

Friedhelm Maiworm, Bernd Wächter (eds.)

# English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes in European Higher Education

Trends and Success Factors

**ACA Papers on  
International Cooperation in Education**

Lemmens



Friedhelm Maiworm, Bernd Wächter

**ENGLISH-LANGUAGE-TAUGHT  
DEGREE PROGRAMMES IN  
EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION**

**Trends and Success Factors**



*ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education*

**Friedhelm Maiworm, Bernd Wächter**

**ENGLISH-LANGUAGE-TAUGHT  
DEGREE PROGRAMMES IN  
EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION**

**Trends and Success Factors**

**Lemmens**



**Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme**

English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes in European Higher Education – Trends and Success Factors/Friedhelm Maiworn, Bernd Wächter –  
Bonn: Lemmens Verlags- & Mediengesellschaft, 2002  
(ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education)

ISBN 3-932306-47-3

NE: ACA Papers

© Copyright 2002 Lemmens Verlags- & Mediengesellschaft mbH, Bonn  
Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Anschrift des Verlages

Matthias-Grünewald-Straße 1-3

D-53175 Bonn

Telefon: + 49 228 42 13 70

Telefax: + 49 228 42 13 729

E-mail: [info@lemmens.de](mailto:info@lemmens.de)

Internet: <http://www.lemmens.de>

Umschlaggestaltung: Christian Padberg, Bonn

Gesamtherstellung: WienandsPrintmedien GmbH, Bad Honnef

ISBN 3-932306-47-3

## Contents

<b>Preface</b> .....	7
<b>1 Executive Summary</b> .....	9
<b>2 Objectives and Methods</b> .....	17
2.1 Background and Aims .....	17
2.2 Definitions .....	19
2.3 Methods .....	20
2.3.1 Institutional Survey .....	20
2.3.2 Programme Survey .....	21
2.3.3 Site Visits .....	21
2.3.4 Survey of Funding Organisations .....	22
2.3.5 Survey of Quality Assurance and Accreditation Agencies ..	22
<b>3 The Quantitative Importance of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes in Individual European Countries</b> ..	23
3.1 Countries Participating in the Study .....	24
3.2 Institutions Providing English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes .....	25
3.3 Degree Programmes Provided in English .....	27
3.4 Enrolment in English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes	29
3.5 Leading Countries .....	31
<b>4 The Institutional Context</b> .....	33
4.1 Characteristics of Institutions .....	33
4.1.1 Year of Foundation and Legal Status .....	33
4.1.2 Type of Institutions .....	34
4.1.3 Student Population .....	35
4.1.4 Disciplinary Profile .....	38
4.2 International Activities of Institutions .....	39
4.2.1 Objectives of Internationalisation .....	40
4.2.2 Enrolment of Foreign Students .....	45
4.2.3 Participation in European/International Programmes and Mobility .....	47
<b>5 Characteristics of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes</b> .....	53
5.1 Subject Areas .....	53
5.2 Degrees .....	57

5.3	Duration and Admission Requirements . . . . .	58
5.4	Year of Introduction . . . . .	62
5.5	Language of Instruction, Examination and Diploma . . . . .	63
5.6	Characteristics of the Curriculum . . . . .	66
5.7	Scholarships and Tuition Fees . . . . .	73
5.8	Eligibility and Regional Origin of Students . . . . .	75
<b>6</b>	<b>Introduction and Operation of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes . . . . .</b>	<b>79</b>
6.1	Motivation . . . . .	79
6.2	Actors and Approaches . . . . .	84
6.3	Marketing . . . . .	88
6.4	Language Proficiency . . . . .	93
6.4.1	Students . . . . .	93
6.4.2	Teachers and Administrative Services . . . . .	99
6.5	Financial Support . . . . .	101
6.6	Accreditation and Quality Assurance . . . . .	104
6.7	Academic Level of Students . . . . .	110
6.8	Workload and Services . . . . .	112
6.9	Spin-Offs and Outcomes . . . . .	116
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusions and Recommendations . . . . .</b>	<b>121</b>
 <b>Annexes</b>		
	Annex 1: Institutions Visited and Persons Interviewed . . . . .	130
	Annex 2: Funding Agencies Surveyed . . . . .	135
	Annex 3: Accreditation and Quality Assurance Agencies Surveyed . . . . .	136

## Preface

Internationalisation of higher education in Europe has come a long way. In the not-too-distant past, internationalisation was a marginal concern of universities and colleges. Activity volumes were low. International activities were not, in most cases, in any way related to the “core policies” of a higher education institution. Rather, they were an add-on, of a past-time sort. Moreover, internationalisation was largely confined to one type of activity only, the mobility of students and scholars.

At the beginning of the new century, we find this situation much changed. Not only has internationalisation now a firm place in many institutions in Europe. Not only is it now worthy of “policies” and “strategies”. Not only have activity volumes risen remarkably. The very concept of internationalisation has developed considerably. It has moved beyond mobility, embracing the curriculum, amongst other things, and it is now being discussed in the context of a wider innovation agenda in higher education.

One of internationalisation’s new emanations are teaching offers provided in English by universities and colleges in countries where English is not the domestic language. This phenomenon has recently been much discussed, but it remains little researched. As a result, the debate on this form of tuition has so far been strangely uninformed and driven by anecdotal evidence and strong feelings more than by hard facts. The Academic Cooperation Association (ACA), a European organisation dedicated, amongst other things, to the analysis of new trends in internationalisation, felt this to be an unacceptable state of affairs. This is why it decided to dedicate a study to the phenomenon, in collaboration with the Gesellschaft für Empirische Studien (GES) in Kassel. The result of this work, which could not have been undertaken without the generous support of the *Stifterverband für die Deutsche Wissenschaft*, is presented in this volume.

Many have contributed to the work. The present volume would not have seen the light of day without the strong support of the ACA Secretariat, above all of Alexander von Balluseck and Julie Sepulchre. Dr. Barbara Kehm (Halle-Wittenberg) supported the authors by carrying out a number of site visits. A team of experts advised the authors on the final text: Mr. Piet Henderikx (Leuven), Dr. Renate Klaasen (Delft), Mr. Foster Ofosu (Turku), Dr. Mathias Pätzold (Bonn), Ms. Lisbeth Pinholt (Odense), Dr. Angelika Schade (Bonn), and Professor Arild Tjelevoll (Oslo). However, the strongest support came from the academic field itself. We are grateful to the innumerable administrators and academics who patiently filled in two substantial questionnaires. We are indebted to the many individuals who made themselves available for interviews during institutional site visits. Likewise, thanks are due to the member organisations of ACA, and to Europe’s quality assurance and accre-

dition agencies, who answered a set of queries. We hope that the result – presented here – will make them feel that the support they gave was worth their while.

Bernd Wächter, Friedhelm Maiworm  
Brussels, October 2002

# 1 Executive Summary

This study was prepared between August 2001 and September 2002 by the Academic Cooperation Association (ACA), in collaboration with the Gesellschaft für Empirische Studien (GES). Its main authors, Friedhelm Maiworm (GES) and Bernd Wächter (ACA), were supported by Dr. Barbara Kehm (Halle-Wittenberg, Germany) and Alexander von Balluseck (ACA). The study was financed by a generous grant from the *Stifterverband für die Deutsche Wissenschaft*, a German think tank specialised in higher education.

## *Background, Objectives and Definitions (Chapter 2)*

The study is devoted to programmes taught in the English language provided by European higher education institutions in countries where English is not the “natural” medium of instruction, i.e. not the domestic language. This new form of tuition has recently become the object of lively debate, as a major instrument of innovation in internationalisation, but also as a means of increasing the competitiveness of European institutions in an emerging global market of higher education. Although the phenomenon is thus a major issue in the higher education policy debate, at any rate in some countries of Europe, research into it has so far been scarce, and not many hard facts are known about it.

Against this general background, the research undertaken pursued three major aims, i.e.

- i. To “map” the provision of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes (abbreviated ELTDPs) in Europe, in order to find out about the general level of provision, the picture in the different countries, the type, size and age of the institutions offering ELTDPs, and the main subject areas in which they are being offered, amongst other items;
- ii. To identify key factors of importance for any institution intending to start or widen the provision of ELTDPs, such as motivation, institutional approaches and the role of single actors inside an institution, marketing, language proficiency, organisation, funding, accreditation and quality assurance, and intended or unexpected spin-off effects;
- iii. To produce, based mainly on ii, a set of recommendations for good practice in the conception, planning, introduction and operation of ELTDPs.

A number of key definitions were used to limit the exact scope of the study. Those were

- i. *Degree Programmes*: for the purposes of this study, programmes qualifying for inclusion are defined as of a minimum duration of (a) three years at undergraduate level, and (b) one year at postgraduate level (and requir-

- ing an undergraduate degree for admission). Therefore, offerings of shorter duration are not included in the study. Neither are Ph.D. programmes.
- ii. *“Europe”*: the study covers those higher education institutions (1,558) which were awarded an “Erasmus Institutional Contract” in 2000/2001. They represent more or less the entirety of universities and colleges in
- (a) all EU countries except Ireland and the United Kingdom, where English is the “normal” language of teaching, and Luxemburg, which has no higher education institution awarding degrees (as defined above),
  - (b) all countries belonging to the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), with the exception of Liechtenstein, which is a case similar to that of Luxemburg, and
  - (c) four countries in accession to the EU, i.e. the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia.
- iii. *“English-Language Programme”*: the study covers programmes taught entirely and partly in English. The minimum percentage of English-language tuition required to qualify was set at 25 percent.

The data and information used in the study were collected by means of

- (a) a questionnaire survey targeted at the “Institutional Contract Coordinators” of the 1,558 higher education institutions mentioned above (“Institutional Survey”),
- (b) a questionnaire survey targeting the “Programme Coordinators” of each ELTDP identified by means of the above Institutional Survey (“Programme Survey”),
- (c) site visits to selected institutions with a high concentration of ELTDPs,
- (d) information requests concerning schemes which fund the setting up and operation of ELTDPs, addressed at organisations responsible for internationalisation of higher education in selected countries,
- (e) information requests concerning quality assurance and accreditation practice relevant for ELTDPs, addressed at accreditation and quality assurance agencies in selected countries.

### *Quantitative Importance and Country Distribution (Chapter 3)*

Although much talked about, programmes provided in English are still a very rare feature in European higher education. While 30 percent of those institutions responding to the surveys report one or more programme taught in English, the share of ELTDPs of all programmes taught at these institutions is between two and four percent only, and the percentage of ELTDP students

of all students enrolled is less than one percent. However, since a remarkable number of institutions intend to enter into the ELTDP business soon, and since most existing programmes were created in the very last years, the quantitative significance of this type of education is likely to grow.

Moreover, the provision of ELTDPs is extremely unevenly spread across Europe. The Alps are a European “ELTDP watershed”. Southern European Countries offer almost no ELTDPs. The provision is concentrated in Western European Countries north of this watershed. Countries in Central Europe occupy a middle position. In absolute terms, the leading ELTDP provider is Germany, with 180 identified programmes. In relative terms, i.e. measured against potential (size of the system), Finland and the Netherlands come out top of the table, in this order.

#### *Institutional Context (Chapter 4)*

Which are the universities and colleges which offer ELTDPs – and which are the ones that do not?

Of all institutional characteristics, size appears to be the single most important factor influencing whether or not an institution offers ELTDPs. The larger an institution (in terms of student population), the higher the likelihood that one or more of its programmes are offered in English. Higher education institutions with a wide range of subject areas show a higher concentration of ELTDPs than “specialised” institutions. The “non-university” (“college”) sector provides ELTDPs much less often than the university segment of higher education. In terms of “age”, older institutions are more often the providers of ELTDPs than younger ones. Public institutions are more “ELTDP-active” than private ones.

Combining these elements, one can safely say that the older, larger, university-type institutions with a wide subject range have a clear lead over the young, small, specialised college-type providers. It would, however, be wrong to conclude from this finding that this type of institution is also necessarily the leader in relative terms. Specialised, non-university and young institutions are, on average, much smaller than universities, and therefore statistically less likely to offer ELTDPs.

There is a strong link between the general level of internationalisation of a university or college, and the likelihood that it will offer ELTDPs. The more active an institution is in participating in European or national-level cooperation programmes, and the more it is involved in student and teacher exchanges, the higher is the probability that it will offer ELTDPs. This does not apply to one particular characteristic, though, the percentage of foreign students of all students. With regard to this indicator, a number of above-average suppliers of ELTDPs score rather low. This is to be explained by the fact that these are located in countries with rarely spoken languages, which find it dif-

difficult to attract foreign students, except through programmes taught in English.

### *Characteristics of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes (Chapter 5)*

There is hardly any conceivable or inconceivable subject area, and any common or rare specialisation, in which there is not an ELTDP available somewhere in Europe. At the same time, two subject areas heavily dominate the offer: business and management studies, on the one hand, and engineering, on the other. 46 percent of all ELTDPs are offered in these discipline areas, and 59 percent of all ELTDP students are enrolled in these subject areas. Especially when measured against the total number of students enrolled in these subject areas in Europe, business and management studies are the clear leaders.

Very predominantly, ELTDPs are a phenomenon of the postgraduate sector of higher education. Over two thirds of all programmes taught in English are second-cycle degrees. The non-university sector differs from this picture, in that more than half of all ELTDPs award Bachelor-level degrees. This is not surprising, given that most college-type institutions may not award postgraduate degrees. This is, for example, the case in Finland, where non-university providers are common, and where ELTDPs in the first cycle therefore make up almost two thirds. First cycle-degrees require, on average, 3.4 years of study, and Master degrees 1.8 years.

