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‘TEMPUS’ is one of the more venerable of the many programmes managed by the European Commission. The Programme was set up in 1990 – shortly after the fall of the Berlin Wall. As the Cold War political boundaries which had divided Europe melted away, Central and Eastern European countries began a rapid transformation process towards becoming modern and prosperous democracies. The European Union helped that process in many ways. The Tempus Programme was aimed specifically at the education sector, and at higher education in particular. The idea was to help in the modernisation and reform process of universities and other higher education institutions in these countries. The assistance delivered through the Tempus Programme could take many different forms – developing new curricula and restructuring old ones, for example, or reforming management structures – but the basic mechanism was always the same: several institutions from several European Union Member States would be encouraged to assist one or more institutions in a partner country through a structured relationship and a carefully constructed project which might last one, two or three years, but which had a clear set of measurable objectives.

The Tempus Programme proved to be a highly successful and increasingly popular instrument and was gradually extended throughout the region of Central and Eastern Europe. Then, in the mid-1990s, when the Soviet Union crumbled, it was rapidly extended to the New Independent States and, indeed, beyond them to Mongolia. In 2001, the Programme was extended to Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, so that it currently covers the whole of the Western Balkans. Now, as I write this introductory note, the Tempus Programme has just been extended to the MEDA Region. The box below shows the way in which the Tempus ‘family’ of partner countries has evolved over the years:

The Year of inclusion in the Tempus Programme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia - from 1993, participation as the Czech and Slovak Republics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Bulgaria, Romania, Yugoslavia for 1991 only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Slovenia, Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Russian Federation, Ukraine, Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Moldova, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Mongolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Croatia, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Algeria, Egypt, Israel(^1), Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, the Palestinian Authority, Syria, Tunisia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Due to the fact that Israel does not benefit from MEDA bilateral funds, its participation will be on a self-financing basis.
The relative ease and speed with which the programme has been extended is a graphic illustration of its flexibility and of its attractiveness as an instrument. The flexibility extends beyond pure mechanics to the basic logic underlying the programme. In the case of the Central and Eastern European countries, it very quickly became clear that these had a vocation to become Member States of the European Union. Tempus was adapted and adjusted in order to help them realise that vocation as rapidly as possible. Indeed, such was the speed of the transition process that by 2000 they had all become Candidate Countries, engaged in the negotiations which, it was expected, would lead rapidly to their accession to the European Union. As part of this new status, they were granted the right to participate fully in the European Union's mainstream education and vocational training programmes and consequently left the Tempus Programme. The last Tempus projects in the ten Central and Eastern European Candidate Countries got under way in the Autumn of 1999 – almost ten years after the first Tempus projects had started in Poland and Hungary.

This rapid transition, and the part that Tempus played in it, is cause for celebration. It is also, I believe, cause for reflection. Wherever it is at work, the Tempus Programme enjoys great popularity. Certainly, the academic communities in the Candidate Countries are quick to extol its virtues. However, as the programme is extended to the countries of the MEDA region, it is perhaps appropriate to ask a simple question: just what did the Tempus Programme achieve? Just why has it been and why is it still quite so popular?

Those are the basic questions behind this study. I should stress immediately that numerous studies and evaluations of the Tempus Programme have been carried out during its life to date. However, many of these have been specific to a particular partner country or to a particular generation of the programme. The departure of the ten Candidate Countries, on the other hand, gives us a good opportunity to look at the overall achievements of the programme for a large group of countries.

The Commission therefore commissioned this report. The author, Ard Jongsma, was given carte blanche. He was encouraged in particular to travel to the countries concerned and to interview as many protagonists as he could. He was given express instructions to take a critical stance. The results are, to my mind, both fascinating and encouraging. Fascinatingly, Jongsma argues that ‘the best of Tempus is yet to come’, in the sense that the programme was instrumental in training up a whole generation of academics and administrators who are only now slowly rising through the elites of the partner countries, and also in the sense that the structured institutional relations encouraged by the programme have led on to equal partnerships for all participating institutions – including, in other words, institutions in the European Union's Member States. Encouragingly, Jongsma draws attention to the programme's flexibility and its adaptability – precisely the qualities which have enabled it to be extended rapidly to the MEDA region. Above all, he strongly emphasises the programme’s vital, if intangible, role in encouraging inter-cultural awareness – a very important consideration in the new political context of dialogue between peoples and cultures.

It is perhaps a commonplace to say that the Tempus Programme has an illustrious past. This report proves the truth of that. But to my mind it also proves that the Tempus Programme has an illustrious future.

Viviane Reding

Member of the European Commission responsible for Education and Culture
Higher education in Central and Eastern Europe and the European Union; a 1989 snapshot

Central and Eastern Europe

It can be hard to remember what societies throughout Europe looked like only ten years ago. Recent history is notoriously hard to record objectively. In order, however, truly to appreciate the achievements of higher education reform in Central and Eastern Europe in the last decade of the 20th century, it is important to observe a chronological perspective.

To a varying extent, all of the higher education systems which emerged from behind the 'Iron Curtain' bore the stamp of decades of communist rule. Education was centrally managed, and contact with other partners in society had been rigidly channelled through national authorities. Most horizontal lines of communication - directly linking universities with each other and with the society in which they operated - had eroded beyond acceptable levels. In many countries, a strong focus on theoretical and applied sciences had left the humanities badly neglected. Academic education and scientific and scholarly research were often strictly separated. University graduates were highly specialised. 'Flexibility' was not part of the academic vocabulary.

However, change was not to be limited to Central and Eastern Europe. Indeed it is important to understand that the difference between higher education in eastern and western Europe in 1989 was arguably not as big as the difference between higher education in 1989 and 1999 within western Europe. For universities from Sofia to Tallinn therefore, catching up with higher education in western Europe meant chasing a swiftly moving target.

The European Union

In western Europe, the late 1980s were the years that signalled the large scale introduction of computers in higher education. Both in university teaching and university administration this caused changes greater than witnessed ever before within the time-span of a mere decade. It was also the period in which internationalisation started to become an integral feature of higher education; when Tempus started, many non-academic and regional higher education institutions had only token international offices or even none at all. Lifelong learning and, as a consequence, continuing education appeared on education agendas throughout western Europe and, together with a surge in interdisciplinary studies, sped up the modularisation of study programmes. After a public subsidising spree in the previous decade, throughout the 1980s higher education financing was severely cut across Europe. This laid root to profound changes in university management. Market mechanisms sneaked their way into higher education funding, not so much as a direct result of changing higher education policies but more as an adequate means of topping up decreasing budgets. In their efforts to initiate reform in central Eastern Europe, western Europeans tended to forget just how recently they themselves had learned many of the lessons they taught.
General post-1989 changes in higher education in Central and Eastern Europe

A number of characteristic changes to higher education in Central and Eastern Europe in the early 1990s were entirely beyond the control of external support for reform. These are briefly highlighted here as they formed the backdrop against which Tempus co-operation developed.

Autonomy

All countries in the region rapidly adopted legislation safeguarding increased autonomy of their higher education institutions. Since many countries drew heavily on academics in their first new administrations, the university sector was often somewhat privileged in this sense, with legislation which was more far-reaching than in other sectors.2

In practice, the legislative changes often led to a degree of autonomy for universities exceeding that enjoyed by universities in most of the European Union Members States. Even if newly introduced legislation was similar to that of European Union countries, the fact that European Union universities were to a larger extent dependent on government funding kept the door open for political influence on the sector. With public funding dwindling in Central and Eastern Europe, the more entrepreneurial of universities looked for funding elsewhere (if their country’s legislation allowed for it). The result in Bulgaria, for example, was that public funds soon accounted for only a minor proportion of the budget of many universities, leaving the national authorities virtually without control. Since autonomy in all cases was granted before the structure of university administration was properly reviewed, changes imposed from above would later prove particularly hard to carry through. For reasons which differ slightly from country to country, only the Czech Republic and Lithuania have been largely spared the consequences of this phenomenon. In Estonia, where competition within the higher education sector was minimal, negative impact was limited by a restrained response on the part of universities.

University administration

Some of the characteristics of university administration in Central and Eastern Europe were different from common practice in the European Union. Contradictory as it may seem, the centralised nature of pre-1989 politics in the region had in a number of countries left university management exceedingly decentralised. In fact, many faculties in the region were legal entities in their own right while others became so in the early years of the 1990s.

The case of Slovenia provides a good example. In 1997, the deans still negotiated their budget directly with the responsible ministries, leaving the central university administration a symbolic office with no budgetary control. In 1998, Prof. Ludvik Toplak, Rector of the University of Maribor, complained, albeit in jest, that while ninety one per cent of the university budget was spent on education and eight per cent went directly to the faculty management, only one per cent was earmarked for central services. Of that one per cent the rector got one per cent to keep his cabinet running. “So, I have control of one ten-thousandth of the budget of my university,” Toplak concluded. The case of the northernmost former Yugoslav republic is even more peculiar than that of other countries in the region because legislative changes curbing the independence of its faculties were already passed in 1993. They simply took half a decade to be implemented.

In other countries, central university management did continue to play an important administrative role; sometimes to such an extent that staff involvement at the departments was at stake. The classic example is how

---

2 Details on legislative measures for each country can be found in the country chapters in Part II of this publication.
ordering a box of pencils would require stamps from all administrative corridors, both within and outside the university. Poland is a good example of a country where increased independence of university units was a requirement for generating more involvement from staff at faculty and departmental level. In his chapters of the Polish Tempus Impact Study, Zdislaw Mach describes the consequences of the decentralisation process that took place at Polish universities in the early 1990s:

The continuing process of decentralisation of organisation, decision-making and finances is perhaps the most important change in Polish universities. [...] The involvement of rectors, deans and heads of departments in Tempus, the special projects designed for restructuring universities, and the increasing awareness among the academic staff of the importance of decentralisation for better functioning and more efficiency of their institutions, created a favourable condition for major changes. The examples of some (not all) European Union universities which were more efficient and more economical due to decentralisation, provided inspiration for Polish institutions. Decentralisation also responded to the growing need for more independence and responsibility at lower levels of the university structure. Staff members who argued for decentralisation usually used the argument that the proposed new structure proved to produce good results in European Union universities. The effects were excellent, beyond expectation. Those universities which went through the decentralisation process were able to reduce deficit, to generate profit, to save money, to create financial resources for research projects and for investment. Consequently, the mentality of people is changing as well: more and more staff members realise that their own rational economic decisions, in their institutes, chairs and research units, generate savings and earnings.

Faculty autonomy came to play an important role in the reform process of the 1990s but its causes and consequences differ from country to country.

The quality of education

In some countries, anarchic tendencies also posed a threat to the quality of higher education. As mentioned above, the scramble for funds resulted in a zealous effort to introduce market mechanisms at many universities. The problem was often caused by the fact that in education there is no single demand to be balanced by the supply. There are two distinct demands – of students and of society (including the economy) – and these do not always match. In Central and Eastern Europe, the student demand for education in the social sciences and humanities – most specifically in economics, business and law studies – soon outweighed the regional need for professionals in these fields. The number of departments and faculties of economics and law soared, often without adequate teaching capacity to match the intake. The number of law faculties in Bulgaria soared from just one in 1989 to fourteen in 1998, while teachers in the field were in such limited supply that legal education became a travelling circus, with professors touring the country to provide lectures at different universities at student-to-teacher ratios of up to 60:1.

Soaring participation

Participation in education in the region initially sharply declined and then embarked on a trend of steady increase. It is generally accepted that the explanation for this is rather more pragmatic than the sometimes proposed increasing awareness of the benefits of a university degree. After the political changes, there was a brief surge in expectations of massive economic opportunities which the new system would provide, causing potential students to opt out and look for work instead. When, against these expectations, economies in the region initially continued their decline, young people increasingly chose to ‘park’ themselves in education.
Nevertheless, in 1989 the participation rates in the region were lower than those in the European Union. This was partly because higher education in the region offered little other than long-cycle academic programmes. In other words, because of the lack of short-cycle non-academic programmes, higher education as a whole was a bit ‘higher’ in Central and Eastern Europe than it was in the European Union. A considerable share of the students who in other countries would enrol in more professionally-oriented higher education was absorbed in these long-cycle programmes. The rest ‘got stuck’ at a level below their capacity. Even in 1999, entry rates in Poland and Hungary for academic programmes were higher than anywhere in the European Union except Finland and Sweden, yet the rates for the total of tertiary education still lagged behind somewhat. (In this context, it should be noted that as long as higher education is the vague identifier it still is in the international context, few facts can be retrieved from statistics. Hungary, for example, is very dissatisfied about its participation rates, yet it receives top-marks from the OECD. Much depends on the calculation method applied).

What is certain, however, is that the diversification of higher education in the region, which is in full progress at this moment, is having a massive impact on participation rates and is allowing an increasing number of young people to be trained to the maximum of their capacity rather than to the maximum level the system allows for. And this is very encouraging indeed.

The academic hierarchy

It has been argued that it is unjust to accuse Central and Eastern Europe's Humboldtian education systems of the late 20th century of putting all students in the same box. The counter-argument used in these cases is the elaborate structure of postgraduate education. Although this has little to do with diversification or meeting labour market demands, indeed some of the degree structures in the region were, and are still, very elaborate, if extremely hierarchic. Poland is a good example of this. It is the President in person who hands out the country's most prestigious academic appointment: that of 'Ordinary Professor'. But few make it beyond the (paradoxically next-best) status of 'Extraordinary Professor'. Before getting even to that stage, a student needs to have passed the pre-university lyceum, a four or five-year Masters, a Doctorate and a second research programme resulting in the characteristic Habilitacja. The latter is a second dissertation which in many countries is still required before higher university appointments can be awarded.

The recently introduced Licensjat is the country's first true undergraduate degree. The Licensjat is Poland's answer to the call for harmonisation from the Bologna process and, although not met without scepticism, is likely to develop into an important sector in higher education in the next few years.
Part I.
Ten years of Tempus

Philosophy: the bottom-up approach

Certainly in the academic world, institutional agreements, if not supported by personal bonds, tend to wither away as soon as the framework through which they were established disappears. Sound individual relationships, even if in the professional sphere, do not.

Programme evaluation reports, from the very first 1992 Coopers-Lybrand study onwards, have always highlighted the discrepancies and therefore often friction - Tempus caused among departments and faculties within universities. During the first years of Tempus in particular, there was a clear distinction between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' - those who had managed to secure a Tempus grant and those who had not. It was a natural first stage of the approach chosen to achieve reform at the institutional level and eventually the political level.

Criticism about the lack of direct influence on reform at the national level was generally uttered in passing statements. None of the official evaluations sufficiently took into account the prevailing scepticism towards authority and top-down initiatives, a legacy of decades of communist rule.

In 1998, Vice-rector for Studies Prof Jacak of the Technical University of Wroclaw said during an interview that when his university needed advice from the authorities it would ask the ministry a question, wait for the answer and then do precisely the opposite. Needless to say he was joking. And yet, this example of Polish humour had a strong bearing on the way authority has been approached in the region for decades.

Authorities were not to be trusted, academic authorities were, by and large, appointed by political authorities and therefore not to be trusted either. The latter didn’t really need to be trusted anyway because decisions on the bulk of issues relevant to departmental staff were taken at faculty level. The general attitude towards orders percolating down the hierarchical ladder was as often as not one of concealed disobedience.

It is therefore doubtful whether more forcefully imposed top-down measures in the early years of Tempus would have had the desired effect, if any effect at all. From the fog of recent history, the early Tempus years now appear as a more a tentative phase of experiments with reform. According to many, the results of this period were the foundation on which many of the changes in later years were built. Tomasz Saryusz-Wolski, Head of the International Faculty of Engineering at Łódź Technical University and one of Poland’s major Tempus actors said: “For three-quarters of the Polish Tempus II and Tempus II bis projects, Tempus I activity had been a necessary prerequisite.”

The bottom-up approach also has had consequences for the sustainability of the programme’s results. Phare - and Tempus as a part of it - was not a programme intended to help just any region considered less well off to get back on its feet again. The region in question was a European region and the overriding aim of the Phare programme was to strengthen European integration. However much ‘European integration’ may strike individuals as far-from-home political rhetoric, it is a process which ultimately builds on an immense network of personal relationships. Certainly in the academic world, institutional agreements, if not supported by personal bonds, tend
to wither away as soon as the framework through which they were established – in this case Tempus – disappears. Sound individual relationships, even if in the professional sphere, do not. A case in point where Tempus is concerned 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. By forging personal and institutional relationships, Tempus set up the scaffolding for the reconstruction work which was to take place in the latter part of the 1990s and helped make the drive towards change an irreversible process.

To place all of this in the brains of those who originally designed the Tempus programme would be reverse engineering. What counts, however, at the end of the decade, is that the chronology of Tempus developments worked out very well indeed, and that, in Central and Eastern Europe, Tempus is widely acclaimed for that.

**Chronology**

**Tempus I: Support to the academic grassroots**

From its early years, Tempus aimed to set the reform process in motion at the bottom end of the university pyramid. Departments in the partner countries were linked to departments in the European Union. Together, academics tackled academic issues in neglected fields or areas requiring immediate support so as to avoid fatal regression. Lasting relationships were built. 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.

The choice for a bottom-up approach in the first years of Tempus was a deliberate one. The will to change was considered strongest on the workshop floor. In preceding years, university management appointments had often been politically driven. In the short term, higher management was feared to be less receptive to the call for reform creating small landslides at the very foundation of academia was therefore more likely to produce lasting results.

In the hundreds of departments where Tempus projects were carried out, the impact of the programme was massive. Rigid curricula were binned and replaced with modular structures or forged into internationally compatible formats. Staff were retrained to the most up-to-date standards. Partner institutions were wired up to access the Internet with its wealth of new information retrieval opportunities. Between 1990 and 1997, tens of thousands of computer terminals were installed and almost 100,000 international staff and student exchanges were carried out with Tempus funding.

**Country participation**

Before the end of the first year, the geographical coverage of the Tempus programme was expanded to include, besides Poland and Hungary, the former DDR and Czechoslovakia. In 1991, support was extended to Bulgaria, Romania and former Yugoslavia. Due to the war, support to the latter was halted in 1992 when, of all former Yugoslav Republics, only Slovenia remained within the programme. In the same year, the Baltic countries entered Tempus. (Of the non-Candidate Countries, Albania also joined the programme in 1992.) Finally, in 1993, support to Czechoslovakia was split among its new halves: the Czech and Slovak Republics.

**Priorities**

In the very first year of Tempus support there were no subject priorities. It was hard enough to find consortia that at such short notice could develop a useful project and put together a project team to carry it out. In the subsequent years, however, a gradual limitation of academic subjects was introduced in order to streamline support. Subjects differed from country to country and were established through a consultation process with the national authorities. Details of these can be found under each country in Part II of this publication.
Budget

The annual Tempus budget for each country was a percentage of its Phare funds (its National Indicative Programme). In the first years, allocations from regional funds and other Phare sources could be added. The percentage was reviewed each year by the national authorities. As Tempus was one of the first Phare programmes to get underway, the initial Tempus share of Phare budgets was quite high. Tempus activity in the Candidate Countries reached its apogee in 1993, when the total budget approached the €130M mark. Of this, €108M originated from the National Indicative Programmes.

Tempus II: Extending programme impact

On 29 April 1993 the European Union’s Council of Ministers adopted the Tempus II Decision. Although the adoption was generally interpreted as an acknowledgement of the programme’s success, Tempus’ aims were thoroughly reformulated. ‘Mobility’, though by no means discontinued, was supplemented by more daring objectives.

Priorities

In the first years of Tempus, the choice of academic subjects was subordinate to the establishment of academic links. When that initial handshake had taken place, the programme was reviewed and, to respond better to the individual needs of each country, under Tempus II (1994-1998) academic content was upgraded to become a crucial selection criterion. Together with the national authorities of the partner countries, ‘national priorities’ were drawn up. They included horizontal issues such as internationalisation, university management and financing, and the implementation of newly adopted legislation. Some countries prioritised projects in which more than one of their universities participated. Others prioritised regional projects. The priorities were reviewed annually and formed the backbone of the project selection process.

