensus on the first two aspects. The guidelines received the highest appreciation; 76 percent found them either excellent or good, 16 percent considered them satisfactory. Only 4 percent marked the answer unsatisfactory or highly unsatisfactory. The reporting mechanisms were likewise considered to be useful and the statistics are very similar.
The technical assistance offered by the Commission/ETF received a somewhat lower appreciation. Nevertheless, 59 percent recorded an excellent or good answer, but on average, 15 percent chose the 'unsatisfactory and highly unsatisfactory' option. A breakdown of the data by region of the respondents shows that the dissatisfaction is mainly found in the Tacis area. There close to 40 percent chose the answer unsatisfactory or highly unsatisfactory (i.e. the scores 4 or 5).

The appreciation for the support received from the NTOs and TIPS varied significantly between the regions. High appreciation was marked in the 10 acceding and candidate countries of the PHARE area, and in the CARDS area. In the Tacis area, the answers show a lower level of satisfaction with 30% being dissatisfied with the support available. This result may reflect the fact that in the Russian Federation, Tempus did for various reasons not establish a TIP. Excluding Russia, the respondents from the other eligible countries in Tacis show a higher satisfaction level so it remains substantially below the findings for the PHARE and CARDS areas.

Figure 9.1 illustrates these findings and shows details for the three regions separately.

9.3.2 Views from the lessons learned workshop

During the final "lessons learned workshop" in Brussels, these findings were put into focus by the participants as follows.

There was a general agreement between the participants that management aspects have a definite impact on quality, and a number of best practices were referred to:

- The decision to accept institutions of the 10 acceding countries in the PHARE areas as co-ordinators and contractors;
- The use of the NTOs in the PHARE area and their evolution into support points for Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci;
- On-site monitoring, as done in the Tacis area by the Tacis monitoring team and as done by NTOs.
In other areas linked to programme management, the second phase of Tempus was perceived as **less successful:**

- The procedures for administrative reporting and invoicing were qualified as very time-consuming. Representatives from EU universities mentioned that this high administrative burden might well be a barrier for universities to participate in the programme.
- The Tempus procedures encourage dissemination (Guidelines, Top handbooks, and Compact projects) but have not had a serious impact. The absence of quality certification limits in many cases the potential for disseminating written course materials, textbooks and best practices from JEPs. A strong dedication to dissemination, inside universities, within countries and between regions has not been provided in the second phase of Tempus. On the other hand the dissemination of ideas is an automatic element of Tempus through its teacher and student mobility activities.

**Other concerns**

In 1997, the pre-JEPs were abolished. There was at the time the fear that this would make universities more hesitant to apply for JEPs. There is no evidence of this in the number of applications. However, there are some indications from lead experts involved in the JEP selection process that this may have negatively affected the academic quality of the applications. Participants in the "lessons learned workshop" also pointed out that the success chance was a main factor for the quality of applications. "Once the chance of being successful drops to very low levels universities may still participate in applications, but senior staff will not devote time to it and the quality will fall"\(^{38}\). During Tempus II and II bis this does not seem to have been a problem. The Tempus annual report for 1999 provided data on success rates. For Tacis the success rates are given for 1996, 1998 and 1999, and these stand at around 27 percent (for JEPs and Compacts). For PHARE the data for 1997, 1998 and 1999 show even slightly higher rates in the order of 32-34 percent.

### 9.4 Conclusions

1. The financial and administrative procedures, which apply to the second phase of the Tempus programme were perceived as highly, time consuming for the participants. Notably in this sphere of project financial management, the second phase of Tempus had gained a reputation for bureaucracy.

2. The guide for applicants and other progress reporting mechanisms that are used as management tools were assessed as very useful by the JEP co-ordinators. Likewise the supporting TA system and the network of NTOs and TIPs was in general assessed positively by the participants of the programme.