For admission, two thirds of all ELTDPs require a proof of English language proficiency (TOEFL: 550 score), and almost half of them also an entrance examination, next to fulfilment of the standard admission requirements of the host country/institution. The English language requirement is rare in central and eastern European countries, though.

ELTDPs are a very young phenomenon. Almost half of all programmes identified started to operate only between 1998 and today. Before 1990, hardly any such programmes were created (8%).

What is the extent to which English is used as the language of teaching and learning? Although "mixed-mode" ELTDPs had been included in the study, the overall share of non-English instruction is rather small. The average percentage of tuition in English in all ELTDPs is 90 percent. The share of mixed-mode ELTDPs is higher in undergraduate than in postgraduate education, and more frequent in Germany than anywhere else. The picture regarding the language of examinations and of diplomas is similar.

In more than half of all ELTDPs, scholarships are available, for some students at least, though it is impossible to specify which percentage of ELTDP students actually receives such support. Scholarships are much more often provided for foreign students than for domestic ones. There are large differ-

rences between countries: 70 percent of all German and 68 percent of all Dutch ELTDPs report scholarships, while such provision is the exception in CEE countries (17%).

Study in ELTDPs is free of charge in 57 percent of all ELTDPs. Fees charged to foreign students are more common than to their domestic counterparts. Fee levels range from the almost symbolical amount of 300 Euro per year to a staggering 32,000 Euro in the most expensive programme. Fee policies differ very much between countries: in the Netherlands, tuition fee-free ELTDPs are almost nowhere to be had (2%). CEE countries have a similar policy. Study free of charge is the rule in Finland (99%), and very frequent in Germany (84%) and in Denmark. However, it is remarkable that there are some fee-charging ELTDPs even in countries where the law does not allow fees.

Programmes taught in English predominantly admit both foreign and domestic students, although there is a minority which admits only foreigners, of 16 percent overall, and 32 percent in CEE countries. In empirical terms, i.e. enrolment, 60 percent of all ELTDP students are foreigners in the country the programme is offered. Their share is highest in Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands. Finland and Poland have the highest proportion of domestic students. Among the foreigners, Europeans lead the enrolment statistics (39%), followed by Asians (29%, of whom almost every second one from China). Africans form the third-largest contingent (14%), with all other regions standing at or under 10 percent.

### *Introduction and Operation of ELTDPs (Chapter 6)*

What are the motives of universities and colleges to introduce programmes taught in English? In the Institutional Survey, the prime reason stated was “to attract foreign students”. In practice, this reason translates into a wide range of more concrete aims, such as: (a) to compensate for a “competitive disadvantage”, be that a domestic language which is rarely spoken (which is the case in the Nordic Countries and the Netherlands), or a geographical location on the periphery; (b) to compensate for a decline in the demographic curve of the domestic population, which puts the further existence of faculties, departments and programmes under threat; (c) to secure the research base of a university, by attracting future Ph.D. candidates from abroad, and (d) to be able to fill a highly specialised programme for which there would not be enough candidates in the country, or (e) to contribute to human resource development in developing countries.

The second most-often stated reason, “to attract domestic students”, practically often means to provide the domestic labour market with graduates who have a high degree of international skills. This is most often the case in Finland, where domestic companies have turned into global players (such as Nokia), and are in need of a workforce with international skills.

Motive number three, stated by more than half of institutions still, is “to offer programmes leading to new degrees”. While it appears that there was initially no link between the Bologna reform (and the degree structure it promotes) and the introduction of ELTDPs, the latter are now being (re-)shaped in a way to fit into the Bologna architecture.

Motives linked to an improvement of the income base of an institution by means of charging fees are very rarely crucial for the creation of ELTDPs. This motivation plays a more important role in CEE countries than anywhere else. It appears that, anyway, hardly anyone makes a “profit” out of ELTDPs, but only recovers some of their extra costs.

Who are the driving forces behind the creation of ELTDPs, and who is likely to view them sceptically, or even to oppose them? The Institutional Survey found that, in most cases of institutions with a high number of ELTDPs, these have been the result of an interaction between central-level actors (Rector, Vice-Rector, international relations office) and academics “on the ground”. External stakeholders (business, authorities) play no major role (except in France), and neither do students. The classical development pattern is that one or a few successful ELTDPs become a role model and spark off the creation of more programmes, at which point an institution starts to formulate an “ELTDP policy”. Clear-cut top-down approaches seem to be very rare. In most cases, scepticism and opposition are rare. Teachers are supportive or even enthusiastic, with few exceptions (usually older academics uncomfortable to teach in English). As a rule, institutions do not force sceptical teachers into ELTDPs, and often build a programme around the content expertise of volunteers.

How do institutions spread the word about their ELTDPs? Marketing is very common, and in most cases state-of-the-art, in terms of the use of modern technology, design, and the use of intermediaries and contacts around the globe. Marketing is primarily addressed at potential students from abroad. The domestic clientele is less important. The number one medium of marketing is the internet. However, marketing can still be improved in terms of target groups: many institutions have not defined their regional target group, and are often surprised that they attract the “wrong students”. No institution was found which had conducted market research prior to introducing its ELTDPs. In some countries, institutional efforts are complemented by national-level campaigns (France, the Netherlands, Germany).

Are there any problems with the mastery of English – be that on the student side, or that of the teachers? The study cannot confirm the horror scenarios sometimes evoked according to which the quality of teaching and learning is seriously hampered by very grave difficulties on both sides. Students’ command of English is, in most cases, sufficient. However, this does not mean that there are no difficulties at all, and that further support (English language training) is not helpful or needed. Indeed, most institutions provide it. Instituti-

ons agree that a TOEFL entrance requirement does not solve all problems. Due to heavy accents, and the lack of the ease which speakers have in their native language, communication in English for most students requires an extra effort. One of the most surprising findings of the study is that, generally, problems with the host country language are viewed as more severe than those with English. This is particularly so in “mixed-mode” ELTDPs, but by no means restricted to them. In some cases, there are also problems with administrative service units, not all of which can always be approached in English.

The picture is similar with regard to teachers. Overall, only 14 percent of institutions feel that there is a significant problem with the command of English of (some) teachers, though teachers’ abilities are practically nowhere tested. Only institutions in the Netherlands, Finland and Germany feel the problem to be more serious. Again, the fact that the overall mastery is viewed to be sufficient does not mean that teaching in English is in all cases problem-free. Teachers interviewed underlined that teaching in English is a more conscious act, which requires a heightened effort. In a few cases, students complained over inadequate proficiency of their teachers. Some recent studies come to the conclusion that the English-language abilities of teachers need some enhanced attention, but the expectations underlying such demands appear to be guided by a certain love of perfection. Language training is available at most institutions, although rarely customised to the particular needs of teachers. Visiting professors and other native speakers are used frequently.

Are any special funds available to support the introduction or operation of ELTDPs? 55 percent of all programmes report no funding at all, beyond the funds they would have received for operating a domestic-language programme. In the CEE countries (84%), Denmark (77%) and the Netherlands, the respective proportion is above this average. Government funds, predominantly from national or regional sources, are the most frequent form of support. In Germany, 61 percent of all programmes receive such funds. Some countries, such as the Netherlands, with a lump-sum philosophy of higher education funding, include financial support in the institutional funding, without “earmarking” a share, so that respondents might not have identified these funds as “extra support”. Special funding for related activities, such as international marketing, can be viewed as indirect support for ELTDPs.

Accreditation and quality assurance are widespread practice in ELTDPs. More than three quarters of all ELTDPs have been or are planning to be accredited soon. Accreditation obtained from national bodies is the norm, although an astonishing 22 percent of institutions received foreign accreditation, with single countries, such as the Netherlands (47%), considerably above this average. Likewise, some form of evaluation, carried out by internal experts, or by external peers, is now standard practice, too. However, parti-

cularly with regard to evaluation by internal experts, there are indications that the procedures employed are often “light”.

It must be stressed, though, that accreditation and quality assurance mechanisms employed in the overwhelming number of cases are not specifically geared to the particular nature of ELTDPs. A survey of selected accreditation and quality assurance agencies revealed no single case of an ELTDP-specific approach. At the same time, guidelines and methodologies for “standard” accreditation and quality assurance more and more reflect international elements, too (with foreign language items playing a prominent role).

ELTDPs pose particular challenges because of the international composition of learner groups and the heterogeneous level of content knowledge of students, as institutions report. Institutions therefore more and more revert to conducting (*in situ*) entrance examinations with applicants in particular regions. This appears necessary because of remarkable variations in quality from providers in one and the same country, and problems with the reliability of education credentials. In postgraduate education, more and more institutions work with selected undergraduate “suppliers” only. While such measures may reduce homogeneity, it is clear that ELTDPs, due to the special composition of learner groups, can never achieve the level of homogeneity known from domestic-language programmes.

ELTDPs produce some remarkable spin-off effects, too. Most important, they seem to enhance the importance European universities and colleges attach to the image they have with potential students, and hence to marketing and recruitment. The introduction of programmes taught in English also seems to strengthen the overall importance of internationalisation of institutions.

## 2 Objectives and Methods

### 2.1 Background and Aims

Internationalisation of higher education has been on a remarkable upswing in the last decade. For a long time, internationalisation (or “international cooperation”, as it was earlier referred to) had been a popular topic for public speeches on solemn occasions, but it did not characterise, to any extent worth mentioning, the reality at higher education institutions. In the 1990s, internationalisation moved centre-stage, at any rate in some European Countries. What is more, new forms of international activity came up. In the early stages, the meaning of internationalisation had been more or less equivalent with the exchange of students and professors. New forms gaining ground in the 1990s were the internationalisation of the curriculum, the use of new information and communication technologies, the introduction of recognition mechanisms, and, once the “Bologna Process” set in, also the transformation of whole systems. As the process of globalisation gained more and more momentum in the latter half of the decade, the competition over “international students” (of whom there are now about two million worldwide) and young researchers, and related activities such as international marketing, reached Europe, too.

One of these new forms of internationalisation are higher education programmes taught in English in countries where this is not the native language. The programmes have, in past years, been a much-debated issue at conferences of higher education “internationalists”, and sometimes the impression created was that of a large-scale phenomenon with the force of a landslide. But the prominence which these programmes gained as an object of discussion and debate stood in stark contrast to the lack of hard facts and information available about them. Almost everyone knew one or two programmes, and therefore anecdotal knowledge was abundant. But there was no systematic overview of these programmes at European higher education institutions, and thus no safe knowledge at all. As a consequence, no really serious policy debate about them was possible. The Academic Cooperation Association (ACA) felt that this was an unacceptable state of affairs. Together with the *Gesellschaft für Empirische Studien* (GES, Kassel/Germany) it therefore started the present study in 2001, generously supported by a grant from a leading German higher education think-tank, the *Stifterverband für die Deutsche Wissenschaft*.

The present study pursues two overriding aims. One, it is to give, for the first time, a detailed description of the scale as well as the nature of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes (ELTDPs) in European higher education. Two, it is intended to identify factors which are of key importance for any institution developing, introducing and running such programmes, and to provide a related set of recommendations on good practice.

In terms of the first aim, i.e. to describe the volume and nature of provision in Europe, answers to the following questions were identified as particularly important:

- What is the overall volume of provision of ELTDPs in Europe? Are we talking of a quantitatively important phenomenon, or (still) of a rather marginal one? And which countries in Europe are the “leaders” in the provision of such programmes, and which, if any, are more or less “abstentious”? The answer to these questions is given in chapter 3 of this study.
- Which are the institutions providing this form of education? Is it predominantly the universities which offer ELTDPs, or their counterparts in the “non-university” (college) sector<sup>1</sup> of higher education? Are large institutions more likely to offer ELTDPs than small ones? Does the age of an institution matter, and is there a difference between public and private providers? Are “comprehensive” institutions (in terms of disciplinary coverage) more likely to provide ELTDPs than their “specialised” counterparts? And are universities and colleges which are very active in other areas of internationalisation more likely to provide ELTDPs than others, or not? These issues are dealt with in chapter 4.
- What are the characteristics of the ELTDPs currently on offer in European higher education? Which subject areas are the most common ones? At which academic level are ELTDPs predominantly offered, i.e. as Bachelor or Master Degrees? What are the qualifications required of a student to be admitted to ELTDPs? Are they a young phenomenon? Are they taught exclusively in English, or in combination with another language? Are tuition fees charged, and are scholarships available? Which parts of the world do the students come from? These questions are addressed and answered in chapter 5.

While the above-mentioned parts of the study are, by their very nature, largely descriptive, those parts which address issues of critical importance in the conception, introduction and operation of ELTDPs are of a more qualitative nature. Chapter 6, which deals with these issues, covers the following topics and areas:

- Why do universities and colleges offer programmes taught in English at all? What are their aims and motives?
- Who are the persons most likely to support and promote the introduction of ELTDPs, and who can be expected to be sceptical, or in outright opposition? Are there typical institutional introduction strategies, and are some of them more successful than others?

---

<sup>1</sup> The terms «non-university institution» and «college» are used synonymously in this study.

- Which efforts do European higher education institutions make to attract “customers” onto these programmes, i.e. how do they market their products, and are the marketing strategies successful?
- Do students and teachers avail of a satisfactory level of English, or are there serious problems of a linguistic sort? Is any training in the English language provided? Which role does the domestic language play, and does it create problems? Likewise, is the level of content-related knowledge and skills of students sufficient, and what do institutions do to assure this?
- Which financial means are available in Europe for the introduction and operation of ELTDPs?
- How and to which extent are ELTDPs accredited and quality-assured, and are there already any QA and accreditation methodologies geared to the peculiarities of this form of higher education?
- Which intended, or surprising, spin-off effects have been created by ELTDPs?