Towards a top-down approach

At the same time, in many countries the focus of higher education reform had moved from the academic to the institutional arena. Public funding was dwindling and local ad-hoc reform activities mushroomed. The need for new administrative structures - efficiently accommodating the changes - became increasingly pressing. A true managerial clear-out had refreshed most of the higher education administrations, justifying a shift of attention up the university pyramid. Within Tempus Phare, actions were devised aiming specifically at institutional reform. Local progress had to be harnessed by institutional long-term strategies and although the ‘bottom-up’ approach was never wholly abandoned, the desire to move towards reforms of a larger scale was reflected in the aims and priorities for Tempus II.

It was also during the implementation of Tempus II that an eastward extension of the European Union turned from a vision into a prospect. This put a whole range of new issues on the agendas of the countries involved. Preparations were made for the inclusion of the Candidate Countries in the regular European Union education programmes, such as Socrates and Leonardo. Tempus could play a crucial role in this transitional phase. More importantly, the prospect of accession suddenly generated a whole new range of training needs on topics such as European law, European financing and European trade. Tempus rose to this challenge and began to offer training in these subjects using the know-how of European Union-based universities.

Funding

After disappointing experiences during the 1993 selection rounds, when hardly any new projects could be funded from the available budgets because of financial commitments to running operations, it was decided to introduce ‘pluri-annual funding’ for the financing of projects under Tempus II. This meant that from the total amount any
country had allocated to Tempus activities, projects were now funded for their full duration. This aimed to safeguard continuity in the implementation of two and three-year projects. It also offered contractors more flexibility in managing their projects, allowing them to carry over certain proportions of funds from one year to the next as appropriate.

**Mobility**

In anticipation of the inclusion of certain Phare countries in European Union mobility programmes, mobility gained importance in Tempus Projects between 1990 and 1995 as illustrated in the figure below. Specific mobility projects, however, were a short lived feature in Tempus because from the middle of the decade a drive towards support for projects engaging in more institutional reform gained strength.

*Figure 1. Average number of students engaged in mobility per Joint European Project for what today are the Candidate Countries in 1991, 1993 and 1995.*

**Tempus II bis: the prospect of accession**

In 1997, the Commission decided to extend the second phase of Tempus by a two-year period (Tempus II bis) starting in 1998 and ending in 2000. The name II bis was not an indication that support would be extended without major changes. In fact, for the Candidate Countries the difference between Tempus II and Tempus II bis would turn out to be bigger than the difference between Tempus I to Tempus II.

**Institution Building**

In the late 1990s, when Phare programme activities became increasingly focused on preparation for accession, the Commission coined the expression 'Institution Building'. Under Phare, this came to describe the process of preparing national administrative, economic and legislative bodies for operating within the Union and for adoption of the accumulation of standards and criteria known as the 'acquis communautaire'. The aim of institution building was to prepare the ground for European integration within the administrative and regulatory bodies of the Candidate Countries.

Between 1998 and 2001, the Phare programme thus came to focus on preparing civil servants, legal officers, social partners and Non Governmental Organisations for accession by providing large scale training programmes in fields considered essential for future participation in an integrated Europe. The aim was to help current administrations cope with the changes accession would bring about. It did not in any way, however, safeguard the adequate training of a future work-force. This is where Tempus II bis found a clear role. Tempus had arrived at a
stage where it was deemed ready to shift its focus towards a reconsideration of the position of higher education in wider society. The accumulated Tempus experience provided an excellent base from which the development of relevant, flexible and responsive training structures could be developed for a broader audience.

**Partners**

Joint European Projects under Tempus II bis typically involved a broader range of partners (both from European Union member states and partner countries) than they had done thus far. Transfer of knowledge from national actors of different European Union countries to their political, economic and social counterparts in the Candidate Countries was channelled through Tempus university networks and supplemented with the technical knowledge available at the academic institutions. Moreover, the involvement of partner universities - where ad hoc training schemes could be adapted for use in the regular curricula - were to safeguard continuity in the process of (re)training. More than ever before Tempus addressed, in its II bis phase, society in general rather than just the higher education sector. Activity was not limited to providing professional training for actors involved in the accession process. It also included 'training for new citizenship'. Previously less involved partners (such as Non Governmental Organisations, media, trade unions, social services and professional associations) were invited to actively participate in Tempus networks.

**Priorities**

The topical priorities of Tempus II bis illustrated the Commission’s commitment to embed the main principles of European integration into the training structures of the acceding countries. The focus was on training in public administration, issues related to the internal market, finance and tax policy, social security, human rights, standards in quality control, European law, communication and media. A prominent role was also reserved for training in European Union languages.

It is interesting to note that, despite initial widespread criticism from throughout the region following the announcement of the focus of Tempus II bis, this brief 'third' phase is now generally regarded as the most successful stage of the 11 years of Tempus in the Candidate Countries. Modest but well-targeted top-down measures in a suitable context led to many fine results and a wider impact than expected.

**Modalities**

**Joint European Projects**

Though they changed in nature, scope and even duration several times throughout the decade Joint European Projects were, from the very beginning, and would remain the main type of project through which Tempus support was channelled. Throughout the decade, there had been Structural Joint European Projects, Mobility Joint European Projects, Joint European Networks (which aimed at consolidating and disseminating Joint European Project results during an additional two-year period) and Joint European Project+ projects (which towards the end of Tempus I covered a horizontal priority area defined by the national authorities). Joint European Project consortia were made up of partner universities from at least two European Union countries and at least one of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. The standard funding period for a Joint European Project was three years. Exceptions were made downwards, never upwards. The typical budget of a
three-year project was well under € 500,000. Under Tempus II bis the duration of Joint European Projects was reduced to two years.

**Complementary Measures / Compact Measures**

Complementary Measures (their name was changed to Compact Measures in 1996) were smaller projects tackling a more narrowly defined issue. These could vary from the drafting of policy documents to the establishment of a cross-faculty unit at a university. The structure of project management was quite similar to that of Joint European Projects.

A total of 417 Complementary Measures were carried out in the Candidate Countries between 1989 and 2001.

**Individual Mobility Grants**

Individual Mobility Grants were small grants awarded to academics and administrators for short visits with typically one specific purpose. The Individual Mobility Grants were subject to national priorities under Tempus II but could otherwise be used for anything from teaching assignments to study visits and Joint European Project consortium preparations.

Individual Mobility Grant activity peaked in 1993 when 2,076 Individual Mobility Grants were awarded under Tempus in the Candidate Countries.

During the three phases, a total of 10,680 Individual Mobility Grants were awarded.

Towards the end of the Tempus programme in the Candidate Countries, Individual Mobility Grant selection and management increasingly took place in the Candidate Countries themselves.

**Youth Exchange Activities (YEX)**

Up until 1994 (the first year of Tempus II), a limited number of youth exchanges and related activities were supported. These were broadly defined as ‘organised cultural interactions intended to provide opportunities for young people normally outside higher education’.

All in all, 444 Youth Exchange projects were supported under Tempus. In Hungary, 88 Youth Exchange projects were supported. In Poland, which had 229 Youth Exchange projects, a larger Youth Pilot Action drew most of the Youth Exchange participants. Their projects were very local in nature and managed by young participants themselves. In the last two selection rounds in 1994, 58 projects were supported with a total budget of € 578,400.
Management

Skills development in project formulation, submission and management is conceived in Central and Eastern Europe as one of the main benefits brought by Tempus.

Programme management

Over the years, a host of exceedingly complicated charts and management models elucidating the Tempus Programme's management structure have been applied as illustrations in various Tempus Annual Reports.

At the outset Tempus was managed by the former Task Force for Human Resources, which later became DG XXII 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.

In the Candidate Countries, the transfer of responsibilities was not limited simply to allowing universities in Central and Eastern Europe to operate as Contractors and Co-ordinators of Joint European Projects. Throughout the decade, the portfolio of the National Tempus Offices in these countries was also gradually expanded. In 1995, for example, parts of the technical and academic assessment of project proposals, some monitoring visits, the evaluation of final reports and the selection of Candidate Country-European Union Individual Mobility Grants was carried out by the National Tempus Offices.

In the same year, the Polish National Tempus Office became responsible for the whole Candidate Country – European Union Individual Mobility Grant cycle, issuing contracts and performing the whole follow-up exercise. In 1996, these tasks were extended to all National Tempus Offices while Warsaw also came to select the European Union-Candidate Country Individual Mobility Grants to Poland.

In 1997, a decision was made to pilot an extension of the tasks of the National Tempus Offices of the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary and Romania in the selection process for Joint European Projects. It was felt this would assist in their preparation for participation in the European Union’s education programmes. The technical assessment of projects was undertaken by these National Tempus Offices while the academic assessment was undertaken locally by a mixed group of experts from both European Union member states and partner countries. These tasks were extended to the National Tempus Offices in other Candidate Countries in 1998.

Project management

One factor which today is considered a landmark in the development of Tempus support is the gradual move of project co-ordination and contracting from the European Union to the Candidate Countries. When offered the chance to co-ordinate their own projects in 1992, Polish partners took the lead in one quarter of all new projects. Even more significant, according to all accounts, was the move to allow financial contractorship to be borne by universities in a gradually increasing number of Central and Eastern European countries in the following years.

In Brussels, there was a persistent worry that control of the use of European Union funds might diminish, with Central and Eastern European contractors managing the funds. As things turned out, the opposite happened and local contractorship became a major catalyst for widening the impact of projects. The central management of contracting universities had to sign the papers and was thus forced into awareness of project activities within its faculties. With rectors barely in control of funds spent by their staff, this was rather revolutionary in many places and caused the odd ripple or wave.
There are also indications that projects were more likely to remain better on track when their management was assumed by the beneficiaries. The number of complaints from project partners about decisions made by the project managers decreased significantly. Research from Nuffic in the Netherlands shows that in 1992, when all Hungarian projects were still co-ordinated by European Union partners, only one quarter of responding local project staff felt that the project was doing what it was supposed to do, while half of them thought the project was off-track. Just a few years later, this situation was reversed. Skills development in project formulation, submission and management is seen in Central and Eastern Europe as one of the main benefits brought by Tempus.

Achievements

There is hardly an institution to be found in the European Union and the Candidate Countries which has not in one way or another been affected by the programme.

Between 1990 and 1999, the last year in which new projects were accepted, Tempus support to the Candidate Countries amounted to a total of €724.75M. Some 2,095 Joint European Projects\(^5\) were carried out by consortia, which over the years, included the vast majority of European Union and Central and Eastern European universities and a large number of other higher education institutions. Through Tempus projects, almost 50,000 European Union staff were sent to work with colleagues in the region while more than 70,000 staff were awarded grants for visiting European Union universities.

Such figures are impressive but, although it requires little imagination to visualise an idea of the impact of such large scale interaction, they are not the true benchmarks for the programme's success. Throughout the 1990s, estimates have been made about the number of computers bought through Tempus, the number of courses developed through Tempus, and the number of new units established through the programme. The latter is a good example to illustrate how misleading such statistics can be. Indeed, a large number of new units, departments and faculties have been established with Tempus support\(^6\) but as the programme progressed throughout the decade, critical comments about precisely this development were increasingly heard. The introduction to this document illustrated how the fragmentation - or decentralisation - of higher education thwarted innovation and development at the institutional and sometimes national level, and that Tempus has been criticised on occasions for contributing to this fragmentation through its mode of support - the 'bottom-up' approach.

The one detail in the above figures that is perhaps most important of all is the fact that there is hardly an institution to be found in the European Union and the Candidate Countries which has not in one way or another been affected by the programme. This suggests that building bridges has been the prime achievement of the programme and personal accounts of those involved in Tempus seem to support this idea. Needless to say, neither the 'bridges' nor their accumulative span are easily quantified.

Contacts with the European Union

Those drawing on statistics about benchmark programme results may find it hard to cope with the idea that more than €700M worth of public funds have been spent on the personal development of an army of Central and Eastern European academics.

\(^5\) Includes Joint European Networks (see page 11).

\(^6\) Refer to, for example, the chapter on Poland in Part II of this publication.
Indeed, the issue which all interviewees quoted at the top of Tempus achievements, was that it built bridges between higher education in eastern and western Europe. It is not only considered the most significant impact of the Tempus programme but Tempus is indeed credited with being by far the most significant catalyst in this area. In Estonia, Higher education DG Madis Lepajoe said Tempus was a ‘window on the world’; in Bulgaria, Dr. Kamen Velev, President of the Bulgarian Rectors’ Conference, called it a ‘ticket back to Europe’. And everyone in between seems to concur.

It puts the main impact of Tempus not in buildings and hardware but in the personal sphere and not all will be equally pleased with that. Those drawing on statistics about benchmark programme results may find it hard to cope with the idea that more than € 700M worth of public funds have been spent on the personal development of an army of Central and Eastern European academics.

**Human capital**

| These are the people who today are 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. |

Since few directions were ever given by the programme management on the collection of specific country-wide impact statistics, each country has, often in a final report, chosen different ways of illustrating the traces Tempus left in academia. The downside of this has been that (other than the budget, the numbers of projects and, to a certain extent, the number of mobilities) there are few comparable figures readily available for all countries. The upside, however, is that some countries have chosen a focus on issues which might not otherwise have been highlighted.

As can be read in the country chapter on Latvia below, Dr Andrejs Rauhvargers, Secretary General of the Latvian Rectors’ Council, performed an interesting exercise in his 2001 *Tempus Impact Study*. He dedicated one chapter of the document to naming all those of more than average importance to the academic community (and beyond) who have worked in Tempus projects, who have travelled on mobility grants or who have otherwise been exposed to benefits brought by the Tempus programme. He then connected their career development to skills development brought about by the programme so far as can be documented.

The Latvian list includes, among others, the head of the Latvian Higher Education Council, the head of the Latvian Rectors’ conference, the head of the State Education Inspection, the head of the Education Ministry’s Department of Higher Education, the chairman of the Board of the Latvian Higher Education Quality Evaluation Centre, the chancellors of the two largest universities and six Latvian rectors. Unfortunately, similar exercises have never been carried out in other countries but academics throughout the region recognise and acknowledge the point Rauhvargers is making.

In neighbouring Estonia, two ex-ministers and the number one contender in the last presidential elections have extensive Tempus experience. The ex-ministers, Profs. Jaak Aaviksoo and Mait Klaassen are now Rector of Tartu University and County Governor in Southern Estonia respectively. The presidential candidate, Peeter Kreitzberg, is an MP.

In Bulgaria, Dr. Kamen Velev, President of the Rectors’ Conference, acknowledges the importance of his Tempus experiences to his further career. In Poland, former education minister Edmund Wittbrodt was an active Tempus actor, while the people who today are the core actors in the Polish quality assurance process are people who started this activity in four complementary Tempus projects. Former Romanian education minister Andrei Marga was involved in a series of Tempus projects in his position as rector of the University of Cluj-Napoca. In Slovenia, former education minister Pawel Zgaga had been involved in a Tempus project while the current education minister, Lucia Èok, was a Tempus project co-ordinator.
In Poland, Ludwik Komorowski, Vice-rector of the University of Wroc³aw, knows from his own experience how Tempus has helped him and many colleagues move into more active roles, thus supporting their own careers and the development of their universities. Komorowski, however, believes that it is still too early fully to assess this part of the impact of the Tempus programme: “Poland is a country with a tradition that gives everyone a small finger in the pie,” he says. “Academic culture is slow; ideas need to ripen before changes take place. Things move slowly but they move solidly. The 1950s generation has now moved up to deans’ level and half of these have Tempus experience. In the following years their impact will surface.”

The above are just flagship examples of a large contingent of Central and Eastern European academic and administrative staff whose thinking and career development have been supported by Tempus. More than 70,000 staff received training in European Union countries. An unknown number worked together with the almost 50,000 European Union colleagues who visited their institutions.

Many among them are now heads of department, deans, vice-rectors, rectors. It would be quite hard indeed to argue that their experience is ‘lost’ in mere personal development. These are the people who today are 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.

Their testimony not only illustrates the range and reach of Tempus impact; it also adds weight to the argument that the chronological centre of gravity of the Tempus Programme might well lie in the future rather than in the past.

**Project management skills and the fight for funding**

“Academics learnt how to support calls for increased funding with convincing arguments. They learnt how to isolate and define particular problem areas and lobby for their improvement. The interesting part of it is that they are now applying the lessons learnt to their own national government in the process of lobbying for funding.”

An important achievement of the programme has been the development of skills in project definition, management, PR and financing among Tempus project co-ordinators and contractors. Although a fair number of projects throughout the region specifically aimed at developing these skills, for example through training in fundraising and Public Relations or through the establishment of industry relationship offices, the main force of impact was a pure spin-off in the shape of experience gathered by more than 2,000 local co-ordinators and contractors.

Marian Gheorghe, today Deputy Director General at the Romanian Ministry of Education and Research, was the co-ordinator of a Joint European Project led by the Technical University of Bucharest in which 15 Romanian universities worked together to establish a network of continuing training departments and management structures for university-industry relationships. He argues that Tempus project proposal requirements not only taught colleagues throughout the country how to access external funding but, much more importantly, that it showed them how to make a good case for funding. “Academics learnt how to support calls for increased funding with convincing arguments. They learnt how to isolate and define particular problem areas and lobby for their improvement. The interesting part of it is that they are now applying the lessons learnt to their own national government in the process of lobbying for funding.”

Gheorghe’s argument is echoed throughout the region and often supported with the example of current Fifth Framework projects. In Slovakia, for example, nearly all managers of Fifth Framework projects acquired their project management experience under Tempus.
Zdzisław Mach, the co-author of the Polish Tempus Impact Study believes that skills development in project management and financing has been "particularly strongly affected by Tempus". "Independent fundraising," he writes, "not existent in Polish universities prior to 1989, is now considered to be an essential part of the duties of chief administrators (rectors, pro-rectors, heads of administration, even deans and heads of departments). Public relations skills are now seen as an important qualification of academics and administrators. Universities learnt how to present themselves to the general public, how to compete for students, how to win industrial contracts, write project applications, manage projects, [and] establish mutually beneficial relations with the regions."

### Student mobility

Tempus made short work of prejudices about the quality of higher education in Central and Eastern Europe among the periphery of those directly involved in the programme. [...] For many ordinary teaching staff in the European Union Tempus crushed the myth that Eastern Europe was a backward region and this in itself is an achievement easily on par with that of the ties knit between a large group of western and Eastern European academics.

The direct and indirect benefits of the more than 40,000 students travelling on Tempus grants are harder to trace than those of staff mobility. This is a plain statement, not an encouragement for anyone to engage in a cost–benefit analysis of Tempus student mobility. In 1996, an analysis of student mobility from Hungary was carried out with a Tempus Complementary Measure grant by the Dutch organisation Nuffic. Although the document is extremely valuable to anyone interested in the subject, this snapshot was taken five years before the closure of the programme and in those five years very much has happened in European higher education. So, unless we want to collect feedback from hundreds of students, for more updated information we must rely on 'witness accounts'. Of those, none raised doubts about the benefit of student mobility in Tempus. Their arguments, however, are interesting, to say the least, and rarely relate to the personal development of students.

### A taste of democracy

Nina Kancewicz-Hoffman, the first director of the Polish National Tempus Office, and today Rector's Deputy for University Advancement at the University of Warsaw, is one of the people who cited the goodwill generated by Tempus among students and parents because of its generally 'innovative' way of selecting students for travel grants. "In general, students were selected on their merits rather than on their connections," she said. "This may sound normal to you but it was the world upside-down in these parts of Europe." Also Prof Dan Grigorescu, Director of the former Romanian Tempus Office remembered many positive experiences with parents who called into the office because they could not believe that their poorly connected children had been awarded study grants. "It really did some marvellous PR work for Tempus and the European Union as a whole," he said. "But the opposite also happened. People who were well-connected were sometimes outraged because their children had not been selected," to which he smilingly added: "I suppose the result in terms of achievements is equally positive."