---

\(^{38}\) This is an observation from the 'lessons learned workshop' held in Brussels.
10 Conclusions and observations

10.1 Introduction

The terms of reference (ToR) focused this final report on the second phase of Tempus on the question: “to what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme produced the outcomes expected?” The ToR further specified what the expected outcomes were.

Taking a global view, and looking at the consensus in the perceptions of the people reached with the questionnaire approach of this evaluation, the main findings of the study can be summarised with the following classification of impact: **direct impact** can be observed when a Joint European Project (JEP) directly addressed the issue. The size of this direct impact can be **major** (1) or **minor** (2) depending on the global / aggregate effect of the outcomes produced by the individual JEPs. **Indirect impact** can be found when the JEPs do not directly address the issue, but a causal relation is nevertheless perceived by participants and the relevant competent authorities as an indirect/side effect of a JEP. The indirect effect can be **major** (3) or **minor** (4). **No impact** means that the participants and competent authorities have indicated that they observed neither a direct nor an indirect effect.

10.2 Outcomes 1-3

**Contribution to Changes in Legislation (Evaluation questions number 1-3)**

*To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme contributed to changes in legislation leading to:*

- Greater convergence of education systems in the eligible countries with those in the EC?
- Education systems better adapted to the changing socio-economic reality, in particular market economies and multiparty political systems?; and
- (Specifically for pre-accession countries) the transposition into national law of the acquis communautaire, particularly insofar as the regulated professions are concerned?
Conclusion 1  A major indirect impact on convergence in all regions

Some ten percent of the Tempus JEPs made direct contributions to the introduction and acceptance of reforms leading to greater convergence of national higher education systems in the eligible countries with those in the EU. Taking major direct, minor direct and major indirect all together, the online survey data in combination with the JEP data show that some 50% of the projects have had a positive influence on convergence. These reforms were linked with the adoption of the ideas of the Bologna Declaration. In the PHARE countries most of the relevant reforms were already adopted and Tempus focused on activities within this framework. In the CARDS area, the Tempus activities helped prepare the way for the adoption of the ideas of the Bologna process. In the Tacis area, this direction of convergence had the least impact, but also there the principles promoted in the Bologna process played an important role in the Tempus activities. The overall conclusion of the analysis has been that Tempus had a major indirect impact on legislative changes promoting convergence.

Major indirect impact basically means that legislative reforms have been passed or implemented that can be partially accredited to Tempus, but which were not addressed as a key issue or explicitly intended as an outcome of one or more specific JEP. Thus Tempus II helped to build a body of opinion, equipped with the necessary lobbying skills, which has been able to wield influence in the eligible countries and greatly assisted the convergence of their higher education legislation. Moreover, the programme has provided the necessary human resources - either trained by Tempus projects or endowed with the knowledge acquired whilst implementing one - for government ministries and higher education institutes that are willing and able to draft and implement new legislative reforms.

Conclusion 2  A major indirect impact on adaptation to socio-economic circumstances

The higher education systems reform referred to in this study as adaptation to the changing socio-economic conditions in the eligible countries covers amongst other things: (a) More autonomous structures at university, faculty or department level (i.e. decentralisation); (b) The introduction of subjects related to the free market economy (economics, accounting, marketing, etc); (c) Capacity for more responsive higher education institutions (quality assurance, private sector links, etc.); (d) Reforms of previously politicised subject areas (history, philosophy, etc.); and (e) Social learning including the transmission to teachers and students of civic values related to democracy and civil society.