The answers to these questions are contained in chapter 6 of this study. They also form the main basis for the following and last chapter, the conclusions and recommendations.

## 2.2 Definitions

The authors of the study had to take a number of decisions in order to define key terms underlying the study. These concerned

- (a) The meaning of “Europe”, i.e. the countries to be included in the study;
- (b) The meaning of a “higher education institution”, i.e. the exact definition of the sample of institutions to be addressed;
- (c) The meaning of an “English-Language-Taught Degree Programme”, i.e. the definition of minimum requirements for any programme to qualify for inclusion in the study.

“Europe” is defined as

- i. All EU member states, with the exception of the United Kingdom and Ireland, where English is the “normal” language of instruction, and Luxemburg, which does not offer degree programmes at the level required (see below);
- ii. All countries belonging to the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), with the exception of Liechtenstein, the situation of which is similar to that of Luxemburg;
- iii. Four larger countries in accession to the EU, i.e. the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia.

For the purposes of this study, any tertiary institution in the above countries qualified for inclusion which had been awarded a so-called “Institutional Contract” in the Erasmus/Socrates Programme of the European Union in the academic year 2000/2001. This criterion was largely motivated by pragmatic considerations: the authors had access to the addresses of all of these institutions’ “Institutional Erasmus Coordinators”, which was essential for being able to address the institutions in a targeted way. Since almost every higher education institution in the relevant countries participates in the Erasmus Programme, the sample is almost identical with the entirety of institutions classified in their own country as belonging to “higher education”.

The above definitions resulted in a sample of 1,558 higher education institutions in Europe, which form the basis of this study.

In order to qualify as an “English-Language-Taught Degree Programme”, two criteria were essential:

- i. That the programme had a minimum duration of three years in the case of Bachelor-level programmes, and of one year at Master level;
- ii. That the share of tuition in English was at least 25 percent in any year. In other words, this study also includes programmes which are only partially taught in English.

It is important to note that the above definition excludes a large number of offerings of higher education institutions of short duration at sub-degree level, as well as doctoral programmes.

## **2.3 Methods**

Next to a review of relevant literature, the perusal of official documentation and internet searches, the following means of information gathering were employed:

- a questionnaire-based survey of “ERASMUS Institutional Contract Coordinators” (hereafter referred to as the “Institutional Survey”);
- a questionnaire-based survey of coordinators of ELTDPs (hereafter referred to as the “Programme Survey”);
- site visits to selected higher education institutions;
- a survey of funding agencies in selected countries;
- a survey of quality assurance and accreditation agencies in selected countries.

### **2.3.1 Institutional Survey**

The Institutional Survey addressed 1,558 higher education institutions in the countries included in the study. An Institutional Questionnaire was sent to the

Erasmus Institutional Contract Coordinators, in order to identify whether or not the respective institutions offered ELTDPs, and which these were, to gather information on the institutional context, and to collect experiences gained in the introduction and operation of ELTDPs at institutional level. The questionnaire, which contained predominantly closed questions, and which was made available in English only, comprised 20 questions with a total of 150 variables.

The questionnaire was mailed out in November 2001. A first e-mail reminder letter was sent in the first week of January 2002, followed by a second reminder letter (by ordinary mail) in mid-February 2002. 821 Institutional Questionnaires were filled in and received back until mid- April 2002. The return rate was thus almost 53 percent (cf. Table 3.1 in chapter 3.1).

### **2.3.2 Programme Survey**

In addition to the Institutional Questionnaire, each ERASMUS Institutional Contract Coordinator was provided with a set of three “Degree Programme Questionnaires”, and asked to forward these questionnaires to the persons responsible for one or more ELTDPs at the institution. The coordinators of those programmes for which no filled-in Degree Programme Questionnaire had been received until March 2002 were sent a reminder letter with a new set of questionnaires (this time directly from the research team). Of the 725 ELTDPs thus addressed, 463 filled in and returned the questionnaire, resulting in a return rate of roughly 64 percent.

The Degree Programme Questionnaire served to collect detailed information on the characteristics of the programmes, as well as on their introduction and operation. The questionnaire was provided exclusively in English. It comprised 25 questions and about 250 variables.

### **2.3.3 Site Visits**

In order to gain a practical insight into the challenges of planning, introducing and running ELTDPs, the research team decided to conduct site visits to a number of institutions. Institutions were selected from amongst those reporting the highest number of ELTDPs in the Institutional Survey. An additional criterion was that they would be located in a country with at least an average provision of ELTDPs. A team of three experts<sup>2</sup> visited a total of 11 institutions (eight universities and three colleges)<sup>3</sup> in eight countries, and conducted interviews with about 100 persons, based on standardised “interview guidelines”. At each institution, all or most of the following types of persons were interviewed: rectors and/or vice-rectors (for internationalisation); heads and

---

2 Dr Barbara Kehm (Institut für Hochschulforschung, Halle-Wittenberg/Germany), Alexander von Balluseck and Bernd Wächter (both ACA, Brussels).

3 Cf. Annex 1 for a list of institutions visited and persons interviewed.

further staff of central-level international relations offices; programme coordinators, as well as teachers and administrative staff at faculty/departmental level; and students.

### **2.3.4 Survey of Funding Organisations**

In order to gain access to information about sources of funding for the development and operation of ELTDPs, national-level organisations responsible for the promotion of higher education internationalisation were approached in a written survey, which enquired (a) whether they themselves provided any funding for the development, introduction or operation of ELTDPs, and (b) if they knew of any other organisation in their country which did so.

This survey addressed exclusively countries with a high or medium supply of ELTDPs.<sup>4</sup>

### **2.3.5 Survey of Quality Assurance and Accreditation Agencies**

A parallel survey was addressed at quality assurance and accreditation agencies in the same countries.<sup>5</sup> The questions posed to them were whether there was (a) a quality assurance or accreditation methodology in place which had been developed with a view to the particular nature of ELTDPs, and, if that was not the case, whether (b) the “standard” accreditation and quality assurance methodology applied in the country contained, to a degree worth mentioning, provisions for international aspects in general and ELTDP characteristics in particular.

---

4 Cf. Annex 2 for a list of organisations addressed in the survey of funding organisations.

5 Cf. Annex 3 for a list of organisations addressed in the survey of quality assurance and accreditation agencies.

### 3 The Quantitative Importance of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes in Individual European Countries

The detailed results of this study will be presented in the following chapters, which provide a description of those institutions offering ELTDPs (Chapter 4), the characteristics of ELTDPs themselves (Chapter 5), as well as a number of thematic issues of major importance (Chapter 6). Before presenting these detailed findings, the authors deemed it helpful to provide an overview of main quantitative trends with regard to two issues. First, is English-Language-Taught education a sizeable phenomenon at all, or is it (still) rather marginal? Second, which countries are the “leaders” in the provision of ELTDPs, and which offer very few or none of these programmes? In order to draw a realistic picture of the relative importance and the country distribution of ELTDPs, three particular questions needed to be answered.

- How many higher education institutions offer ELTDPs, and what is their proportion of all higher education institutions addressed in the study?
- How many ELTDPs exist, and what is their proportion of all programmes taught at the higher education institutions addressed in the study?
- How many students are enrolled in ELTDPs, and what is their proportion of all higher education institutions addressed in the study?

The study had been designed in a way that the data necessary to answer these questions would become available through the Institutional Survey. However, a substantial number of institutions did either not return the Institutional Questionnaire or did not provide the information requested on the overall number of students in their institution, or the overall number of degree programmes. This incomplete body of data obviously entails the risk of invalid conclusions. In order to limit this risk, the following “safeguarding” measures were introduced.

a) For each of the above questions, results were calculated on the basis of an “optimistic scenario” (maximum score) and a “pessimistic scenario” (minimum score).

- *Optimistic scenario*: the results are calculated based on the *maximum score*, i.e. on the assumption that the institutions responding to the survey constitute a representative sample of all higher education institutions, in terms of the overall number of degree programmes, of the number of ELTDPs, of the overall number of students and of the number of students enrolled in ELTDPs.
- *Pessimistic scenario*: the results are calculated on the basis of the *minimum score*, i.e. on the assumption that the sample of non-responding

institutions is not representative, and that the non-respondents do not offer ELTDPs.

There are indications that many non-responding universities and colleges do not offer ELTDPs and that therefore the “pessimistic scenario” could be the realistic one. On the other hand, at least in the case of certain countries, such as the Netherlands, it is clear from other sources that a substantial proportion of ELTDP-providing institutions did not participate in the survey, which would speak for the “optimistic scenario”.

b) The missing data on student numbers and degree programmes were replaced by data from other sources, for example national or European statistics, or estimations drawn from data collected by the survey.

### **3.1 Countries Participating in the Study**

It might be helpful to recall that the study targeted a total of 19 European Countries, i.e. (1) all 15 European Union Countries, except the United Kingdom and Ireland, where English is the standard language of instruction, and Luxemburg, which does not offer degree-level higher education, (2) the four countries belonging to the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) with the exception of Liechtenstein, which is a case similar to that of Luxemburg, and (3) four larger countries from among those in accession to the EU, i.e. Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary.

Each higher education institution in these countries which took part in the Erasmus Programme (award of an “Institutional Contract”) was included in the Institutional and Programme Survey. With the exception of very few and in most cases very small institutions, the sample of the surveys was the entire tertiary system of the above countries. The number of institutions addressed was 1,558.

As Table 3.1 reveals, more than half of the addressees in the sample (52.7%) filled in and returned the Institutional Questionnaire, providing a solid basis for the analysis of most of the issues addressed in this study. However, return rates differ very much between countries. The Czech Republic heads the table of respondents with 85%, followed by Finland (80%), Hungary (74%), Germany and Norway (67% each). At the low end of the table are France (35%), the Netherlands (38%) and Italy (41%), with modest response rates only. As will later be seen, in most cases, the countries with a high response rate are also those with a concentration of ELTDPs, so that the modest response from some countries does not negatively affect the results of the study. However, the low return from the Netherlands is a real disadvantage, for there are clear indications from other sources that a substantial proportion of non-responding Dutch institutions does actually offer ELTDPs.

In most cases, the country distribution of institutions participating in the survey is similar to the country distribution of all institutions (respondents and

**Table 3.1**  
**Higher Education Institutions Addressed by the Study, Respondents to the Institutional Questionnaire and Return Rate – by Country**

Country	All institutions		Respondents <sup>1)</sup>		Return rate
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Percent
Belgium	73	4.7	44	5.5	60.3
Denmark	91	5.8	51	6.3	56.0
Germany	245	15.7	165	20.1	67.3
Finland	51	3.3	41	5.2	80.4
France	333	21.4	115	13.9	34.5
Greece	31	2.0	17	2.1	54.8
Iceland	8	0.5	5	0.5	62.5
Italy	107	6.9	44	5.5	41.1
Netherlands	60	3.9	23	2.1	38.3
Norway	42	2.7	28	3.3	66.7
Austria	83	5.3	47	6.0	56.6
Poland	100	6.4	50	6.2	50.0
Portugal	75	4.8	39	5.1	52.0
Sweden	38	2.4	20	2.4	52.6
Switzerland	70	4.4	36	4.3	51.4
Slovakia	17	1.1	10	1.2	58.8
Spain	74	4.8	39	4.8	52.7
Czech Republic	26	1.7	22	2.6	84.6
Hungary	34	2.2	25	2.9	73.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1558</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>821</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>52.7</b>

1) A small number of institutions (13) did not return the Institutional Questionnaire, but provided at least one of the programme questionnaires.

non-respondents). The most visible deviations can be observed in the case of Germany, which is slightly overrepresented (20% compared to 16%), and of France, which is clearly underrepresented (14% compared to 21%). However, since the main target group of the study is the sub-group of higher education institutions offering ELTDPs, the overall representativeness of respondents is of little importance for most of the issues discussed and analysed further on.

### 3.2 Institutions Providing English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes

An astonishingly high proportion of 30 percent of institutions responding to the survey reports the existence of ELTDPs. Based on the Institutional Survey, three out of ten European higher education institutions offer at least one

ELTDP. However, as already mentioned above, there are some doubts if it is legitimate to extrapolate from the sample of responding institutions to the entirety of institutions addressed in the survey. Indeed, the assumption that this is not possible is supported by a number of non-responding institutions which informed the research team by email, fax or phone that they offer no ELTDPs.

In order to provide a more realistic picture of the proportion of higher education institutions offering ELTDPs, the figures calculated on the basis of respondents to the survey (maximum value) is contrasted with a calculation of the percentage of ELTDP-providing institutions of all institutions addressed in the survey (minimum value).

**Table 3.2**  
**Higher Education Institutions Offering English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes – by Country** (absolute numbers and percentages)

Country	(1) Institutions addressed	(2) Institutions <sup>1)</sup> responding	(3) Institutions <sup>2)</sup> offering ELTDP	Percentage of institutions offering ELTDP		
				A Minimum (3:1)	B Maximum (3:2)	Difference B – A
Finland	51	41	34	66.7	82.9	16.2
Czech Republic	26	22	11	42.3	50.0	7.7
Iceland	8	5	3	37.5	60.0	22.5
Germany	245	165	74	30.2	44.8	14.6
Netherlands	60	23	17	28.3	73.9	45.6
Sweden	38	20	10	26.3	50.0	23.7
Norway	42	28	9	21.4	32.1	10.7
Hungary	34	25	7	20.6	28.0	7.4
Poland	100	50	16	16.0	32.0	16.0
Slovakia	17	10	3	17.6	30.0	12.4
Denmark	91	51	12	13.2	23.5	10.3
Switzerland	70	36	8	11.4	22.2	10.8
Belgium	73	44	8	11.0	18.2	7.2
Greece	31	17	2	6.5	11.8	5.3
Italy	107	44	7	6.5	15.9	9.4
Austria	83	47	5	6.0	10.6	4.6
France	333	115	19	5.7	16.5	10.8
Spain	74	39	1	1.4	2.6	1.2
Portugal	75	39	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	1558	821	246	15.8	30.0	14.2

1) A small number of institutions (13) did not return the Institutional Questionnaire, but provided at least one of the programme questionnaires.