### Pressure from the inside

According to Prof. Velev, the effect of the student mobility on Bulgarian higher education should not be underestimated either. He thinks the most important luggage many students brought back home was a point of reference. "Armed with first hand experience of European Union practice they started exerting pressure on the system from the inside. But they also found evidence that not everything we did in Bulgaria was all that bad. This had a positive effect on other students and staff too."

---

7 The report is called Impact of the Tempus Programme on Hungarian Students and can be downloaded from the web site of the Hungarian Tempus Office at [www.tpf.iif.hu/tempus](http://www.tpf.iif.hu/tempus)
Logistics

Tempus student mobility gave a foretaste of what could be expected once the Socrates programme would be opened to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. It has been argued that all of this could have been achieved in ways more cost-effective than having 40,000 students roam around Europe causing supreme havoc at understaffed student counselling offices. In the event, it taught many Central and Eastern European universities that they needed a properly staffed and managed central international office. It taught others how to strengthen their existing services. And in the European Union, international offices were confronted with the particular demands of dealing with students who had no other resources than their grants.

Not least, Tempus student mobility exposed often-embarrassing prejudices. Firstly, there were inconsistencies governing visa regulations all across the European Union. In just one example, Polish students needed a clean criminal record to be eligible for a visa to the Netherlands while their Czech contemporaries needed a satisfactory medical test. Irritating as they may have been, many such examples helped streamline student mobility ahead of the countries’ participation in the Socrates programme. Secondly, Tempus made short work of prejudices about the quality of higher education in Europe among the periphery of those directly involved in the programme. A large group of teaching staff acquired direct experience with a top contingent of students from Central and Eastern European countries, and few could afterwards deny having been impressed with the level of theoretical knowledge of many of the students. They may have displayed a learning culture which was not always compatible with that of the home students, and indeed may have represented only the cream of students from partner institutions, but for many ordinary teaching staff in the European Union Tempus crushed the myth that Central and Eastern Europe was a backward region and this in itself was an achievement easily on a par with that of the ties knit between a large group of Western and Eastern European academics.

Credit transfer

The above-mentioned 1996 Nuffic study also uncovers the implications Tempus student mobility has had for the debate on credit transfer in the region. It paints a sombre image of the reality of credit recognition in the middle of the 1990s. “Average recognition is only 50 per cent, meaning that half of the credits obtained abroad were recognised by the home institution. Only a third of students received full recognition; another third no recognition at all. In spite of this, nearly 75 per cent of respondents did not have or did not expect any prolongation of the total study duration. The students that do have to prolong their studies, however, need a lot of extra time, nearly half as much again as the time they spent abroad.” Again, much has happened since, not least because increased pressure from the Socrates programme and practical implications of the Bologna Process have pushed credit transfer ever higher on European academic education agendas.

Material support

In many faculties, the first fax machine was bought with Tempus funds. More departments, faculties and sometimes even whole universities were wired up to the Internet with Tempus support. These were small investments with a huge impact and although much of the hardware paid for through Tempus may already be found in the scrap yard today, its contribution was significant in that it helped bridge a gap during a period of devastating financial hardship while simultaneously working on developing capacity for self-sustenance in related areas.

The impact of Tempus on the technological infrastructure of the departments and faculties where projects were carried out was enormous. In stating that, we touch both the strength and the weakness of Tempus material support. Data from the Hungarian National Tempus Foundation give an indication of the size of support.
The National Tempus Foundation estimates that of the € 118M of Tempus support to Hungary, some € 24M (or 20 per cent) were invested in equipment. If we were to project that figure to the whole of Tempus support to the Candidate Countries (and material support was higher in some of the other countries) the total amount spent on material investments would be some € 140M. Since the vast majority of equipment purchases concerned computers (only teaching and administration-related material purchases were eligible), we may assume that at least 50,000 computers were installed in Central and Eastern European universities. Whether it is exactly that number is irrelevant, it’s the scale that counts and the figure is unlikely to be under the mark.

What really matters is whether this is to be regarded as substantial support. Opinions are divided on the simple question as to whether 50,000 is a lot or not. Some, also in the region, argue that with a half-life of little more than a year, 50,000 computers are a drop in the ocean of 2.3 million tertiary education students\(^8\) in the region. ‘By 2002 we will have to start all over again,’ argued one Bulgarian professor.

From the other camp, György Ispanki, who is responsible for Tempus at the Hungarian National Tempus Foundation, argued that this support came at a time when it did make a difference and many others agree. “We had barely enough to pay staff salaries at a time when Western Europe was rearranging its budgets to cope with the sudden demand for computers,” said Ispanki. In many faculties, the first fax machine was bought with Tempus funds. Departments, faculties and sometimes even whole universities were wired up to the Internet with Tempus support. These were small investments with a huge impact and although much of the hardware paid for through Tempus may already be found in the scrap yard today, its contribution was significant in that it helped bridge a gap during a period of devastating financial hardship whilst simultaneously working on developing a capacity for self-sustenance in related areas.

In development aid, stop-gap solutions are generally eyed with suspicion. The aim of the Tempus Programme, however, was not to supply universities with computers. Tempus aimed at upgrading education systems that were relatively similar to those found in European Union countries – with features that may have been somewhat outdated but not altogether incompatible or unfamiliar. Moreover, throughout the region there was massive potential and a strong and very widely supported desire to catch up. This potential and desire ensured that maximum efforts would be made to sustain project achievements; in this situation, stop-gap support was fully justified.

**Curriculum development**

In the vast majority of Tempus Joint European Projects, curriculum development was the core element of the activities collected under the phrase ‘curriculum development’. The aim was to build partnerships, the sustained effect of which went far beyond the improvement of one, one hundred or even one thousand curricula.

The group of activities collected under the phrase ‘curriculum development’ was the core element of the vast majority of Tempus Joint European Projects. In Tempus, the term covered anything from course development to the establishment of new degree programmes.

Although courses were reviewed and developed in all fields of study, it was in new and newly integrated subjects that Tempus left its deepest marks. Curricula built up from scratch in many countries included market economics, subject specific economics and management (such as engineering management or agricultural economics), European studies, applied modern European languages, environmental sciences, et cetera.

Curriculum development and the subjects covered differed greatly from country to country and are therefore discussed in more detail in the country chapters below.

Many attempts have been made to illustrate with statistics the scale at which curriculum development activity took place. The Hungarian Tempus Office found that 102 new courses and some 500 new teaching modules were developed in just 29 Institution Building projects between 1998 and 2001. Out of the 581 Joint European Projects carried out in Poland, 466 helped in upgrading the contents of existing programmes or establishing new curricula and specialisations.

Such statistics are not very helpful in that they obscure other outcomes of collaboration in the field of curriculum development. Perhaps, again pressed by a demand for quantifiable results, curriculum development has to a too large extent been seen as an end – carrying out reform at a limited level – rather than as a means to build partnerships, the sustained effect of which went far beyond the improvement of one, one hundred or even one thousand curricula.

**University management**

"The impact [of Tempus at university management level] was not always very effective or sustainable. On the other hand, a systematic focus on institutional management during the first years of Tempus could have led to increased problems because of clashes between existing old-fashioned structures and pressure for reform. The 'smooth', indirect way of changing management seems in the end to have been a more realistic way to induce changes."

As far as the impact of the Tempus programme on the management of universities in Central and Eastern Europe is concerned, the bottom-up nature of the programme is both criticised and praised. A study by the Conference of Rectors in Europe commissioned in 1996 remarked that the grassroots approach resulted in an indirect impact on university management.

The first conclusion of the study evokes the core dilemma of the programme philosophy in that it acknowledges that any alternative might not have worked either:

"The results of site visits and of desk research confirmed our original hypothesis: an impact has without any doubt been identified, but it is mostly of an indirect nature, a side effect of Tempus activities. Since it was not really planned in most cases, the impact was not always very effective or sustainable. On the other hand, a systematic focus on institutional management during the first years of Tempus could have led to increased problems because of clashes between existing old-fashioned structures and pressure for reform. The 'smooth', indirect way of changing management seems in the end to have been a more realistic way to induce changes."

As reform progressed and the environment was considered more receptive to directly intervening measures, projects specifically targeting university management were introduced in Tempus – first through Compact Measures and later, in Tempus II bis, though full-scale projects called University Management Joint European Projects. In that last phase of the programme, countries had only three types of project to choose between: University Management projects, Institution Building projects and Curriculum Development projects. As before, however, universities were free to choose between them. The results of those calls for proposals are an indication of the readiness to carry out reform at the level of university management. In Poland, for example, the largest group of project proposals submitted in 1998 was of the University Management type (51 per cent), while in Slovenia, where there continued to be strong resistance against university management reform, project proposals of this type made up only 15 per cent of all applications.

---


10 For an explanation of the Institution Building concept, see page 10.
Regional co-operation

In the Polish Tempus Impact Study, Zdzislaw Mach, Professor at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, writes: "Tempus failed in its role to promote co-operation in [central Europe]." Prof. Mach is not alone in this criticism; he is quoted because his formulation leaves little to the imagination. Interestingly, Prof. Mach is particularly critical of the way in which the programme failed to encourage continued collaboration with the countries of the former Soviet Union.

Indeed, despite specific attempts to encourage regional cooperation within the Programme, the design of Tempus II in particular basically discouraged it. If under Tempus I, regional projects were still a regular feature, under Tempus II national priorities shaped the selection rounds and competition for projects was often so stiff that project designers steered well clear of trying to match the priorities of neighbouring countries even in cases where regional cooperation was included as a priority in its own right.

This is not to say that there have been no good examples of regional projects after 1994. Particularly in the Baltic countries strong encouragement for regional projects yielded some good results. But in other regions, most notably the Czech and Slovak Republics, opportunities to multiply project results efficiently were missed. This notion is important for any future Tempus activity where the drawbacks of (in principle plausible) project funding from national budgets and extreme focus on compliance with national priorities need to be reconsidered. A frequently suggested option would have been to reserve a percentage of the total programme funds for regional projects, perhaps as an altogether separate branch of the programme.

Legal reform

Tempus never meant directly to assist national authorities in the design and formulation of new legislation. Except for Complementary/Compact Measures, which were used to address legislative issues in some countries, typical Tempus projects were not designed to cover such tasks. Nevertheless, an important underlying aim of the programme was to influence these processes by bringing about a desire for change at the bottom of the education pyramid. The extent to which the wind of grassroots change penetrated the policymaking arena varied greatly from country to country. Legal reform is therefore covered in more detail in the country chapters below.

Legal reform is perhaps the one field in which opinion on the impact of Tempus will remain divided. Clues drawn from interviewees in Central and Eastern Europe depend entirely on the formulation of the questions. Most argue that Tempus had little direct impact on legal developments but reconsider when asked whether it is possible to mobilise such a large part of the academic force without somehow influencing policy development.
Most countries in the region changed their educational legislation in the immediate aftermath of their respective revolutions. A wave of thorough revisions and refinements engulfed the region in the second half of the decade.

Tempus had no influence whatsoever on the drafting of the original legislation. It did, however, play a major role in implementing this legislation - carrying through the required changes and experimenting with different models applicable within the framework of this legislation. It was a rule, not an exception, for the national priorities to encourage the implementation of legally prescribed changes, particularly where these concerned the introduction of new study programmes, the application of quality assurance mechanisms, the transferability of study credits and not least the introduction of what is often referred to as the ‘Anglo-Saxon’ three-tier degree system.

Admittedly resorting to sheer numbers and taking Poland as an example - one of the countries for which it is most foolhardily argued that Tempus had no impact on the legislative process - one could justifiably question whether it is possible for a programme to support 581 consortia of universities piloting reform in medium-sized projects largely on the basis of government-defined priorities, get almost 40,000 university staff out of, and European Union colleagues into, the country to build experience and not have an impact on policy developed for academics and largely by academics.

From islands of innovation to a continent of change

Tempus has managed to bridge the gap between academics in eastern and western Europe in many ways and within a very short time period. Despite its scale, Tempus has remained both diversified and targeted, trying to find common denominators, but never losing sight of each partner country's changing needs. Through Tempus, an impressive amount of academics and other university staff were equipped with skills, competencies and knowledge not previously at their disposal. Finally, Tempus has left a large and lasting impact at most of the university departments and faculties that were involved in Joint European Projects.

The programme's impact was long considered limited to those units which were lucky enough to win themselves a Tempus project. Key skills transferred to staff in these units, almost without exception included skills required for international co-operation and fund-raising. In the words of Jaak Aaviksoo, former Education Minister of Estonia: “Tempus often made the strong even stronger.” Aaviksoo is a ‘supporter’, as were many others who have voiced similar criticism. In 1997, Darius Jakimavicius, former Director of the Lithuanian National Tempus Office, said: “Tempus stirred things up by creating conflicts, in many cases this set processes in motion reaching far beyond the scope of the original projects.”

It can be argued that the Tempus programme in some cases allowed individual departments to develop disproportionately in relation to their immediate neighbours. This was an inevitable consequence of the bottom-up approach opted for in the first two phases of the programme. With an eleven-country budget representing less than 15 per cent the size of Poland’s higher education expenditure alone even in a good year such as 1995, Tempus was never intended single-handedly to fund the reform of higher education in Central and Eastern Europe. The programme aimed to initiate a process by introducing far-reaching reform at selected nuclei. Tempus was meant to spur change and did so by supporting what often became islands of innovation.

Despite its grassroots aims, the coverage of the programme turned out, over time, to be vast. An example from Poland, taken from the chapters by former Polish National Tempus Office Director Ewa Kolanowska in the country’s 1998 Tempus Impact Study illustrates this. “Joint European Projects [under Tempus I and II] involved in total nearly 270 faculties representing 74 public higher education institutions [of over 470 faculties in 90

11 Both quotes from the 1997 Tempus Conference in Portoroz, Slovenia.

12 In 1995: the ten now Candidate Countries and Albania.
institutions], and 13 of over 120 mostly new non-public higher education institutions, not to mention units such as libraries and international relations offices."

The traces Tempus has left in Central and Eastern Europe densely cover the higher education sector in the region. In Central and Eastern Europe, there is hardly an academic whose work has not in one way or another been affected by the programme. They may not all have seen their departments materially refurbished with state-of-the-art equipment, but most of them have been exposed to the benefits of innovation and internationalisation.
Part II.
Tempus by country


“As a result of Tempus, a new style of thinking and academic organisation has been developed, as well as a new type of professional with new skills and an international outlook - yet working for Bulgaria.”
Dr. Igor Damyanov, Deputy Minister of Education and Science

Developments in Bulgarian higher education policy throughout the 1990s have to a large extent been a reflection of the political changes taking place within the country. Of all the Candidate Countries of Central and Eastern Europe, Bulgaria was perhaps the one that witnessed the most extreme political shifts throughout the decade.

Already in 1990, Bulgarian universities were granted a level of autonomy unparalleled by that of most of their European Union counterparts. With it, they acquired a powerful shield against what many in their ranks conceived as the frills of a rapid succession of changing administrations. When the drive towards political reform gained momentum, particularly in the second half of the decade, this often caused considerable friction. It should, however, not be misinterpreted as a situation with academia, as one block, continuously opposing a political drive towards reform. Quite the contrary: remarkable and innovative achievements have been made throughout the country in the ten years that passed. However, much of the initiative leading up to these changes originated at individual universities or local or regional clusters of institutions. Within these institutions and clusters, individuals who pulled the cart can often be pointed out. Because of its modus operandi, Tempus was a perfect tool for this kind of initiative and this is visible in the kind of impact the programme has had in the country.

Bulgaria adopted a new Higher Education Act in 1995. This legal tool had far-reaching consequences. It stipulated the introduction of a three-tier degree level (with a four-year undergraduate cycle), set new national standards for the development of syllabi and curricula, regulated specialisations and laid the foundation for a higher education quality assurance system.

The latter was perhaps even more needed in Bulgaria than in any of the other countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Institutional proliferation in Bulgaria was in a league of its own. The demand for student places in fields such as economics and law soared throughout the nineties. In 1989, Bulgaria had one Faculty of Law. By 1998, there were 14. Locally, teacher-student ratios were down to as little as 1:60. Professors – and lawyers hastily accredited as such - toured the country day and night to satisfy the appetite of the ever-increasing student population. Parts of academia had become a travelling circus and the level of education suffered badly. Established universities feared for their reputation as international focus threatened to be turned towards decaying education standards. The Bulgarian National Agency for Accreditation and Assessment started operating in 1997.

Several efforts to force mergers among the large number of universities in the second half of the 1990s failed. For many universities, public financing had simply become too small a part of the institutional budget to play more than a marginal role as an agent of change. In the past couple of years, however, universities in several centres,
such as Sofia and Plovdiv, but also Burgas and Varna, have stepped up regional collaboration, again very much at their own initiative and often with support from the Tempus programme.

**Tempus in Bulgaria**

The authors of the 1998 Bulgarian *Tempus Impact Study* wrote in their introductory paragraphs that 'the first phase of [the programme] was marked by the birth of initiative, independence and autonomy. [...] The people gradually denied the common habit of waiting for the 'green light' and of distrusting their own capacity in favour of other institutional decision makers' judgement.' The years following the launch of Tempus II in 1994 would show how well this lesson was learnt.

One of the most remarkable examples of decentralised reform initiatives was the way in which, in 1997, Plovdiv's Higher Institute of Agriculture took the lead in a Tempus project preparing Bulgarian universities for participation in Socrates. At a time when many European Union universities were still trying to get to grips with the European Credit Transfer System and its compatibility with their own grading traditions, the institute's vice-rector Prof. Rada Angelova said in an interview: "Well, we're all introducing the European Credit Transfer System in all of our courses and both centrally and at all faculties we are training Erasmus contact persons. Those modules for which we expect a lot of interest from European Union students are being translated into English." Agricultural reform being a national priority for Bulgaria throughout the 1990s, the institute participated in no less than 22 Joint European Projects and 5 Complementary Measures. It estimates the total value of Tempus investments to be € 2.8M.

The *Tempus Impact Study* referred to Tempus support as being ‘exceptionally influential’ in the implementation of the Higher Education Law of 1995, most notably where the move towards the new degree structure and the establishment of assessment and accreditation procedures were concerned. The law was far-reaching enough to meet with considerable resistance in autonomous Bulgarian academia. But much of the resistance stemmed from a lack of understanding and many of the Tempus projects launched since 1996 have aimed, indeed very successfully, at helping Bulgarian universities appreciate and implement the stipulations of the law. All but six of the 33 *Structural Joint European Projects* launched in 1996 and 1997 aimed at the restructuring of degrees and the modularisation of study programmes. Among the others were projects aimed at university management development and the introduction of self-assessment procedures.

Prof Kamen Velev, President of the Bulgarian Rectors’ Conference, thinks the development of human capital has been the most important outcome of the programme. "Among academics, much of the change in attitude and newly developed skills can be directly or indirectly attributed to the Tempus programme." His personal experience is illustrative in this respect: “The information I obtained through training and contacts in European Union countries helped me develop a clear vision of how teaching and training should be organised. Now, as President of the Rectors Conference, I am helping shape higher education policy in this country and I use this experience every day.” Tempus funded almost 10,000 European Union study visits for Bulgarian staff while more than 2,000 students attended courses at European Union partner universities.

The importance, particularly in the first years of Tempus, of the material support provided is widely acknowledged. Since 1985, universities had been badly under-funded and in a time of rapid technological advancement, an acquisition gap of just five years would have been disastrous. “It is hard to underestimate the value of the help we all received to bridge this gap,” says Prof. Velev and his colleague Prof. Boris Tomov of the University of Ruse agrees: “When Tempus started we had three computers in the whole university. Now we have more than 1,000 and half of these were bought through Tempus projects. But computers are only a part of the problem and the laboratory base in areas which depend on it, such as physics, is in a dire condition.”

