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By letter of 18 July 2002 the Commission submitted to Parliament, pursuant to Article 251(2) and Article 149 of the EC Treaty, the proposal for a European Parliament and Council decision establishing a programme for the enhancement of quality in higher education and the promotion of intercultural understanding through co-operation with third countries (Erasmus World) (2004-2008) (COM(2002) 401 – 2002/0165(COD)).

At the sitting of 2 September 2002 the President of Parliament announced that he had referred this proposal to the Committee on Culture, Youth, Education, the Media and Sport as the committee responsible and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security and Defence Policy, the Committee on Budgets, the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs and the Committee on Women’s Rights and Equal Opportunities for their opinions (C5-0360/2002).

The Committee on Culture, Youth, Education, the Media and Sport appointed Marielle de Sarnez rapporteur at its meeting of 10 September 2002.

It considered the Commission proposal and draft report at its meetings of 10 December 2002, 20 January and 17 March 2003.

At the last meeting it adopted the draft legislative resolution unanimously.

The following were present for the vote: Michel Rocard, chairman; Mario Mauro and Theresa Zabell, vice-chairmen; Marielle de Sarnez, rapporteur; Pedro Aparicio Sánchez, Juan José Bayona de Perogordo (for Vasco Graça Moura), Christopher J.P. Beazley, Raina A. Mercedes Echerer, Janelly Fourtou (for Francis Decourrière), Geneviève Fraisse, Marie-Hélène Gillig (for Giorgio Ruffolo), Lissy Gröner, Ruth Hieronymi, Ulpu Iivari, Renzo Imbeni, Maria Martens, Pietro-Paolo Mennea, Juan Ojeda Sanz, Barbara O'Toole, Doris Pack, Roy Perry, Christa Prets, Marieke Sanders-ten Holte, Peder Wachtmeister (for Domenico Mennitti), Eurig Wyn and Myrsini Zorba (for Gianni Vattimo).

The opinions of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security and Defence Policy, the Committee on Budgets, the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs and the Committee on Women's Rights and Equal Opportunities are attached.

The report was tabled on 25 March 2003.
DRAFT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION


(Codecision procedure: first reading)

The European Parliament,

– having regard to the Commission proposal to Parliament and the Council (COM(2002) 4011),

– having regard to Article 251(2) of the EC Treaty and Article 149 of the EC Treaty, pursuant to which the Commission submitted the proposal to Parliament (C5-0360/2002),

– having regard to Rule 67 of its Rules of Procedure,

– having regard to the report of the Committee on Culture, Youth, Education, the Media and Sport and the opinions of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security and Defence Policy, the Committee on Budgets, the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs and the Committee on Women’s Rights and Equal Opportunities (A5 0087/2003),

1. Approves the Commission proposal as amended;

2. Considers that the financial statement attached to this report is compatible with the heading 3 ceiling, provided that the budgetary authority determines the appropriate means of financing this amount within the limits of the Financial Perspective or pursuant to the provisions of the IIA of 6 May 1999;

3. Asks to be consulted again should the Commission intend to amend the proposal substantially or replace it with another text;

4. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council and Commission.

Text proposed by the Commission Amendments by Parliament

Amendment 1

Title

Proposal for a European Parliament and Council Decision establishing a programme

Proposal for a European Parliament and Council Decision establishing a programme

for the enhancement of quality in higher education and the promotion of intercultural understanding through cooperation with third countries (Erasmus \textit{World}) (2004-2008)

\hspace*{2cm} for the enhancement of quality in higher education and the promotion of intercultural understanding through cooperation with third countries (Erasmus \textit{Mundus}) (2004-2008)

\textit{(This amendment applies to the whole of the legislative text; its adoption will imply technical adjustments throughout the text.)}

\textbf{Justification}

\textit{Giving this programme a universal name will enable it to be identified throughout the world, thereby preserving the principle of linguistic diversity.}

\textbf{Amendment 2}

Recital 1

(1) The European Community \textit{and the Member States} shall contribute to the development of quality education inter alia through co-operation with third countries.

\hspace*{2cm} (1) The European Community shall contribute to the development of quality education inter alia through co-operation with third countries.

\textbf{Justification}

\textit{Article 149 of the EC Treaty specifies that Community intervention in the field of education is restricted to supporting and supplementing the actions of the Member States.}

\textbf{Amendment 3}

Recital 5

(5) In its Communication on reinforcing cooperation with third countries in the field of higher education, the Commission argued that greater internationalisation of higher education is necessary to respond to the challenges of the process of globalisation, identified overall objectives for a third-country cooperation strategy in this field and suggested concrete measures for achieving these objectives; \hspace*{2cm} (5) In its Communication on reinforcing cooperation with third countries in the field of higher education, the Commission argued that greater internationalisation of higher education is necessary to respond to the challenges of the process of globalisation, identified overall objectives for a third-country cooperation strategy in this field and suggested concrete measures for achieving these objectives, in
particular with the Mediterranean area countries;

Justification

The European Union has already drawn up a strategy vis-à-vis the countries of the Mediterranean – rich and ancient depositories of civilisation and knowledge – but this strategy should not exclude co-operation in the field of higher education.

Amendment 4
Recital 5 a (new)

(5a) Since the promotion of linguistic diversity and language-learning was one of the aims of European Year of Languages 2001, it is essential that the European Union takes this into account in its relations with third countries.

Justification

Linguistic diversity and language learning must be involved in promoting students’ mobility.

Amendment 5
Recital 6

(6) There is a need to step up Community efforts to promote dialogue and understanding between cultures worldwide, specially as mobility fosters the discovery of new cultural and social environments and facilitates understanding thereof

(6) There is a need to step up Community efforts to promote dialogue and understanding between cultures worldwide, and to disseminate the ideals of democracy, including equality of women and men, specially as mobility fosters the discovery of new cultural and social environments and facilitates understanding thereof

Amendment 6
Recital 6 a (new)
6 a. This programme provides for the establishment of an ‘Erasmus Mundus Masters Course’ which will enable students to travel round Europe attending several different universities. This new European dimension to higher education should be taken into account in the review of existing programmes such as Socrates (Erasmus), in order to take adequate measures to promote access to this programme for European students;

Justification

This new programme offers a new vision of higher education in Europe. Existing programmes should therefore be reviewed (with a view to facilitating access to programmes, reconsidering the level of scholarships, developing means of information, etc.)

Amendment 7
Recital 6 a (new)

(6 a) Intensifying cultural co-operation programmes with third countries can, within the framework of development co-operation, contribute to improving standards of living and to raising the poverty threshold;

Justification

Self-explanatory.

Amendment 8
Recital 7 a (new)

7a. There is a need to make society more proactive and to promote voluntary, decentralised cooperation between higher education institutions; the EU’s role in this ought to focus on monitoring and recognition;
Justification

It is important to achieve a catalytic effect so that the higher education institutions themselves take the decision to organise masters courses in cooperation with other institutions, thus ensuring the continuity of this action.

Amendment 9
Recital 7 a (new)

(7 a) Some higher education establishments in the Member States have already acquired experience in terms of co-operation with third countries.

Justification

The Commission proposal does not sufficiently appreciate the achievements of some higher education establishments in terms of cooperation with third countries. Several experiences are worthy of consideration, such as, in France, the academic research undertaken by the Leonardo da Vinci University Centre in partnership with American, Canadian, Lebanese or Russian universities.

Amendment 10
Recital 7 b (new)

(7 b) There is, however, a common recognition, among the European Union institutions and among relevant stakeholders, that currently the EU’s academic institutions fail to attract a proportionate share of internationally mobile students of a high calibre;
Regrettably, despite the very high quality of much of what is on offer in EU institutions of higher education, many more very able third country students are attracted to institutions in, for example, the United States or Canada.

Amendment 11
Recital 8

(8) European higher education institutions must remain at the leading edge of developments; to this end they should seek to establish co-operation with third-country institutions that have achieved a level of development comparable to that of higher education institutions in the Community.

(8) European higher education institutions must remain at the leading edge of developments; to this end they should step up their co-operation with third-country institutions that have achieved a level of development comparable to that of higher education institutions in the Community.

Justification

The Commission proposal does not sufficiently appreciate the achievements of some higher education establishments in terms of cooperation with third countries. For these countries – for the Leonardo da Vinci University Centre in France, for example – the Erasmus World programme will complement and enhance the current scientific cooperation programmes.

Amendment 12
Recital 8 a (new)

8 a (new) Higher education must be understood as a whole, of which occupational training forms an integral part, taking account of specific pathways such as training courses for engineers or higher technicians.
Justification

Article 2 of this proposal gives a broad definition of what is to be understood by 'higher education institution'; nevertheless it should be recalled that institutions offering specific training courses or higher qualifications are also targeted by this programme.

Amendment 13
Recital 9 a (new)

9a. Calls on the Member States to look at the need for the programme to receive recognition so that participating students, once they have completed it, may have the option to validate the qualification obtained and can, if they wish to, take their postgraduate studies further by undertaking more specialised study such as a doctorate;

Justification

The programme should not be considered an end in itself, and therefore I consider it valuable to offer the possibility of continuing education via specialisation in further postgraduate studies, which would entail express recognition of the validity of the masters course and the actions set out in this programme.

Amendment 14
Recital 9 a (new)

(9 a) The aim of this programme is to contribute to improving the quality of higher education in Europe, it will at the same time have an impact on the visibility and perception of the European Union around the world as well as building a capital of goodwill among those who have participated in the programme;
Justification

While the primary aim of the programme will be educational, improving the quality of higher education in Europe by bringing the most able students in third countries, it will in turn bring benefits all round, and will also have a positive impact on how the EU is perceived outside Europe.

Amendment 15
Recital 10

(10) In order to reinforce the added value of Community action it is necessary to ensure coherence and complementarity between the actions implemented in the framework of this Decision and other relevant Community policies, instruments and actions, in particular the sixth framework programme for research and external co-operation programmes in the higher education sector.

(10) In order to reinforce the added value of Community action it is necessary to ensure coherence and complementarity between the actions implemented in the framework of this Decision and other relevant Community policies, instruments and actions, in particular the sixth framework programme for research, the Community programmes relating to education and vocational training, and external co-operation programmes in the higher education sector.

Justification

The ‘Socrates’ and ‘Leonardo da Vinci’ programmes aspire to be laboratories of innovation and best practice in education and vocational training. The results of these programmes should be transferred more systematically to other Community programmes and measures. This is, indeed, one of the recommendations made in the study entitled ‘The globalisation of education and training: recommendations for a coherent response by the European Union’.

Amendment 16
Recital 10 a (new)

(10 a.) The intervention of the European Union should in no way jeopardise the fundamental principles of higher education in the Member States, namely academic neutrality of teaching, freedom of research and the independence of university teachers.
Justification

The Erasmus World programme must on no account be used to infringe in any way the guiding principles on which the credibility and quality of higher education are based; in addition freedom of research is one of the foundation stones of higher education in Europe.