2) A few institutions were not counted as ELTDP providers because they reported programmes which did not fulfil the basic definition of ELTDPs, in terms of duration of the programme and/or proportion of courses taught in English.

Overall, the proportion of institutions offering ELTDPs lies between the 16 percent in the “pessimistic scenario” and 30 percent in the “optimistic” version. The extent of the difference between the minimum and maximum estimates for individual countries, which is mainly a reflection of the return rate and the share of ELTDP-providing institutions among the respondents, can be used as an indicator to assess the validity of the scores. The smaller the difference, the closer the estimates should be to reality. For most countries the difference is around 10 percent or less, which indicates rather good estimates. But a high degree of uncertainty remains in the case of the Netherlands (difference of 45%) and Sweden (23%).

Taking the minimum estimates (“pessimistic scenario”) as closest to the reality, the table of countries with institutions offering ELTDPs is topped by Finland (67%), followed by the Czech Republic (42%), Iceland (38%), Germany (30%) and the Netherlands (28%). The lowest providers of ELTDPs are higher education institutions in France, and in the Southern Countries Greece, Italy and Portugal, with a percentage of under 10. Table 3.2 displays clearly that there is a “north-south divide”. Based on the “optimistic scenario”, Finland again comes out top (82.9%), ahead of the Netherlands (73.9), Iceland (60%) and the Czech Republic (50%). Once again, the Southern Countries come out low. By and large, the Alps are a European “ELTDP watershed”. In most countries north of them, ELTDPs are a relatively common feature, while those located south of them are almost “ELTDP-free”. Central and Eastern European Countries occupy a middle position.

It is interesting to note that every fifth institution not offering ELTDPs at the time the survey was conducted stated its intention to develop such programmes in the near future. This underlines that ELTDPs are a growing phenomenon in European higher education.

### **3.3 Degree Programmes Provided in English**

Overall, 725 English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes are offered by higher education institutions participating in the study.<sup>6</sup> Germany reports 180 ELTDPs, the highest number of all countries, followed by the Netherlands with 115 and Finland with 85. At the bottom end, fewer than 10 ELTDPs are reported by institutions from Iceland, Spain, Slovakia, Austria and Greece. The only country without a single ELTDP is Portugal.

Measured against the overall number of degree programmes offered, i.e. in the domestic language, in English or in a third language, the average proportion of ELTDPs ranges between two and four percent only (see Table 3.3). On the basis of the minimum estimate (“pessimistic scenario”), the highest proportion of degree programmes taught in English can be found in the

---

<sup>6</sup> This number refers to ELTDPs which were, in the academic year 2000/01, either in operation (majority), or in the final phase of preparation (minority).

Netherlands (12.5%), followed by Denmark (7.5%), Belgium (7.4%) and Finland (5%). In the “optimistic” version, the Netherlands lead again (20.1%), with Denmark (15.6%), Belgium (10.2%) and Finland (8.2%) following.

Although Germany is the country with the highest absolute number of ELTDPs, its 180 ELTDPs represent only 2.4 (“pessimistic scenario”) and 3.5 percent (“optimistic” scenario) of all programmes offered in the country. All southern countries are at the bottom of the list, with less than one percent of degree programmes taught in English (“pessimistic scenario”).

**Table 3.3**  
**Overall Number of Degree Programmes and ELTDPs – by Country**  
(absolute numbers and percentages)

Country	Number of degree programmes reported by responding institutions <sup>2)</sup>			Proportion of ELTDPs		
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	Difference %
	Estimated number of degree prog. <sup>1)</sup>	Total number	ELTDPs	Minimum % (C : A)	Maximum % (C : B)	
Netherlands	1,000	571	115	11.5	20.1	7.6
Denmark	600	270	42	7.0	15.6	8.1
Belgium	800	560	57	7.1	10.2	2.8
Finland	1,700	1,035	85	5.0	8.2	3.2
Norway	900	578	35	3.9	6.1	2.3
Sweden	1,200	598	42	3.5	7.0	3.5
Czech Republic	1,000	596	35	3.5	5.9	2.4
Iceland	100	58	3	3.0	5.2	0.9
Hungary	700	556	21	3.0	3.8	0.5
Switzerland	600	329	15	2.5	4.6	2.0
Germany	7,500	5,169	180	2.4	3.5	1.1
Poland	2,600	971	27	1.0	2.8	1.8
Greece	1,000	408	9	0.9	2.2	1.3
Austria	800	597	6	0.8	1.0	0.2
Slovakia	700	390	5	0.7	1.3	0.6
France	6,500	1,736	33	0.5	1.9	1.4
Italy	3,500	1,373	11	0.3	0.8	0.5
Spain	3,000	1,332	4	0.1	0.3	0.2
Portugal	1,500	887	0	0	0	–
Total	35,700	18,014	725	2.0	4.0	2.0

1) The overall number of degree programmes per country was calculated on the basis of data collected with the help of the Institutional Questionnaire. The number of degree programmes in non-responding institutions was estimated by taking into account available data from other sources, i.e. the number of students enrolled, and the average size of degree programmes in individual countries calculated on the basis of data collected by the survey.

2) Data were collected with the help of the Institutional Questionnaire.

### 3.4 Enrolment in English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes

The overall number of ELTDP students reported by institutions is roughly 28,000 (academic year 2000/01). Germany, with 6,000 ELTDP students, as well as Finland and the Netherlands (5,000 each) lead the table. Hungary, Poland, Belgium and Switzerland have between 1,000 and 2,000 ELTDP students.

In relation to the overall number of students enrolled, ELTDP students are almost a *quantité négligéable* (cf. Table 3.4). In the “optimistic scenario”, their average proportion is 0.47 percent. In the “pessimistic” version, the percentage is a meagre 0.22.

**Table 3.4**  
**Overall Number of Students and Students Enrolled in ELTDPs**  
**– by Country** (absolute numbers and percentages)

Country	Number of students reported by responding institutions <sup>2)</sup>			Proportion of ELTDP students		
	(A) Estimated total number <sup>1)</sup>	(B) Total number	(C) ELTDP students	(D) Minimum % (C : A)	(E) Maximum % (C : B)	(F) Difference %
Finland	250,000	195,841	5,117	2.05	2.61	0.56
Switzerland	100,000	58,535	1,231	1.20	2.10	0.90
Netherlands	550,000	238,253	4,954	0.90	2.08	1,15
Hungary	200,000	177,745	1,751	0.88	0.99	0.08
Czech Republic	170,000	137,464	881	0.52	0.64	0.09
Denmark	180,000	81,968	842	0.47	1.03	0,55
Belgium	300,000	173,306	1,273	0.42	0.73	0.29
Iceland	15,000	10,403	50	0.33	0.48	0.08
Norway	200,000	107,231	657	0.33	0.61	0.26
Germany	2,100,000	1,227,547	5,840	0.28	0.48	0.20
Sweden	350,000	210,764	733	0.21	0.35	0.15
Poland	1,000,000	448,861	1,774	0.18	0.40	0.21
Austria	300,000	267,739	410	0.14	0.15	0.01
France	2,000,000	457,028	827	0.04	0.18	0.14
Slovakia	100,000	61,738	40	0.04	0.06	0.02
Spain	1,700,000	778,612	721	0.04	0.09	0.05
Italy	2,000,000	819,973	671	0.03	0.08	0.05
Portugal	350,000	217,374	0	0	0	-
Greece	500,000	218,342	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,365,000</b>	<b>5,888,724</b>	<b>27,772</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>0.24</b>

1) The student numbers per country were calculated on the basis of information provided by institutions in their applications for a SOCRATES Institutional Contract (1999/2000).

2) The data were collected with the help of the Institutional Questionnaire.

Based on the figures of the “pessimistic scenario”, there are only two countries with a share of ELTDP students above one percent. Finland leads, with 2.05%, followed by Switzerland 1.20%. Two further countries, the Netherlands (0.90%) and Hungary (0.88%) come close to one percent. In other countries with a comparably high absolute number of ELTDP students, such as Germany, Poland or Belgium, the respective proportion is close to the average, i.e. around 0.22 percent.

Overall, slightly more than half of the students enrolled in ELTDPs are foreign students. Their proportion is highest in Iceland (100%), Switzerland (88%), the Czech Republic (85%), Denmark (83%), and Hungary (76%). At the low end, the proportion of foreign ELTDP students is only about one third or less in Finland (35%), Belgium (34%), Italy (33%), Poland (28%), Austria (26%), Spain (13%) and Slovakia (10%).

To put it in a nutshell: although there are marked differences between countries, the quantitative importance of education provided in English is extremely limited everywhere in Europe.

**Table 3.5**  
**Ranks of Individual Countries by Different Criteria Measuring the Provision of Degree Programmes Taught in English**

Country	Institutions offering	Degree Programmes	Enrolment of	Total
	ELTDPs	taught in English	students in ELTDPs	Average rank
	Rank	Rank	Rank	
Finland	1	4	1	2.0
Netherlands	5	1	3	3.0
Czech Republic	2	7	5	4.7
Iceland	3	8	8	6.3
Denmark	11	2	6	6.3
Hungary	8	9	4	7.0
Norway	7	6	9	7.3
Belgium	13	3	7	7.7
Sweden	6	7	11	8.0
Switzerland	12	10	2	8.0
Germany	4	11	10	8.3
Poland	9	12	12	11.0
Slovakia	10	15	14	13.0
Austria	16	14	13	14.3
Greece	14	13	18	15.0
France	17	16	14	15.7
Italy	14	17	17	16.0
Spain	18	18	14	16.7
Portugal	19	19	19	19.0

### **3.5 Leading Countries**

In order to arrive at an overall (average) ranking of the individual countries as providers of ELTDPs, the three indicators used above were transformed into one single value. This was calculated by making the sum of each country's rank for the three indicators (a. institutions offering ELTDPs, b. programmes taught in English, and c. student enrolment in ELTDPs) and by dividing it by three. The overall ranking provides an insight into which countries are the leaders in the provision of ELTDPs, and which score very poorly.

Finland and the Netherlands are clearly the leaders in ELDTP provision, followed by the Czech Republic, Iceland and Denmark. Countries such as Belgium, Switzerland and Germany form a middle group, while Southern Europe very much lags behind. Thus, this measure also confirms the existence of a European north-south divide, as far as ELTDPs are concerned.



## 4 The Institutional Context

What are the institutions like which provide ELTDPs – and those which do not? Are they old institutions or recent creations? Are they private universities or public organisms? Are non-university institutions the main providers, or are most ELTDPs supplied by universities? Does size matter? And is there a link between the general level of internationalisation of a university or college, and its engagement in the particular field of ELTDPs? These are the questions which this chapter explores. It intends to describe the factors which have an influence on whether or not an institution is likely to offer programmes in English.

Most of the findings in this chapter are based on the results the Institutional Survey, carried out by means of the Institutional Questionnaire and directed at central-level staff responsible for the ERASMUS Institutional Contract. In addition, information obtained during the site visits has been used.

### 4.1 Characteristics of Institutions

#### 4.1.1 Year of Foundation and Legal Status

Slightly more than two thirds of the higher education institutions taking part in the survey were founded after World War II: 13 percent between 1945 and 1964, 17 percent between 1965 and 1974, 11 percent between 1995 and 1988 and 28 percent after 1989. As Table 4.1 shows, the remarkable number of new foundations is not only caused by the fall of the ‘iron curtain’ and the restructuring of higher education systems in Central and Eastern European Countries. The last decade was also characterised by substantial changes in higher education in some of the EU and EFTA member states. The highest proportions of institutions founded since 1989 could be observed in Finland (54%, amongst them the entire non-university sector), Spain (53%) and Belgium (52%). In Central and Eastern Europe, the respective proportion is more than one third in each country. Only few institutions were newly created, on the other hand, in Denmark (8%), Greece (12%), France, Italy and Portugal (15% in each country). Most of the new institutions in Germany are located in the new Bundesländer, where a complete restructuring of the higher education system took place after unification.

While there is a strong dominance of “young” institutions amongst respondents to the survey, these are not, in relative terms, providing more ELTDPs than their “old” counterparts. This is at any rate the case if the measure applied is the availability of at least one ELTDP per institution. By this measure, institutions founded before World War II lead younger ones. On average, 34 percent of them offer at least one ELTDP, while younger universities and colleges reach only an average percentage of 29.

The vast majority of higher education institutions belong to the public sector (82%). However, there are substantial differences between countries. With

**Table 4.1**  
**Year of Foundation of the Higher Education Institution – by Country**  
 (percentages)

	Country of institution										Total
	AT	BE	CH	CZ	DE	DK	ES	FI	FR	GR	
Prior to 1945	26	33	30	32	26	45	18	27	44	18	31
1945 – 1964	6	5	13	32	14	20	0	2	13	12	13
1965 – 1974	34	7	10	0	28	18	16	15	17	18	17
1975 – 1988	6	2	10	0	9	8	13	2	12	41	11
1989 – 2001	28	52	37	36	23	8	53	54	15	12	28
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(47)	(42)	(30)	(22)	(155)	(49)	(38)	(41)	(102)	(17)	(778)

	Country of institution									Total
	HU	IS	IT	NL	NO	PL	PT	SE	SK	
Prior to 1945	32	40	46	32	30	29	18	22	22	31
1945 – 1964	16	0	5	18	7	29	13	6	33	13
1965 – 1974	12	0	12	9	19	10	13	17	0	17
1975 – 1988	0	20	22	18	7	2	41	28	0	11
1989 – 2001	40	40	15	23	37	31	15	28	44	28
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(25)	(5)	(41)	(22)	(27)	(49)	(39)	(18)	(9)	(778)

Question 1.1: Please state the foundation year of your institution.

less than 10 percent the private sector plays only a very marginal role in Germany, Denmark, Greece, the Netherlands and the Slovak Republic. On the other hand more than a quarter of institutions in France (30%), Switzerland (29%), Poland and Portugal (26% each) are run by non-state providers.