A final remark needs to be made about the public status of Tempus in Bulgaria. While knowledge of the programme in some countries was limited to public administrators and staff and students at universities,
Bulgaria a far wider circle of people knew the programme. The writers of the above mentioned Impact Study attribute this to the large and active participation in the programme of non-academic partners in Tempus projects. Indeed, there have been more than 100 of these, including not only ministries but also unions, professional associations, broadcasting companies and a host of private enterprises. In Bulgaria their involvement dates back to as early as 1994. Links developed with society and economy in those years gave universities a head start when their role in ‘institution building’ was actively promoted through Tempus II bis.

They resulted in some very successful projects through which Bulgarian higher education institutions helped regional and local administrators, Non Governmental Organisations and enterprises in Bulgaria prepare for future accession into the European Union. Examples of these include the establishment of a Centre for Training on European Union Industrial and Ecological Standards in which four universities collaborated with the Ministry of Environment and Waters of Bulgaria and the country’s Committee for Standardisation and Metrology. Another consortium of universities, municipalities, chambers of commerce, private foundations and other Non Governmental Organisations worked on the establishment of a network for teaching and training staff of regional Non Governmental Organisations, generally developing their organisation and generating awareness of the implications of accession into the European Union.

**Key information on Tempus in Bulgaria**

**Selected statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget M€</th>
<th>Joint European Projects¹</th>
<th>Complementary Measures</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants Out</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>124²</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68.93</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ In addition to this, 18 Joint European Networks were supported.
² Includes students.

**Mobilities in Bulgarian Joint European Projects 1991–1997:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Mobility</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff from Bulgaria</td>
<td>5,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff to Bulgaria</td>
<td>3,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from Bulgaria</td>
<td>1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students to Bulgaria</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evolution of Bulgarian priorities

As elsewhere, in the first phase of the Tempus programme, Bulgarian priorities coincided with general Phare priorities. The subjects called for related to the demands of a market economy mostly and included management and business administration, economics, agriculture and agribusiness, engineering sciences and technology, medicine and health care, social sciences, public administration, European law and European languages.

In Bulgaria, these priorities remained largely unchanged in Tempus II. In the last two years of the second phase, the programme was opened to all academic subjects and structural priorities became the main selection criteria. These included in 1995:

- the improvement of curricula and study programmes with a view to the introduction of new degrees in higher education;
- the improvement of the link between theoretical and practical training and the introduction of interactive teaching methods;
- the development of short programmes for continuing education and;
- the development of inter-university networks.

The latter was included as a preparatory measure for planned regional mergers.

In 1996, the overriding priority became implementation of newly adopted legislation reforming the degree system to a structure of Bachelors and Masters. Experiments with the European Credit Transfer System were also encouraged and yielded some impressive, early, results in Plovdiv.

In 1997, projects improving the management of higher education were called for. The priority was linked to a call for the establishment of a university self-assessment quality control system. Other priorities added related to the process of European integration, preparing universities for participation in the new European programmes and the development of short-cycle postgraduate educational and qualification programmes for training of specialists in areas of strategic importance for joining the internal market of the European Union.

Under Tempus II bis, the phrasing, not the nature of the priorities changed. In the last year of Tempus, all but two of the projects accepted in Bulgaria were of the ‘Institution Building’ type.

Partners

Germany and the UK are the home countries to most of the European Union universities that co-operated with Bulgarian counterparts through Tempus, each participating in 60 per cent of all Bulgarian projects. For German universities, this was 15 per cent above their average Tempus participation.

Above average participation was also noted of neighbouring Greece and, perhaps more surprisingly, of Benelux partners. There was a Belgian partner in almost every fourth Joint European Project running in 1998.

French and Italian partners participated in 39 per cent and 26 per cent of Bulgarian projects respectively.

“...The strength of the Tempus programme was that its success depended on the initiative of individuals. These people lived for their projects, propelling results to levels that could otherwise never have been achieved with the same level of funding.”

Petr Holec, Head of the Technology Transfer Unit of the Technical University of Brno

Although, in 1990, the Czechs (as part of Czechoslovakia) were among the first in Central and Eastern Europe to adopt new educational legislation, they were also careful. The law was not as daring as some of its counterparts in the region would soon prove to be. As everywhere else, universities got their autonomy, but the gates to higher education were not thrown wide open and the educational structure was not dramatically revised. Although criticised initially, in the long run the limitations of the 1990 Higher Education Act proved to be a blessing. The Czech Republic was less exposed to the anarchic interpretation of the newly acquired democracy which characterised higher education in some of the other Candidate Countries in the nineties.

Of course there were similarities between higher education in the Czech Republic and in other Central and Eastern European countries. The student population grew well beyond the capacity of the higher education system. Public funds were insufficient. Research was primarily carried out at specialised research institutes, not at the universities. The faculties enjoyed a great deal of autonomy. A Bachelor’s degree was generally viewed as an unfinished Master’s. Higher professional education failed to gain acceptance as a serious higher education sector. But there was one major difference: the government remained firmly in charge because it was the universities’ main source of funding.

The old Czech legislation did not allow universities to enter the free market with courses and generate additional income from affluent part-timers. Any extra income was to be reserved for grants to students who, for one reason or another, could not afford the cost of study. By the very same token, entrepreneurial individuals or organisations could not start their own universities and grant nationally recognised degrees. Thus, the private education supply remained limited to a small number of not very popular overseas faculties of American universities which could hardly evoke any competitive response from the state universities.

Competition between the different state universities was also limited because growth of the student body at any given university was legally limited to three per cent per annum. That is, numbers were allowed to increase but no extra funding would be provided. This fixed the existing proportions and created, as a spin-off effect, a rather healthy climate for inter-university co-operation in the Czech Republic.

Their safe position in the driver’s seat allowed the authorities to work in relative peace and quiet on new legislation between 1995 and 1997. The resulting law, which came into force in January 1998, saw partial agreement by all and total acceptance by none. There were four major changes; diversification was the key word. The field was finally opened to private universities – the hitch being that state recognition would be required before Czech degrees could be issued. The status of non-university higher education was raised. University property was transferred from the state to the institutions. And finally, faculties lost their status as independent legal entities.

Since 1998, 50 requests for the establishment of private institutions have been filed. Of those, 16 have been accepted.

In 2001, in the spirit of the Bologna Declaration, an amendment to the 1998 act was passed which regulates the division of long-cycle higher education into undergraduate and postgraduate levels.
Tempus in the Czech Republic

Until 1993, Tempus support for the Czech Republic formed part of the assistance offered to the then Czechoslovakia. This section focuses on the period following the creation of two separate entities.

Outside the circle of direct beneficiaries, the significance of European Union support to the national reform of education in the Czech Republic is downplayed somewhat. This is not limited to Tempus but also applies to other education reform programmes, perhaps with the exception of the Phare multi-country distance education programme. There may be something to it because a possible lack of direct impact on national policymaking could be explained in part by the far-reaching independence of faculties until 1998. This may have hampered the sharing and dissemination of Tempus results beyond the walls of the involved faculties.

The paradox, however, is that of all of the Candidate Countries, the Czech republic was the country with the highest participation of the national authorities in Joint European Projects. In 1997, seven per cent of all Czech Joint European Projects had a ministry among their participants compared to one per cent in both Poland and Hungary. By 1998, the first year of Tempus Institution Building projects, this figure had risen to 15 per cent in the Czech Republic against still less than five per cent in Poland and 8.5 per cent Hungary.

Also the relatively large number of Tempus consortia updating curricula in subject areas such as finance, law and public administration guaranteed a considerable impact through a very specific group of Czech labour market entrants which is being felt now and will be felt for many years to come. In Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland and Romania, the percentage of projects in the applied sciences towered above the others without fail. The Czech authorities had other priorities. In 1997, only one in five projects were in any of the applied sciences while even among these, many had an accession related angle. They introduced European standards in, for example, construction, biotechnology and environmental issues.

Environmental sciences cropped up increasingly in newly accepted Tempus projects each year and were a timely focus in a region dominated by heavy industries. It all started with the establishment of a curriculum for environmental studies at Charles University in the first year of Tempus involvement in Czechoslovakia. By 1995, 17 projects had been launched in this field, establishing continuing training centres, developing brand new curricula and introducing courses on European Union standards and legislation into existing programmes throughout the country. The Ministry of Environment was involved in a 1996 project, co-ordinated by the Technical University in Ostrava, through which a curriculum in environmental law was developed. The last environmental project to be accepted (in 1998) also involved Ostrava and the public authorities, this time training local and regional authorities in Northern and Southern Moravia in issues related to pollution prevention.

Despite the country's initially inhospitable climate for private investments in higher education, the Czechs came to take a lead role in developing the framework for university-industry relationships, not only within the country but also in the whole region. Two Complementary Measures at Brno Technical University went beyond the structural and managerial demands of university-industry collaboration. CzechTech I and II, in 1996 and 1997 respectively, pioneered training in the specific skills required for successfully developing commercial services in higher education. The projects resulted in the establishment of a Technology Transfer Unit at the university whose director, Dr Petr Holec, subsequently came to co-ordinate a network of similar units established through the Phare Cross-Border Co-operation Programme. He is now involved in a Fifth Framework project establishing a regional network of similar training centres involving six other Candidate Countries.

Tempus projects supporting the establishment of an European Union Technical Assistance and Training Centre and the development of cutting edge training programmes in European aviation regulations for civil aviation

---

13 For example, mention of the programme in the excellent and detailed 2001 overview publication Higher Education in the Czech Republic is limited to two short, descriptive paragraphs.

14 Dissemination of project results among Czech universities was never below average. As said above, national co-operation among faculties was good. Out of the 45 JEPs in 1997, there were only seven with just one Czech partner involved.
authorities also indicate Brno Technical University's successful move towards closer interaction with its social and economic environment.

The scene, however, where Czech Tempus partners changed the landscape most thoroughly is that of European studies. From 1990 to 2001, everywhere in the country project consortia worked hard at building capacity for satisfying the training needs that arose from the prospect of accession into the European Union. Charles' University's brand new Faculty of Social Sciences has, with the help of several Tempus projects, become one of the focal points for information on European Union policy and legislation in the country. In later years, some of the most successful courses providing European Union-related training for local and regional public administrators were developed through Tempus projects in Hradec Králové and Pardubice, to name but two. In 1998, every third Tempus Joint European Project carried out in the country aimed at increasing the country's training and retraining capacity in European Union related fields.

Last but not least, Tempus has played an instrumental role in the process of integrating Czech universities into the European Union academic community. Preparations for participation in Socrates were started long before 1999 and many projects had components introducing the European Credit Transfer System at departmental or faculty level. Tempus helped the Prague School of Economics create the necessary conditions for inclusion in the prestigious Community of European Management Schools (CEMS) and supported the participation of Czech universities in important European university networks such as the Coimbra group (Charles University, Prague) and the Utrecht network (Masaryk University, Brno).

**Key information on Tempus in the Czech Republic**

**Selected statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget M€</th>
<th>Joint European Projects</th>
<th>Complementary measures</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants Out</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>81^1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36.94</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^1 In addition to this, 25 Joint European Networks (JENs) were supported.

^2 Figure represents all Czech projects transferred after the Czech-Slovak split.

**Mobilities in Czech Joint European Projects 1993–1997:**

| Staff from the Czech Republic | 3,523 |
| Staff to the Czech Republic  | 2,326 |
| Students from the Czech Republic | 2,034 |
| Students to the Czech Republic | 674  |
| **Total**                     | **8,557** |
Evolution of Czech priorities

In 1994, at the start of Tempus II, Czech subject priorities included economics, law, medical sciences and environmental studies. All fields were further specified to cover just areas that were considered crucial for reform, such as free market economics, mercantile and commercial law and waste processing. From among these, proposals with interdisciplinary aspects, proposals prepared in co-operation with industrial partners and proposals for projects with Czech co-ordinators and contractors were given preferential treatment. The bulk of projects accepted in 1994 were in economics and the environmental sciences.

The focus on subject areas was abandoned in 1995 when relevance to European Union matters became the overriding priority which it remained until the end of the programme. In 1995, the Czech called for proposals aiming at the development of a 'European dimension in higher education', more specifically in the fields of law, applied social sciences and industrial quality control. Also the design of projects aimed at increasing the compatibility of Czech and European Union higher education through curricular reform, the introduction of credit transfer systems and the design and implementation of evaluation and accreditation mechanisms was encouraged.

The priority calling for projects aimed at the development and implementation of internal and external quality assessment systems clearly fitted in with the desire of the Czechs to have quality assurance measures in place before the field was opened to private actors. It remained on the list also in 1996 and 1997. A large project co-ordinated by the University of West Bohemia in Plzen involved universities in Prague, Ostrava and Olomouc as well as the Centre for Higher Education Studies and provided recommendations to the national education authorities on external assessment standards and procedures.

As in Hungary, key priorities in the Czech Republic included accession-related issues well before institution building became the overriding priority under Tempus II bis in 1998. The development of new courses and programmes in European studies (1997 and onwards), European Union legislation (1996) and public administration (1996 and onwards) were a priority already throughout Tempus II.

In 1996, other general Phare priorities added included banking and international finance and insurance systems, social work and teacher training.

Having been a legally regulated area until the adoption of the higher education act in 1998, university management appeared on the list of priorities only in 1997.

Finally, as elsewhere, Tempus II bis focussed on the consolidation of Tempus results and the preparation for Socrates, as well as on strengthening the role of higher education in 'institution building'.

Partners

Among European Union partner universities, the Czech Republic was a popular country to work with. Between 1994 and 1996, only Finland's participation in Czech projects was lower than its Tempus Phare average. In those years, UK universities participated in 38 per cent of all Tempus Phare projects. In the Czech Republic they participated in 73 per cent of all projects. German universities participated in every second Czech project and Dutch partners in 41 per cent of them (against an average of 'just' 19 per cent in all Tempus Phare projects).

In 1997/98, UK involvement in Czech Joint European Projects had risen to 84 per cent, while German and Dutch involvement had dropped to 40 per cent and 32 per cent respectively. By then, French involvement had dropped to well below its average Tempus Phare involvement, which was approximately 40 per cent. In 1990/91, French universities featured in 55 per cent of all Czechoslovak Joint European Projects. In 1998/99, only one of 11 accepted projects had French participation.

The successful integration of Czech universities in the European Union academic community is also reflected in the country's successful participation in the Socrates programme through which, in 2001/02, an impressive 3,300 Czech students are studying at European Union universities.

“For our universities, Tempus was a window on the world. It was one of the most successful reform programmes we have had in Estonia.”

Madis Lepajoe, Director General, Ministry of Education

The current situation in Estonian higher education is quite different from that in other Candidate Countries and, to a certain extent, also from that in the other Baltic countries. Challenging the stereotype image of a stern and prudent Nordic people, the Estonians made short work of their share of the Soviet legacy. The country’s approach to transforming society and economy after gaining independence was more radical than elsewhere. Liberalisation was the key word and the country did well out of it.

Higher education bears the marks of this policy in many ways. Today, private universities abound, international marketing of programmes is approached in a remarkably professional way15 and the government experiments with funding the training of students abroad in areas where the small country has insufficient capacity of its own.

The prospect of accession to the European Union has been of major importance in Estonian reform strategies with education policy no exception. The desire to align higher education with 'European Union practice' boosted the introduction of not only a three-tier degree structure, with Bachelors, Masters and PhD degrees, but also of elaborate accreditation and recognition guidelines.

However, Estonia together with its neighbours and other countries in Central and Eastern Europe shares the struggle for recognition of non-academic higher education. Although the three-tier degree system was adopted already in 1995, a projected seamless integration of the ‘Diploma’ courses into it had not yet materialised in 2001.

In sharp contrast with most of the other Candidate Countries, Estonia did not grant its universities unfettered autonomy immediately after independence. It would be tempting to ascribe this fact a role in positive developments later on, but the country’s academics and politicians would disagree. Jaak Aaviksoo, former education minister and today rector of the University of Tartu, said in 1999: “We didn’t need a government to grant us autonomy; we had already taken it.” That nicely sums up the rules in a country, which seems to run on common sense (or ‘moral sense’ as many Estonians would rather call it) more than on legislative regulations. The Law on Higher Education, which was adopted in January 1995, merely gave a political blessing to what had been accepted practice since 1991.

This example serves to illustrate the light in which higher education reform in Estonia should be seen. The influence of administrative regulations on education development is modest and the small size and tempered culture of the country allow broad consensus to be the main, and steady, thrust towards improvements in the higher education system and towards European integration. The example also illustrates that Estonian culture offered a perfect environment for Tempus’ grassroots approach to have the desired effect.

Tempus in Estonia

Tempus is evaluated extremely positively in the country and the programme has indeed had a very positive impact on key areas in higher education. Apart from the surge in international collaboration, the areas most commonly referred to by Estonian academics and administrators are university management, curriculum development, national and regional collaboration and material acquisitions. Two of these issues are particularly significant because other countries have reported mixed results in these: university management and national collaboration.

15 Today, some 5 per cent of the students at the (public) University of Tartu are full-fee paying foreigners, most of them from Finland.
Prof. Toivo Maimets had entered the Tempus era as a dean at the University of Tartu. He was involved in a Tempus project with his department when he was appointed to the rectorate in 1995: “I discovered that, while lecturers and researchers had developed very quickly in the preceding years, the mid-level management had not. In fact, we had little opportunity to make a useful contribution because we lacked information about what was happening within the university. For example, we simply did not know how much money we had. Increased diversification of funding sources made the accounting system less transparent for every year that went.” A Tempus project helped dramatically to change that situation. Information Technology was introduced for management functions with accounting systems and current research databases a priority. Because the situation was hardly better at other universities, the project had two other Estonian partner universities.

This leads us to the second issue which is generally seen as a particularly positive result of Tempus involvement in both Latvia and Estonia: the surge in co-operation among universities within the country. Traditionally, competition for government funding (annually divided on the basis of ‘ordered’ students) kept co-operation among Estonian universities at a low level. By the middle of the decade the significance of this budget line had decreased a lot, creating a far more favourable atmosphere for intensified collaboration. A lateral priority for projects including multiple Estonian partners was added in 1995. By that time, the focus of Tempus had shifted from grassroots support towards more integrated measures and a series of projects involving the full spectrum of Estonian academia took off, some involving faculty within a particular field, others involving parts of the administration of universities throughout the country.

The visual and performing arts were also major beneficiaries of Tempus assistance to Estonia. The Estonian Academy of Music, not least through Ms Marje Lohuaru who is now one of its vice-rectors, has been one of the most active Tempus actors in Estonia. In 1994, the Academy started out with a limited curriculum reform project. The experience garnered from this exercise led to later projects developing library management at the arts and music academies in Tallinn, revising management practise and institutional development plans at both institutions, and developing public relations and fundraising capacity. In this context, it is interesting to note that the visual and performing arts were out of Tempus’ bounds in most other countries. In fact, in many countries (e.g. Slovakia, Poland) art and music academies were among those most eagerly awaiting participation in Socrates because limited Tempus priorities had limited their options for intensifying collaboration with colleagues in European Union sister institutions. This was not the case in Estonia.

As far as the development of human capital is concerned, the Estonian picture conforms to that of other countries. Many, including rectors and leading administrators, confirm that experience acquired through Tempus-related activity has strengthened their positions and continues to influence their decision-making. In Estonia, this is of particular significance because of the personal level at which policy development often takes place. At the top-end of the education authorities, three of the Estonian education ministers of the past six years have had personal involvement in Tempus. Prof. Jaak Aaviksoo, who at the 1997 Tempus conference in Slovenia coined the later oft-quoted reference to Tempus being ‘manna from the heavens’ is now rector of the University of Tartu. Prof. Mait Klaassen was involved in Tempus projects at the Estonian Agricultural University before becoming its rector. He is now a County Governor in Southern Estonia. Peeter Kreitzberg, MP and presidential candidate in the 2001 elections, has also been actively involved in Tempus projects and was a recipient of an Individual Mobility Grant in 1994.