Amendment 17
Article 1, paragraph 1

1. This Decision establishes a programme for the enhancement of quality in higher education and the promotion of intercultural understanding through co-operation with third countries, ‘Erasmus World’, hereinafter referred to as ‘the programme’.

Justification

This programme will need not only to improve the quality of European higher education but also to promote it throughout the world. A ‘universal’ name for the programme will help identify it and so preserve the principle of linguistic diversity.

Amendment 18
Article 1, paragraph 2 a (new)

(2a) This programme will respect the competences of the European Union and the Member States in education and training, and their cultural and linguistic diversity.

Justification

Cultural and linguistic diversity must be preserved, as Article 1(4) of the Socrates II Programme requires.
Amendment 19
Article 2, paragraph 3

3. ‘third country scholar’: means a national of a third country other than those from EEA EFTA States and countries candidate for accession to the European Community; who is not a resident of any of the Member States or the participating countries as provided for in Article 12; who may not have carried out his or her main activity (studies, work, etc.) for more than a total of 12 months over the last five years in any of the Member States or the participating countries; and who has outstanding academic and/or professional experience.

Justification
The draftsman takes the view that beneficiaries should have outstanding academic and professional experience; however, priority should be given to outstanding academic experience.

Amendment 20
Article 3, paragraph 1

1. The programme’s overall aim is to enhance quality education by improving the perception of European higher education world-wide and by fostering co-operation with third countries in order to improve the development of human resources and to promote dialogue and understanding between peoples and cultures.

Justification
To aid clarity. In addition, every opportunity should be taken to spread the ideals which underlie European cooperation.
Amendment 21
Article 3, paragraph 2, point (b)

(b) to encourage a greater world-wide interest in the acquisition of European qualifications and/or experience among highly qualified graduates and scholars from all over the world, and to enable them to obtain such qualifications and/or experience;

(b) to encourage students and university teachers from all over the world to obtain European experience and/or qualifications;

Justification

To aid clarity.

Amendment 22
Article 3, paragraph 2, point (c)

(c) to strengthen a more structured co-operation between European Union and third country institutions and a greater EU outgoing mobility as part of European study programmes.

(c) to strengthen a more structured co-operation between European Union and third-country higher education institutions and a greater EU outgoing mobility as part of European study programmes.

Justification

To aid clarity.

Amendment 23
Article 3, paragraph 3

3. The Commission shall, when pursuing the objectives of the programme, observe the Community’s general policy on equal opportunities for men and women. The Commission shall also ensure that no group of citizens or third country nationals is excluded or disadvantaged.

3. The Commission shall, when pursuing the objectives of the programme, observe the Community’s general policy on equal opportunities for men and women. The Commission shall also ensure that no group of citizens or third country nationals is excluded or disadvantaged, in
accordance with Article 21(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

Justification

Amendment 24
Article 3, paragraph 3 a (new)

3 a (new) The Commission must seek to ensure that the programme does not exacerbate the brain drain from third countries or EU Member States;

Justification

It is very important that the programme should not exacerbate the brain drain, which is already a problem both for EU Member States and for third countries.

Amendment 25
Article 4, paragraph 1, introduction

1. The objectives of this programme as set out in article 2 shall be pursued by means of the following actions:

Justification

Article 3 deals with the programme’s objectives.

Amendment 26
Article 4, paragraph 1 (a)

(a) European Union Masters Courses;

(a) Erasmus Mundus Masters Courses labelled as such and taking account of the proposed training and hosting of students;
Justification

The use of the term ‘Erasmus Mundus Masters Course’ will make it possible to identify the training offered by the European Union easily and in every country. Every time the text refers to ‘EU Masters Course’, this must be understood as meaning ‘Erasmus Mundus Masters Course’. The labelled training must guarantee a particular quality of training and of hosting.

Amendment 27
Article 4, paragraph 2, point (a)

(a) support for the development of joint educational programmes and co-operation networks facilitating the exchange of experience and good practice;

(a) support for the development of joint educational programmes and co-operation networks and for pilot projects based on transnational partnerships, facilitating the exchange of experience and good practice;

Justification

It is preferable not to diversify activities too much but to target the main ones. Joint educational programmes and pilot projects based on transnational partnerships are activities that will need substantial and widespread support.

Amendment 28
Article 4, paragraph 2, point (b)

(b) support for mobility, between the European Community and third countries, of people in the field of higher education;

(b) increased support for mobility, between the European Community and third countries, of people in the field of higher education;

Justification

Promoting language skills and understanding for cultural differences, particularly by using the languages of at least two countries involved in the EU Masters Courses, and helping the mobility of students, university teachers and researchers from third countries are activities that will need substantial and widespread support.
Amendment 29
Article 4, paragraph 2 (c)

(c) promotion of language skills and the understanding of different cultures;

(c) promotion of language skills, in particular by the use of at least two languages spoken in the countries in which the institutions involved in the Erasmus Mundus Masters Course are situated, and promotion of the understanding of different cultures;

Justification

The promotion of language skills, before and during a third country student's or graduate's stay in Europe, must be given broad support. One of the objectives to be achieved at the end of the Erasmus Mundus Masters Course should be for the student to be able to use at least two languages spoken in countries in which the institutions offering the Masters Course are situated. In this way it will be possible for English to be the vehicular language of training, and for particular support to be given to enable the student to acquire a good knowledge of another language spoken in the country of the institution he is attending.

Amendment 30
Article 4, paragraph 2, point (d)

(d) support for pilot projects based on transnational partnerships designed to develop innovation and quality in international higher education; deleted

Justification

It is preferable not to diversify activities too much but to target the main ones so that those chosen can be accomplished in accordance with the programme’s objectives.

Amendment 31
Article 4, paragraph 2 (e)

(e) support for the development of methods of analysis and follow-up of trends in, and evolution of, international trends in, and evolution of, international
evolution of, international higher education.

**Justification**

To raise the level of European higher education it is particularly important to monitor the development of international higher education. However, for this purpose there is no need to develop separate analysis and follow-up methods; what is needed is to make use of the existing, tried and tested methods.

**Amendment 32**

Article 5 (e)

(e) public or private bodies *involved with* higher education.

**Justification**

Higher education must be seen as a whole of which occupational training forms an integral part, taking account of the existence of specific pathways, e.g. for engineers or higher technicians, offered in institutions other than universities.

**Amendment 33**

Article 6, paragraph 1 (c)

(c) consult the relevant associations and organisations in the field of higher education at European level and shall inform the Committee referred to in Article 8 of their opinions;

(c) *involve and* consult the relevant associations and organisations in the field of higher education at European level and shall inform the Committee referred to in Article 8 of their opinions;

**Justification**

It will be essential to consult, and take into account wherever possible, the opinions of relevant associations and organisations in the field of higher education at European level such as the European University Association (EUA, which has been given the task of implementing the pilot action on European Masters Courses for 2002-2003).
Amendment 34  
Article 6, paragraph 1, point (d)  
(d) seek synergies and develop joint actions with other intra-Community programmes and actions in the field of higher education and research.

**Justification**

The Commission should be developing joint activities with other intra-Community programmes and actions in the field of higher education and research, such as Socrates or e-Learning.

Amendment 35  
Article 6, paragraph 2 (b)  
(b) designate appropriate structures that shall cooperate closely with the Commission; and facilitate access to information for all parties likely to be interested in this programme;

**Justification**

Information measures on this programme must be as broadly based as possible and must make use of all the available means of communication: the press, the Internet, etc. This calls for the participation both of Member States and of the universities, associations and organisations involved in higher education.

Amendment 36  
Article 6, paragraph 2, point (d) a (new)  
**d a)** ensure that there is complementarity and coherence between the programme and any similar national initiatives.
Justification

A number of Member States already have national programmes aimed at promoting student exchanges with non-European third countries. The amendment aims to ensure that there are synergies between this programme and the national initiatives.

Amendment 37
Article 6, paragraph 2 a, point (a) (new)

2a. The Commission, in cooperation with the Member States, shall

(a) ensure appropriate information, publicity and follow-up for the actions supported by this programme;

Justification

The wording of this new paragraph 3 takes up Article 5(3) of the Socrates II Programme.

Amendment 38
Article 6, paragraph 2 a, point (b) (new)

(b) ensure the dissemination of the results of the actions undertaken within the framework of this programme.

Justification

The wording of this new paragraph 3 takes up Article 5(3) of the Socrates II Programme.

Amendment 39
Article 6 a (new)

6 a (new) The Commission and the Member States shall jointly ensure that the administration of the programme is transparent, accessible and comprehensible
to all.

Justification

Self-explanatory.

Amendment 40
Article 7, paragraph 1, point (c)

(c) the annual budget and the breakdown of funds among the different actions of the programme;

Justification

To ensure that the budget is primarily used for grants to students, a budget breakdown for the various actions is proposed in the annex below.

Amendment 41
Article 7, paragraph 2 a (new)

2 a. The selection procedures referred to in Article 7(1)(a) concerning the projects and beneficiaries listed under Actions 1 and 3 shall be carried out by a high-level selection board appointed on a proposal from the Commission and with the approval of the committee referred to in Article 8 of this programme. This selection board shall be made up of prominent figures from the academic world reflecting the diversity of higher education in the European Union.

Justification

This amendment aims to minimise political influence over the selection of projects/beneficiaries.
Amendment 42  
Article 8, paragraph 3 a (new)

3 a (new) The Committee shall involve and consult the relevant associations and organisations in the field of higher education;

Justification

It will be essential to consult, and take into account wherever possible, the opinions of relevant associations and organisations in the field of higher education at European level.

Amendment 43  
Article 9

Article 9 deleted

Co-operation with other programme committees and information on other Community initiatives

To ensure the consistency of this programme with other measures referred to in Article 11, the Commission shall keep the Committee regularly informed about Community initiatives taken in the fields of education, training and youth, including co-operation with third countries and international organisations.

Justification

To ensure the programme is clear, deleted here and reinserted in Article 11 as amended below.
Amendment 44
Article 10

Funding
1. The financial framework for the implementation of this programme for the period specified in Article 1 is hereby set at EUR 200 million.

2. The annual appropriations shall be authorised by the budgetary authority within the limits of the financial perspective.

Amendment 45
Article 11, paragraph 1

1. The Commission shall, in co-operation with the Member States, ensure overall consistency and complementarity with other relevant Community policies, instruments and actions, in particular with the sixth framework programme for research and with external co-operation programmes in the field of higher education.

1. The Commission shall, in co-operation with the Member States, ensure overall consistency and complementarity with other relevant Community policies, instruments and actions, in particular with the sixth framework programme for research and, if possible, the Community’s vocational education and training programmes, and with external co-operation programmes in the field of higher education.

Justification

The ‘Socrates’ and ‘Leonardo da Vinci’ programmes aspire to be laboratories of innovation and best practice in education and vocational training. The results of these programmes should be transferred more systematically to other Community programmes and measures. This is, indeed, one of the recommendations made in the study entitled ‘The globalisation of education and training: recommendations for a coherent response by the European Union’.
Amendment 46
Article 11, paragraph 1a (new)

1a. To ensure the consistency of this programme with other measures referred to in this Article, the Commission shall keep the Committee regularly informed about Community initiatives taken in the fields of education, training and youth, including cooperation with third countries and international organisations.