Interestingly, private universities and colleges slightly less often provide ELTDPs than public institutions (27% compared to 29%). However, this finding should not be over-interpreted. The definition of “public” and “private” differs between European Countries. And, more important, “private” in many, if not most cases, does neither mean that the provider is by necessity a corporation, nor that the (major share of) funding necessarily does not come from the state. The many church-run establishments in Europe are but one example illustrating the need for this distinction.

#### 4.1.2 Type of Institutions

Most European countries have a “dual” system of higher education, made up of a university sector, on the one hand, and non-university institutions, on the other. Examples of the latter are the German, Austrian and Swiss *Fachhoch-*

*schulen*, the Dutch and Flemish *hogescholen*, the Greek *Technologika Ekpaideftika Idrimata*, or the Finnish *Ammattikorkeakoulu*, to name only some. The differences between the two sectors are, amongst other things, the degree of their research orientation (which is strong in universities and marginal in most college-type institutions), the degrees they are awarding (most, though not all non-university institutions, are confined to conferring first-cycle Bachelor-type degrees only), and the nature of the education they provide, which is regarded as more theoretical in universities, and more practice-oriented or professional in colleges. The distinction has not remained uncontested: the boundaries between the two sectors are getting increasingly blurred.<sup>7</sup> The exact roles and missions also vary considerably between European countries.

Although, for the reasons stated above, an exact definition of the non-university sector with a Europe-wide validity is an impossible thing to achieve, the distinction is a classical and widely-applied differentiation criterion, and it is therefore also used in this study. The institutions taking part in this study were categorised on the basis of earlier research carried out on the Erasmus Programme, and, in the case of new countries, by higher education experts from the countries concerned.

More than half of the institutions responding to the survey belong to the non-university sector (56%).<sup>8</sup> As Table 4.2 shows, their share is especially high in Belgium (84%), Denmark (84%), Switzerland (83%), France (82%) and Austria (79%). On the other hand, no non-university sector exists in the Slovak Republic, and it is, measured by the number of institutions, a marginal phenomenon in Spain and Poland (5% and 8%), and a small one in the Czech Republic (14%), Italy (18%) and Sweden (21%).

Institutions belonging to the university sector state more often than their non-university counterparts that they offer one or more ELTDP (37% compared with 22%). This general trend is also reflected in countries with a high availability of ELTDPs, and with a significant non-university sector, such as Finland (87%:81%), Germany (46%:40%) and the Netherlands (100%:57%).

### 4.1.3 Student Population

The average number of students at the institutions responding to the survey is 7,364. It should be noted that it was impossible to differentiate between full-time and part-time students (and thus into full-time-equivalents), since data according to this differentiation are available only in some countries.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Bernd Wächter (ed.), *Internationalisation in European Non-University Higher Education*, Bonn: Lemmens 1999.

<sup>8</sup> The fact that college-type institutions outnumber universities does not mean they have a larger share of the student population as well. Austria and Switzerland are good examples in this respect. While their share of non-university institutions is high, enrolment numbers are still modest, at 10 percent or below.

**Table 4.2**  
**Type of Higher Education Institutions – by Country (percentages)**

	Country of institution										Total
	AT	BE	CH	CZ	DE	DK	ES	FI	FR	GR	
University	21	16	17	86	50	16	95	37	18	47	44
Non-university	79	84	83	14	50	84	5	63	82	53	56
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(47)	(43)	(35)	(22)	(159)	(50)	(39)	(41)	(114)	(17)	(808)

  

	Country of institution										Total
	HU	IS	IT	NL	NO	PL	PT	SE	SK		
University	40	80	82	36	33	92	28	79	100		44
Non-university	60	20	18	64	67	8	72	21	0		56
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		100
Count (n)	(25)	(5)	(44)	(22)	(27)	(50)	(39)	(19)	(10)		(808)

Source: Institutional Questionnaire.

As Table 4.3 shows, there are large deviations from the overall average. The smallest institution has fewer than 50 students, the largest one 140,000. Only 10 percent of responding institutions enrol more than 20,000 students, and 12 percent of respondents enrol between 10,000 and 20,000. Small institutions, with a student population of up to 1,000, make up more than one third (34%), and they are most common in Switzerland (79%), Austria (74%), Denmark (64%) and France (60%). Large institutions, of more than 10,000 students, are most common in Spain (58%) and Italy (47%), with their virtually non-existent non-university sector, and in the Netherlands (41%).

**Table 4.3**  
**Overall Number of Students (full-time and part-time) Enrolled – by Country (percentages and mean)**

	Country of institution										Total
	AT	BE	CH	CZ	DE	DK	ES	FI	FR	GR	
Up to 500	48	9	55	18	8	33	8	7	35	6	18
501 – 1,000	26	9	24	5	13	31	5	2	25	6	16
1,001 – 2,500	7	28	6	9	19	27	3	22	18	18	16
2,501 – 5,000	2	35	9	18	20	2	3	34	3	18	14
5,001 – 10,000	4	9	3	23	15	4	24	24	4	24	14
10,001 and more	13	9	3	27	24	4	58	10	15	29	22
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(46)	(43)	(33)	(22)	(155)	(49)	(38)	(41)	(103)	(17)	(781)
Average number of students	5787	4030	1698	6248	7854	1660	20417	4777	3820	12844	7364

	Country of institution									Total
	HU	IS	IT	NL	NO	PL	PT	SE	SK	
Up to 500	0	20	14	0	19	4	13	0	11	18
501 – 1,000	16	40	14	0	11	11	21	11	33	16
1,001 – 2,500	20	20	0	18	33	15	11	5	11	16
2,501 – 5,000	12	0	7	23	19	20	16	5	11	14
5,001 – 10,000	32	20	19	18	11	15	18	42	11	14
10,001 and more	20	0	47	41	7	35	21	37	22	22
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(25)	(5)	(43)	(22)	(27)	(46)	(38)	(19)	(9)	(781)
Average number of students	7110	2081	18745	10830	3972	9275	5715	11093	4628	7364

Question 1.3: Please state the overall number of students (full-time and part-time) enrolled at your institution in the academic year 2000/2001 and estimate the proportion of foreign students.

Generally, European universities tend to be larger than college-type institutions. While more than three quarters of the non-university institutions have at most 2,500 students, the corresponding share of universities is only about one quarter. One fifth of all universities, but only one percent of the non-university sector, have more than 20,000 students in 2000/01.

**Table 4.4**  
**Offering of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes**  
**– by Number of Students Enrolled (percentages)**

	Overall number of students						Total
	Up to 500	501 to 1,000	1,001 to 2,500	2,501 to 5,000	5,001 to 10,000	10,001 and more	
Yes	9	11	25	41	39	46	29
No, but intended	10	15	21	17	21	12	15
No	81	75	54	42	40	42	56
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(140)	(123)	(126)	(109)	(112)	(171)	(781)

Question 1.4 Does your institution offer English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes?

Table 4.4 shows a clear correspondence between the size of the higher education institutions and the availability of ELTDPs. While only about 10 percent of the institutions with at most 1,000 students provide ELTDPs, the corresponding proportion is 25 percent for institutions with up to 2,500 students, about 40 percent for institutions with up to 10,000 students, and 46 percent for institutions with more than 10,000 students. From a statistical point of view, the size of an institution plays a much more significant role for the availability of ELTDPs than the type of the institution, i.e. university or non-university.

#### 4.1.4 Disciplinary Profile

The majority of higher education institutions (53%) offers degree programmes in a broad range of subject areas and might thus be classified as “general”. For the purposes of this study, an institution classified as “general” offers a subject range covering the humanities and social sciences, as well as the natural sciences and engineering. Table 4.5 shows that 26 percent of all institutions provide study programmes exclusively in the humanities and social sciences, and 15 percent offer natural science and engineering programmes only.

Institutions focussing exclusively on either humanities and social sciences, or natural sciences and engineering (“specialised institutions”) are most frequently found in Denmark, France, Austria, Switzerland and Poland. Institu-

**Table 4.5**  
**Disciplinary Profile<sup>9</sup> of the Institutions – by Country (percentages)**

	Country of institution										Total
	AT	BE	CH	CZ	DE	DK	ES	FI	FR	GR	
General (Hum/Soc/Nat)	26	66	28	63	70	9	87	71	26	88	53
Humanities a. social sc.	44	22	34	11	22	48	10	24	34	0	28
Nat sc./ engineering	21	12	28	16	5	35	0	5	39	13	15
Other	9	0	9	11	3	9	3	0	2	0	3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(43)	(41)	(32)	(19)	(148)	(46)	(31)	(41)	(98)	(16)	(736)

	Country of institution									Total
	HU	IS	IT	NL	NO	PL	PT	SE	SK	
General (Hum/Soc/Nat)	43	40	64	68	54	52	70	63	70	53
Humanities a. social sc.	52	60	29	32	35	27	12	19	20	28
Nat sc./ engineering	4	0	5	0	8	18	15	19	10	15
Other	0	0	2	0	4	2	3	0	0	3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(23)	(5)	(42)	(22)	(26)	(44)	(33)	(16)	(10)	(736)

Question 1.5: Please provide information on the disciplinary profile of your institution, the implementation of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes and, if data available, on the distribution of students by subject area for the academic year 2000/2001.

9 The three subject areas Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences and Engineering comprise the following disciplines:

- Humanities: Art and Design; Languages and Philology; Humanities.
- Social Sciences: Business and Management Studies; Education and Teacher Training; Law; Social Sciences; Communication and Information Studies.
- Natural Sciences and Engineering: Agriculture; Architecture, Urban and Regional Planning; Engineering and Technology; Geography and Geology; Mathematics and Informatics; Medical Sciences; Natural Sciences.

tions exclusively active in the humanities and social sciences are most common in Hungary, Norway and the Netherlands. Greece, Spain, Portugal and Germany have the largest number of institutions with a general disciplinary profile.

Universities more often provide a broad range of subjects than non-university institutions, as was to be expected, given their generally wider subject spectrum. The respective proportions are 68 percent and 42 percent. On the other hand a larger percentage of non-university institutions specialises in the humanities and social sciences (35% as compared to 20% of the universities) or in sciences and engineering (20% as compared to 10%).

As could also have been anticipated, higher education institutions offering a broad range of subject areas are on average much larger than specialised institutions. While more than 80 percent of institutions specialised either in the humanities and social sciences or in natural sciences and engineering have a student population of at most 2,500, the corresponding share of institutions with a general disciplinary profile is only about 20 percent.

**Table 4.6**  
**Offering of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes**  
**– by Disciplinary Profile of Institutions (percentages)**

	Subject areas offered				Total
	General (Hum/Soc/Nat)	Humanities and social sciences.	Natural sciences/ engineering	Other	
Yes	40	24	19	25	32
No, but intended	17	11	18	8	15
No	44	65	62	67	53
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(392)	(206)	(114)	(24)	(736)

Question 1.4: Does your institution offer English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes?

Taking into account the inter-correlation between the range of subject areas offered, the type of institution and the size of institution in terms of student enrolment, it is not surprising that higher education institutions with a general disciplinary profile offer ELTDPs more often than specialised institutions. As Table 4.6 displays, the respective shares are 40 percent for institutions with a broad subject range, 24 percent for institutions specialised in humanities and social sciences and 19 percent for institutions providing exclusively science and engineering programmes.

## 4.2 International Activities of Institutions

Despite sometimes fervent lip-service, for many decades internationalisation had been a rather marginal concern of most European higher education

institutions. This changed, in many institutions and countries, in the 1990s. A “European” or “international dimension” was often deemed a necessary part of an institutional mission. Not only did internationalisation gain in political importance, it also grew in terms of activity volumes, and it diversified in terms of activity types. The European Union education and training programmes contributed to this development, as did comparable national schemes. Student and teacher mobility was and remained the cornerstone of internationalisation, but new elements, such as internationalised curricula, membership in international networks, recognition mechanisms, and recently “off-shore” operations and the provision of e-based learning were added. In the very last years, system-level internationalisation, in the guise of the “Bologna Process” of innovation and harmonisation of degree and other structures, has been added to the list. The discussion on whether or not education should become an internationally tradable service is the next candidate for the list of internationalisation issues. ELTDPs are, of course, an internationalisation measure, too.<sup>10</sup>

Given this wider context, the authors felt it worthwhile to be able to “contextualise” the findings about ELTDPs. What is the “international profile” of the institutions in the survey? Are institutions offering ELTDPs also at the forefront regarding other internationalisation activities, or is there no such link? To find out about this, three different sets of questions were asked, relating to

1. The major objectives institutions pursue;
2. The enrolment of foreign students;
3. The participation in important European and international support programmes.

#### 4.2.1 Objectives of Internationalisation

All higher education institutions participating in the institutional survey were asked to state the relative importance they attach to 13 single objectives of internationalisation. In order to identify and validate the structure of the objectives, i.e. the inter-correlation of the various issues addressed, a factor analysis was employed, which resulted in four groups.