For all Estonian higher education institutions, Tempus was, as higher education DG Madis Lepajoe describes it “a window on the world”. “It was one of the most successful reform programmes we have had in Estonia,” he says. Tempus offered a long-awaited opportunity to revive historical ties in the region and helped develop the human capital needed to support Estonia’s decisive drive towards European integration.
Key information on Tempus in Estonia

Selected statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget M€</th>
<th>Joint European Projects</th>
<th>Complementary Measures</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants Out</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mobilities in Estonian Joint European Projects 1992–1997:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff from Estonia</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff to Estonia</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from Estonia</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students to Estonia</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evolution of Estonian priorities

Key priorities in Estonia included first of all the development of interdisciplinary studies and new disciplines. Impressive results have been recorded in these areas. One example of a very positively evaluated initiative is a project introducing a new structure for teaching of SEN\textsuperscript{16} teachers at all Estonian teacher training establishments. Also in the fields of environmental and European studies, excellent results have been achieved.

As discussed above, another thread in the Estonian priorities has been the introduction of Information Technology in higher education, both in teaching and at the management level.

In 1997, the increased focus on quality insurance brought by the 1995 law resulted in QA being assigned a position of high priority which it kept until the closure of the programme. In the same year, a set of common Baltic priorities was formulated together with Latvia and Lithuania. Baltic co-operation was actively promoted, resulting, among others, in projects aimed at the internationalisation of agricultural studies in the three countries and at the joint development of biomedical engineering programmes.

As elsewhere, from 1998, preparations for accession and participation in the European Union education programmes dominated the priorities.

\textsuperscript{16} Special Education Needs.
Partners

The fact that Finland was the prime partner for co-operation with Estonia need not come as a surprise but the extent to which it was involved in Tempus activity in one country is unparalleled in the programme. In both 1995 and 1996, for example, there was Finnish involvement in all newly accepted Estonian Joint European Projects.

Through Tempus, Estonian higher education cemented its position in the Nordic academic community, eventually resulting in a seat at the discussions exploring the potential of a Nordic-Baltic space for higher education and training. Between 1992/93 and 1996/97, Sweden (which entered the European Union in 1995) participated in eight per cent of all Tempus Phare projects while its universities were involved in 39 per cent of Estonian projects. For Denmark these figures were 10 per cent and 30 per cent respectively.

Italy (21 per cent/three per cent), Belgium (20 per cent/six per cent) and to a certain extent France (29 per cent/21 per cent) were underrepresented in this period.

Hungary, 1990 – 2001

It would be difficult to overestimate the significance of the modernisation of higher education brought about by the TEMPUS programme.”

Csaba Forgács, former Vice-rector of Budapest University of Economics 17

Throughout the nineties, Hungary was considered the front-runner as far as preparations for European Union accession were concerned. Asked why, most Hungarians will reply that Hungary is a small and dynamic country or something along that line. But Hungary is not all that small; of all of the Candidate Countries only Poland and Romania are significantly bigger. Nor is it all that dynamic beyond its the private sector; even Hungarians will agree that, although generally effective, their administrative apparatus is quite a heavy machinery.

So what put Hungary ahead of the crowd? Hungary had a flying start in 1989. In fact, it didn’t even take a revolution to bring about the turnaround. From the fated year 1956 onward, shocked by the vulnerability of a concentration of power at the centre, successive Hungarian governments had systematically divided administrative tasks throughout the country and carried through a silent reform. In the 1980s, these reforms gained momentum and culminated in 1989 into very little indeed. Hungary simply proceeded on the road it had been following anyway and, attracting almost half of the foreign investment in the region, received a giant financial boost to finish the job.

While other countries in the region saw their number of universities explode in the early 1990s, in Hungary there was little left to be sliced up. That had already been done in the preceding decades. In 1995, Hungary had almost 100 higher education institutions and only one true ‘Universitas’ left: the prestigious Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest. Among the other institutions, only a handful offered a fairly broad programme. The process of decentralisation scattered the academic community. Even the administration of the small and specialised institutions was divided, by subject, among the different ministries until well into the 1990s.

Although administrative and geographical decentralisation proved to have a somewhat negative impact on the ability of the central government to push through reform plans, it had the positive effect of placing the higher education institutions firmly in their regional surroundings, with ivory tower status exclusively reserved for Eötvös Loránd University. Also, it fostered a culture of networking among similar institutions throughout the country. This sets Hungary apart from its neighbours in Central and Eastern Europe and has reflected very positively indeed on the interaction between Hungarian universities and their political, social and economic environments.

17 Quoted from: The Tempus Programme’s Role in the Modernisation of Hungarian Higher Education, NTF, Budapest 2001
A sustained government drive for mergers, partly a consequence of the small print on a US$150M World Bank loan contract, eventually resulted in the number of higher education institutions being halved. The number of state universities was brought down from 55 to 12. High profile mergers recently took place in, among others, Budapest, Szeged and Pécs.

The main thrust of post-communist higher education reform started in the 1980s. Significantly, for example, curricular reform at the then Budapest University of Economics took off in 1988, one year before the fall of the iron curtain. Many other educational reforms of the early 1990s have their roots in the period just before, rather than just after, 1989. Preparations for a new, comprehensive higher education law were started in 1990 and resulted in the 1993 Act on Higher Education.

Legislation passed in 2001 helped fill the last remaining gap between vocational and higher education by introducing a new type of two-year professional higher education programmes. It underlines the current administration’s strong commitment to align higher education output with the actual needs of the labour market.

The nature and status of Hungary’s professional higher education sector made the move to Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees an uncomplicated affair. College certificates were simply equated with Bachelor’s degrees and university certificates were equated with Master’s degrees. This cosmetic change, however, conceals the lack of structural change in the five-year university programmes. Where other countries zealously worked at breaking down their Humboldtian long-cycle studies into two-tier programmes, the Hungarians did not make much of a fuss about it and adopted the German stance: why change a good system? Nevertheless, the existing programmes have been thoroughly modularised, college graduates can smoothly be streamed into the long-cycle programmes and credit transfer is regulated by governmental decree. So a future change, which may be anticipated in the framework of the Bologna process, should present no major problems.

**Tempus in Hungary**

In all respects, Tempus support to Hungary was on a different scale than it was to any of the other countries in Central and Eastern Europe. First, the Tempus decade had 11 years, as it did in Poland and the Czech and Slovak republics. Second, Tempus investments, with their specific focus on educational reform, were complemented in Hungary with sizeable structural investments in other parts of the higher education system, most notably a $150M World Bank loan, and also by a series of additional Phare and bilateral programmes tied in closely with Tempus activities. This allowed Tempus support to be more focussed than it could ever be in many of the other countries. Finally, and most significantly, in relative terms Hungary received twice the amount of financial support other Candidate Countries received through Tempus. Where, for example, in 1995 all other countries hovered around the €50 in Tempus support per full-time student per year, Hungary received more than €100.

Already in 1992, more than 180 Tempus Joint European Projects were running throughout the country, while the €108M spent through Tempus for the benefit of Hungarian higher education bought the country almost 20 per cent of all Tempus Joint European Projects carried out in the Candidate Countries. Only Poland took a larger share with just over 30 per cent. Poland, however, had five times as many students. In the early years, Tempus support amounted to almost five per cent of the Hungarian budget for higher education. Among a total teaching staff population of 21,000, an estimated 11,000 Candidate Country-European Union staff mobilities were funded through the Tempus programme. Some 8,000 student mobilities to and from Hungary took place.

According to György Ispánki of the National Tempus Foundation, there is a general notion that Tempus support came at precisely the right time. It should be remembered that in most countries in the regions, a severe financial crisis had already been raging since the early eighties; budgetary belt-tightening was not a new feature of the early nineties or even a consequence of the 1989 revolutions. The latter merely exposed the severity of these crises. Where, however, in other countries, disgruntled academic staff had until 1989 had scant opportunity to escape the misery, the significantly larger freedom of Hungarian professionals made it easier for them to seek
refuge elsewhere. "For professors who otherwise might have left the academic sector, Tempus was a strong motivation to stay at their universities and help with reforms," says György Ispánki.

Everywhere in Central and Eastern Europe, it is also widely acknowledged that Tempus came at the right time in terms of the material support provided through projects, and Hungary is no exception in this respect. In the review from which the introducing quote is taken, Prof. Csaba Forgács writes how Tempus' multi-million Euro equipment injection "contributed to the mitigation of our pressing backwardness." Winking at the flaws of collective memory, he comments that "its effect would be immediately brought home to us if we had to re-establish the communication level we had 10 years ago, even if only for a week."

The University of Miskolc is probably the best example of how co-ordinated reform initiatives transformed whole institutions. In 1990, Miskolc was Hungary's university of mining and metallurgy and little more than that. A continuous flow of projects between 1990 and 2001 transformed teaching and management at the university and cemented its position on the academic map of Hungary. The results exceeded all expectations. Vice-rector Prof. Aladár Nagy: "Tempus transformed the culture, the status and the dimensions of our university. Projects until 1998 had transformed teaching, study programmes and the related material inventory of our university and readied us for what would prove to be the most dramatic changes. These were made in the last two years of Tempus when our university management was profoundly reformed." Indeed, all aspects of university management were thoroughly overhauled in the project and the case is a flagship example of co-ordinated support activities. Tempus facilitated educational and managerial reform, while infrastructure changes were paid for with funds from the World Bank loan.

Assessing whether it was the people, the funds or the flying start that did the trick is well beyond the scope of this document, but it should be pointed out here that Hungary was the showcase of the Tempus programme. As planned, projects started out as department and faculty-level initiatives, but the message that the central university management and industrial partners needed to be involved was understood at many Hungarian universities well before it had to be hammered home in other countries under Tempus II. And Tempus history repeated itself when the programme's focus became geared towards accession. Yet having said that, and referring to the excellent documentation on Hungarian success stories, we may safely choose to describe the two fields where Tempus impact was disappointing.

Although a very early Tempus project supported the development of a National Higher Education Development Plan, Tempus had little direct impact on the development of education legislation in Hungary. Although Tempus Joint European Project consortia were never meant to draft legislative reform plans, impact in this field was an underlying objective of the programme which was also achieved in a number of other countries. Hungary, however, seems to have relied less on academia for its supply of politicians and policymakers than any of the other countries in the region, perhaps with the exception of the Czech and Slovak republics. This reduced the indirect impact of the programme through people whose qualifications and skills had been improved in the context of Tempus programmes.

The other field in which it is widely acknowledged that Tempus impact was less than hoped for is the development of a quality assurance system for higher education institutions. To supervise education and scientific activity in higher education and to support quality assurance, the 1993 Higher Education Act established a Hungarian Accreditation Committee already in 1993. The main reason that nevertheless much remained to be done is this field at the closure of the programme seems to be the overriding focus of 1996 legislative amendments on the merging process. Developing a quality assurance system became reasonable only after the implementation of this whole merging process, the deadline of which was January 2000. Also active engagement in the Bologna process guarantees that this problem will be addressed in the near future.

As discussed above, Tempus projects often were or became closely linked to other Phare projects. The Phare Multi-country Programme for Distance Learning had fruitful co-operation with several distance learning...
networks created through Tempus projects. Another key example is that of seven higher education establishments whose curricula in European Studies had been strengthened with Tempus support and which later played a crucial role in the network of European studies centres in the framework of a € 3M Phare project.

Tempus 'Institution building' through the provision of acquis-related training for a non-academic target audience was a concept introduced in Hungary well before the Commission made it the cornerstone of Tempus II bis. Thus, in 1998, at the start of the last phase it was the Hungarians who published the clearest guide yet to what Tempus 'Institution Building' was really all about. The two calls for applications resulted in a choice of 56 projects, which was far higher than anywhere else and exceeded the funding potential by so much that positive impact was almost guaranteed beforehand. Through the 29 selected projects an estimated 3,300 staff at local, regional and national authorities, as well as social partner organisations and Non Governmental Organisations, were trained in the European Union do's and don'ts of agriculture, environment, finance, justice, and other areas. A quick recent sound-out from the National Tempus Office showed that almost all of the involved universities had integrated the developed course modules in their regular curricula and would continue offering them to an external audience.

**Key information on Tempus in Hungary**

**Selected statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget M€</th>
<th>Joint European Projects</th>
<th>Complementary Measures</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants Out</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>203²</td>
<td>148²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>216²</td>
<td>68²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117.9</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ In addition to this, 34 Joint European Networks (JENs) were supported.
² Includes students.

**Mobilities in Hungarian Joint European Projects 1990-1997:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff from Hungary</td>
<td>8,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff to Hungary</td>
<td>6,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from Hungary</td>
<td>7,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students to Hungary</td>
<td>1,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24,114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The key results of the 29 Hungarian Institution Building Joint European Projects include:

- number of developed courses: 102
- number of teaching modules/subjects: 503
- total duration of training courses in hours: 10,563
- number of trained participants by the end of the project: 3,300
- number of European Union partners in the Hungarian IB projects: 145

**Evolution of key priorities**

In the first four years of Tempus, Tempus priorities followed those of the Phare programme which for Hungary included: management and business studies, applied economics, applied natural sciences, engineering, engineering training, modern European languages, agriculture and agronomics, environmental protection and social sciences linked to economic and social changes (e.g. European studies).

During Tempus II, priorities were reviewed annually but the underlying call remained for activities supporting the implementation of the 1993 Act and the Policy on Higher Education, which was adopted in 1995. Already in 1994 European Union accession and support with the implementation of the Europe Agreement appeared on the Tempus agenda and they would not leave it until the end of the programme. Other 1994 priorities included strengthening university-industry relationships, improving university management and supporting the introduction of credit transfer systems. Also from early on, the introduction of postgraduate training was actively supported.

In 1995 continuing education appeared on the list of priorities. A call for new institutions to be developed was, among others, replied to by the Lajos Kossuth University in Debrecen where a new Faculty of Economics was established.

The establishment of new trans-European student mobility networks, particularly with a view towards introducing the European Credit Transfer System, was called for throughout Tempus II.

In Tempus II bis, the reform of higher education and the promotion of European Union integration, the tightening of relationships between higher education and economic life, as well as a better awareness of economic needs in training were spelled out as direct requirements, rather than priorities. Programmes aiming at the development and improvement of university management continued to be supported.

**Partners**

With such a large proportion of the total number of Tempus projects, it is no surprise that involvement from most European Union countries was close to their Tempus Phare average. Right through the decade, however, universities from the Netherlands were very active in Hungary. A number of these had already made contacts in the very early 1990s through an actively promoted Dutch bilateral programme. German involvement was also slightly above average.

---

19 As the Final Reports of the projects were not yet available at the time of writing, the listed data is based on a questionnaire of April 2001 evaluated by the Hungarian Tempus Office.
Latvia, 1992 – 2001

“Let’s remember the time when we didn’t have a single fax machine at our universities. And when we got the fax machine, we didn’t have the paper. And if we got the paper, our colleagues would queue at this, the only fax machine at our university. Such was the situation when Tempus started operating in Latvia.”

Baiba Rivza, Chair of the Council of Higher Education of Latvia

One of the first laws to be adopted in Latvia after independence was regained in 1991, was a Law on Education. Praised and criticised, the law granted autonomy to higher education institutions, established a new degree structure and opened the market for private universities. It also drove the wedge between professional and academic higher education that it took the country an eight-year struggle to successfully remove again. But the move had an important signal function: education was a priority for the Latvian authorities.20

At face value, the chronology of Latvian higher education developments in the nineties is exemplary. Development of a credit point system was initiated in 1992. Development of a quality assurance mechanism was started in 1994. 1995 saw the adoption of the Law on Higher Education Institutions. Accreditation regulations were adopted and a Council of Higher Education was established in 1996. In 1997, Latvia signed the Lisbon convention and in 1998 the country joined the Socrates and Leonardo programmes. Finally, in 1999 and 2000, activity culminated with the adoption of a new Frame Law on Education (which, among other things, regulates academic recognition), the introduction of a student loan system, the adoption of the Law on Professional Education, and an amendment to the Law on Higher Education adopting a system of professional and academic Bachelor's and Master's degrees.

Yet, the road towards reform in Latvia was only marginally less troublesome than elsewhere in Central and Eastern Europe. While there was never a shortage of innovative ideas, a matrix linking reform activity into a coherent framework took almost a decade to take shape. Critics within the country often blamed a lack of strategic thinking from the part of the successive administrations. Indeed much of the credit for the innovative thrust can be extended to various councils, units and centres on the fringe of education politics, which had, unlike in many other countries in the region, the blessing of being of a fairly stable composition with strong individuals at the helm. They travelled across Europe, adding new elements to the drawing board from which the reformed Latvian higher education system was to emerge.

All the while the country was pressed to address what many in the international community perceived as a potential time-bomb: the cultural divide that split the country in virtually perfect halves. At 48 per cent, the Russian population in Latvia can hardly be considered a minority. In Latvia's eight most populous towns and cities this minority actually makes up a majority.

However, what matters today is the result: a modernised higher education system with all the building blocks in place to face a future in which human resources development and intensified European collaboration will play a key role.

Tempus in Latvia

Tempus was not and was never meant to be the driving force shaping the final stages of higher education reform in Latvia. The programme's presence was strongest in the exploratory years between 1992 and 1998. It is nevertheless hard to find anyone in higher education between Liepaja and Daugavpils who will dispute the notion that most of the seeds yielding the recent harvest were sown by the Tempus programme.

20 Not so for Latvian students, it would soon appear. The number of higher education students tumbled in 1993 to 39,000. By comparison, today it is in excess of 100,000. See also: Participation Rates under Lithuania.
Tempus helped Latvian academics and administrators move throughout the European Union in search of curricular, administrative and political building blocks and in search of partners who could help position these in a Latvian context. With Tempus support, personal relationships were forged into institutional partnerships, paving the way for closer academic collaboration and ultimately for participation in the European Union mobility and research programmes. In the material sense, Tempus helped Latvian higher education establishments bridge a period which was characterised by a perilous cocktail of rapid technological developments on the one hand – most notably in the field of information and communication technologies – and tough budgetary constraints on the other.

Development funding

Dr. Andrejs Rauhvargers, Secretary General of the Latvian Rectors’ Council and lead author of the 2001 Impact Study, argues that the general perception in Latvia is that Tempus is responsible for almost all of the positive developments that have taken place in higher education since independence: “All we had was sustenance money, any development funding came from Tempus,” he says.

“Tempus projects brought much needed equipment into Latvian higher education institutions. Libraries either received significant support through TEMPUS projects, or they could buy at least some of the books most relevant to the needs of the teaching staff. Computers and copiers were such rare commodities in Latvia’s higher education institutions that the first educational units to purchase them with the support of Tempus developed at a faster rate than the rest.”

Rectors throughout Latvia agree. Prof. Ivars Knets was the first Latvian Tempus project co-ordinator and is now the rector of Riga Technical University. “We cannot underestimate the value of the programme to us. There were three very important things to it. First, it allowed us to upgrade our teaching staff. Second, it was the only opportunity in the early nineties to buy some much needed equipment. Third, it pushed our staff and students to learn foreign languages and enter the international academic community.”

On that latter note, Vice-rector Prof. Peteris Busmanis of the Latvian University of Agriculture, comments: “Today we have a modern and strong higher education system. Our programmes are recognised by international colleagues and experts and this is, to a large extent, due to the Tempus programme.”

Tempus has had a profound impact on higher education legislation, quality assurance and recognition in Latvia. The programme provided administrators involved in the drafting of higher education legislation, the establishment of a functioning quality assurance system and the creation of a working academic recognition centre, with exposure to current practice across the European Union and with training at a host of European universities.