Justification

For clarity Article 9 of the Commission proposal is inserted here as a new paragraph.

Amendment 47
Article 13, paragraph 2

2. This programme shall be evaluated regularly by the Commission. This evaluation is intended to assess the relevance, effectiveness and impact of actions implemented with regard to the objectives referred to in Article 3. It will also consider the impact of the programme as a whole. Special attention will be paid to gender issues and equity issues, as well as the prevention of brain drain.

This evaluation will also examine the complementarity between action under this programme and that pursued under other relevant Community policies, instruments and actions.

Justification

Abridged wording is guided by Article 14 of the Socrates II Programme.
Amendment 48
ANNEX, PART 1, ACTION 1, paragraph 1

1. The Community will identify and grant European postgraduate courses the label of ‘European Union Masters Courses’ through a rigorous selection process as provided for in Article 7(1) and in accordance with the procedure set out in Article 8(2).

1. The Community will identify and grant European postgraduate courses the label of ‘Erasmus Mundus Masters Courses’ on the grounds of the quality of courses offered and the quality of student hosting, through a rigorous selection process as provided for in Article 7(1) and in accordance with the procedure set out in Article 8(2).

Justification

The ‘Erasmus Mundus Masters Course’ label must be granted in recognition of the quality of the training offered by universities as well as the quality of hosting given to students (ease of access to accommodation, language courses, granting of visas, etc.).

Amendment 49
Annex, Action 1, paragraph 1 a (new)

1a. Masters courses will be selected on the basis of a table of objective evaluation criteria, including quality, in order to guarantee continuity of courses.

Justification

It is important, in addition to the common minimum criteria set out in paragraph 2 of this action, for a table of objective evaluation criteria to be laid down in order to ensure that the action programme is properly effective.

Amendment 50
ANNEX, PART 1, ACTION 1, paragraph 2 (a) a (new)

a) a. are representative of the various fields of study (scientific and literary in particular);
**Justification**

In order to guarantee the effectiveness of the objective of promoting dialogue and comprehension between peoples and cultures set out in Article 3 of this programme, there needs to be a fair representation of the various university disciplines, and in particular the humanities, which promote knowledge of oneself and of others. This is fully consistent with the EU’s 6th Research Framework Programme which includes the humanities among the research areas covered by the thematic priority entitled ‘citizens and governance in a knowledge-based society’.

**Amendment 51**

ANNEX, PART 1, ACTION 1, paragraph 2 (b)

(b) implement a study programme which involves a period of study in at least two of the three institutions under (a);

(b) implement a study programme which involves a period of study in at least two of the three institutions under (a) and permit students to acquire a knowledge of at least two languages spoken in the countries in which the higher education institutions involved in the Erasmus Mundus Masters Course are situated;

**Justification**

The promotion of language skills, before and during a third country student’s or graduate’s stay in Europe, must be given broad support. One of the objectives to be achieved at the end of the Erasmus Mundus Masters Course should be for the student to be able to use at least two languages spoken in countries in which the institutions offering the Masters Course are situated. In this way it will be possible for English to be the vehicular language of training, and for particular support to be given to enable the student to acquire a good knowledge of another language spoken in the country of the institution he is attending.

**Amendment 52**

ANNEX, PART 1, ACTION 1, paragraph 2 (h)

(h) put in place adequate arrangements to facilitate access for, and hosting of, third country students (information facilities, accommodation, etc.);

(h) put in place adequate high-quality arrangements to facilitate access for, and hosting of, third country students, particularly in conjunction with local and regional authorities;
regional authorities.

Justification

The ‘Erasmus Mundus Masters Course’ label must be granted in recognition of the quality of the training offered by universities as well as the quality of the hosting of students (ease of finding accommodation, language courses, granting of visas, etc.). It is important in particular to involve local and regional authorities in setting up hosting arrangements, since they are in a position to provide simple and effective solutions to specific problems such as student accommodation.

Amendment 53
ANNEX, PART 1, ACTION 1, paragraph 2 (i)

(i) provide, as appropriate, for students' language preparation and assistance.

Justification

Linguistic diversity should be promoted by the teaching of at least two languages spoken in the countries of the higher education institutions involved in the Erasmus Mundus Masters Course.

Amendment 54
Annex, ‘Action 1: European Union Masters Courses’, paragraph 2, point (i a)(new)

i a) provide for relations with research centres and businesses;

EN
Justification

It is in the interests of the European Union to facilitate employment market access for the students concerned by this programme, with a view to lasting integration. Partnerships between the universities and industry can help to further this aim.

Amendment 55
Annex, Action 1, paragraph 3

3. European Union Masters Courses will be selected for a five-year period, subject to a light-weight annual renewal procedure based on progress reporting, which period could include a year's preparatory activities before the actual course begins to run. Funding would be subject to the annual renewal procedure.

Justification

In view of how important monitoring of the masters courses is in terms of achieving the objectives set in this programme, it would be useful for the Commission to consult a committee of experts – perhaps the committee which analysed the masters courses for initial selection.

Amendment 56
Annex, Action 2, paragraph 4

4. In accordance with Article 6(2), Member States shall take the necessary steps to expedite the granting of entry visas and stay permits to grantees and, where required, the granting of degree equivalence.

4. In accordance with Article 6(2), Member States shall take the necessary steps to expedite the granting of entry visas and stay permits to grantees and the granting of degree recognition and/or equivalence.
Justification

The granting of degree equivalence requires, in many cases, the existence in the country of origin of the same qualification or a similar one, meaning that the student would run the risk of the degree not being recognised in his or her country.

Amendment 57
ANNEX, PART 1, ACTION 2, paragraph 5

5. The selection procedure shall ensure appropriate balance across fields of study and students' and scholars' regions of provenance and Member State of destination and will encourage the participation of women and less-advantaged students from third countries.

Justification

In order to guarantee the effectiveness of the objective of promoting dialogue and understanding between peoples and cultures set out in Article 3 of this programme, the various university disciplines, and in particular the humanities, which promote knowledge of oneself and of others, need to be fairly represented. This is fully consistent with the EU’s 6th Research Framework Programme which includes the humanities among the research areas covered by the thematic priority entitled ‘citizens and governance in a knowledge-based society’.

Amendment 58
ANNEX, PART 1, ACTION 3, paragraph 3

3. Partnerships will serve to develop, whenever possible, institutionalised networks, based on structured and sustainable cooperation designed to contribute to the development of local capacity through the transfer of know-how; every masters course meeting the required criteria and providing for this type of
partnership shall be given priority for the award of the Erasmus Mundus Master’s Course label.

Justification

Every master’s course meeting the required criteria which provides for partnership with a third country university should be given priority in consideration of its request for the Erasmus Mundus Master’s Course label in view of the effort made to give the master’s course in question an international dimension, in line with the spirit of this programme.

Amendment 59
Annex, ‘Action 3: Partnerships with third country higher education institutions’, paragraph 5, third indent

- development and dissemination of new methodologies in higher education, including the use of information and communication technologies, e-learning, and open and distance learning;

- development and dissemination of new methodologies in higher education, including the use of information and communication technologies, e-learning, and open and distance learning; development of partnerships with undertakings with a view to fostering links and exchanges of information between universities and undertakings, thereby facilitating integration into/access to working life;

Justification

Self-explanatory.
Amendment 60
Annex, Part 1, Action 4, paragraph 1

1. The Community will provide support to higher education institutions and public non-profit making organisations working towards the promotion of European higher education abroad with the aim of not exceeding more than 3% of the total budget.

Justification
To aid clarity. The new wording avoids a long list of possible actions and ensures the programme budget is mainly used to promote student mobility.

Amendment 61
Annex, action 4, point 2

2. Eligible institutions would include public or private organisations dealing with issues pertaining to the provision of higher education domestically or at international level. Activities shall be conducted within networks involving a minimum of three organisations from three different Member States and may involve organisations from third countries. Activities (which may include seminars, conferences, workshops, development of ICT tools, production of material for publication, etc.) may take place in the Member States or in third countries. Particular consideration shall be given to organisations working on behalf of the less-advantaged, such as women’s rights organisations in countries where there is an imbalance of equality, and in particular where women are under-represented at the decision-making level.
Amendment 62
Annex, ‘Action 4: Enhancing attractiveness’, paragraph 4.1, point 2, first indent

- development of general written or visual common information and dissemination tools contributing towards a better understanding of the value of study in Europe;

- development of general written or visual common information and dissemination tools contributing towards a better understanding of the value of study, and if possible of its synergy with vocational training, in Europe; establishment of an Internet gateway to facilitate access to EU Masters Courses and other European courses within the framework of this action which are likely to supply up-to-date information on them; the participating universities shall work together on the exchange of this information;

Justification

To aid clarity. The new wording avoids a long list of possible actions. The introduction of an Internet gateway, to which Annex, Part 1, Action 4, paragraph 4.2, point 2, last indent refers, should more logically appear in this paragraph dealing with the production of general information. This portal should include specific and up-to-date information on this programme so that those interested are able to obtain all the information they need on course content and the requirements for participation and obtaining scholarships, on the universities, on the various actions being carried out and, finally, all information that may be of interest related to the above.
Amendment 63
Annex, Part 1, Action 4, paragraph 4.2, point 2, last indent

– further development of an internet gateway to facilitate access to European Union Masters Courses as well as to other European courses suitable for third country students.

Justification

The introduction of an Internet gateway should more logically appear in the paragraph dealing with the production of general information (see Amendment 35 – Action 4, paragraph 4.2, point 2, indent 1).

Amendment 64
Annex, Action 4.3, paragraph 1, indent 4

- evolving curriculum development needs; - evolving curriculum development needs which take account of the mainstreaming principle;

Amendment 65
Annex, Action 4.3, paragraph 1, indent 5

- changes in society and in education systems; - changes in society and in education systems which must promote equal treatment and opportunities for women and men;

Justification

Need to promote a male-female balance in the different areas.
Amendment 66
Annex, Part 1, Action 4, paragraph 4.3, point 1, last indent

– surveys and studies (e.g. on the decision-making process of foreign students seeking study abroad, on obstacles to study in Europe, etc.).

– surveys and studies of high quality and in limited numbers (e.g. on the decision-making process of foreign students seeking study abroad, on obstacles to study in Europe, etc.).

Justification

To aid clarity. The new wording avoids a long list of possible actions and ensures the programme budget is mainly used to promote student mobility.
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

I  BRIEF HISTORY

Article 149 of the Treaty says that ‘the Community and the Member States shall foster cooperation with third countries ...’ with the aim of developing quality education in Europe. This is the purpose of the proposal now before us.

We may discern three main stages in the implementation of a Europe of education that is both attractive and open to the world.