The evaluation shows that in relation to these issues the second phase of Tempus has made a significant difference. Over eighty percent of the Tempus JEPs addressed one or more of these issues. A large proportion of the respondents indicated that the JEPs in which they had participated had either a direct or indirect major impact on relevant legislative and regulatory changes. The overall conclusion is that the Tempus scheme had a major indirect impact. This suggest that the reforms were initiated by Tempus, but that the full implementation of the reforms took place either after completion of the JEPs or as a result of a more complex set of factors, in which Tempus played a significant role. Analysis of the results does indicate that there have been significant differences between the various regions and the specific eligible countries.
Conclusion 3  Regulated professions – Major direct and indirect influence (PHARE only)
Some 42 percent of the JEPs have either directly or indirectly influenced the development of national regulations and legislation with respect to the regulated professions (doctor, pharmacists, dental practitioner, midwife, general case nurse, veterinary surgeon and architect). The database is insufficient to say more about this subject. In the CARDS area a smaller percentage of projects has dealt with similar issues and the competent HEA classified the influence as being minor and indirect. In the Tacis area the issue has, understandably, not been addressed.

10.3 Outcome 4

Openness and Preparedness for International Co-operation (Evaluation question number 4)

To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme prompted reforms in higher education institutions (including polytechnics and technical schools) leading to:
- institutions’ openness and preparedness for international co-operation?

Conclusion 4  A major direct impact on openness and international co-operation
This conclusion holds for the programme as a whole as well as for the separate regions. However, there are differences between the regions, which are caused by the different socio-economic and political changes that have affected the eligible countries.

10.4 Outcome 5

New management approaches and structures in line with more independent, accountable Higher Education Institutions (Evaluation question number 5)

To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme prompted reforms in higher education institutions (including polytechnics and technical schools) leading to:
- new management approaches and structures in line with more independent, accountable higher institutions?

Conclusion 5  A minor direct impact on deep management reforms
Tempus has had a major direct impact on the first steps of management reforms, and a minor direct impact on deeper management reforms in HEIs leading to new management approaches and structures in line with more independent, accountable higher institutions.
10.5 Outcome 6

The acquisition by staff and students of skills and qualifications necessary for the transition process and for the new socio-economic reality (Evaluation question number 6)

To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme brought about curriculum development and reforms leading to

- the acquisition by staff and students of skills and qualifications necessary for the transition process and for the new socio-economic reality.

Conclusion 6.1 Tempus has contributed to promoting a commitment to reforms

The staff exchanges and mobility programmes which are part of the IMGs and JEPs are the Tempus tools for meeting the CEEC needs of helping people to surpass the communist mindset and communist experience as frame of reference for action. It is undisputed that Tempus has, more than any programme or initiative, made a significant direct contribution to meeting this socio-economic need in the transition countries. The staff exchange and mobility programmes have reached hundreds of thousands of students, teachers and lecturers from CEEC higher education institutions. This exposed the participants of Tempus I and Tempus II to new ideas, ideals, concepts and best practices on virtually every aspect of EU societies, and has shown the policy variety within EU Member States for dealing with the challenges for societal reform and education. This exposure has involved nearly all participants in extensive and wider ranging dialogues and this has contributed to awareness raising, comparison of national values and cultures, attitude changes, and increased commitment towards supporting the social and economic reform process in their own societies and in their own HEIs working environment.

Conclusion 6.2 Tempus has a major direct impact on curriculum development and training

In the field of curriculum development, the second phase of the Tempus programme has produced its main outcomes. The second phase of Tempus has had a major direct impact on curriculum reform in all eligible countries. The depth of the reforms varies between countries, in the sense that it has been easier to bring about changes that go beyond modernisation in PHARE accession countries, than in the major countries in the Tacis region. The curriculum development JEPs are recognised by the overwhelming majority of the participants as having played a crucial role in improving the reputation of universities, as well as having increased employability prospects for students.

Conclusion 6.3 Tempus had a major impact on capacity building for curriculum reform

A main benefit of participation in Tempus CD projects for eligible country higher education institutions is the capacity for implementing future reforms that it generates.

Conclusion 6.4 Tempus has had a major impact on providing universities, teachers and students with the skills and qualifications needed for the new socio-economic reality

In all regions, the JEP participants are convinced that their JEPs have had a direct positive impact on their university’s reputation. The JEPs have helped the HEIs to market their...
courses and attract students, and the JEPs have had a positive effect on employability of students.