European studies

All fields of study have received support through the Tempus programme but in some areas the results have had a particularly positive direct impact on society. In Latvia, the most notable of these is European studies. Zaneta Ozolina of the EC Delegation in Latvia believes that the European studies programmes in Latvia have a lot for which to thank Tempus. With three Joint European Projects, the Department of Political Sciences of the University of Latvia received a formidable boost. Project participants have said that “there was nothing to be modernised in political sciences in Latvia as everything had to be created from scratch.” Asst. Prof. Ozolina: “Riga now has the biggest political sciences library in the Baltic countries and its use is not limited to academic staff and students; administrative officials and journalists also use the materials.” Dr. Rauhvargers also particularly stresses the impact of Tempus on European studies and the European integration process in general: “It is amazing to see the impact of the European studies programmes developed under Tempus. Already, their students can be found all over the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the European integration offices.”
Human capital

The impact of Tempus on the development of human capital was discussed in some detail in the introduction to this document. Reference was made to the difficulties surrounding the precise measurement of programme results in this area. In his Impact Study, however, Dr. Andrejs Rauhvargers proves that in fact all it takes is inside knowledge of the whereabouts of previous Tempus players. He used one chapter of his Impact Study to name those players in Latvian higher education who, in one way or another, owe to the Tempus programme part of the skills and knowledge they now devote to Latvian higher education on a daily basis. The list includes the head of the Latvian Higher Education Council, the head of the Latvian Rectors’ conference, the head of the State Education Inspection, the head of the Education Ministry’s Department of Higher Education, the chairman of the Board of the Latvian Higher Education Quality Evaluation Centre, the chancellors of the two largest universities, six rectors and many, many others.

Key information on Tempus in Latvia

Selected statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget M€</th>
<th>Joint European Projects</th>
<th>Complementary Measures</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants Out</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> In addition to this, 1 Joint European Network (JENs) was supported.
<sup>2</sup> Of which 2 extensions

Mobilities in Latvian Joint European Projects 1992–1997:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff from Latvia</td>
<td>1,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff to Latvia</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from Latvia</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students to Latvia</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evolution of Latvian priorities

Social sciences and European studies

From 1993 onwards, priority was given to projects relating to social and economic changes in Latvia. These were considered of crucial importance in the first years of independence. This first priority group was followed in later years by a priority given to interdisciplinary studies in European literature, arts, history, philosophy and languages. With the advancement of the European Union integration process, TEMPUS priorities in this group came to include the training of teaching staff in European studies, projects supporting European Union integration and projects supporting development in education for regulated professions.

Teacher training

It was well understood from the early nineties that the development of higher education in Latvia depended on the quality of the country's secondary education provision. Therefore, as early as 1992 priority was given to training, retraining and further education of teachers in general secondary schools. In 1993, this priority was formulated more broadly and came to include new educational technologies and adult education. It targeted teachers at all levels although vocational schools were not included until the following year. Finally, in 1995 priority was given to the creation of modern facilities for teacher training. By 1996, the teacher-training sector had received such substantial support that it was left out of the Tempus priorities. However, teacher training institutions still participated in several Tempus projects under other priority areas.

Specific subject areas

While support to social sciences and European studies continued throughout the years of Tempus assistance, each year priority was given to projects stimulating development of a particular higher education sector. This started with studies of materials and methods relevant to Latvian technology in 1993. In the following year priority was given to agriculture, environment and energy. The 1995 priority covered vocationally oriented programmes and facilities for continuing education. Support to study programmes in regulated professions began also in 1995 with a priority on public health, engineering and architecture, and continued in 1997 with a priority on projects concerned with the revision of curricula in the seven professions regulated by the European Union sectoral directives. The latter were also the focus of the 1998-2000 priorities.

Integration of higher education and research

This smaller yet very important priority area touches on a crucial issue in higher education and science in the whole region (see also page 3). In 1994, the priorities encouraged support for a feasibility study on the integration of research institutions into the universities. Following this, in 1996 priority was given to Joint European Projects aimed at strengthening the capacity of higher education institutions to integrate education and research. This led to several successful projects through which the integration of research institutes into the universities was eventually carried out.

Consolidation areas

The priorities of 1998-2000 reflected a desire to wrap up all Tempus achievements in a successful consolidation of national higher education reform. This brought in several new activities. First, it called for projects supporting university management and administration, fund raising, co-operation with industry, and international and public relations. Second, it called for projects preparing Latvia's higher education for joining the Socrates and Leonardo programmes - stressing implementation of the European Credit Transfer System, recognition and quality assurance issues and participation in Socrates' Thematic Networks. Third, the 1998-2000 priorities supported an active role for higher education in preparations for accession into the European Union, mainly through the development of short courses on European Union related topics.
Partners

Partner country statistics of Latvia are quite different from the Tempus average. French participation is relatively low. The UK and Germany are the home countries of most partner institutions. Participation from the Nordic countries has been very high with Finnish partners involved in no less than 44 per cent of all Latvian Joint European Projects. By comparison, Finland was only involved in 13 per cent of Joint European Projects in all Tempus countries. Finland is closely followed by Sweden (participating in 38 per cent of all Latvian projects) and Denmark (25 per cent). Perhaps more surprisingly, the Danish participation rate is equalled by that of Italy. Lithuania, Estonia and Norway were the main non-European Union partners in Latvian Joint European Projects.

The figures are quite different for mobility which took place via Tempus. Denmark topped the bill among both groups but students clearly preferred the UK over Germany while staff preferred it the other way around. Mobility towards Finland and Sweden was smaller than towards Belgium and the Netherlands. This is partly explained by the fact that Sweden and Finland joined the European Union three years after the start of the Tempus programme in Latvia while the bulk of mobility took place in the first years of the programme.

Lithuania, 1992 – 2001

“Suddenly, we found ourselves forced to think about the how-s and why-s of everything we were doing - perhaps only because that was the way we thought we had always done them. It instilled in us awareness of the fact that we are big organisations and we started to think and behave accordingly.”
Vaidotas Viliunas, Head of the International Office at Kaunas University of Technology

In Estonia and Latvia, Lithuania is described as ‘the Baltic Mediterranean’. This has nothing to do with favourable weather conditions in the South-eastern Baltic. What the Latvians and Estonians refer to is the rather more warm-blooded nature of the Lithuanians. Lithuania is a country with much activity and if the result of reform would equal the sum of all reform activities, the country would score well. In practice, not least due to a strong emphasis on economic indicators, in the late 1990s the country became generally viewed as lagging behind the other Baltic countries – also in higher education. Although Lithuania definitely was the odd-man-out of the three, this view is not entirely justified.

There has been no lack of development of ideas in Lithuania. In 1999, Jaak Aaviksoo, the Rector of Tartu University and former Education Minister in Estonia, said that his country was too small for White Papers. At roughly the same time, clicking the hyperlink “Download White Paper” on the website of the Latvian Academic Programme Agency returned an ‘Error 404 - Document Not Found’. All the while in Lithuania printing presses were running overtime to respond to the need for copies of White Papers, Green Papers, Briefing Papers and circulating draft legislation.

In brief, the man responsible for much of this output was Prof. Vladislavas Domarkas, former Education Minister, Vice-Minister of Home Affairs and Rector of the Kaunas University of Technology. In the late 1990s, he was the national co-ordinator Phare Multi-country Higher Education Reform Programme in Lithuania (HERIL). His team circulated a maelstrom of ideas which covered all of the mainstream reform ideas that surfaced elsewhere in the region, including the refinement of the model of Bachelors’ and Masters’ degrees (the idea of which was already introduced through earlier legislation), opening the field to private higher education, accreditation and credit transfer systems, and a reform of the (outdated and constantly changing) higher education financing system. For reasons beyond the scope of this document, however, Domarkas enjoyed little support in the academic community while the authorities changed too frequently to be a force of concerted action.

In the mean time, the universities (not least Domarkas’ former home in Kaunas, now under the guidance of Prof. Krisciunas) forged ahead with their own interpretations of reform. The envy of any technical university in the
world, Kaunas saw its number of students sky-rocket after it put the particularly criticised Soviet legacy of long lists of irrelevant subjects in the curriculum to good use by changing them to subjects in the social sciences rather than just narrowing down the programmes by completely abolishing these. One of the few universities in the region (and in the whole of Europe for that matter) to do so, they effectively introduced a system of majors and minors and in that way managed to fight off competition from the 'new' subjects at other universities. With that, Kaunas became a popular hunting ground for Scandinavian companies in search of young talent.

Criticism from Vilnius, one of the oldest academic centres in the region, focused on the methodology of reform and this is important to bear in mind in relation to Tempus support. Algimatas Lipinaitis, Head of the International relations Office at Vilnius University and co-author of the 1997 study *Impact of the Tempus Programme on the Reform of Higher Education in Lithuania*, said in 1999: "The reformers are beginning at the end: with legislative change. In doing so, they make the same mistake their predecessors made in 1991 when a large set of legislative measures, which lacked a bearing on the Lithuanian reality, were forced through parliament."

Throughout the 1990s, the situation in Lithuania had a lot in common with that of the Czech Republic. The first Education Law after independence was tabled almost before the demonstrators' cobble stones had been returned to the pavement. It kept the door shut for private entrepreneurs to enter the higher education arena and, to a large extent, for income generation at the universities. The Ministry kept a degree of influence but, it has to be said, the Lithuanians were better than the Czech at scrubbing around the power of the authorities. But then, the Czech were never called 'Mediterranean' by their northern neighbours. The Czech did, however, thoroughly revise their education legislation in 1999. At the time of writing, the Lithuanian reform plans have still not escaped the draft stage.

**Tempus in Lithuania**

For some universities in Lithuania, the arrival of Tempus signalled the end of years of isolation. Formerly one of the 'closed' cities of the Soviet Union, Kaunas, for example, worked particularly hard at building networks of contacts with colleagues in the European Union. But also other universities in the country point at the development of international relations as the main achievement of the Tempus programme. These contacts, however, were a means and not an end.

Vaidotas Viliunas, Head of the International Office at Kaunas University of Technology, believes that, above all, contact with the European Union universities through Tempus helped university staff develop management skills. "Our institutional management structures in particular received a major boost through the programme," he says. "Tempus projects had to be rooted in an institutional strategy. None of our universities had those defined so suddenly we found ourselves forced to think about the how-s and why-s of everything we were doing – perhaps only because that was the way we thought we had always done them. It instilled in us awareness of the fact that we are big organisations and we started to think and behave accordingly."

The above mentioned Tempus Impact Study confirms Viliunas' comments. It states that "another important contribution of Tempus was the methodology for the institutional reform." As a result "institutional development plans, initially considered a formal condition of participation, lately evolved to institutional strategies – internal motivating power of institutional reform."

As the country's main importer of reform ideas, Tempus played an important and widely acknowledged role in the development of quality assurance mechanisms in Lithuania. Although a wedge had been driven into the five-year programmes already in 1993, it was little more than that. They had been artificially split up into two phases, essentially representing one curriculum with each constituent part rather worthless without the other. It was experiments through a host of Tempus projects that kicked off the modularisation of study programmes, increasing the flexibility of higher education and in the process raising an unavoidable demand for quality assurance mechanisms because overlooking the quality of tailor-made programmes was not a task that could be borne by individuals any longer.
As to impact of the programme on a national level, the study resorts to the general comments others also use but its arguments are noteworthy. Tempus started in Lithuania at a time when a full set of legislative measures had just been adopted and its initial method of work was an introvert one. Having said that, horizontal priorities were introduced relatively early in the country and were an important pillar on which programme activity rested (see below). When it was time for the second wave of legislative changes to be introduced (or, in the case of Lithuania, proposed) Tempus experiences were used as models of reform. Also, in the words of the impact study, “Tempus contributed to the reform by providing the reformers.”

To prove this latter point, the study refers to three Tempus projects which were particularly successful in developing the human resources required by the process of transition. The first was a project developing management and international business training at Vilnius University. The interesting point is not so much what the project achieved but rather how it recycled its co-ordinators. For the three year project, three co-ordinators were needed. The first swapped his position for that of Minister of Foreign Affairs (and subsequently signed the 1995 Free Trade Agreement), the second left his job to become Phare co-ordinator for Lithuania. The third moved on to become the head of the Lithuanian Diplomatic Mission in Brussels.

The other two projects were developed at the newly established Institute of International Relations and Political Science in Vilnius. They are now acknowledged to have been the projects that launched the institute into the influential position it has today and whose graduates are scattered all over the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Lithuanian embassies throughout the world.

It is important to note in this respect that the Tempus Board in Lithuania was made up of high ranking academics. In the mid to late 1990s, the cream of academic authority served on the board. Ignorance of Tempus achievements among the higher echelons of academia, a criticism frequently uttered elsewhere, is thus not a factor of any significance in Lithuania. If there were a reason why the vibrant stream of Lithuanian reform ideas had insufficient impact on the national authorities, it would be a faltering dialogue between the latter and the higher education sector as a whole.

**Key information on Tempus in Lithuania**

**Selected statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget M€</th>
<th>Joint European Projects</th>
<th>Complementary Measures</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants Out</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 In addition to this, 1 Joint European Network (JENs) was supported.
Mobilities in Lithuanian Joint European Projects 1992–1997:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff from Lithuania</td>
<td>1,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff to Lithuania</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from Lithuania</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students to Lithuania</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,938</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evolution of Lithuanian priorities**

Under Tempus I, Lithuanian priorities were limited to subject areas such as management and business administration, finance and banking, law, international relations, advanced technologies, environmental protection, modern European languages and pedagogics.

At the beginning of Tempus II, most of these were dropped as horizontal priorities gradually found their way into the programme. The subjects remaining on the list in 1994 included environmental studies in relation to energy and material studies, agricultural reform and multidisciplinary transport and communication studies. In the same year, preference was given to projects working at the integration of research into the universities.

In 1995, only horizontal priorities were left. They included establishing structures for sustainable international co-operation, developing information networks and technologies and developing curricula for continuing education. Preference was given to projects with more than one Lithuanian partner.

In 1996 the call for mobility structures was refined, now specifying the development of credit transfer systems. Also with a view to participation in Socrates, a call was made to improve foreign language skills and teaching.

Specifically aimed at the rather cosmetic nature of the change to a dual degree system was a call to create inter-disciplinary studies in which at least two faculties participated. Also projects developing the capacity of universities to teach European studies were called for.

In the following years, the development of a European dimension in higher education, both in terms of curriculum development and in terms of administrative capacity to handle international mobility, as well as the restructuring of degree programmes continued to be the main activities called for.

**Partners**

Although the United Kingdom topped the list of partner countries in the early years of Tempus, Germany shared the second place with Denmark. Both countries participated in 55 per cent of all Lithuanian projects. For Germany this was on par with its Tempus average. For Denmark it was six times its average Tempus involvement. Swedish universities were represented in 35 per cent of all Lithuanian projects in the first three years of Tempus in Lithuania. Nothing really changed towards the end of the decade although Sweden surpassed both Denmark and Germany in activity in 1998 when Swedish partners were represented in every other Lithuanian project. In the same year, Danish partners participated in 42 per cent of all Lithuanian projects.

Throughout the decade, activity of Dutch universities in Lithuania was slightly higher than their Tempus average. They participated in almost every third Lithuanian Tempus project.
Poland, 1990 – 2001

“Those universities which went through the decentralisation process were able to reduce deficit, to generate profit, to save money, to create financial resources for research projects and for investment. Consequently, the mentality of people is changing as well: more and more staff members realise that their own rational economic decisions, in their institutes, chairs and research units, generate savings and earnings.”

Zdislaw Mach, Professor, Jagiellonian University in Kraków, and co-author of the Polish Tempus Impact Study

Poland has a very long academic tradition, and awareness of this is very much alive in the country. The Jagiellonian University dates back to 1364 and in the country Wilno (Vilnius) and Lwów (Lviv) are considered almost equally important parts of Polish academic heritage. This makes for a higher education sector not void of pride and, in practice, one which is used to navigating by its own devices. One result of this is the considerable divide between academia and the higher education authorities, which survived the 1990s, just as it had done – with ups and downs – for centuries. The quote from Prof Jacak in the introduction to this document 21 is tell-tale in this respect. All of this in spite of the fact that ministers, vice-ministers and state secretaries tend to be drawn directly from the rostrum (and returned there after serving their terms).

If communication with the authorities left something to be desired, national collaboration among Polish universities became stronger throughout the decade. During the second half of the 1990s in particular, the different Rectors’ Conferences gained considerable influence and put it to good use, eventually assuring via that channel the impact of steering groups on politics in various fields. Developments in credit transfer and quality assurance are two good examples of fields in which initiatives from within the academic community by this track left their marks on adopted legislation.

The Polish 1990 Law on Higher Education marked the reinstatement of academic and administrative autonomy and considerably increased the autonomy of each university’s constituent units. Perhaps more significantly, competitive financing was introduced. The law also opened the higher education sector to private players. It needs to be noted in this context that private (or rather ‘non-state’) higher education was the driving force in Polish academia right up until WWII.

The financing system introduced in 1990 gave higher education institutions considerable freedom to address different funding sources. In other words, they were given the freedom to earn money as private entrepreneurs and spend it the way they pleased. The law also allowed them to charge for extramural and evening studies. Full-time day studies in state higher education institutions are free as long as progress follows a predefined time-table.

A series of major legislative amendments in 1997 (more on which below) followed the revision of the Polish higher education reform strategy in 1996. Quality assurance found its legislative framework in a 1999 law stipulating the establishment of an Academic Accreditation Committee in 2000.

Compared to many other countries in the region, Poland recognised the importance of professionally-oriented higher education, at least at the political level, from relatively early on. A Law on Higher Vocational Schools was adopted in 1997 and although implementation has not been as smooth as originally hoped, the signal value of government meddling in this field cannot be underestimated.

Unlike most countries in the region, Poland did not experience a dip in student numbers in the early 1990s. Student numbers have simply exploded, tripling in the period between 1990 and 2000 to more than 1.2 million. Roughly half of these are full-time students. The number of students in business and management studies, the sector which bears the brunt of the invasion of part-time students, is today seven times higher than it was in 1990.

21 See paragraph: on page 7.
Tempus in Poland

As the country that lent the acronym Phare its P, Poland was one of the three countries for which the Tempus decade had 11 years. It also was the country with the highest Tempus budget. Throughout the nineties, €223M were allocated to 619 Joint European Projects and Joint European Networks, 157 Complementary Measures and 3,345 Individual Mobility Grants.

The Polish national Tempus Office is the only national office that has chosen to specify the concrete results at 33 institutions around the country in its final report (in Polish only). The list includes all of the larger universities. From this it appears that, with the help of the Tempus programme, 53 new units were established at the listed universities. A pick from the list includes:

- a new International Business school in at the University of Silesia in Katowice;
- a Centre for Human Rights at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków;
- an interdepartmental Centre for Ecology at the University of Toruń;
- a centre for Medical Technology at Gdańsk Technical University;
- technology transfer centres at the University of Mining and Metallurgy in Kraków, and at Warsaw and Wrocław technical universities.

Of the 581 Joint European Projects carried out in Poland, 466 of them helped upgrade the contents of existing programmes or establish new curricula and specialisms.

In the Polish Tempus Impact Study, Ewa Kolanowska, the former head of the National Tempus Office, gave us an idea of quantitative results of just 11 Tempus institutional development projects in Poland. These took place under Tempus I and II – before the targeted university management projects took off in Tempus II bis. Ms Kolanowska writes that international relations offices of the universities in Łódź, Toruń and Katowice and the technical universities in Warsaw, Łódź and Gliwice have established databases storing information on various aspects of international co-operation. Finance departments at five major academies of economics, five major technical universities, the universities of Wrocław and Warsaw as well as the Academy of Agriculture in Warsaw have developed models for a uniform computerised finance management. The central libraries of the Technical Universities in Kraków, Gdańsk, Warsaw, Poznań, Rzeszów, Łódź, Wrocław, Kielce and the Academy of Mining and Metallurgy in Kraków have established a uniform cataloguing format (which, incidentally, has resulted in a blooming inter-library lending culture in Kraków today). Finally, in the same field, the Universities in Łódź, Toruń and Poznań and the Teacher Training Colleges in Bydgoszcz and Olsztyn have developed common databases for the exchange of information on library resources.