In the Bologna declaration of 19 June 1999 the Education Ministers of the Member States and 14 other European countries confirmed the need 'to ensure that the European higher education system acquires a world-wide degree of attraction equal to our extraordinary cultural and scientific traditions.'

The Lisbon European Council of 24 March 2000 said that the European Union had been confronted by, and must respond to, a quantum shift resulting from globalisation and the challenges of the new knowledge-driven economy. The Member States and the European Community were beginning to realise that, in the present context of globalisation and interdependence, the needs of higher education would go beyond the frontiers of the European Union, and even of Europe itself.

Finally, the European Ministers of higher education meeting in Prague on 19 May 2001 confirmed their resolve to enhance the attractiveness of European higher education to students from Europe and other parts of the world.

The proposal also takes account of policies adopted by the United States of America, Canada and Australia in response to the globalisation of higher education.

It follows up the Commission Communication to the European Parliament and Council on strengthening cooperation with third countries in the field of higher education 1.

II  THE COMMISSION PROPOSAL

1. The general aim of the five-year the Erasmus World Programme (EW), which is to run from January 2004 to December 2008, is to contribute to the development of quality education through closer cooperation with third countries. It seeks to:
   •  to better prepare citizens in Europe and partner third countries, to live and work in a global, knowledge-based society;
   •  to strengthen Europe’s attractiveness as a pole of excellence in higher education;
   •  to improve mutual understanding between peoples and cultures, thus contributing to world peace and stability through people-to-people exchanges and structural cooperation.

2. To this end the programme will provide financial assistance for:

• EU Masters Courses, selected for a period of five years, involving at least three higher education institutions from three different Member States and leading to double or multiple degrees;
• scholarships for third-country visiting scholars for teaching and scholarly assignments (average three months) connected with EU Masters Courses;
• scholarships for third-country graduate students;
• partnerships (up to three years) between European Union Masters Courses and third-country higher education universities, including European Union student and staff outgoing mobility;
• studies, conferences, seminars, publications, joint development of marketing actions, joint development of Web-based and other tools to support international education and student mobility.

3. The Commission is proposing a multiannual budget of EUR 200 million; three-quarters (144 million) will be allocated to grants for third-country students (131 million) and travelling scholars (13 million). For the reference period the Commission plans to support 4170 graduate students from third countries and 1020 travelling scholars. EUR 26 million are earmarked to support partnerships with third-country higher education institutions. Administrative costs and support expenditure total EUR 13 million, or 6.5% of the programme’s total cost.

The programme will be centrally administered by the Commission with the help of an implementing agency. National agencies designated by the Member States will provide information and advisory activities in relation to the programme’s objectives.

III RAPPORTEUR’S COMMENTS

The programme is eagerly awaited, not only by students but also universities. The aim is to set up a European higher education system of a high standard, recognised for the quality of its teaching and student facilities. The system will enable students to go on a ‘European tour’ in the course of their university studies. What better way could there be to promote a knowledge-based Europe?

I can only approve the principle of this programme as a whole. But I would wish to make a few clarifications.

1 Selection procedures

The selection procedure should comply with the arrangements laid down in each Member State, encouraging the participation of leading figures from the European academic world.

The qualification of EU Masters Course should be awarded primarily for two reasons: the quality of teaching proposed by the three universities for their project, and the hosting facilities for students.

On the selection of students for the award of a grant, pre-selection will be carried out by the institutions participating in the EU Masters Course.
2 Exchange and reciprocity

At a time when it is our ambition to build a Europe of solidarity, open to the world at large, we need to provide for the funds so that students in the quality Masters course network can also visit the universities of the partner third countries.

The Commission proposal states that partnerships with third-country universities will not be compulsory. But since this programme has long-term international ambitions, it would be wise to give preference to Masters courses applying for the EU label which have made provision for a partnership with at least one third-country higher education institution.

3 Scholarships

The total figure for scholarships granted to third-country students visiting the EU calls for a brief comment. Since it works out at approximately EUR 1600 per month, some have regarded this as excessive, comparing it to the figure granted to European students taking part in other exchange programmes.

While comparisons with such programmes as Erasmus are inevitable, we should insist on the need to take advantage of the mid-term review of Socrates to revise upward the figure for such scholarships.

On the present programme, the figure seems consonant with its objective of attracting motivated and talented students from third countries to the European universities in the right conditions. Students often receive offers of higher scholarships from the American universities, such as those under the Fulbright programme which are for more than EUR 1800.

4 Linguistic diversity

This programme cannot be implemented without giving thought to the problem of linguistic diversity. Of course it does not insist on the use of a specific language. But there are fears that the proposed courses will be given, for convenience, in English. This raises the question as to whether or not we want English to become the de facto sole language for the courses.

So I am making the following proposal: students from third countries visiting EU universities must be able to use at least two languages of the countries participating in the network of Masters courses with the EU label. This obviously means that they can if necessary improve their standard by taking language courses offered before enrolling on the course and throughout its duration.

5 Length of stay

There can be little doubt that the conditions for implementing this programme will provide for minimum periods of study in each of the participating universities. But we should ensure that the pattern of these periods of residence is consistent.
For this reason I am recommending that the period of stay for third-country students should, where possible, be of equal length in each of the universities in the course network.

6 Title of the programme

The name ‘Erasmus World’ uses an English term which has been reproduced, no doubt for convenience, in all the language versions. The choice of title must fulfil two requirements: first, it must make the programme identifiable in the Member States as well as in third countries; second, it must respect the cultural and linguistic diversity of the Member States, the need for which we have just underlined. For this reason I am proposing that the present title is translated into Latin as ‘Erasmus Mundus’. Latin is a universal language and remains intelligible throughout the world. The new title also makes it possible to identify the European origin of the programme, without drawing attention to the pre-eminence of a language of one of the Member States.

7 University exchanges

The programme makes provision for university teachers to visit Europe. This is very important for promotion of the programme as well as for its smooth operation.

But we need to ensure that the people who will benefit from the programme are selected in accordance with rigorous criteria based on the requirements of quality. So applications will be subject to scrutiny in the originating institutions and the applicant’s professional career will be a determining factor for selection.

8 Budgetary aspects

The programme should have a multiannual budget of around EUR 200 million. As the Commission points out, in paragraph 2.4 of the financial statement, this proposal will involve reprogramming heading 3 of the Financial Perspective. Indeed, in accordance with the declaration of 20 July 2000 the Commission will need to assess the impact of its new proposals on the current financial framework. Parliament will also assess the compatibility of the envelopes proposed by the Commission, taking account of the need to maintain existing programmes.

To implement a large-scale programme that could benefit a substantial number of students and achieve the ambitious aims that we have set ourselves, I propose that the programme should benefit from a multiannual budget of around EUR 300 million.

I shall recommend a budget breakdown close to that proposed by the Commission, but with a greater endowment to assist the mobility of third-country students. To this end, the measures undertaken in Action 4, ‘Enhancing Attractiveness’, should not exceed 3 % of the total budget, thus releasing funds for scholarships for students.

9 Enhancing the attractiveness of European higher education

Here the Commission proposes to support a number of communication and information projects about the new programme and studies, conferences, seminars, publications and
marketing campaigns. Software tools will also be jointly devised, mainly using the Internet, to encourage the international education and mobility of students and promote the image of European higher education.

It would seem to me wiser and more logical not to overdo the spending on these operations. This programme’s budget should as a priority and for the most part be allocated to student mobility, in accordance with its intentions and our policy objective.

IV CONCLUSIONS

The programme responds to a strong demand for mobility, which has been apparent for some years in the success of the Erasmus Programme. At the beginning of the 21st century, we should be stepping up our efforts to promote high-quality European education throughout the world. The new technologies have opened up the world of knowledge in an exceptional way, and Europe has great potential to offer in this field, which it has not yet entirely developed.
FINANCIAL STATEMENT*

*accompanying the report, pursuant to Rule 159(3)(c) of the Rules of Procedure (only if the proposed financial framework differs from the Commission proposal)

Report: A5-0087/2003
Rapporteur: Marielle DE SARNEZ

1. DESCRIPTION

1.1 Title of the action: programme for the enhancement of quality in higher education and the promotion of intercultural understanding through cooperation with third countries (ERASMUS MUNDUS)

1.2 Political field(s): education and culture
Activity/activities: education

1.3 ABB nomenclature (traditional nomenclature)

ABB nomenclature : 15020205 (new budget heading: B3-1005).

2. OVERALL FIGURES

2.1 Application period : 2004-2008

2.2 Total financial framework of the action (part B): EUR 300 million in CA

2.3 Overall multi-annual estimate of expenditure:

a) Schedule of commitment/payment appropriations (financial intervention)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>N + 4</th>
<th>N + 5 and subsequent financial years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>8.134</td>
<td>20.566</td>
<td>37.448</td>
<td>85.333</td>
<td>135.519</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>6.753</td>
<td>16.576</td>
<td>32.230</td>
<td>73.668</td>
<td>125.083</td>
<td>32.690</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Technical and administrative assistance (TAA) and support expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>N + 4</th>
<th>N + 5 and subsequent financial years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EUR millions (to 3 decimal places)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-total a + b</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>N + 4</th>
<th>N + 5 and subsequent financial years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>8.834</td>
<td>22.466</td>
<td>40.348</td>
<td>88.933</td>
<td>139.419</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>7.253</td>
<td>18.276</td>
<td>35.030</td>
<td>77.168</td>
<td>128.883</td>
<td>33.390</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Total financial impact of the human resources and other operating expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>N + 4</th>
<th>N + 5 and subsequent financial years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA/PA</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL a+b+c</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>N + 4</th>
<th>N + 5 and subsequent financial years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>12.079</td>
<td>25.925</td>
<td>43.602</td>
<td>90.592</td>
<td>139.202</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>311.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>10.459</td>
<td>21.654</td>
<td>38.446</td>
<td>79.249</td>
<td>129.038</td>
<td>32.554</td>
<td>311.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. COMPATIBILITY OF PROPOSAL WITH FINANCIAL PROGRAMMING AND THE FINANCIAL PERSPECTIVE

[X] Compatible

[ ] Partially incompatible

[ ] Totally incompatible
4. **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Commitment appropriations in EUR millions *(to 3 decimal places)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breakdown</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>N + 4</th>
<th>N + 5 and subsequent financial years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus Mundus Masters Courses</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>2.302</td>
<td>3.070</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.678</td>
<td>11.511</td>
<td>21.794</td>
<td>58.015</td>
<td>104.517</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>201.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>1.688</td>
<td>7.213</td>
<td>9.515</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>20.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships with third-country higher education institutions</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.604</td>
<td>8.441</td>
<td>13.813</td>
<td>13.813</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>40.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing attractiveness of European higher education</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>2.302</td>
<td>4.297</td>
<td>3.990</td>
<td>4.604</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>16.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8.134</td>
<td>20.566</td>
<td>37.448</td>
<td>85.333</td>
<td>135.519</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HUMAN RIGHTS, COMMON SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICY

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

on the proposal for a Council decision on establishing a programme for the enhancement of quality in higher education and the promotion of intercultural understanding through cooperation with third countries (Erasmus World) (2004-2008)


Draftsman: Jean-Charles Marchiani

PROCEDURE


It considered the draft opinion at its meetings of 27 January 2003 and 19 February 2003.