- 1) *Internationalisation in general*: strengthening of internationalisation in general; improving the international visibility of the institution; and establishing a coherent policy;
- 2) *Mobility*: increasing the number of incoming and outgoing students and teachers;

---

<sup>10</sup> For an in-depth account of internationalisation, cf. Bernd Wächter, *Internationalisation in Higher Education*, Bonn: Lemmens 1999; Marijk van der Wende, *Internationalising the Curriculum in Dutch Higher Education: an International Perspective*, The Hague 1996; Hans de Wit, *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe. A Historical, Comparative and Conceptual Analysis*, Westport (Connecticut) 2002.

- 3) *Framework conditions for mobility*: development of foreign language competencies of students; improvement of recognition (e.g. ECTS); and development and maintenance of a network of partner institutions abroad;
- 4) *Quality of teaching and research*: development of internationalised curricula; improvement of the quality of teaching and learning; improvement of the quality of research.

The main and slightly disappointing (since hardly revealing) finding is that, by and large, a sizeable majority of respondents finds most of the 13 objectives important or very important. Therefore, differences concern mostly nuances only.

The vast majority of responding institutions underline the importance of a general improvement of international activities. "Strengthening of internationalisation of the institution in general" is ranked as important or very important by 87 percent. 80 and 77 percent respectively classify the "improvement of the international visibility of the institution" and the "introduction of a coherent policy for internationalisation" in the same category.

As Table 4.7 shows, institutions from Southern Countries report on average a higher emphasis on "general internationalisation" than their counterparts from Northern Europe. Italy and Spain attach the highest importance to this aim, while the Netherlands and Denmark find it least important. There are some indications that these findings reflect the extent of internationalisation already reached in the different countries, i.e. that institutions from the northern half of Europe are already more "internationalised" than those in the south, and therefore put less emphasis on further developments.

Universities stress more often than college-type institutions the importance of objectives related to a general improvement of internationalisation. It is also interesting to note that the size of the institutions plays a differentiating role only in the university sector, but not in the non-university sphere. The larger the universities are, the more often they attach a high importance to the general improvement of internationalisation.

Regarding the second group of objectives, related to mobility, a similarly homogeneous pattern emerges. Most institutions seek to increase the number of a) outgoing (domestic) students (84%), b) incoming (foreign) students (81%), c) outgoing (domestic) and incoming teachers (both 76%).

Particularly higher education institutions in Spain, Greece, Portugal, Finland, Norway and Sweden, as well as most of those in Central and Eastern Europe pursue these aims. In the Netherlands and in Switzerland the increase in numbers of mobile teachers clearly has a lower importance than in other countries.

More often than smaller institutions, large ones consider mobility as important. There are no significant differences between different institution types.

**Table 4.7**  
**Important Objectives of Internationalisation – by Country (percentages)**

	Country of institution																		Total	
	AT	BE	CH	CZ	DE	DK	ES	FI	FR	GR	HU	IS	IT	NL	NO	PL	PT	SE		SK
Strengthening of internationalisation in general	83	76	88	76	90	79	95	90	87	100	92	100	90	64	89	84	89	89	80	87
Introduction of a coherent policy for internationalisation	70	80	66	55	71	65	95	76	84	80	84	100	88	59	78	75	89	84	70	77
Improvement of international visibility of the institution	78	65	79	81	77	71	92	83	81	87	92	80	93	71	85	88	82	79	80	80
Improvement of the quality of teaching/learning	89	73	78	76	81	85	95	85	78	94	96	100	98	71	93	94	92	74	90	85
Development of foreign language competencies of students	70	61	53	81	72	44	82	66	75	81	88	80	88	41	33	84	76	47	80	69
Internationalisation of curricula	61	58	55	81	60	65	76	88	66	88	80	100	80	82	70	76	76	63	100	69
Improvement of the quality of research	78	55	68	67	66	54	89	66	64	100	84	100	86	35	81	78	79	63	90	70
Improvement of recognition (e.g. ECTS)	85	83	71	81	66	77	97	66	75	88	96	60	90	57	74	92	92	74	80	78
Development and maintenance of a net of partner institutions abroad	87	80	88	86	88	89	97	90	94	100	92	60	90	82	89	94	89	74	70	89
Increase of number of outgoing students	76	76	82	62	90	73	95	93	77	88	84	80	86	73	93	94	84	84	90	84
Increase of number of incoming students	76	68	71	95	82	67	92	83	80	88	92	100	86	64	89	90	92	68	80	81
Increase of number of outgoing teaching staff	72	68	39	62	77	78	95	90	72	81	80	40	83	50	85	84	87	89	90	76
Increase of number of incoming teaching staff	70	67	42	86	74	69	95	90	67	94	92	50	78	45	85	90	89	89	80	76
Count (n)	(46)	(41)	(34)	(21)	(156)	(49)	(38)	(41)	(112)	(16)	(25)	(5)	(42)	(22)	(27)	(50)	(38)	(19)	(10)	(792)

Table 2.1: How important are the following objectives of internationalisation at your institution?

Most institutions of higher education also aim to improve the framework conditions of mobility, by means of a) the creation and further development of a network of partner institutions abroad (89 %), b) the implementation of academic recognition measures (e.g. ECTS) (78%) and c) the improvement of their students' foreign language competencies (69%).

With respect to framework conditions, big differences exist between countries. While fewer than half of the institutions from Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands and Denmark consider the development of foreign language competencies of students an important issue, the respective proportion is three quarters or more in Eastern and Southern European Countries. This picture seems to be based on a sober appreciation of actual needs: foreign language skills of Nordic and Dutch students are usually excellent (at least in English), while the mastery of foreign languages in Central Europe is often only in the process of development. The proportion of institutions aiming to improve recognition measures ranges from 57 percent in the case of the Netherlands to up to 97 percent in Spain. Again, recognition practice is much more advanced in the Netherlands than in Spain.

The majority of respondents also view the improvement of the quality of teaching and research as important internationalisation objectives. Ranked by sub-categories, the improvement of the quality of teaching and learning comes out top (85%), followed by the improvement of research quality (70%) and the internationalisation of curricula (69%). Again, the Southern European Countries put special emphasis on these issues, while institutions from the Netherlands, Belgium and Sweden attach least importance to them.

It is hardly surprising that universities prioritise the improvement of the quality of research more often than non-university institutions (84% : 60%). Regarding the improvement of the quality of teaching and learning, the difference is rather small (88% : 82%).

In the context of this study, the objective of curricular internationalisation (development of new and international restructuring of existing programmes) must be regarded as especially important. Indeed, more than two thirds (69%) of all respondents consider curricular internationalisation as an important institutional objective. On the other hand, this is the lowest rating of all 13 internationalisation items (together with improvement in foreign languages). The importance attached to this aim is clearly above average in all CEE countries, as well as in Iceland (100%), Finland (88%) and the Netherlands (82%). At the other end, the respective proportions are lowest in Switzerland (55%), Belgium (58%), Austria (61%) and Germany (60%).

Larger institutions more often underline the importance of curricular internationalisation. The proportion ranges from 62 percent of the institutions with up to 1,000 students to 78 percent of the institutions with more than 10,000 students.

**Table 4.8**  
**Important Objectives of Internationalisation**  
**– by Status of Implementation of ELTDPs (percentages)**

	Offer of ELTDPs			Total
	Yes	No, but intended	No	
<b>Internationalisation in general</b>				
Strengthening of internationalisation in general	92	89	83	87
Improvement of international visibility of the institution	89	79	76	80
Introduction of a coherent policy for internationalisation	80	82	74	77
<b>Academic mobility</b>				
Increase of number of outgoing students	90	86	80	84
Increase of number of incoming students	85	89	77	81
Increase of number of outgoing teaching staff	78	86	72	76
Increase of number of incoming teaching staff	80	82	72	76
<b>Pre-conditions of academic mobility</b>				
Development and maintenance of a net of partner institutions abroad	90	92	88	89
Improvement of recognition (e.g. ECTS)	71	87	79	78
Development of foreign language competencies of students	71	80	66	69
<b>Quality of teaching and research</b>				
Internationalisation of curricula	80	73	63	69
Improvement of the quality of teaching/learning	80	91	85	85
Improvement of the quality of research	68	75	71	70
Count (n)	(231)	(121)	(440)	(792)

Question 2.1: How important are the following objectives of internationalisation at your institution?

As Table 4.8 shows, more ELTDP providers than non-providers attach a high importance to internationalisation. In nine out of the thirteen individual internationalisation items, the share of ELTDP-offering institutions which opt for “important” or “very important” is larger than that amongst non-providers. The exceptions, where non-providers show higher percentages, are

- the introduction of a coherent internationalisation policy;
- the improvement of recognition;
- and the improvement of the quality of teaching/learning, and of research.

The particular item of curricular internationalisation, which is of a special relevance in this study, is viewed as more important among ELTDP providers than non-ELTDP-providing institutions (80% : 69%). However, this item still by no means tops the table of objectives of ELTDP providers, but occupies rather a middle rank.

In order to gain an impression of the expectations accompanying the introduction of ELTDPs, it might also be helpful to look at institutions which have not yet set up such degree programmes but are intending to do so in the near future. In contrast to other higher education institutions, this group attaches a higher importance to

- increasing in the number of incoming students;
- fostering teacher mobility;
- improving the quality of teaching and learning; and
- improving the framework conditions of academic mobility, especially factors related to recognition and foreign language competence of students.

By and large, institutions intending to develop ELTDPs in the near future currently have the broadest range of important internationalisation objectives.

#### **4.2.2 Enrolment of Foreign Students**

The average percentage of foreign students enrolled in the universities and colleges which participated in the survey is 6.8. Again, the differences between individual countries are considerable. No Nordic Country, and none from Central and Eastern Europe, reaches a five-percent share of foreign students. The Netherlands (5.1%) only narrowly escape this low-percentage league. The leading countries are, in that order, Switzerland (17.9%), Belgium (9.7%), Germany (9.6%), and France, Austria and Greece (8.3% each).

This picture is more or less in line with statistics on foreign students published by UNESCO or OECD<sup>11</sup>, which is why the results can be regarded as fairly representative. It should be noted, though, that the high number of foreign students in Greece is not explicable against this background.

At the same time, the picture is surprising: measured against any benchmark other than the percentage of foreign students, the Nordic Countries of Europe, as well as the Netherlands, usually come out as “leaders” in Europeanisation and internationalisation of higher education. As this study shows, they are certainly among the more advanced countries regarding the introduction of ELTDPs. Why then is their achievement in respect of foreign students so modest? A lot speaks for it that, for them, the introduction of ELTDPs is a means to counter-balance the effects of a particular competitive disadvantage, i.e. their rarely-spoken languages, which also explains the low number of foreign students. The reservoir of students in this world mastering such rare languages as Finnish, Icelandic or Danish, and even, comparatively speaking, Dutch, is so small that these countries cannot hope to attract sizeable numbers of foreigners by means of tuition in the host country lan-

<sup>11</sup> Cf. for example, OECD, *Education at a Glance*, 2000 edition, Paris 2000, p. 177.

guage.<sup>12</sup> The pressure on them to revert to English is much greater than it is, say, on Germany, Spain, or France.

**Table 4.9**  
**Number of Foreign Students at the Institution – by Country**  
(percentages and mean)

	Country of the institution										Total
	AT	BE	CH	CZ	DE	DK	ES	FI	FR	GR	
Up to 10	34	10	21	5	1	52	5	8	24	7	18
11 – 50	39	26	33	32	17	23	13	20	27	29	23
51 – 100	0	12	21	9	12	9	11	15	13	21	12
101 – 250	2	24	3	27	20	5	26	43	11	21	17
251 – 500	0	14	6	14	10	9	11	8	7	0	9
501 – 1000	7	7	3	14	12	2	13	8	5	21	9
1001 and more	17	7	12	0	27	0	21	0	12	0	12
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(41)	(42)	(33)	(22)	(153)	(44)	(38)	(40)	(99)	(14)	(733)
Average number of foreign students	820	377	286	208	856	74	574	167	370	220	431
Average percentage of foreign students	8.3	9.7	17.9	4.3	9.6	3.9	3.1	3.9	8.3	8.3	6.8

	Country of the institution									Total
	HU	IS	IT	NL	NO	PL	PT	SE	SK	
Up to 10	39	40	10	11	12	43	41	19	0	18
11 – 50	17	40	21	16	44	17	25	6	33	23
51 – 100	9	0	21	0	16	14	3	13	17	12
101 – 250	17	0	18	16	16	14	6	38	33	17
251 – 500	9	20	5	21	4	7	16	0	17	9
501 – 1000	4	0	15	21	8	2	6	25	0	9
1001 and more	4	0	10	16	0	2	3	0	0	12
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(23)	(5)	(39)	(19)	(25)	(42)	(32)	(16)	(6)	(733)
Average number of foreign students	145	69	493	473	105	114	180	265	120	431
Average percentage of foreign students	3.0	3.5	4.1	5.1	4.0	2.5	2.4	2.6	3.6	6.8

Question 1.3: Please state the overall number of students (full-time and part-time) enrolled at your institution in the academic year 2000/2001 and estimate the proportion of foreign students.

<sup>12</sup> This only partly explains the Finnish result, though. As will later be seen, the proportion of domestic students on ELTDPs is unusually high in Finland.