Conclusion 6.5 Tempus had a major direct impact on curriculum development and reforms leading to the acquisition by staff and students of skills and qualifications necessary for the transition process and for the new socio-economic reality.

10.6 Outcome 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training of decision makers and retention of trained staff at HEIs (Evaluation question number 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme contributed to the training of decision makers in eligible countries and to what extent has staff with experience in Tempus played and continues to play a role in the universities in the partner countries?

Conclusion 7.1 Tempus has in a major direct way contributed to the training of people who shape today's and tomorrow's academic environment

This conclusion is valid for the Tempus programme as a whole and for the PHARE and CARDS regions. For the Tacis region this impact has varied from major direct and minor direct to major indirect. Tempus has reached today's policy makers, national education experts and university deans with Joint European Projects, Compact Measures and Compact Projects that contributed directly to legislative and regulatory reforms linked to curriculum development and university management at national levels. Tomorrow's policymakers i.e. teachers and students were reached by Tempus JEPs and IMGs. Over time they made a career and 'cascaded upwards' in higher education and elsewhere. This conclusion is important as it helps to understand how Tempus affects the education reform process, and how its bottom-up approach contributes to the reforms.

Conclusion 7.2 Tempus has a positive influence on career development

Participation in Tempus has increased the awareness of today's and tomorrow's decision-makers (teachers and students) of the need for higher education reforms, and has strengthened their commitment to the reforms. In addition, Tempus participation has provided the participants with the skills, qualifications and with the international experience and network of contacts needed to contribute to the reforms. All these factors have contributed to career development.

Conclusion 7.3 Tempus does not seem to contribute much to the brain drain in the eligible countries

The explanation for this somewhat surprising finding may well be that Tempus is not focused on research. The top talents in these fields may not have participated in the Tempus mobility and staff exchanges. However, the data base available for this conclusion is fairly weak and this limits the validity of this conclusion.
10.7 Outcome 8

**Sustainable partnerships in higher education involving EC and partner countries (Evaluation question number 8)**

"To what extent has the second phase of the Tempus programme contributed to the formation of sustainable partnerships in higher education involving EC and other countries?"

**Conclusion 8.1 Tempus had a major direct impact on the formation of sustainable partnerships in the higher education sector**

This conclusion is valid at the global programme level as well as for each of the three regions as well as for each individual country in which Tempus has operated. Different types of partnership are formed. A quarter of the respondents indicated that they continued to operate a joint curriculum based on diplomas and accreditation after the formal ending of the JEPs. Moreover, academic networking and participation in conferences was mentioned by 75 percent of the respondents. More than half of the JEP co-ordinators further mentioned the exchange of academic staff (59%), joint research and publications (53%); and the regular exchange of students (51%).

**Conclusion 8.2 The basis for the sustainable partnerships are academic as well as personal relationships**

In many cases the initial contacts have been made through an exchange of letters between universities and personal contacts generated by participation in conferences. The JEPs enabled these contacts to develop into professional partnerships. The majority of these have turned out to be so valuable for the partners, that the continuation of the co-operation made professional sense. These win-win situations explain why many of the former JEP Partners have allocated their own university budget sources for continuation of joint activities and/or have actively searched for and obtained external sources. Of this latter category other EU programmes (Socrates) have been important especially for the accession countries of the PHARE region.

**Conclusion 8.3 The bottom-up approach of Tempus can be credited with being instrumental for the high success rate and sustainability of the partnerships**

It has enable people who want to work together to do so. Thus it has promoted the matching of faculties who fit each other in academic terms and in many cases had champions who drove the co-operation.