At the latter meeting it adopted the following amendments unanimously.

The following were present for the vote: Baroness Nicholson of Winterbourne, acting chairman; Geoffrey Van Orden, vice-chairman; Jean-Charles Marchiani, draftsman; Alexandros Baltas, John Walls Cushnahan, Véronique De Keyser, Michael Gahler, Ulpu Iivari (for Magdalene Hoff), Armin Laschet, Philippe Morillon, Arie M. Oostlander, Doris Pack (for Alfred Gomolka), Jacques F. Poos, Amalia Sartori, Jürgen Schröder, Charles Tannock, Demetrio Volcic, Jan Marinus Wiersma, Matti Wuori, María Izquierdo Rojo (for Rosa M. Diez González, pursuant to Rule 153(2)) and Seán Ó Neachtain (for Luís Queiró, pursuant to Rule 153(2)).
SHORT JUSTIFICATION

1. In 2001 the Commission published a Communication on strengthening co-operation with third countries in the field of higher education (COM(2001) 385). The aim was to launch a debate on the EU's international collaboration in the field of higher education, and Parliament delivered its opinion on the Communication (rapporteur: Marielle de Sarnez)¹.

2. The proposal currently under examination is for a Decision to establish a programme ("Erasmus World") and aims, by definition, to enhance quality in higher education and to promote inter-cultural understanding through co-operation with third countries.

The programme has a proposed duration of five years (2004-2008) and the financial framework for its implementation is set at EUR 200 million.

Its specific objectives are listed as fourfold, although they are all inter-linked: "to promote a distinctly European offer in higher education, attractive both within the European Union and beyond its borders"; to encourage a greater world-wide interest in the acquisition of European qualifications; to facilitate a more structured co-operation between EU and third country institutions and a greater EU outgoing mobility as part of European study programmes; to enhance the profile and visibility of, and improved accessibility to European education.

Programme actions foreseen cover: EU Masters courses involving at least 3 higher education institutions from 3 different Member States, and a scholarship scheme for these courses; possibility of partnerships with third country higher education institutions; enhancing the attractiveness of European higher education institutions; "technical support measures" - i.e. fostering co-operation and synergies with existing structures and agencies.

3. The draftsman supports the general thrust of the proposal, recognising that, while the objective is primarily educational in scope, the programme also has the potential to further raise the international profile of the European Union as a world centre for higher education and to make the EU's universities a first-choice destination for greater numbers of talented students. As the Explanatory Memorandum accompanying the proposal for a Decision puts it (page 4), "Europe's status as a centre of excellence is not always appreciated or understood by third country universities, nor by students looking for an international education. One of the reasons behind this situation is the lack of a European higher education identity". While the draftsman stresses that the diversity and independence of the different Member States' educational establishments is a major strength, and must at all costs be respected and preserved, he applauds the aim of enhancing their status and visibility as a whole by making sure that the courses on offer are of top quality.

4. A number of amendments are proposed. These fall into two broad categories: 1) general reinforcement of the principles underlying the proposal, and 2) a firm recognition of what Article 149 very clearly states, that is, that Community intervention in the field of education is limited to supporting and complementing Member States' action, and that legislative harmonisation is proscribed.

5. In addition, given the very broad and ambitious scope of the programme - as illustrated in the annexes accompanying the proposal - the draftsman proposes a significant - 50% - increase in the budget foreseen for its implementation. It is obvious that resources are not infinite but if the Union is serious - and, just as importantly - wants to be seen as being serious - about the aims and aspirations of the programme, then it needs to allocate adequate resources.

6. Finally, the draftsman wishes to draw attention to the "brain drain" issue, which is of course applicable both to third countries and to the European Union.

As well as being enriching to the development of individual students, study at a centre of academic excellence in another country will bring benefits to the student's country of origin on his/her return. As such, the draftsman takes note of the comments in the Commission's Explanatory Memorandum (p. 20) where it "strongly [encourages] ... higher education institutions ... to make provisions in their application and admission procedures in order to avoid or discourage brain drain from less developed countries". He also recalls Parliament's request (in the de Sarnez report referred to above) that developing countries be involved in closer co-operation with third countries in the field of higher education and to make provisions for grants for those who intend to return to their country of origin as a means of preventing the "brain drain".

However, it should not be forgotten that this question also applies to EU students studying outside their own country of origin and who might also choose to stay in the country where they have obtained advanced qualifications. Hence the thrust of the relevant amendment.

7. In conclusion, the proposal for a Decision to establish the "Erasmus World" programme is, with the provisos stated above, essentially very valid. The Commission intends to monitor the programme in co-operation with the Member States (Article 13) and the results of this monitoring and evaluation process are to be used in the implementation of the programme; this evaluation will also "examine the complementarity between action under this programme and that under other relevant Community policies, instruments and actions". As such, the European Parliament looks forward to receiving the interim evaluation report promised by 30 June 2007.

AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, Human Rights, Common Security and Defence Policy calls on the Committee on Culture, Youth, Education, the Media and Sport, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:
Amendment 1

Recital 1

(1) The European Community shall contribute to the development of quality education inter alia through co-operation with third countries.

(1) The European Community and the Member States shall contribute to the development of quality education inter alia through co-operation with third countries.

Justification

Article 149 of the EC Treaty specifies that Community intervention in the field of education is restricted to supporting and supplementing the actions of the Member States.

Amendment 2

Recital 5 a (new)

(5 a) It is also important to strengthen co-operation in the higher education sectors with the Mediterranean area countries;

Justification

The European Union has already drawn up a strategy vis-à-vis the countries of the Mediterranean -, rich and ancient depositories of civilisation and knowledge - this strategy should not exclude co-operation in the field of higher education.

Amendment 3

Recital 6

(6) There is a need to step up Community efforts to promote dialogue and understanding between cultures worldwide, specially as mobility fosters the discovery of new cultural and social

deleted

environments and facilitates understanding thereof.

Justification

This recital is a pointless platitude which adds nothing to the Commission text.

Amendment 4
Recital 6 a (new)

(6 a) Intensifying cultural co-operation programmes with third countries can, within the framework of development co-operation, contribute to improving standards of living and to raising the poverty threshold;

Justification

Self-explanatory.

Amendment 5
Recital 7 a (new)

(7 a) Some higher education establishments in the Member States have already acquired experience in terms of co-operation with third countries.

Justification

The Commission proposal does not sufficiently appreciate the achievements of some higher education establishments in terms of cooperation with third countries. Several experiences are worthy of consideration, such as, in France, the academic research undertaken by the Leonardo da Vinci University Centre in partnership with American, Canadian, Lebanese or Russian universities.
Amendment 6
Recital 7 b (new)

(7 b) There is, however, a common recognition, among the European Union institutions and among relevant stakeholders, that currently the EU's academic institutions fail to attract a proportionate share of internationally mobile students of a high calibre;

Justification

Regrettably, despite the very high quality of much of what is on offer in EU institutions of higher education, many more very able third country students are attracted to institutions in, for example, the United States or Canada.

Amendment 7
Recital 8

(8) European higher education institutions must remain at the leading edge of developments; to this end they should seek to establish co-operation with third-country institutions that have achieved a level of development comparable to that of higher education institutions in the Community.

(8) European higher education institutions must remain at the leading edge of developments; to this end they should step up their co-operation with third-country institutions that have achieved a level of development comparable to that of higher education institutions in the Community.

Justification

The Commission proposal does not sufficiently appreciate the achievements of some higher education establishments in terms of cooperation with third countries. For these countries – for the Leonardo da Vinci University Centre in France, for example – the Erasmus World programme will complement and enhance the current scientific cooperation programmes.

Amendment 8
Recital 9 a (new)

(9 a) The aim of this programme is to contribute to improving the quality of higher education in Europe, it will at the same time have an impact on the visibility
and perception of the European Union around the world as well as building a capital of goodwill among those who have participated in the programme;

Justification

While the primary aim of the programme will be educational, improving the quality of higher education in Europe by bringing the most able students in third countries, it will in turn bring benefits all round, and will also have a positive impact on how the EU is perceived outside Europe.

Amendment 9
Recital 10 a (new)

(10 a.) The intervention of the European Union should in no way jeopardise the fundamental principles of higher education in the Member States, namely academic neutrality of teaching, freedom of research and the independence of university teachers.

Justification

The Erasmus World programme must on no account be used to infringe in any way the guiding principles on which the credibility and quality of higher education are based; in addition freedom of research is one of the foundation stones of higher education in Europe.

Amendment 10
Article 3, paragraph 1

1. The programme's overall aim is to enhance quality education by improving the perception of European higher education world-wide and by fostering co-operation with third countries in order to improve the development of human resources and to promote dialogue and understanding between peoples and cultures.

1. The programme's overall aim is to enhance quality education by improving the perception of European higher education world-wide and by fostering co-operation with third countries in order to improve the development of human resources and to promote dialogue and understanding between peoples and cultures and to disseminate the European Union's ideals of democracy and human rights.
Justification

Every opportunity should be taken to spread the ideals which underlie European cooperation.

Amendment 11
Article 3, paragraph 3 a (new)

(3 a) The Commission shall make provisions for initiatives to enable third countries and European Union Member States jointly to develop training programmes, student exchanges and scholarships as well as vocational integration grants for those who intend to return to their country of origin order to address the 'brain drain' issue, so that the loss of national intellectual capital ("brain drain") is kept to a minimum for both sides;

Justification

Self-explanatory.

Amendment 12
Article 10, paragraph 1

1. The financial framework for the implementation of this programme for the period specified in Article 1 is hereby set at EURO 200 million.

1. The financial framework for the implementation of this programme for the period specified in Article 1 is hereby set at EURO 300 million.

Justification

The programme is - rightly - ambitious, as can be seen in detail in the Annexes. Therefore, adequate means need to be allocated to it.
20 January 2003

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUDGETS

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

on the proposal for a Council decision establishing a programme for the enhancement of quality in higher education and the promotion of intercultural understanding through co-operation with third countries (Erasmus World) (2004-2008)


Draftsman: Brigitte Wenzel-Perillo

PROCEDURE

The Committee on Budgets appointed Brigitte Wenzel-Perillo draftsman at its meeting of 12 September 2002.

It considered the draft opinion at its meeting of 20 January 2003.

At the last meeting it adopted the following amendments unanimously with 1 abstention.

The following were present for the vote: Terence Wynn, chairman; Franz Turchi, vice-chairman; Kathalijne Maria Buitenweg, Joan Colom i Naval, Den Dover, Göran Färm, Markus Ferber, Salvador Garriga Polledo, Neena Gill, Catherine Guy-Quint, María Esther Herranz García, Jan Mulder, Juan Andrés Naranjo Escobar, Per Stenmarck, Kyösti Tapio Virrankoski, Ralf Walter and Brigitte Wenzel-Perillo.
SHORT JUSTIFICATION

Introduction

The Commission has put forward a proposal for a Regulation on the enhancement of quality in higher education and the promotion of intercultural understanding through cooperation with third countries (Erasmus World) with a proposed duration of five years (2004-2008).