The previously cited Tempus Impact Study, is also more specific than any other Tempus document about the extent to which the Tempus Programme inspired amendments to higher education legislation. Ms Kolanowska writes: “A number of Tempus-generated issues were incorporated in the proposals for legislative amendments presented in September 1997 by a committee of experts working for the Ministry of National Education.” She names as concrete examples of such influence:

- official recognition of credit transfer mechanisms, both nationally and internationally;
- the introduction of degree courses or part of these in foreign languages which, in Poland, has remained limited compared to, for example, Hungary; improvement in university administration and management, where a breakthrough was made by Tempus which both revealed weaknesses in this area and introduced special administrative Joint European Projects;

---

22 The Tempus contribution in relation to the size of the population was higher in Hungary. See also the chapter on Hungary in this section.

23 Impact study on Tempus in Poland, Ewa Kolanowska and Zdzisław Mach, Warsaw, 1998.
greater involvement of non-public higher education institutions in the Polish higher education system, supported by the participation of non-public universities in Joint European Projects;

- the availability of state budget funds for international academic co-operation, for which Tempus set a precedent by attracting additional funding from the Ministry of National Education.

Another area mentioned in the study is that of quality assurance and it is indeed in this field that groundbreaking progress has been carried out in Tempus projects. A national accreditation and quality assurance system and the above-mentioned Academic Accreditation Committee were strongly influenced by the results of several Tempus II projects tackling internal quality assurance procedures and nation-wide projection of these, pioneered actively under Tempus II bis. According to Tomasz Saryusz-Wolski, who is the Head of the International Faculty of Engineering at Łódź Technical University and very active in the Polish accreditation debate, the group of players in this field is closely connected via Tempus: “We all know each other because we were involved in similar Tempus activities,” he says.

Poland out-performed many European Union countries with the introduction of the European Credit Transfer System. “Several years ago, no one even knew what the European Credit Transfer System was but a co-ordinated effort to put credit transfer on the agenda through Tempus projects bore fruit and by 2000, the European Credit Transfer System was used at all major universities in Poland,” said Wiesław Studencki, former director of the National Tempus Office.

**Key information on Tempus in Poland**

**Selected statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget M€</th>
<th>Joint European Projects</th>
<th>Complementary Measures</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants Out</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>750²</td>
<td>134²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>338¹</td>
<td>106¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>37.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>222.53</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ In addition to this, 38 Joint European Networks (JENs) were supported.
² Includes students.
Mobilities in Polish Joint European Projects 1990-1997:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff from Poland</td>
<td>15,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff to Poland</td>
<td>10,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from Poland</td>
<td>12,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students to Poland</td>
<td>1,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,445</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evolution of key priorities**

As elsewhere, Polish priorities evolved from subject areas in Tempus I to a combination of subject areas and structural changes in Tempus II and Tempus II bis. In a breakdown of subject areas for all years, two main large groups may be clearly distinguished. The first one covers areas directly related to the economic, social, political and technological changes brought about by the transition to a market economy. These included economics, management, business administration, environment protection, engineering and technology, social and political sciences. The second group, introduced in Tempus II, comprised areas which contributed to the development of a European dimension in higher education and which supported integration of Poland with the European Union. Priorities in this group included European Union languages, European studies and the harmonisation of curricula in regulated professions.

The structural priorities in Tempus II and Tempus II bis, corresponding to the main targets of the higher education reform in Poland, include among others; the transformation of uniform five-year master degree courses, the development of three-four year Bachelor degree courses, the introduction of internal credit systems and a credit transfer system, the introduction of internal quality assurance systems, the modernisation of university administration and management, and university-industry co-operation.

Wiesław Studencki attributes the success of Tempus projects in this period to the consistency in Polish priority setting. “The priority for measures supporting the introduction of the two-tier degree system in Poland returned year after year and this provided a continuity which some other countries lacked,” he says.

Applications in areas not specifically mentioned in the priorities could in the last two years of Tempus II be submitted under the structural priorities which were open for all fields.

**Partners**

Being the country with the largest number of Joint European Projects projects, Poland was such an important contributor to what are Tempus ‘averages’ that a comparison with these makes little sense. Somewhat surprisingly though, the participation of German partners was slightly below the Tempus average. This changed again in the last years of the programme.

Below are the project participation figures for Tempus I and Tempus II from the Polish Tempus Office’s Final Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Romania, 1991 – 2001

“The Tempus programme, through all its three stages, became the most successful programme initiated by the European Union, not only from the point of view of the academic community, but also that of the entire social, economical and cultural environment in our country.”

Mircea Ivănescu, Rector, University of Craiova

Romanian higher education was less affected by pre-1989 political ideology than primary and secondary education. It also fared better after the 1989 revolution, in part because the higher education sector was so heavily represented in Romanian post-revolution politics. Yet, some fields had been neglected while others had been corrupted. Together with new areas in political and economic sciences, these became a priority on the reform agenda as it unfolded throughout the nineties.

Romania did not introduce any major legislative amendments in the field of higher education until 1995, when the new Law on Education was approved. Until then, specific provisions of the new 1991 Constitution governed education. Together with the old communist Government Decisions (1978), these proved to be sufficient as a temporary framework pending a comprehensive law, except in the field of private higher education. With close to 100 universities set up as private enterprises in the first years after 1989, regulation of this sector could not be delayed until 1995. Therefore, a 1993 Special Act provided for a temporary higher education evaluation and accreditation system. In fact, this act was not replaced entirely until 1997 when the Law on University Accreditation and Recognition of Diplomas was passed. It should be stated in this context that many of the provisions of the 1995 law are still under intense debate.

Although Romania signed the Bologna Declaration, it did not yet make an all-out shift to the three-tier degree system. In fact, the number of different higher education degrees existing side-by-side can be somewhat confusing to outsiders. Although short-cycle undergraduate higher education exists, the degrees awarded do not enjoy significant prestige. The offer of short postgraduate programmes, on the other hand, has grown rapidly and they have achieved considerable status.

Very positively indeed, modularisation of study programmes and the widespread introduction of the European Credit Transfer System in Romanian higher education not only simplified recognition of courses taken abroad, it also brought about increased mobility of students within the country. Since 1996, when the introduction of the European Credit Transfer System began, it has become much easier for students to ‘pick-and-mix’ from the national supply of university programmes. Special provisions to facilitate this are also included in current educational legislation.
Higher education in Romania is no homogenous mass, indeed perhaps even less so than in other countries in Central and Eastern Europe. For example, the national higher education lobby is not as strong (and for that matter paralysing) as in some other countries in the region. Moreover, Ceausescu’s pre-1989 regime had been frighteningly successful in breaking down horizontal information structures. As a result, Romania has proved to be a country where effective dissemination of information is crucial to the success of any nation-wide operation. One case in point is the false start which the introduction of Erasmus was heading for when preparations for the programme were carried out in too small a circle around the education authorities in 1997. National Tempus Office director Prof. Dan Grigorescu recalls from those days the queries he received from Tempus academics throughout the country who had understood that Socrates was the new name for the next phase of the Tempus programme. The fact that enquiries arrived at his desk is in itself telling. The office has received due credit throughout Romanian academia for driving the impact of Tempus to the outer regions of the country.

**Tempus in Romania**

The positive impact of the Tempus programme on Romanian higher education is manifold. Tempus I is widely considered to have been the laboratory that fostered the foundations of the 1995 Education Law. According to former Education Minister Prof. Virgil Petrescu “the programme anticipated, laid the foundation of, and contributed greatly to the 1995 education law.” One of many examples of projects experimenting with innovative methods in higher education is a French-co-ordinated Joint European Project pioneering short-cycle higher education development (a major issue in the 1995 law) at 12 Romanian universities which was launched as early as 1992. After the adoption of the law and the publication of the *White Book on Education Reform in Romania* in the same year, university management and political reform initiatives were channelled through Phare and World Bank supported actions under the *Higher Education Reform Programme*, allowing Tempus to focus on what it did best: reform on the workshop floor. This constitutes a significant difference from most of the other Phare countries which now have candidate status.

As stated above, the modularisation of study programmes and the introduction of the concept of credit transfer were particularly successful in Romania. Tempus made a significant contribution to this. One example of a Joint European Project that explored curricular compatibility is a Joint European Project aligning environmental syllabi with European practice. The project was initiated at Bucharest University but later, through a follow-up project, extended to the Technical University of Bucharest and Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies. Between 1995 and 1998, many of the newly launched Joint European Projects included a credit transfer component.

Projects in this area were launched from 1996 and onwards throughout the country. In 1999, almost 200 Romanian enterprises and organisations participated alongside universities in Tempus Joint European Projects. One of the most influential projects in this field was a 1997 Joint European Project led by the Technical University of Bucharest in which 15 Romanian universities worked together to establish a network of continuing training departments and management structures for university-industry relationships. Project co-ordinator Prof. Marian Gheorghe, now Deputy Director General at the Ministry of Education, points out how the project generated awareness of the critical state that corporate investment in training is in: “Generally, modern production processes are lacking, making international competition hard. The resulting lack of income means that there is no money left for innovation. It’s a vicious circle.” The projects sparked a debate about how to create self-sustained funding for human resources development in industry. A new law for continuing training which includes a proposal for a national training fund is now in the making.
A positive general aspect of the impact of Tempus, which was also highlighted in Poland, was the hitherto unseen impartiality of selection procedures, particularly for mobility grants. According to Prof. Paul Cristea, a Tempus co-ordinator at the Technical University of Bucharest, the high public profile of the programme contributed significantly to this. "Many parents have told us that the impartial way in which students were selected for grants reflected positively on public opinion of European Union support. Students were generally selected on their individual merits rather than on their family connections. In Romanian society this was downright revolutionary and it lent the programme much credibility."

Similarly, programme procedures radically improved the confidence of many ordinary teachers and professors, strengthening their belief that their voice and actions could make a difference. At the Tempus closing conference in Bucharest in October 2001, Prof. Radu Mircea Damian, Secretary of State for Education and Research said: "Tempus, largely because of its decentralised programme management, had a dramatic impact on the life of Romanian university professors. After 1989, it took little time for us to realise that quality in higher education does not come of its own accord; we have to fight for it. Tempus built confidence. It taught us to take charge - to assess needs, define and formulate them, and fight with our financiers, be they national or international, for the means to address them."

Finally, even the briefest of summaries of Tempus activity in Romania must highlight the impact of the programme on European studies in the country. Throughout the country, 57 new courses were launched which addressed needs arising from the prospect of accession into the European Union. A high-profile example is the establishment of the Faculty of European Studies at Babes-Bolyai University in Cluj. As a result of its strong and well-defined institutional strategy, Babes-Bolyai University is considered to be one of the Romanian universities where Tempus impact has been most broadly felt.

### Key information on Tempus in Romania

#### Selected statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget M€</th>
<th>Joint European Projects</th>
<th>Complementary Measures</th>
<th>Out</th>
<th>In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105.75</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In addition to this, 22 Joint European Networks (JENs) were supported.
2. Includes students.

See also paragraph on page 17 and the chapter on Poland on page 49.
Mobilities in Romanian Joint European Projects 1991-1997:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff from Romania</td>
<td>6,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff to Romania</td>
<td>4,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from Romania</td>
<td>5,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students to Romania</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,397</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evolution of Romanian priorities**

Three lateral issues have dominated priority settings for Tempus in Romania. These were curricular reform, the strengthening of relationships between education and industry, and preparations for European Union accession.

Curricular reform focussed on the modularisation of existing programmes, the introduction of short-term undergraduate programmes with new training content and the introduction of new advanced study programmes at Master's level alongside the existing doctorate studies.

Most of the accession-related Tempus projects resulted in the development of new courses and units at Romanian universities covering European studies and European Union-related issues. New courses originally served mostly the regular student body. Later on, particularly under Tempus II Bis, the target group was often widened to include social, political and commercial audiences.

The bias of Romanian Tempus subject priorities shifted gradually from engineering and technology (63 Joint European Projects) at the start of the programme to economic, social and to some extent also medical sciences. Projects in agriculture and food technology (15 Joint European Projects) were supported throughout the decade.

Also throughout the period of Tempus support, co-operation among Romanian universities was actively, and successfully, encouraged.

**Partners**

Romanian partner statistics underscore the important role of language in international co-operation programmes. French universities topped the list of European Union partner institutions throughout the decade. French partners were involved in 176 out of the total of 267 Romanian Joint European Projects. In 1997/98, French partners participated in two out of every three Romanian Joint European Projects, while their average for all of the Phare countries was 40 per cent. UK and German partners participated in 134 and 92 projects respectively. Both were well under their average Tempus Phare involvement.

Relatively well-represented compared to general Tempus Phare figures were Belgian (90 Joint European Projects) and Spanish (82 Joint European Projects) partners. Also Greek and, in later years, Italian universities participated more than average in Romanian projects. Scandinavian countries, although not altogether absent, were underrepresented.

"Nobody can be a prophet in their own country. Broad acceptance of local Tempus results has been slow. And yet, many of the people who were active in Tempus are now deans and heads of departments. That holds a promise for the future."
Anna Butašová, Deputy Director, National Institute for Education

The legal bedrock of Slovak higher education is the 1990 Czechoslovak Higher Education Act. For the Czech, the cautious nature of the document was a blessing; for Slovakia it appeared more of a curse - the difference being that the Czech authorities used the time it won them to formulate more daring legislation while Slovakia's turbulent politics between 1993 and 1998 offered insufficient breathing space for the development of a studied education reform policy.

Initially, after the Czech and Slovak Republics went separate ways in 1993, considerable effort was put into drawing up a policy plan for education reform. Program Konstantin, prepared under Moravcik’s 1993-1994 transition government, had already passed all stages of the public debate when a new government was installed. By then, the minister responsible was projected out of office (and lost his position as the Director of the National Office for Planning in Higher Education). Program Konstantin flew out of the door with him.

In the meantime, student figures had begun their continued journey upwards, rising from 64,000 in 1992 to 115,000 in 1999, and it became generally acknowledged that any substantial legislative reform would have to address the issue of tuition fees. This was so unpopular that up until 1998 the authorities did not dare to burn their fingers on major legal amendments. A 1996 Act reformulated the responsibilities in the administration of higher education and was criticised for encroaching on academic freedom. Other than that, it brought few structural changes and was largely a rephrased version of the 1990 Act.

Before 1989, Slovakia had two regular universities, one in Bratislava (Komensius University) and one in Kosice (Pawel Josef Safarik) in the east of the country. In the early 1990s, 13 faculties and colleges were given the status of independent universities and in 1997 another three regional towns were, not without controversy, donated a university.

All of these universities initially provided only long-cycle programmes at an academic (Master’s) level. Short-cycle professionally-oriented higher education was scarce and poorly accepted. For years this remained a source of complaints, in particular from the transforming Slovak industry. Slovakian enterprises were desperate for highly qualified but less academic staff. Although Bachelor-level study programmes were introduced with the 1990 law, higher education is still overwhelmingly dominated by long-cycle programmes. In 1999, almost 70,000 out of a total of 87,000 full-time students were enrolled in five-year programmes, against a mere 5,500 in three-year programmes. Today, a burgeoning change in attitude towards short-cycle higher education programmes can be noted throughout the country.

Another important issue against the backdrop of which Tempus in Slovakia must be seen is the balance of power in academia. Until 1997 at least, the central management of Slovakian universities was little more than a token force. The real power was with the faculties who, like their Czech counterparts until 1998, enjoyed considerable independence and were legal entities in their own right. When in 1997 the rectors of Slovakia finally mobilised themselves through a Rector’s Conference, the deans responded with an 81-strong Club of Deans which, until the 1998 elections, even enjoyed a stronger negotiating status than the Rector’s Conference. This situation has now been reversed completely; the independence of the faculties will be limited by new legislation which was being debated in parliament at the time of writing.

If adopted, the same legislation will introduce major changes in the system of financing higher education and, indeed, in the status of professional higher education.

25 See also the chapter on the Czech Republic in this section.


Tempus in Slovakia

No country in central Europe had a higher regional participation in Joint European Projects than the Slovak Republic. Under Tempus I, 41 of the total of 77 Joint European Projects included a partner from one of the other Phare countries. This excludes 'collaboration' with the Czech Republic before the 1993 split. Poland obviously had the linguistic advantage and, with 34 Joint European Projects featuring partners from both countries, collaboration with the country was good in the first years after 1990. Also, Hungarian and Slovak universities worked side by side in no fewer than 28 Joint European Projects. Regional co-operation, however, was a trend in continuous decline throughout the 1990s, not only in the Slovak Republic but throughout the region26. Unfortunately, Tempus collaboration among Czech and Slovak universities came to a grinding halt after 1993, letting large pools of relevant and cheaply accessible expertise on both sides of the new border go to waste.

Mobility projects served not only the purpose of training students abroad. They also helped generate the critical mass necessary for internal reform at universities. In Slovakia, mobility projects were specifically needed to develop logistical capacity for student mobility and to force the implementation of credit transfer mechanisms. These, in turn, supplied arguments to the debate on internal and national credit transfer which needed to accompany the modularisation of study programmes and the introduction of short-cycle regular and continued higher education. More than 1,500 Slovak students were trained abroad between 1990 and 1997 in a total of 20 mobility projects.

If, in Tempus statistics, the applied sciences had not been treated as one entity, languages would have appeared as the most popular theme in Slovak Tempus Joint European Projects. Thirteen Joint European Projects focussed exclusively on linguistics, and language training components appeared in a large proportion of other projects. Recognising the country's immense training needs in this area, the national authorities kept languages high on the list of priorities throughout Tempus II and many excellent projects, particularly in the field of special purpose language training, were carried out.

New units developed through Tempus include the Faculty of Horticulture and Landscape Engineering at the Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra and a Centre for Visually Handicapped Students at the Faculty of Mathematics and Physics of Comenius University in Bratislava. Also at Comenius University, the development of the Faculty of Management was heavily supported by Tempus. In Zilina and Košice, life-long learning centres were established with Tempus support.

Although not established through Tempus, much of the development of the new Faculty of Philosophy and Arts at Prešov University was carried out through various Tempus projects. Prešov University and Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica are good examples of how Tempus in Slovakia helped build confidence among the large number of new universities. Under Tempus II Bis, Comenius University and the Slovak University of Technology had 13 and 12 Joint European Projects respectively, while nine projects were carried out in Prešov and 10 in Banská Bystrica in the same period.

Tempus II bis was in many respects a catching up phase for Slovakia. The country kept its Tempus budget at pre-1998 levels and was therefore in relative terms by far the best supported country in 1998 and 1999. (In the country statistics, compare for example the Slovak Tempus II bis budget with that of Poland and Hungary.) Changes in the political environment reflected positively on Tempus projects carried out in this period and motivated involvement, particularly from the regional universities, yielded impressive results which, in turn, led to a very positive evaluation at the closing conference in Bratislava in September 2001. Under Tempus II bis, belatedly, some of the country's most successful projects in the field of university management were carried out. Interesting examples include the project PRIMA, co-ordinated by Zilina University, which aimed to improve language and computer skills of not the upper level management but staff with lower level qualifications. Management training was provided for staff from the University of Economics, the Slovak University of Technology, the University of Matej Bel, the Technical University of Košice and the Slovak University of

26 See also page 21.
Agriculture in Nitra. A project co-ordinated by Comenius University aimed to find consensus among national authorities and universities on the hot issue of quality assurance. The latter was a topic touched by several Joint European Projects in the final phase of Tempus in Slovakia.

Finally, through 24 Tempus ‘Institution Building’ projects carried out between 1998 and 2001, more than 2,500 professionals from local, regional and national authorities as well as professional organisations and Non Governmental Organisations received European Union accession-related training at the country’s universities.

**Key information on Tempus in Slovakia**

**Selected statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget M€</th>
<th>Joint European Projects</th>
<th>Complementary Measures</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants Out</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>46¹</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32.68</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ In addition to this, 13 Joint European Networks were supported.
² Includes projects transferred to Slovakia after the split with the Czech Republic.