**Conclusion 8.4 The bottom-up, multilateral university co-operation approach of Tempus is successful**

It promotes not only education system reforms in the eligible countries. It also promotes the forging of longer-lasting sustainable partnerships at personal and professional level between teaching staff and faculties/universities in the eligible countries and the EU. This can be considered as an added value of the scheme. A value (or outcome), moreover, which is not produced by higher education support schemes based on a 'technical assistance approach' or by 'structural investment in education'.
10.8 Management issues

1. The financial and administrative procedures, which apply to the second phase of the Tempus programme were perceived as highly, time consuming for the participants. Notably in this sphere of project financial management, the second phase of Tempus had gained a reputation for bureaucracy.

2. The guide for applicants and other progress reporting mechanism that are used as management tools were assessed as very useful by the JEP co-ordinators. Likewise the supporting TA system and the network of NTOs and TIPs was in general assessed positively by the participants of the programme.

10.9 Final Observations

This evaluation confirms that the second phase of the Tempus programme has performed satisfactorily in relation to its objectives. The outcomes of the programme can be considered relevant for the higher education reform processes in the eligible countries and the extent to which Tempus has contributed to the various issues in the reform process was shown to range from a major direct impact to a minor indirect impact. Taking a global view the main conclusion is that Tempus programme has reached its expected outcomes and as such has made important direct and indirect contributions to higher education reform in the eligible countries.

The evaluation further shows that a main driving force for the effectiveness of the second phase of the Tempus programme has been the enthusiasm of the participating academics and the joy that partners have found in co-operation. Tempus is a people programme and is based on initiatives taken at faculty level, at the bottom end of the university pyramid. The evaluation also shows that more is needed than enthusiasm to achieve sustainable results and impact. Curriculum development and university management changes need commitment from the rector or dean of the university, and/ or competent education authorities involved in accreditation of courses etc. In the most successful projects these have been involved. To gain support, and thus a foothold in a university, the Tempus provision for material support has especially in the beginning helped to gain co-operation from the academic leaders of the faculties and universities. At later stages, once trust is gained, further steps in university management become easier. The evaluation thus confirms the success of the Tempus formula, and the appropriateness of the JEPs and IMGs for promoting a reform process which starts with mobility and curriculum development, and moves forward through university management towards sustainable reforms.

In the period covered by this evaluation (1994-2000) the prospect of membership of the European Union provided an unambiguous policy orientation for higher education reforms and for institution building activities in the PHARE area. This orientation, together with the substantial levels of funding for the programme in the PHARE region has contributed to the relevance and impact of the programme. In the CARDS region many years of violent conflict prevented systematic reform progress. Only in the last few years have the eligible countries in the region been given a real perspective of further
economic integration with the EU, and this has started to provide an orientation for harmonising curriculum development, promoting EU languages, accreditation and mutual recognition of degrees. In the Tacis area the perspective of convergence has been less obvious, and the programme had less focus, with less specific thematic national priorities. For the larger countries in the Tacis area, the evaluation shows that the reforms have mainly been relevant for the faculties and universities involved in the programme. In Russia especially this island effect is prominent. Asked about his assessment of the overall impact of Tempus on the overall higher education reforms in Russia, deputy Minister for Education Mr. Grebnev selected the option minor indirect impact.

At the end of the second phase of Tempus, the new contours of Europe and the role of higher education institutions therein started to come into focus, and this has benefited the impact of the programme. The enlarged EU and its new neighbours can be expected to further increase their economic ties and may well start negotiations on a free trade zone and other forms of economic integration and/or cultural co-operation. In the CARDS area, accession will stay on the agenda, and the ideas of the Bologna process will provide a clear framework for setting horizontal national priorities. Over the coming years the programme will have to adapt to further socio-economic changes, something Tempus has proved to be adept at thus far.

The type of mobility that Tempus facilitates has proven to be a strong pillar for building durable personal relations between academics, policy makers and students of EU universities and universities in partner countries. These relations form the basis for the further development of cultural and scientific co-operation to meet the social and technological challenges of the future. Given these perspectives the Tempus programme remains as relevant today as it was a decade ago.