The programme would be aimed primarily at enhancing the quality of European Higher Education and although third country nationals and institutions would benefit from involvement in the programme it is, according to the Commission, a tool primarily serving Community interests. Consequently, the proposal would be financed under heading 3 of the Financial Perspective.

The general objectives of the programme are:

- to better prepare citizens in Europe, but also in partner third countries, to live and work in a global, knowledge-based society.

- to ensure that higher education in Europe becomes an increasingly more attractive destination world-wide

- to improve mutual understanding between peoples and cultures

In order to achieve these ambitious goals a number of specific actions are proposed, namely:

- The creation of European Union Masters Courses
- The establishment of a scholarship scheme for students and teachers/researchers
- Partnership schemes with third country higher education institutions
- Support measures

Budgetary Aspects

The Budgets Committee has since long discussed and evaluated the compatibility of new programmes with the expenditure ceilings fixed for each heading of the budget. In doing so, the possible effect on other programmes must be taken into account.

This evaluation takes place even for quite small amounts due to the fact that the available margin under heading 3 is virtually non-existent (€ 0,199 million for 2003).

Also, such an analysis often deals with the amounts proposed for programmes replacing previous ones, for example when a Regulation is renewed. For Erasmus World, the situation is different in that this is a new action. It would thus be added "on top" of what is already covered by heading 3 of the Financial Perspective. This poses a problem given the minimal margin under heading 3 and considering the EP's traditional policy of defending existing programmes.
The Commission's indicative programming for the new programme looks as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expenditure and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technical assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A distinction should be made between the period 2004-2006, for which there is a Financial Perspective, and the period 2007-2008 for which there is not.

Given the minimal room for manoeuvre, even the amounts for 2004-2006 might necessitate a reduction of other actions over that period.

The draftsman notes that some 85% of heading 3 of the Financial Perspective consists of programmes decided under co-decision (with a prioritised financial envelope for the duration of the legal act, a so-called "financial framework"). Therefore, any reduction of other actions for 2004-2006 which might be necessary in order to accommodate Erasmus World would presumably have to come from the few actions which are not co-decided: Leonardo, Information & Communication.

For 2007-2008, the Commission already states that the significant increase (+117% compared to proposed 2006 allocation) will be found through "identical reductions in other measures in the field of education and culture...". The draftsman would draw the attention of the lead committee to this situation.

The amounts for 2007-2008 would in any case be dependent on an agreement on a new Financial Perspective (and the budgetary margins then available), or on purely annual decisions by the budgetary authority.

In conclusion, the draftsman is of the opinion that the proposal is not compatible with the ceiling of heading 3 of the Financial Perspective without a reduction of other policies. An amendment to this effect has been tabled to the legislative resolution. This fact is also reflected in the amendments to the references concerning the Financial Framework for the programme, highlighting the fact that it is subject to the necessary budgetary space being available.

As regards comitology, the draftsman is of the opinion that the Budget Committee's traditional approach should apply and the "advisory procedure" is recommended.
AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Budgets calls on the Committee on Culture, Youth, Education, the Media and Sport, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:

Amendment 1

AMENDMENT TO THE LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

[The European Parliament]

Considers that the financial statement of the Commission proposal is not compatible with the ceiling of heading 3 of the Financial Perspective except through a reduction of other policies or through recourse to the provisions of the IIA of 6 May 1999.

Justification:

The financial statement of this programme entails expenditure under the ceiling of heading 3 of the FP. According to the common declaration of 20 July 2000, the budgetary authority is entitled to evaluate the compatibility of new proposals with the expenditure ceilings in place.

Text proposed by the Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendments by Parliament</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amendment 2

Recital 15

This Decision establishes a financial framework for the entire duration of the programme which is to be the principal point of reference for the budgetary authority, within the meaning of point 33 of the Interinstitutional Agreement of 6 May 1999 between the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission, on budgetary discipline and improvement of the budgetary procedure.

This Decision establishes a financial framework for the entire duration of the programme which is to be the principal point of reference for the budgetary authority, within the meaning of point 33 of the Interinstitutional Agreement of 6 May 1999 between the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission, on budgetary discipline and improvement of the budgetary procedure. This financial framework is established on condition that the Budgetary Authority finds the appropriate means of financing

1 OJ C ##.
under the Financial Perspective.

Justification

It is necessary to point out that the financing of this programme can only be realised if the budgetary space to do so can be made available, possibly involving a reduction of other actions in the field of education and culture, for the years concerned.

Amendment 3
Article 7

Implementing measures

1. The following measures necessary for the implementation of this Decision shall be adopted in accordance with the management procedure referred to in Article 8(2):

(a) the annual plan of work, including priorities, and the selection criteria and procedures;

(b) the general guidelines for implementing the programme;

(c) the annual budget and the breakdown of funds among the different actions of the programme;

(d) the arrangements for monitoring and evaluating the programme and for the dissemination and transfer of results.

2. All other measures necessary for the implementation of this Decision shall be adopted in accordance with the advisory procedure referred to in Article 8(3).

Implementing measures

I. The measures necessary for the implementation of this Decision shall be adopted in accordance with the advisory procedure referred to in Article 8(2).

Justification

The draftsman considers that the Budget Committee's traditional approach as regards comitology shall apply.
The advisory procedure is therefore recommended for all measures and the references to the management procedure are deleted.

Amendment 4
Article 8

1. The Commission shall be assisted by a Committee composed of representatives of the Member States and chaired by the representative of the Commission.

2. Where reference is made to this paragraph, Articles 4 and 7 of Decision 1999/468/EC shall apply, having regard to the provisions of Article 8 thereof.

The period laid down in Article 4(3) of Decision 1999/468/EC shall be set at two months.

3. Where reference is made to this paragraph, Articles 3 and 7 of Decision 1999/468/EC shall apply, having regard to the provisions of Article 8 thereof.

4. The Committee shall adopt its rules of procedure.

Amendment 5
Article 10

1. The financial framework for the implementation of this programme for the period specified in Article 1 is hereby set at EUR 200 million.

Justification

The draftsman considers that the Budget Committee's traditional approach as regards comitology shall apply.

The advisory procedure is therefore recommended and the references to the management procedure are deleted.

1. The financial framework for the implementation of this programme for the period specified in Article 1 is hereby set at EUR 200 million on condition that the Budgetary Authority finds the appropriate means of financing under the Financial
2. The annual appropriations shall be authorised by the budgetary authority within the limits of the financial perspective.

Justification

*It is necessary to point out that the financing of this programme can only be realised if the budgetary space to do so can be made available, possibly involving a reduction of other actions in the field of education and culture, for the years concerned.*
11 December 2002

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS

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


Draftsman: Ioannis Koukiadis

PROCEDURE

The Committee on Employment and Social Affairs appointed Ioannis Koukiadis draftsman at its meeting of 4 September 2002.

It considered the draft opinion at its meetings of 11 November and 10 December 2002.

At the last meeting it adopted the following amendments by 26 votes in favour, with 4 abstentions.

The following were present for the vote: Theodorus J.J. Bouwman (chairman), Marie-Hélène Gillig (vice-chairman), Winfried Menrad (vice-chairman), Marie-Thérèse Hermange (vice-chairman), Ioannis Koukiadis (draftsman), Jan Andersson, Elspeth Attwooll, Regina Bastos, Philip Bushill-Matthews, Chantal Cauquil (for Sylviane H. Ainardi), Alejandro Cercas, Harald Ettl, Jillian Evans, Carlo Fatuzzo, Ilda Figueiredo, Richard Howitt (for Proinsias De Rossa), Stephen Hughes, Karin Jöns, Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou, Arlette Laguiller, Elizabeth Lynne, Thomas Mann, Mario Mantovani, Manuel Pérez Alvarez, Bartho Pronk, Lennart Sacrédeus, Herman Schmid, Miet Smet, Claude Turmes (for Jean Lambert), Ieke van den Burg and Sabine Zissener (for Anne-Karin Glase).
SHORT JUSTIFICATION

I. The Commission proposal

The starting point for the discussions which eventually led to the presentation of this proposal by the Commission was the fact that the European Union attracts fewer international students than the United States and that, at the same time, bilateral exchanges between the European Union and the United States show a growing imbalance in favour of the United States. Europe therefore risks losing market shares in the lucrative sector of international higher education, while also suffering a haemorrhaging of some of its highly qualified human resources to the United States.

With a view to reversing this trend, the Commission proposal contains four types of action designed to increase the attractiveness of European higher education:

1. setting up European Union Master’s courses, which would be the future flagship products of European higher education: these would be postgraduate courses (i.e. for people already holding a university degree) organised jointly by at least three universities in three Member States;

2. a programme of scholarships linked directly to the EU Master’s, open only to highly qualified students from third countries;

3. the possibility of extending cooperation within the EU Master’s programme to partnerships with leading universities in third countries; these extended partnerships would form a framework for mobility of the European students participating in an EU Master’s;

4. horizontal support measures such as promotional activities, improving hosting of foreign students and projects related to internationalising higher education.

The programme would be allocated a budget of €200 million for the period from 2004 to 2008. As regards management of the programme, the proposal provides for the Commission to be responsible for its day-to-day running, while strategic decisions would be taken by a management committee in accordance with the rules of comitology.

II. Draft opinion

The proposed Amendments fall into four areas:

1. Including vocational training

The draftsman has not set out to broaden the scope of the proposal systematically to include vocational training, since this would mean a virtual doubling of the whole programme. However, he takes the view that vocational training could find a place under certain aspects of the programme. The draftsman proposes in particular that:
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• the innovative approaches that came out of the ‘Socrates’ and ‘Leonardo da Vinci’ programmes should be incorporated;

• the ‘vocational training’ dimension should be included in the horizontal actions in part 4 of the proposal.

2. Employment aspects

It is in the interests of the Union to facilitate access to the job market for highly qualified foreign students. The draftsman suggests in this context:

• streamlined administrative procedures for visas, residence and work permits for the programme’s beneficiaries;

• strengthening partnerships between the universities involved in the EU Master’s and industry.

3. Anti-discrimination

The draftsman proposes reinforcing the non-discrimination clause in connection with access to the programme.

4. Management and selection principles

Given the complexity of the programmes at European level, the draftsman takes the view that simplicity and transparency are essential criteria for the success of the programme. In this context care must be taken to define objectives and responsibilities clearly; dispersal among different objectives of the programme (attracting an international elite, geopolitical and development objectives) and national interests (‘geographical balance’ etc.) would lead to a considerable weakening of the programme. The draftsman has therefore includes amendments aimed at:

• limiting political influence over the selection of projects by setting up a selection committee made up of independent experts;

• introducing a clear hierarchy of criteria for selecting projects/beneficiaries.

AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Employment and Social Affairs calls on the Committee on Culture, Youth, Education, the Media and Sport, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following Amendments in its report:
Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment 1
First citation

having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular Article 149 thereof,

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular Articles 149 and 150 thereof,

Justification

The proposal is unquestionably concerned mainly with higher education (hence Article 149 of the Treaty). However, the legal base needs to be extended given that the draftsman proposes incorporating some points relating to vocational training (Article 150 of the Treaty).

Amendment 2
Recital 10

(10) In order to reinforce the added value of Community action it is necessary to ensure coherence and complementarity between the actions implemented in the framework of this Decision and other relevant Community policies, instruments and actions, in particular the sixth framework programme for research and external co-operation programmes in the higher education sector.

(10) In order to reinforce the added value of Community action it is necessary to ensure coherence and complementarity between the actions implemented in the framework of this Decision and other relevant Community policies, instruments and actions, in particular the sixth framework programme for research, the Community programmes relating to education and vocational training, and external co-operation programmes in the higher education sector.

Justification

The ‘Socrates’ and ‘Leonardo da Vinci’ programmes aspire to be laboratories of innovation and best practice in education and vocational training. The results of these programmes should be transferred more systematically to other Community programmes and measures. This is, indeed, one of the recommendations made in the study entitled ‘The globalisation of education and training: recommendations for a coherent response by the European Union’.

1 Not yet published.
Amendment 3
Article 2, paragraph 3

3. ‘third country scholar’: means a national of a third country other than those from EEA EFTA States and countries candidate for accession to the European Community; who is not a resident of any of the Member States or the participating countries as provided for in Article 12; who may not have carried out his or her main activity (studies, work, etc.) for more than a total of 12 months over the last five years in any of the Member States or the participating countries; and who has outstanding academic and/or professional experience.

Justification

The draftsman takes the view that beneficiaries should have outstanding academic and professional experience; however, priority should be given to outstanding academic experience.

Amendment 4
Article 3, paragraph 1

1. The programme’s overall aim is to enhance quality education by improving the perception of European higher education world-wide and by fostering co-operation with third countries in order to improve the development of human resources and to promote dialogue and understanding between peoples and cultures.

1. The programme’s overall aim is to enhance the quality of education by improving perceptions of it, and of European higher education in particular, worldwide and by fostering co-operation with third countries in order to improve the development of human resources and to promote dialogue and understanding between peoples and cultures.
Justification

Although the proposal is concerned mainly with higher education, it could also serve as a framework for improving perceptions of European vocational training. (See also the amendment relating to Article 3, paragraph 2, point d.)

Amendment 5
Article 3, paragraph 2, point (c)

(c) to strengthen a more structured co-operation between European Union and third country institutions and a greater EU outgoing mobility as part of European study programmes.

(c) to strengthen a more structured co-operation between higher-education establishments in the European Union, on the one hand, and European Union and third country institutions on the other, as well as a greater EU outgoing mobility as part of European study programmes.

Justification

Amendment 6
Article 3, paragraph 2, point (d)

(d) to enhance the profile and visibility of, and improved accessibility to, European education.

(d) to enhance the profile and visibility of, and improved accessibility to, European education, including its interconnection with vocational training.

Justification

Although the proposal is concerned mainly with higher education, it could also serve as a framework for improving perceptions of European vocational training.

Amendment 7
Article 3, paragraph 3

3. The Commission shall, when pursuing the objectives of the programme, observe
the Community’s general policy on equal opportunities for men and women. The Commission shall also ensure that no group of citizens or third country nationals is excluded or disadvantaged.

**Justification**

**Amendment 8**

Article 5, point (e)

(e) public or private bodies involved with higher education.

(e) public or private bodies involved with higher education or similar bodies involved with vocational training and recognised as being equivalent to higher-education establishments.

**Justification**

*Although the proposal is concerned mainly with higher education, it could also serve as a framework for improving perceptions of European vocational training. This means that the group of eligible bodies must be extended.*

**Amendment 9**

Article 6, paragraph 1, point (d)

(d) seek synergies with other intra-Community programmes and actions in the field of higher education and research.

(d) seek synergies with other intra-Community programmes and actions in the field of higher education, including vocational education and training, and research.
Justification

The ‘Socrates’ and ‘Leonardo da Vinci’ programmes aspire to be laboratories of innovation and best practice in education and vocational training. The results of these programmes should be transferred more systematically to other Community programmes and measures. This is, indeed, one of the recommendations made in the study entitled ‘The globalisation of education and training: recommendations for a coherent response by the European Union’.

Amendment 10
Article 6, paragraph 2, point (d) a (new)

d a) ensure that there is complementarity and coherence between the programme and any similar national initiatives.

Justification

A number of Member States already have national programmes aimed at promoting student exchanges with non-European third countries. The amendment aims to ensure that there are synergies between this programme and the national initiatives.

Amendment 11
Article 7, paragraph 2 a (new)

2 a. Selection of projects and beneficiaries under the actions listed in Article 4, paragraph 1, points (a) to (d) shall be carried out by a high-level selection board made up of independent experts and chaired by the Commission. This selection board shall be instructed to select only projects and applications meeting the highest academic standards and complying rigorously with the principles and criteria laid down under the present programme.

Justification

This amendment aims to minimise political influence over the selection of projects/beneficiaries.
Amendment 12  
Article 10, paragraph 1

1. The financial framework for the implementation of this programme for the period specified in Article 1 is hereby set at EUR 200 million. This financial framework shall not be granted to the detriment of the existing programmes in the area of education, occupational training and youth. Should the forthcoming financial perspective not permit those programmes to be continued at least at the same level as at present – taking enlargement of the European Union into account - the Commission shall submit a proposal for the review of the financial framework for this programme.

Justification

The proposed financial framework does not endanger the financing of programmes currently running, viz. Socrates, Youth for Europe and Leonardo. But problems could arise for their successor programmes, the life-cycle of which will extend well into the next (as yet unknown) financial perspective.

If financial bottlenecks arising from the present programme were then to affect the other programmes, the Commission should submit a proposal for adjustments to the programme's financial framework.

Amendment 13  
Article 11, paragraph 1

1. The Commission shall, in co-operation with the Member States, ensure overall consistency and complementarity with other relevant Community policies, instruments and actions, in particular with the sixth framework programme for research and with external co-operation programmes in the field of higher education. the Community’s vocational education and training programmes, and with external co-operation programmes in the field of higher education.
The ‘Socrates’ and ‘Leonardo da Vinci’ programmes aspire to be laboratories of innovation and best practice in education and vocational training. The results of these programmes should be transferred more systematically to other Community programmes and measures. This is, indeed, one of the recommendations made in the study entitled ‘The globalisation of education and training: recommendations for a coherent response by the European Union’.

Amendment 14
Annex, ‘Action 1: European Union Masters Courses’, paragraph 2, point (f)

(f) establish transparent conditions for admissions, which pay due regard, inter alia, to gender issues and equity issues; f) establish transparent conditions for admissions, which pay due regard, inter alia, to gender issues and equity issues and warn against any discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, handicap, age or sexual orientation;

Amendment 15
Annex, ‘Action 1: European Union Masters Courses’, paragraph 2, point (i a)(new)

i a) provide, preferably, for structured relations with research centres and businesses;
Justification

It is in the interests of the European Union to facilitate employment market access for the students concerned by this programme, with a view to lasting integration. Partnerships between the universities and industry can help to further this aim.

Amendment 16
Annex, ‘Action 2: Scholarships’, paragraph 4

4. In accordance with Article 6(2), Member States shall take the necessary steps to expedite the granting of entry visas and stay permits to grantees and, where required, the granting of degree equivalence.

Justification
Self-explanatory.

Amendment 17

5. The selection procedure shall ensure appropriate balance across fields of study and students’ and scholars’ regions of provenance and Member State of destination and will encourage the participation of women and less-advantaged students from third countries.

5. Candidates shall be selected on the basis of qualitative criteria. Other criteria, such as appropriate balance across fields of study and students’ and scholars’ regions of provenance and Member State of destination, and participation of women and less-advantaged students from third countries, may be applied as secondary criteria.

Justification
This amendment aims to clarify the selection criteria.
Amendment 18
Annex, ‘Action 3: Partnerships with third country higher education institutions’, paragraph 5, third indent

- development and dissemination of new methodologies in higher education, including the use of information and communication technologies, e-learning, and open and distance learning;
- development and dissemination of new methodologies in higher education, including the use of information and communication technologies, e-learning, and open and distance learning; development of partnerships with undertakings with a view to fostering links and exchanges of information between universities and undertakings, thereby facilitating integration into/access to working life;

Justification

Self-explanatory.

Amendment 19
Annex, ‘Action 4: Enhancing attractiveness’, second paragraph

Eligible institutions would be public or private organisations dealing with issues pertaining to the provision of higher education at international level. Activities shall be conducted within networks involving a minimum of three organisations from three different Member States and may involve organisations from third countries. Activities (which may include seminars, conferences, workshops, development of ICT tools, production of material for publication, etc.) may take place in the Member States or in third countries.

Eligible institutions would be public or private organisations dealing with issues pertaining to the provision of higher education or vocational training at international level. Activities shall be conducted within networks involving a minimum of three organisations from three different Member States and may involve organisations from third countries. Activities (which may include seminars, conferences, workshops, development of ICT tools, production of material for publication, etc.) may take place in the Member States or in third countries.

Justification

Although the proposal is concerned mainly with higher education, it could also serve as a framework for improving perceptions of European vocational training. This means that the group of eligible bodies must be extended.
Amendment 20
Annex, ‘Action 4: Enhancing attractiveness’, paragraph 4.1, point 1

The Community will provide support to higher education institutions and public non-profit making organisations working towards the promotion of European higher education abroad.

The Community will provide support to higher education institutions and public non-profit making organisations working towards the promotion of European higher education and vocational training abroad.

Justification

Although the proposal is concerned mainly with higher education, it could also serve as a framework for improving perceptions of European vocational training. This means that the group of eligible bodies must be extended.

Amendment 21
Annex, ‘Action 4: Enhancing attractiveness’, paragraph 4.1, point 2, first indent

- development of general written or visual common information and dissemination tools contributing towards a better understanding of the value of study in Europe;
- development of general written or visual common information and dissemination tools contributing towards a better understanding of the value of study, and if possible of its synergy with vocational training, in Europe;

Justification

Amendment 22
Annex, ‘Action 4: Enhancing attractiveness’, paragraph 4.1, point 2, second indent

- joint representation of European higher education and European Union Masters Courses at international fairs and other events;
- joint representation of European higher education and European Union Masters Courses or vocational training at international fairs and other events;
Justification

Although the proposal is concerned mainly with higher education, it could also serve as a framework for improving perceptions of European vocational training.

Amendment 23

Promotional activities shall seek to establish links between higher education and research, and exploit whenever possible potential synergies, in particular with the Marie Curie Fellowship Schemes, Jean Monnet Action and with the European Union Centres in third countries.