**Mobilities in Slovak Joint European Projects 1991–1997:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff from the Slovak Republic</td>
<td>2,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff to the Slovak Republic</td>
<td>1,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from the Slovak Republic</td>
<td>1,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students to the Slovak Republic</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evolution of Slovak priorities**

As in the other countries, the main priority during the first phase of Tempus was the restructuring and development of curricula. In Slovakia the fields covered were applied sciences (including agricultural, environmental and medical sciences), management, economics, modern European languages, teacher training, social sciences and the visual and performing arts. To encourage more proactive participation of Slovak universities, towards the end of Tempus I projects co-ordinated by Slovak institutions were prioritised. Under Tempus II, 50 out of a total of 53 projects were co-ordinated from within the Slovak Republic.

Curriculum development remained the most important central theme of projects under Tempus II but the subject areas became more narrowly defined. They included, at different stages of this phase, regional planning, tourism,
banking and accounting, European law and European studies, preventive medicine and biomedical sciences, environmental protection, transport logistics, management issues related to quality control, teacher training and applied language studies.

In addition, Tempus II saw the introduction of projects aimed at the improvement of university management. Seven such projects were carried out during this phase. Preparation for large scale student mobility became an issue as early as 1994 when three multi-disciplinary mobility projects took off, exploring credit transfer mechanisms and strengthening the position and management of international offices. Another three projects started in the same year introduced internal credit transfer, preparing the ground for a modularisation of study programmes.

Finally, co-operation with the commercial environment was actively stimulated throughout Tempus II. Enterprises participated in every third project between 1994 and 1997 while general non-academic partnership was even more common.

In the third phase of Tempus (Tempus II bis) curriculum development activities were limited just to the fields of teacher training and social work. The institutional focus was on university management. Yet together, these two types of project consumed just one third of the Slovak Tempus II bis budget. The other two-thirds, totalling more than € 6M, were dedicated to 'institution building' projects. A total of 24 of these were approved in 1998 and 1999, the majority of which addressed the training needs of participants in national, regional and local public authorities, while a smaller number of projects concentrated on professional organisations and enterprises.

Partner countries

As in the Czech Republic, UK universities were the ones that featured most frequently in Slovak Tempus Joint European Projects. In 58 per cent of all Joint European Projects there was at least one UK partner. Also the other partnership trends are quite similar, with much German activity and Dutch universities very active in comparison with their Tempus Phare average. Belgian, French and Italian partners all featured in roughly one-third of Slovak Joint European Projects. Scandinavian participation was low. Universities from neighbouring Austria, which did not enter the European Union until 1995, participated in 21 per cent of all Slovak Joint European Projects. In fact, the Technical University of Vienna already participated in (Czecho-)Slovak Joint European Projects starting in 1990, 1993 and 1994 and remained one of the most active partner universities until the end of Tempus II bis.

Slovenia, 1991/92 – 2001

“We cannot analyse the impact [of Tempus] only through descriptions of direct outcomes, [...] development of the capacity to adapt to changes in the environment and the processes of learning at the individual and institutional level is also important.”

Bogomir Mihevc, University of Ljubljana

A microcosm in terms of higher education, Slovenia has only two real universities. It is not altogether fair, but a popular definition indicates that the academics are based in Ljubljana (where some stubbornly argue that there is only one real university in the country), while the entrepreneurs have made their stronghold in Maribor since 1975. Both universities, however, offer professionally and academically-oriented programmes. Plans for a university in Koper have been on the drawing board for quite some time and should come to fruition in the next few years.

Throughout the 1990s, higher education in Slovenia was in a state of restrained anarchy: anarchy because legislation is largely ignored on the ground, restrained because, despite a weak central direction of reform efforts,
much innovation has taken place in the country’s higher education since 1990. A Higher Education Act of 1993 (which was amended in 1999) and a White Paper of 1995 set out the framework for reform, but its implementation was never forced upon the country’s higher education institutions. A Higher Education Master Plan was much discussed and drafted by the Council for Higher Education and the national education authorities in 1997. The final version is waiting for a reading in parliament at the time of writing.

As we have seen before,27 faculty independence has proved exceedingly difficult to root out in Slovenia. Statistics on the web site of the Ministry of Education, Science and Sport classify students in higher education not as ‘university students’ but as ‘faculty students’ and Slovenia’s Tempus chronicler, Bogomir Mihevc, refers to Ljubljana and Maribor as ‘multiversities’ and ‘conglomerations of independent institutions’.28 To the despair of the central university authorities, deans of faculties continued to negotiate their budgets directly with the relevant ministries until 1999, despite the fact that legislation to change this situation had been adopted much earlier in 1993. Although today budgets are negotiated by the central administration, funds are still paid directly into the accounts of faculties of the University of Ljubljana. In Maribor, faculty independence has now been curbed.

On the other hand, curricular developments have progressed as intended in the 1993 legislation. Contrary to all other Phare countries, Slovenia entered the 1990s with a broad offer of short higher education programmes which were widely accepted as a valid alternative to long-cycle academic training. After 1993, many of these two-three year programmes were extended to cover three-four years.29 In the mean time, study programmes were steadily modularised. The degree system, however, is in constant flux and reflects the reluctance of the academic community to acknowledge the equivalence of professionally and academically oriented study programmes.

Faculty autonomy does not seem to have hampered the development of interdisciplinary studies, although ‘interdisciplinary’ in Slovenia rarely means that more than one faculty is involved in teaching the programme. Private education has a modest role in the professionally-oriented segment of Slovenian academia.

The lack of central co-ordination in Ljubljana caused problems when, in Autumn 1998, the country was preparing for entry into the Socrates programme the following year. Maribor’s international office, greased by intensive co-operation with partners throughout Europe, was ready to go and only waiting for the country’s Europe Agreement to be signed, while the badly understaffed central International Office of the University of Ljubljana was still unaware of the preparations that were taking place just kilometres away at the agency preparing Slovenia’s participation in Socrates.

**Tempus in Slovenia**

In 1991, Tempus support for all Yugoslav republics went through Belgrade. In reality, much of it went to universities in Ljubljana and Maribor which secured 40 per cent of the federation’s 1991 Tempus budget. While Tempus ceased to operate in Yugoslavia the year after, the 24 northernmost projects continued in an independent Slovenia.

The country’s successive administrations had education reforms high on their agendas. In line with their political rhetoric, Tempus took a major slice of the annual Phare support for Slovenia. Under Tempus I, the country used 25 per cent of its Phare funds on Tempus. In the other Candidate Countries this figure hovered around the 10 per cent.30

---

27 Refer to the paragraph on page 4.


29 The name of the institutions that provided the short higher education programmes, višja šola, was changed to visoka šola and, confusingly, the old name was readopted for a new type of upper vocational education outside the higher education system.

30 In this context, however, it is important to note that throughout the 1990s, one Euro bought considerably less in relatively affluent Slovenia than in any of the other Phare countries. In 1998, GDP per capita in Slovenia was still twice as high as in Hungary (eight times as high as in Bulgaria) although the purchasing power of Slovenians was only 47 per cent more than that of Hungarians.
The result was 80 projects (plus 13 extensions in the form of Joint European Networks) in a country which, in 1995, had 45,000 students. That's roughly one project per 560 students. Using the same parameters, Poland had 'only' one project for every 1,400 students and of all Tempus countries only Hungary fared marginally better than Slovenia. The figures are rough because the calculation method belies any claim to accuracy. There sole purpose, and one they serve well, is to put the scale of support in perspective. In Tempus, Slovenia was the next best supported country.

This is fortunate because the decentralised nature of Slovenian higher education allowed Tempus projects to operate in blissful ignorance of each other and were it not for the relatively large number of projects, it is doubtful whether a reasonably even spread of benefits among the country's faculties would have been achieved.

As it turned out, Tempus produced some very visible results in Slovenia, most notably in the shape of a number of new institutions which, in this case, did not add to the fragmentation but filled some important voids. In Portoro, a higher professional school for hospitality management was established with the support of Tempus. Tourism is an important source of revenue for Slovenia, but the disintegration of Yugoslavia cut Slovenians off from their professional education in this field because hotel management had traditionally been taught on territory which now suddenly was 'abroad' - in Croatia. Institutions which, if not established through the programme, were developed largely with Tempus support include the School of Environmental Sciences, established in 1995 in Nova Gorica and the GEA College of Entrepreneurship, established in 1996 in Portoro.

The establishment of the Portoro College for Hotel Management and Tourism was a flagship example of sound collaboration among economic and educational partners and of that, Slovenia had a good share indeed. In his thoroughly researched Impact Study of Tempus in Slovenia, Bogomir Mihevc not only notes that companies feature on the list of partners of the majority of Tempus projects, but also that the university-industry relationships thus forged often remained alive after conclusion of the projects.

In general, and entirely in line with what is described above on the nature of Slovenian university organisation, the Mihevc' study is as damning as academic terminology gets about the impact of the programme on institutional management practice in Slovenia. Mihevc quotes sources from within the country as well as the team from the European Conference of Rectors which visited the country for the Tempus Output Promotion study on university management: "High academic impact on the teaching process [...] some managerial impact at faculty level [...] no visible impact on the very weak institutional central administration." Although the study was written in late 1997, Tempus II bis changed little in this respect.

Although no projects specifically addressed legislative reform, Albin Babiè, the head of the former National Tempus Office, is adamant that the programme had a great impact on legislative developments, using arguments not dissimilar to those discussed in the paragraph Legal reform in Part I of this publication (see page 21). "Models for the development of the 1993 education law and its 1999 amendment were largely taken from European Union countries and familiarity with these models was the virtue of Tempus," said Babiè. 'These models were adapted to the national reality through a consultation process - workshops, seminars and symposia - in which Tempus people played key roles.'
Key information on Tempus in Slovenia

Selected statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget M€</th>
<th>Joint European Projects¹</th>
<th>Complementary Measures</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants Out</th>
<th>Individual Mobility Grants In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>47²</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ In addition to this, 13 Joint European Networks were supported.
² Includes Yugoslav projects transferred to Slovenia after independence.

Mobilities in Slovenian Joint European Projects 1992–1997:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff from Slovenia</td>
<td>1,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff to Slovenia</td>
<td>955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from Slovenia</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students to Slovenia</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evolution of key priorities

Slovenia had in-service training for public administrators on the Tempus agenda as early as 1994. In the same year a project was accepted which set out to introduce new curricula in public administration at the University of Ljubljana, and which drew courses from that for in-service training of Slovenian civil servants. Other priorities in 1994 included banking and public finance, short-cycle programmes for the hospitality industry, teacher training, European languages and European Law.

In 1995 and 1996, horizontal priorities formed the core of the Slovenian call for projects. In both years there was again focus on teacher training (for which no successful bids had been made in 1994), and for the development of short-cycle programmes.

In 1996, the Slovenian authorities also called for projects specifically aimed at supporting the implementation of Slovenia’s Europe Agreement, which was expected to be negotiated later that year³. However, this too kept the focus on European studies and languages.
The phrasing changed, but also in 1997 the main themes were the same. There was emphasis on interaction between the university and its environment, although 1997 was the first year in which industrial partners were specifically mentioned. The main addition in 1997 was a call for projects preparing for participation in the Socrates programme including, significantly, elements of university management and quality assurance.

**Partners**

Between 1992 and 1995 there were as many projects in Slovenia with a German partner as there were with a UK partner (59 per cent each). For the UK, this was just under their Tempus Phare average (60 per cent), for Germany it was well above it (50 per cent). By 1999, as in most countries, the UK would appear to have been the main partner country for Slovenia.

The interesting partner statistics for Slovenia are not in the high figures but in the middle range. Partners from neighbouring Italy featured in 43 per cent of the projects before 1996 and kept their high involvement throughout Tempus II and Tempus II bis.

Northern neighbour Austria joined the European Union in 1995 but its universities had by then already participated in many Slovenian projects. By 1997, Austrian universities were involved in more than half of all Slovenian Joint European Projects.

Universities from the Netherlands were very active in the first half of the nineties. Between 1992 and 1996 there was a Dutch partner in every third Slovenian Joint European Project.

More surprisingly, Danish universities appeared in six out of the 13 running Joint European Projects in 1998. At that time, Danish universities were only involved in 13 per cent of all Tempus Phare Joint European Projects and the majority of these were in the Baltic countries.

---

31 Slovenia’s Europe Agreement initially became bogged down on a tussle with Italy over property buying rights. It was signed in July 1997 following what became known as ‘the Spanish Compromise’, but ratification required an amendment of the Slovenian constitution which was held off until late 1998.
Tempus @ 10 seeks to review a decade of cooperation between universities in the European Union’s Member States and what have now become the Candidate Countries of Central and Eastern Europe. The first part of the study provides a general overview of the major trends and overall achievements of a decade of Tempus in the Candidate Countries. The second part zooms in on the individual countries, with the achievements of the Tempus programme viewed against the backdrop of overall developments in education policy in each of these. The study adopts a frank and at times critical approach but it also documents the commendable flexibility with which the programme tackled many of the obstacles with which it was, inevitably, confronted.

The study looks beyond the initial, overt political drive behind the Phare programme. By doing so, it reveals some trends and draws some conclusions which are not normally found in programme reports and evaluations. Such reports and evaluations traditionally weigh a programme's achievements against its stated objectives; they risk overlooking parts of the harvest that have not grown directly from the seeds sown, but nevertheless developed in the newly prepared and nourished soil.

Perhaps the most surprising conclusion of this study is that the best of Tempus is yet to come. First, the programme has been instrumental in training up a whole generation of academics and administrators who are only now slowly rising through the political, social and economic elites in the Candidate Countries. Second, the structured relations between institutions which the programme encourages have often led on to equal partnerships for all participants – including participating institutions in the European Union’s Member States. The study attempts to describe in words the programme's vital, if intangible, role in encouraging inter-cultural awareness. Growing awareness about other peoples and cultures is not a phenomenon that can be easily quantified, yet all governments are agreed on its importance.

Although curriculum development was the main activity in the vast majority of Tempus-funded projects in the Partner Countries, the study does not dwell too long on this aspect of the programme. Rather, it concludes that: “pressed by an understandable demand for quantifiable statistics, previous studies have to too large an extent focussed on curriculum development as an end in itself - achieving reform at a limited level, rather than as a means to build partnerships. In fact, the sustained effect of East-West collaboration in curriculum reform went far beyond the improvement of one, one hundred or one thousand curricula.” In the past, this underlying effect has not received the recognition it deserves but it is of obvious relevance with regard to the programme’s most recent extension to the MEDA partners.

Thus, Tempus @ 10 eschews the typically preferred variables such as ‘transfer of skills’ and ‘educational reform’. Instead, it emphasises the benefit of academic dialogue as a bridgehead to intercultural contact. As one interviewee stated: “For many ordinary teaching staff in the European Union, Tempus crushed the myth that Central and Eastern Europe was a backward region, and this in itself is an achievement easily on a par with that of the ties knit between a large group of Western and Eastern European academics.”

Last but not least, the study shows how, throughout Europe, there is broad agreement that the strength of the programme has been its flexibility and adaptability. This concluding finding should serve as a reminder for future Tempus activity in the Western Balkans, Eastern Europe and Central Asia and, now, North Africa and the Middle East.
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About this publication

In his review of eleven years of Tempus co-operation between universities in the European Union and in the Candidate Countries of Central and Eastern Europe, Ard Jongsma examines the programme from a vantage point a thousand kilometres east of Brussels, exploring the local impact of the programme in the context of national higher education reform in each country.

By largely and deliberately ignoring the political drive behind the Phare programme, he draws some conclusions that are not usually found in programme reports and evaluations, which tend necessarily to take a starting point in programme writings – weighing achievements against original aims at the risk of overlooking parts of the harvest that may not directly have grown from the seeds sown but, rather, developed in the newly nourished and prepared soil. They are weeds to the farmer, gems to the botanist and part of a system to the ecologist. As a journalist, the author is a botanist; in this review he dabbles with the role of an ecologist.

Unburdened by the knowledge that impact at the individual level was never intended to be the main impact of the programme, and therefore not in desperate need of finding treasure where perhaps there is none, his view is one of optimism: Tempus (in the Candidate Countries) was a good programme whose impact was thorough, if largely impossible to quantify, and the great news is: the best may yet be to come. The turns that careers of many of those affected have taken since their isolation was broken through Tempus leads him to conclude that “the chronological centre of gravity of Tempus’s impact might well lie in the future rather than in the past.” Tempus is dead – long live Tempus.

Unburdened by the knowledge that curriculum development was the main activity in the vast majority of Tempus projects he discusses the topic in less than one page, concluding that "perhaps, again pressed by a demand for quantifiable results, curriculum development has to a too large extent been seen as an end, carrying out reform at a rather limited level, rather than as a means to build partnerships, the sustained effect of which went far beyond the improvement of one, one hundred or one thousand curricula."

Not burdened by the knowledge that the transfer of skills and educational reform were the preferred jargon when the attainments of the programme were to be publicised, he emphasises the benefit of academic dialogue as a bridgehead to intercultural contact when he writes that “for many ordinary teaching staff in the European Union [Tempus] crushed the myth that Central and Eastern Europe was a backward region,” and that “this in itself is an achievement easily on a par with that of the ties knit between a large group of western and Eastern European academics.”

The one issue on which he seems to find agreement throughout Europe is that the strength of the programme was its flexibility and adaptability. “Dynamic it was, and dynamic it remained and in this lay its strength.” And this message is perhaps the most important reminder for future Tempus activity in the Western Balkans, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, North Africa and the Middle East.
Ard Jongsma is a freelance journalist who specialises in education in Central and Eastern Europe. He has written about the region since 1989, first for Nuffic in the Netherlands and since 1995 for a range of European magazines including the Times Higher Education Supplement, the Deutsche Universitätszeitung and daily newspapers in the UK, Denmark and Germany. In 1998/1999 he wrote a series of ten articles on the general progress of higher education reform and the preparations of the Candidate Countries for participation in the Socrates programme for five European newspapers and magazines. This publication draws extensively on the research carried out for this exercise.

Ard Jongsma is the co-ordinator of International Correspondents in Education (ICE). ICE is a global network of freelance writers who specialise in education, training and labour market issues.
This section is by no means an exhaustive overview of documents related to the Tempus programme but rather a list of publications which treat some of the topics discussed in this document in greater detail.

Tempus Impact Studies

Tempus Impact studies were commissioned by all National Tempus Offices in 1997 and 1998. Some countries repeated the exercise towards the end of the programme in 2001. Of these, the Polish 1998, and the Romanian and Latvian 2001 studies in particular go well beyond the listing of programme statistics and are therefore mentioned separately below.

Tempus in Romania

A comprehensive overview of 10 years of Tempus in Romania published in conjunction with the Tempus closing conference in Bucharest in 2001. The publication quotes a large selection of prominent Romanians looking back at a decade of East-West university cooperation.

Editor Dr. Dan Grigorescu, Bucharest, 2001

Tempus in Latvia, Impact Study

A very frank review of nine years of Tempus in Latvia highlighting, among others, the personal impact of Tempus on Latvian participants in the programme.

Dr. Andrejs Rauhvargers, Riga, 2001

Tempus in Poland, Impact Study

An Impact Study in two parts, one written by a former National Tempus Office director, the other written by one of the most experienced Tempus project coordinators in Poland.

Ewa Kolanowska and Zdisław Mach, Warsaw, 1998
Tempus Annual Reports

The Tempus Annual Reports offer further statistical details per year and per country for all years of the programme. Until 1993-1994 they were published per academic year, after that per calendar year.

TOP Studies

In 1996, in the framework of the Tempus Output Promotion project, external experts were commissioned to prepare five studies on timely topics. These were:

- The Impact of Tempus on National Reform
- Mutual Benefits of Tempus Project Partnership
- The Impact of Tempus on Institutional Management
- Tempus’ Contribution to University – Enterprise Co-operation
- Tempus Student Mobility

Other publications

Impact of the Tempus Programme on Hungarian Students


The Dynamics of Tempus in Higher Education

Report of the 1997 Tempus Conference in Portoroz
Slovenia, Brussels, 1998