As Table 4.9 shows, in nine out of 19 countries represented in the study, the majority of higher education institutions have only up to 50 foreign students (Austria, Switzerland, Denmark, France, Hungary, Iceland, Norway, Poland and Portugal). On the other hand, in only three countries more than a third of all institutions enrol upwards of 500 foreign students: Germany (39%), the Netherlands (37%) and Spain (34%). The average number of foreign students per institution is highest in Germany (856), Austria (820), Spain (574), Italy (493) and the Netherlands (473) and lowest in Iceland (69), Denmark (74), Norway (105) and Poland (114). These findings do, of course, also reflect the size of the individual institutions, and the size of institutions in a given country. It is therefore not surprising that for example Denmark, with its many tiny college-type institutions, or Austria, with its large number of small *Fachhochschulen*, avail of a big share of institutions with a few foreign students only.

**Table 4.10**  
**Offering of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes**  
**– by Number of Foreign Students Enrolled (percentages)**

	Number of foreign students						Total
	Up to 10	11-50	51-100	101-250	251-500	501 and more	
Yes	3	18	29	37	52	50	29
No, but intended	19	15	16	18	11	13	16
No	79	67	55	44	38	37	55
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(135)	(171)	(86)	(126)	(64)	(151)	(733)

Question 1.4: Does your institution offer English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes?

There appears to be an obvious relationship between the number of foreign students enrolled (and size, as explained above) and the availability of ELTDPs. The higher the number of foreign students in an institution, the more likely it is to offer one or more ELTDPs, as Table 4.10 reveals. Only 20 percent of institutions with 50 or fewer foreign students offer ELTDPs, while 29 percent do so in the 51-100 foreign student group, and 37 percent of institutions with between 101 and 250 students. Upwards of 250 foreign students, almost every second university or college provides an ELTDP offer.

### 4.2.3 Participation in European/International Programmes and Mobility

Next to institutional aims and foreign students, participation in relevant European and international mobility and cooperation programmes was the third factor by means of which the Institutional Survey tried to capture the “international profile” of institutions. Institutions were asked in which of a selected number of programmes they had been active in 2000/2001. The results are displayed in Table 4.11. They show that:

- 99 percent took part in SOCRATES, an EU programme for cooperation and mobility in all sectors of education, of which the Erasmus Programme is a part;
- 55 participated in LEONARDO da VINCI, an EU programme in the field of vocational education and training;
- 31 percent were involved in TEMPUS, an EU programme in the field of higher education cooperation between EU countries and their counterparts in Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (and today also the MEDA countries);
- 27 percent took part in the 5th Framework Programme of the EU, which funds collaboration in research and development;
- 21 percent participated in the Fulbright Programme, a higher education exchange scheme with the United States of America;
- 16 percent were involved in NORDPLUS, an intra-Nordic higher education cooperation programme;
- 10 percent took part in ALFA, an EU programme fostering cooperation between Latin America and Europe in the field of higher education;
- 3 percent participated in the EU-China Higher Education Cooperation Programme, an EU programme aiming to support cooperation between higher education institutions in China and the EU member states; and
- 25 percent received support from other European or international programmes.

There are large differences in the participation rate of the different countries (cf. Table 4.11), but they can mostly be explained by the specificities of the programmes in question, particularly by the regional focus of some of them.

- In TEMPUS, which was created to support higher education in Central and Eastern Europe, participation of institutions from this region outweighs that of most Western European countries. What is remarkable here is the high participation rate from Greece.
- NORDPLUS limits participation to institutions from the five Nordic Countries, which explains why only they make use of it.
- ALFA, a programme for cooperation with Latin America, is most popular in Spain (44%), Greece (35%) and Italy (25%) while it plays only a minor role in most other countries. In the case of Spain, at least, this finding is explained by old cultural and language links.
- The differences in the use of the Fulbright Programme (about half of the German institutions, and more than a quarter of institutions from Czech Republic, Hungary, Iceland, Italy and Sweden) can, however, not be explained by regional factors.

**Table 4.11**  
**Participation in European/international Programmes for Mobility and Cooperation – by Country (percentages, multiple reply possible)**

	Country of institution										Total
	AT	BE	CH	CZ	DE	DK	ES	FI	FR	GR	
SOCRATES	100	100	94	100	100	98	100	100	99	100	99
LEONARDO DA VINCI	38	52	19	65	66	26	56	71	62	82	55
TEMPUS	18	31	0	40	37	6	44	39	27	71	31
Fifth framework programme	18	17	19	40	26	4	46	29	20	59	27
Alfa	4	10	0	0	8	2	44	7	10	35	10
Fulbright Programme	13	10	3	30	49	4	10	24	6	6	21
NORDPLUS	0	0	0	0	0	76	0	90	0	0	16
EU-China Higher Education Cooperation Programme	2	5	0	0	4	2	3	5	4	0	3
Other EU or international programmes	22	38	13	40	21	22	33	27	30	29	25
Total	216	262	148	315	311	240	336	393	258	382	286
Count (n)	(45)	(42)	(31)	(20)	(158)	(50)	(39)	(41)	(110)	(17)	(791)

	Country of institution										Total
	HU	IS	IT	NL	NO	PL	PT	SE	SK		
SOCRATES	96	100	100	100	96	98	100	100	100	99	
LEONARDO DA VINCI	64	60	52	68	44	39	54	53	60	55	
TEMPUS	40	0	39	32	0	45	24	42	70	31	
Fifth framework programme	28	20	45	27	15	43	19	42	40	27	
Alfa	0	0	25	0	0	0	16	16	0	10	
Fulbright Programme	36	40	30	18	11	20	3	26	10	21	
NORDPLUS	0	80	0	0	93	0	0	100	0	16	
EU-China Higher Education Cooperation Programme	0	0	9	5	0	2	0	0	0	3	
Other EU or international programmes	28	0	23	18	15	27	27	32	30	25	
Total	292	300	323	268	274	273	243	411	310	286	
Count (n)	(25)	(5)	(44)	(22)	(27)	(49)	(37)	(19)	(10)	(791)	

Question 2.2: In which European/international programmes of student/staff exchange, higher education cooperation etc. has your institution participated in the academic year 2000/2001?

- The 5th Framework Programme is most often mentioned by Greek (59%), Spanish (46%) and Italian (45%) institutions, and least often by Danish institutions (4%). Higher education in Greece, Italy and Spain is characterised by a dominance of large universities, which naturally have a research orientation, while Denmark has very many small non-university institutions, where research plays a small role only.

Overall, participation in European and international programmes for cooperation and mobility is strongly dependant on the type and on the size of institu-

tion. While universities are, on average, involved in four programmes, college-type institutions are active in only two. The largest differences between the two institution types exists regarding participation in the 5th Framework Programme (49% of the universities, but only 9% of non-universities), the Fulbright Programme (36% and 9%) and the TEMPUS Programme (47% and 18%).

The larger the institutions, the higher the number of programme involvements. Small institutions with at most 1,000 students state on average between one and two programmes. Large institutions with more than 10,000 students receive support from more than four programmes on average.

**Table 4.12**  
**Participation in European/International Programmes for Mobility and Cooperation – by Availability of ELTDPs**  
(percentages, multiple reply possible)

	ELTDPs offered			Total
	Yes	No, but planned	No	
SOCRATES	100	100	99	99
LEONARDO DA VINCI	73	60	44	55
TEMPUS	47	25	24	31
Fifth Framework Programme	44	26	18	27
ALFA	9	12	10	10
Fulbright Programme	38	15	13	21
NORDPLUS	26	10	12	16
EU-China HE Programme	6	1	2	3
Other EU or international programmes	31	25	23	25
Total	373	274	244	286
Count (n)	(232)	(119)	(440)	(791)

Question 2.2: In which European/international programmes of student/staff exchange, higher education cooperation etc. has your institution participated in the academic year 2000/2001?

The comparison between institutions offering ELTDPs and such that do not is provided in Table 4.12. The overall result is straightforward: ELTDP-providing universities and colleges participate more often in European and international programmes than those who do not. In seven out of the eight relevant programmes<sup>13</sup>, ELTDP providers' participation is ahead of that of non-providers. In some cases, they double or treble the "ELTDP-abstentious" institutions. The only programme where this does not apply, ALFA, is used predo-

<sup>13</sup> The inclusion of the SOCRATES Programme led, of course, to a predictable result. The institutions addressed in the survey were those who participated in the SOCRATES-ERASMUS Programme (Institutional Contract), so that there should have been a 100% participation rate. That this is not (quite) the case is probably due to a few institutions which did not, in the end, sign the contract they were offered.

minantly by Southern European Countries, which, as we know, are largely “ELTDP-free”. Thus, measured by the criterion of participation in international programmes, ELTDP-offering universities and colleges are by far more “international” than other institutions.

There are only marginal differences in this respect between institutions intending to implement ELTDPs in the near future and those neither offering nor intending the development of degree programmes taught in English.

**Table 4.13**  
**Average Number of ERASMUS Students and Teachers Sent and Received in the Academic Year 2000/2001 – by Country (mean)**

	Country of the institution										Total
	AT	BE	CH	CZ	DE	DK	ES	FI	FR	GR	
Students sent abroad	61	66	22	59	75	17	235	60	49	57	69
Students received	51	58	27	16	73	26	232	63	47	40	64
Teachers sent abroad	9	12	3	22	10	3	21	16	6	10	10
Teachers received	6	5	3	8	5	2	17	14	3	8	5
Count (n)	(38)	(42)	(25)	(18)	(155)	(48)	(39)	(40)	(106)	(17)	(756)

	Country of institution									Total
	HU	IS	IT	NL	NO	PL	PT	SE	SK	
Students sent abroad	46	26	158	80	23	37	46	76	27	69
Students received	11	26	126	114	24	7	44	135	5	64
Teachers sent abroad	11	3	11	11	5	7	8	10	6	10
Teachers received	5	2	5	9	3	4	4	5	2	5
Count (n)	(24)	(5)	(44)	(20)	(26)	(44)	(37)	(19)	(9)	(756)

Question 2.3: Please state the number of ERASMUS students sent and received in the academic year 2000/2001 Question 2.4: Please state the number of teachers sent and received in the framework of ERASMUS in the academic year 2000/2001.

As a further indicator of the extent of internationalisation, all higher education institutions were asked to state the number of mobile students and teachers supported by SOCRATES-ERASMUS in the academic year 2000/01. On average

- 69 students were sent abroad;
- 64 students were received;
- 10 teachers were sent abroad, and
- 5 teachers were received.

As Table 4.13 shows, the number of students sent and received per institution differs markedly from country to country. The average student numbers are highest in Spain and Italy (with their very large universities) and compar-

ably low in Denmark, Switzerland, Norway and Iceland (with a large number of small institutions). In most countries the number of students sent by individual institutions is higher than the number of students received. This imbalance of incoming and outgoing students is especially high in all Central and Eastern European Countries (a well-known problem in all east-west exchanges). Only Swedish and Dutch institutions report a significant higher import than export of foreign SOCRATES-ERASMUS students.

The average number of teachers abroad in SOCRATES-ERASMUS is rather low everywhere and ranges, on average, from three in Denmark and Switzerland to 22 in the Czech Republic.<sup>14</sup>

**Table 4.14**  
**Average Number of ERASMUS Students and Teachers Sent and Received in the Academic Year 2000/2001 – by Availability of ELTDPs (mean)**

	Offer of ELTDPs			Total
	Yes	No, but planned	No	
Students sent abroad	95	74	53	69
Students received	94	61	49	64
Teachers sent abroad	14	9	7	10
Teachers received	8	5	5	5
Count (n)	(226)	(118)	(412)	(756)

Question 2.3: Please state the number of ERASMUS students sent and received in the academic year 2000/2001 Question 2.4: Please state the number of teachers sent and received in the framework of ERASMUS in the academic year 2000/2001.

Obviously, and as could not be expected otherwise, the number of ERASMUS students and teachers sent and received is highly correlated with the size of the institutions, in terms of number of students enrolled. Taking into account also the previous findings regarding the relationship between size of institutions and the existence of ELTDPs, it is not surprising that institutions offering ELTDPs state on average more student and faculty exchanges than other institutions. However, it is interesting to note that institutions intending to develop ELTDPs send and receive more ERASMUS students than institutions which do not. (cf. Table 4.14). Obviously, a significant volume of mobile students and the introduction of ELTDPs often go hand-in-glove.

14 The fact that there is a strong overall imbalance between outgoing and incoming faculty mobility in Europe is striking and hard to explain. How can it be that so many professors on teaching grants set out from home but never arrive? Has Erasmus become a “defectors’ programme”, or is there a “Bermuda triangle” somewhere in Europe?

## 5 Characteristics of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes

While the previous chapter described the institutions which provide ELTDPs, the present one takes a closer look at the programmes themselves. In which disciplines are they on offer most frequently? At which degree level are they provided predominantly – at the Bachelor or Master level? How long does it take students to complete these degrees, and which conditions do they need to fulfil in order to be admitted to them? Are ELTDPs a particularly young phenomenon, or have they already been in place for many years? Is English the sole language of instruction, or are their “mixed-language models”, and what is the share of tuition in English in these cases? How high are the tuition fees charged, if any, and are there any scholarships for students? Where do the students come from?

This chapter provides answers to the above and further questions. The results presented were obtained first and foremost through the Programme Survey and, to a lesser extent, through the site visits paid to selected universities and colleges. In the Programme Survey, the Programme Coordinators of 725 ELTDPs identified by means of the earlier Institutional Survey were asked to fill in a Degree Programme Questionnaire, which about 64 percent (or 464) did. In most countries, the return rate was well above 50 percent. Excluding countries with a number of ELTDPs below 10 (Austria, Greece, Iceland, Italy and Slovakia), return rates below 50 percent occur only in the Netherlands (39%) and in the Czech Republic (40%). Thus, in the case of most countries, the base of available data is sufficiently broad to draw a reliable picture of the characteristics of ELTDPs.