Promotional activities shall seek to establish links between higher education, vocational training and research, and exploit whenever possible potential synergies, in particular with the Marie Curie Fellowship Schemes, Jean Monnet Action and with the European Union Centres in third countries.

Justification

Although the proposal is concerned mainly with higher education, it could also serve as a framework for improving perceptions of European vocational training. This means that the group of eligible bodies must be extended.

Amendment 24

The European Community will support collaborative activities aimed at facilitating access to, and encouraging study in, Europe.

The European Community will support collaborative activities aimed at facilitating access to, and encouraging study and vocational training in, Europe.

Justification

Although the proposal is concerned mainly with higher education, it could also serve as a framework for improving perceptions of European vocational training.
Amendment 25
Annex, ‘Action 4: Enhancing attractiveness’, paragraph 4.2, point 2, second indent

- joint development of more effective methods of hosting and integrating third country students;
- joint development of more effective methods of hosting and integrating third country students, including access to the labour market;

Justification

It is in the interests of the European Union to facilitate employment market access for the students concerned by this programme with a view to lasting integration.

Amendment 26
Annex, ‘Action 4: Enhancing attractiveness’, paragraph 4.2, point 2, fourth indent

- services facilitating mobility between university partnerships within and outside European Union Masters Courses as defined above;
- services facilitating mobility between university partnerships within and outside European Union Masters Courses as defined above, as well as between universities and industry;

Justification

It is in the interests of the European Union to facilitate employment market access for the students concerned by this programme with a view to lasting integration.

Amendment 27
Annex, Section ‘Action 4: Enhancing attractiveness’, paragraph 4.3, point 1

1. The Community shall support complementary activities dealing with issues crucial to the internationalisation of higher education such as the international dimension of:
1. The Community shall support complementary activities dealing with issues crucial to the internationalisation of education such as the international dimension of:

Justification

Although the proposal is concerned mainly with higher education, it could also serve as a framework for improving perceptions of European vocational training.
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON WOMEN’S RIGHTS AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

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


Draftsperson: Olle Schmidt

PROCEDURE

The Committee on Women’s Rights and Equal Opportunities appointed Olle Schmidt draftsperson at its meeting of 5 November 2002.

It considered the draft opinion at its meetings of 23 January and 19 February 2003.

At the latter meeting it adopted the following amendments by 19 votes to 0, with 1 abstention.

The following were present for the vote: Anna Karamanou, chairperson; Marianne Eriksson and Jillian Evans, vice-chairpersons; María Antonia Avilés Perea, Regina Bastos, Johanna L.A. Boogerd-Quaak (for Marieke Sanders-ten Holte pursuant to Rule 153 (2)), Armonia Bordes, Lone Dybkjær, Mary Honeyball, María Izquierdo Rojo (for María Rodríguez Ramos), Karin Jöns (for Helena Torres Marques), Astrid Lulling, Maria Martens, Christa Prets, Amalia Sartori, Patsy Sörensen, Joke Swiebel, Feleknas Uca, Elena Valenciano Martínez-Orozco and Sabine Zissener.
SHORT JUSTIFICATION

Your draftsman welcomes the Commission’s proposal to set up an Erasmus World Programme. Higher education is becoming an increasingly important factor in creating skilled jobs and in strengthening European competitiveness. The Erasmus programme has already been a great success. More than a million European students have taken the opportunity to study in another European country, which has improved academic quality, knowledge of languages, interfacing and cross-border mobility. It is now important to create the same opportunities for non-European students in order to give them a chance to study in Europe and to enhance the image of European higher education.

The overriding focus of the programme must be scientific and academic quality. Synergy and coordination with other programmes is laudable but the top priority should be high quality in education, which in turn produces positive developments on the labour market. Your draftsman would therefore clarify the selection criteria. Primarily, students should be selected on merit and qualifications. Other aspects, such as an appropriate balance between areas of study, regions of origin and gender, should be secondary. However, underrepresented categories of students and teachers, e.g. women and ethnic minorities, should be encouraged to apply to take part in the programme.

Your draftsman also considers it highly important that the programme should help propagate the European Union’s democratic ideals, including gender equality. Equal opportunities and equal rights are prerequisites for democratic development. If the programme helps propagate these ideals, then equality can also be improved at later stages as the participants in the programme continue to spread those ideals once they are back in their own countries. In this connection, it is important to stress the value of gender research and of integrating a gender perspective into all education (gender mainstreaming).

Your draftsman has also elected to make some minor changes to the text in relation to brain drain. Special measures to prevent brain drain should not result in students from less developed countries necessarily encountering obstacles to taking part in the programme or being forced to take part on special conditions. Encouraging students to return to their countries of origin must not entail coercion. Whether to stay or return should be for the students themselves to decide.

In addition, students and teachers who are accepted on the programme and have children or limited financial resources must be given financial and other forms of support. Students with children, in particular, are a category which often falls outside the framework as students are rarely expected to have children. Finally, your draftsman considers that students from third countries should have the same rights to work in tandem with their studies as students who are citizens of an EU Member State.
### AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Women’s Rights and Equal Opportunities calls on the Committee on Culture, Youth, Education, the Media and Sport, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text proposed by the Commission¹</th>
<th>Amendments by Parliament</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Amendment 1

**Recital 6**  

(6) There is a need to step up Community efforts to promote dialogue and understanding between cultures worldwide, specially as mobility fosters the discovery of new cultural and social environments and facilitates understanding thereof

(6) There is a need to step up Community efforts to promote dialogue and understanding between cultures worldwide, and to disseminate the ideals of democracy, including equality of women and men, specially as mobility fosters the discovery of new cultural and social environments and facilitates understanding thereof

#### Amendment 2

**Recital 10**  

(10) In order to reinforce the added value of Community action it is necessary to ensure coherence and complementarity between the actions implemented in the framework of this Decision and other relevant Community policies, instruments and actions, in particular the sixth framework programme for research and external co-operation programmes in the higher education sector.

(10) In order to reinforce the added value of Community action it is necessary to ensure coherence and complementarity between the actions implemented in the framework of this Decision and other relevant Community policies, instruments and actions, in particular the sixth framework programme for research and external co-operation programmes in the higher education sector. *The primary focus, however, should be to enhance academic quality in European higher education.*

Amendment 3
Article 3, paragraph 1

1. The programme’s overall aim is to enhance quality education by improving the perception of European higher education world-wide and by fostering co-operation with third countries in order to improve the development of human resources and to promote dialogue and understanding between peoples and cultures.

1. The programme’s overall aim is to enhance quality education by improving the perception of European higher education world-wide and by fostering co-operation with third countries in order to improve the development of human resources and to promote dialogue and understanding between peoples and cultures, and to disseminate the ideals of democracy, including equality of women and men.

Justification

The new terminology should be used, including the ‘women’ dimension.

Amendment 4
Article 4, paragraph 2, point b

(b) support for mobility, between the European Community and third countries, of people in the field of higher education;

(b) support for mobility, between the European Community and third countries, of people in the field of higher education. Particular consideration shall be given to facilitating participation in the programme by financially disadvantaged students and students with children.

Amendment 5
Article 8, paragraph 1

1. The Commission shall be assisted by a Committee composed of representatives of the Member States and chaired by the representative of the Commission.

1. The Commission shall be assisted by a Committee composed of representatives of the Member States and chaired by the representative of the Commission. In composing the Committee, it shall be ensured that there is a balanced representation of women and men. The main consideration of the Committee
should be quality in higher education and science.

Amendment 6
Article 10, paragraph 1

1. The financial framework for the implementation of this programme for the period specified in Article 1 is hereby set at EUR 200 million.

Amendment 7
Article 13, paragraph 2, first subparagraph

This programme shall be evaluated regularly by the Commission. This evaluation is intended to assess the relevance, effectiveness and impact of actions implemented with regard to the objectives referred to in Article 3. It will also consider the impact of the programme as a whole. Special attention will be paid to gender issues and equity issues, as well as the prevention of brain drain.

Amendment 8
Annex, action I, point 2 d)

d) result in the awarding of double or multiple recognised or accredited degrees from the participating institutions.

Amendment 9
Annex, action I, point 2 h)
h) put in place adequate arrangements to facilitate access for, and hosting of, third country students (information facilities,
accommodation, etc.); accommodation, etc.) giving particular consideration to financially disadvantaged students and students with children once they have been selected for the programme in accordance with the relevant criteria;

Amendment 10
Annex, action 2, point 1

1. The Community will establish a single, global scholarship scheme targeted at the best qualified third country graduate students and scholars.

Amendment 11
Annex, action 2, point 3

3. Participating institutions will be encouraged to involve stakeholders in the field of higher education in third countries and will be required to make provision in their application and selection processes to avoid or discourage brain drain from less developed countries.

Amendment 12
Annex, action 2, point 4

4. In accordance with Article 6(2), Member States shall take the necessary steps to expedite the granting of entry visas and stay permits to grantees and, where required, the granting of degree equivalence.

4. In accordance with Article 6(2), Member States shall take the necessary steps to expedite the granting of entry visas, stay permits and possibly work permits to grantees and, where required, the granting of degree equivalence.
5. The selection procedure shall ensure appropriate balance across fields of study and students’ and scholars’ regions of provenance and Member State of destination and will encourage the participation of women and less-advantaged students from third countries.

5. The selection procedure shall ensure appropriate balance across fields of study and students’ and scholars’ regions of provenance and Member State of destination, on the basis of objective quality criteria, and will encourage the participation of women and less-advantaged students from third countries.

Amendment 14
Annex, action 3, point 5, indent 2

- exchanges of teachers, trainers, administrators, and other relevant specialists;  

- exchanges of teachers, trainers, administrators, and other relevant specialists with a view to achieving an even gender distribution within each category and subject area;

Amendment 15
Annex, action 4, point 2

2. Eligible institutions would include public or private organisations dealing with issues pertaining to the provision of higher education domestically or at international level. Activities shall be conducted within networks involving a minimum of three organisations from three different Member States and may involve organisations from third countries. Activities (which may include seminars, conferences, workshops, development of ICT tools, production of material for publication, etc.) may take place in the Member States or in third countries.

2. Eligible institutions would include public or private organisations dealing with issues pertaining to the provision of higher education domestically or at international level. Activities shall be conducted within networks involving a minimum of three organisations from three different Member States and may involve organisations from third countries. Activities (which may include seminars, conferences, workshops, development of ICT tools, production of material for publication, etc.) may take place in the Member States or in third countries. Particular consideration shall be given to organisations working on behalf of the less-advantaged, such as women’s rights organisations in countries where there is an imbalance of equality,
and in particular where women are under-represented at the decision-making level.

Amendment 16
Annex, Action 4.3, paragraph 1, indent 4
- evolving curriculum development needs;
- evolving curriculum development needs which take account of the mainstreaming principle;

Amendment 17
Annex, Action 4.3, paragraph 1, indent 5
- changes in society and in education systems;
- changes in society and in education systems which must promote equal treatment and opportunities for women and men;

Justification

Need to promote a male-female balance in the different areas.