### 5.1 Subject Areas

Almost half of all ELTDPs are offered in two subject areas only: management studies/business administration (24%) and engineering (22%). Disciplines with a share of more than five but less than ten percent of ELTDPs are social sciences (8%), mathematics/informatics (8%), natural sciences (6%), medical sciences (6%) and agriculture (5%). All other subject areas remain under five percent.

At the same time, and despite this concentration, it should not go unnoticed that there is no discipline, and probably hardly any specialisation, which is not available as an ELTDP somewhere in Europe. Offers such as “Viking Studies” or “Mathematical Psychology” bear witness to this fact.

Compared to the entirety of degree programmes (ELTDP and “traditional”) at higher education institutions participating in the survey, the proportion of ELTDPs in business administration/management studies and agriculture is more than twice as high as could have been expected (cf. Table 5.1). Further subject areas “over-represented” in ELTDPs are engineering, social sciences,

and mathematics and informatics. However, these and the following figures must be treated with care, since a substantial proportion of higher education institutions addressed by the study either did not return the questionnaire, or did not provide information on their disciplinary profile. On the other hand, no data on the distribution of degree programmes by subject area are available from any other source known to the authors.

The concentration of ELTDPs in business studies is also demonstrated by the fact that far more ELTDP-students are enrolled in this subject area than in any other (42%), and that the respective proportion is more than twice as high as was to be expected on the basis of overall enrolment in business and management studies. On the other hand, the proportion of ELTDP students in engineering, which amounts to 17 percent, is slightly lower than the corre-

**Table 5.1**  
**Distribution of Institutions of Higher Education, Degree Programmes and Students Enrolled by Subject Area (percentages)**

Subject area	(A) Institutions offering degree ELTDPs programmes		(B) Degree Programmes All ELTDPs		(C) Students enrolled All degree ELTDPs programmes	
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Agricultural sciences	15.1	7.7	2,4	5.2	2.4	8.0
Architecture, urban and regional planning	19.0	3.4	1,7	1.3	3.2	1.8
Art and Design	26.5	3.4	4,8	1.4	2.5	0.2
Management, business administration	52.0	46.4	9,3	24.3	16.7	42.2
Education, teacher training	34.9	6.0	8,7	2.4	7.6	2.5
Engineering, technology	42.8	29.6	14,6	22.4	18.2	16.8
Geography, geology	15.6	3.0	1,8	1.2	1.1	0.2
Humanities	23.2	6.4	6,7	4.0	6.4	0.8
Languages and philological sciences	23.2	2.1	7,5	1.6	5.3	0.5
Law	20.4	6.4	2,5	3.7	7.1	0.8
Mathematics, informatics	32.5	10.3	4,3	7.5	4.3	1.2
Medical sciences	28.4	12.4	6,5	5.5	6.7	7.3
Natural sciences	25.7	12.4	5,9	6.2	4.5	4.5
Social sciences	37.6	14.2	5,9	8.3	8.6	7.7
Communication and information sciences	24.3	7.3	2,0	2.7	2.1	3.0
Other areas of study	27.4	6.0	15,4	2.2	3.3	2.6
Total	449.0	177.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

1) The calculation of the proportions of ELTDP-students enrolled in each subject area is based on student numbers provided by about three quarters of higher education institutions offering ELTDPs.

sponding share of the total student population (18%). Business studies apart, only the proportion of ELTDP-students in agriculture (8%) is clearly higher than to be expected (2%). Further subjects with more than five percent of all ELTDP-students are social sciences (8%) and medical sciences (7%).

Almost half of the higher education institutions offering ELTDPs report the existence of ELTDPs in business studies. Programmes in engineering are reported by 30 percent of the institutions, with social sciences (14 %), medical sciences and natural sciences (12 % each) and mathematics/informatics (10%) following. ELTDPs in other subject areas are on offer from fewer than 10 percent of the institutions. Again, the proportion of institutions providing ELTDPs in business studies, but also in engineering and agriculture, is higher than to be expected against the background of institutions offering degree programmes in those subject areas in their domestic language.

To sum up: according to the findings of this study, more ELTDPs exist in business studies than in any other single subject area. Although engineering is also a preferred ELTDP discipline, the number of students enrolled in these programmes is rather small. Other subject areas playing a role (although a much more limited one) are agriculture, social sciences, natural sciences, informatics and medical sciences.

The ELTDP discipline pattern differs between countries to a certain extent. Taking into account only ELTDP-offering institutions, the following country profiles emerge (cf. Table 5.2):

*Germany:* the proportion of institutions offering ELTDPs in engineering (44%), natural sciences (24%) and mathematics or informatics (15%) is above the European average, while it is below in business studies (35%) and medical sciences (4%).

*Denmark:* institutions offering ELTDPs in communication and information sciences (36%), social sciences (27%) and mathematics/informatics (18%) are more common than in most other countries, while the percentage of business studies programmes is lower than in any other European Country (27%).

*Finland:* ELTDPs in business studies (59%) and medical sciences (26%) are more common than in most other countries.

*France:* the proportion of institutions offering ELTDPs in business studies (44%) and in engineering (28%) is close to the European average. A broad range of subject areas were currently not covered by ELTDPs.

*The Netherlands:* on average, Dutch institutions report the existence of ELTDPs in three different subject areas, while institutions from other countries offer only one or two disciplines. The most common disciplines in the Netherlands are business studies (63%) and engineering (44%). A substan-

tial proportion of Dutch institutions introduced ELTDPs also in education and teacher training (31%) and in law (25%).

*Poland:* the proportion of institutions offering ELTDPs in business studies (56%) is above the European average, while it is below it in engineering.

**Table 5.2**  
**Subject Areas, in which English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes are Offered – by Country** (percentages, multiple replies possible)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
Agricultural sciences	7	0	6	6	0	0	14	14	8
Architecture, urban and regional planning	6	0	0	6	6	0	4	0	3
Art and Design	4	0	6	0	13	0	0	5	3
Management	35	27	59	44	63	56	53	38	46
Education, teacher training	3	0	6	0	31	0	10	0	6
Engineering, technology	44	18	29	28	44	19	14	24	30
Geography, geology	4	9	3	0	6	0	0	5	3
Humanities	7	0	6	0	19	0	10	0	6
Languages and philological sciences	0	0	0	0	13	0	6	0	2
Law	4	0	0	6	25	6	10	5	6
Mathematics, informatics	15	18	6	0	19	6	6	14	10
Medical sciences	4	9	26	0	19	13	10	29	12
Natural sciences	24	9	6	0	13	6	12	5	12
Social sciences	12	27	15	11	19	13	18	5	14
Communication and information sciences	6	36	9	0	13	6	6	0	7
Other areas of study	4	9	6	11	6	0	10	0	6
Total	181	164	182	111	306	125	186	143	177
Count (n)	(68)	(11)	(34)	(18)	(16)	(16)	(49)	(21)	(233)

Question 1.5: Please provide information on the disciplinary profile of your institution, the implementation of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes and, if data are available, on the distribution of students by subject area for the academic year 2000/2001.

With the exception of Poland, a comparably high proportion of institutions from CEE countries provides ELTDPs in medical sciences.<sup>15</sup> These programmes are often foreign language versions (for foreign students) of otherwise identical programmes taught in the domestic language.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> These programmes are often among the oldest ones and were created in response to the scarcity of medical education capacity (*numerus clausus*) in West European countries.

<sup>16</sup> As the research team learned during a site visit to a Czech university, Czech law demands that any ELTDP must also be taught in Czech.

## 5.2 Degrees

Most ELTDPs are predominantly postgraduate programmes. Of the 464 ELTDPs for which a Degree Programme Questionnaire was completed,

- 25 percent award a first-cycle degree, i.e. a Bachelor Degree or an equivalent qualification;
- 68 percent award a second-cycle degree, i.e. a Master Degree or an equivalent (as will be seen further on, a small proportion of these programmes are “long” single-cycle Master Degrees);
- 5 percent the provide the opportunity to earn both a first-cycle and a second-cycle degree; and
- 2 percent award other degrees, such as a Ph.D. or a certificate.<sup>17</sup>

The level of the degree awarded strongly depends on the type of higher education institution offering them (Table 5.3). While the majority of non-university institutions provide ELTDPs leading to a first-cycle degree (52%), the corresponding proportion among universities is rather low (10%). However, the share of non-university institutions awarding second-cycle degrees is surprisingly high (45%). Obviously, a substantial number of non-university institutions used the ELTDPs to widen their range of offers to what is commonly perceived as “university level”.

**Table 5.3**  
**Degree(s) Awarded on the Successful Completion of the Degree Programme – by Type of Institution (percentages)**

	Type of institution		Total
	University	Non-university	
Only Bachelor	10	52	24
Only Master	81	42	68
Bachelor + Master	6	3	5
Master + other	1	1	1
Other degree	2	2	2
Total	100	100	100
Count(n)	(301)	(161)	(462)

Question 1.8: Please state the academic degree awarded on successful completion of the English-Language-Taught Degree Programme and the duration of study in years (multiple replies possible).

Two thirds of ELTDPs on offer from German and French non-university institutions are second-cycle degrees. In the Netherlands and Denmark, the second-cycle share of all ELTDPs in the college sector is almost a half. Fin-

<sup>17</sup> Both categories had actually been excluded from the study, as was made clear in both the Institutional and the Degree Programme Questionnaire.

nish non-university institutions, on the other hand, offer almost exclusively first-cycle ELTDPs (93%). The latter is simply due to a legal restriction in Finland.

**Table 5.4**  
**Degree(s) Awarded for the Successful Completion of the Degree Programme – by Country (percentages)**

	Country of institution							Total	
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
Only Bachelor	15	18	63	21	29	27	12	19	24
Only Master	77	82	35	64	69	73	79	51	68
Bachelor + Master	6	0	0	4	2	0	6	22	5
Master + other	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1
Other degree	0	0	1	7	0	0	3	8	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(126)	(38)	(68)	(28)	(45)	(22)	(98)	(37)	(462)

Question 1.8: Please state the academic degree awarded on successful completion of the English-Language-Taught Degree Programme and the duration of study in years (multiple replies possible).

Differences between countries in the distribution of Bachelor (first cycle) and Master (second cycle) Degrees are rather small, as Table 5.4 displays. The only country that does not fit into this overall picture is Finland, with a 63 per cent share of first-cycle degrees. But, given the legal restrictions on Finnish “polytechnics”, this is not surprising.

### 5.3 Duration and Admission Requirements

The duration of ELTDPs ranges between one and six years. The duration of ELTDPs depends mainly on the type of degree awarded and comes very close to the duration of the corresponding domestic language degree. Thus, the award of a first-cycle degree requires on average 3.4 years of study, and the award of a second-cycle degree a further two years. Depending on the academic qualifications already gained prior to enrolment in an ELTDP, the duration can be even shorter.

For the vast majority of ELTDPs leading to a first-cycle degree (92% of such programmes), the minimum educational admission requirement is a secondary-school-leaving certificate at advanced level or the general eligibility to enter into higher education. Of these ELTDPs

- 40 percent have a duration of 3 years,
- 33 percent have a duration of 3.5 years, and
- 27 percent have a duration of 4 years.

The remaining first-cycle ELTDPs offer the opportunity to their own or to foreign exchange students to study only the final year in English.

Most second-cycle ELTDPs require an undergraduate degree for admission (87%). Only about every tenth second-cycle ELTDP accepts secondary school leavers directly. Of those ELTDPs requiring a Bachelor Degree (or equivalent) for admission

- 43 percent have a duration of between one and one and a half years,
- 51 percent have a duration of 2 years, and
- 6 percent have a duration of more than 2 years.

Taking into account only 'standard' types of ELTDPs, i.e. first-cycle programmes requiring as a minimum the eligibility to attend higher education and second-cycle programmes requiring a Bachelor Degree or equivalent for admission, only marginal differences can be found in the duration of study programmes between countries (cf. Table 5.5), subject areas or universities and non-university institutions.

**Table 5.5**  
**Duration of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes**  
 – by Country (mean in years)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
First-cycle ELTDPs	3,3	3,0	3,7	3,5	3,7	3,4	3,2	3,2	3,4
Second-cycle ELTDPs	1,8	1,9	2,0	1,6	1,6	1,8	1,5	2,8	1,8
Count (n)	(127)	(36)	(62)	(28)	(43)	(19)	(95)	(29)	(439)

Question 1.8: Please state the academic degree awarded on successful completion of the English-Language-Taught Degree Programme and the duration of study in years (multiple reply possible).

Beyond these standard educational admission requirements, almost all programme coordinators state additional requirements to be admitted to an ELTDP:

- 66 percent require a Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL),
- 44 percent require an entrance examination test,
- 22 percent demand "extraordinary disciplinary, artistic or intellectual potential",
- 18 percent demand professional work experience,
- 12 percent require an extraordinary personal and social potential and
- 21 percent mention other admission requirements, e.g. letters of motivation, references or recommendations, special skills etc.

As Table 5.6 shows, these extra admission requirements differ substantially between countries. While almost all ELTDPs in the Netherlands (98%) and the vast majority in most other EU and EFTA countries require proof of a minimum level of proficiency in English (measured by the TOEFL Test), only a quarter of ELTDPs in Central and Eastern European Countries have such a language requirement at all.

More than three quarters of these latter ELTDPs enrol students only if they reach a TOEFL score of minimally 210 (computer-based) or 550 (paper based). These scores are lower than those demanded by top-class US research universities, but not very low either.

**Table 5.6**  
**Other Admission Requirements – by Country**  
(percentages, multiple responses possible)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
Extraordinary disciplinary/ artistic/intellectual potential	39	5	13	21	16	41	18	8	22
Extraordinary personal/ social potential	13	11	16	21	7	14	8	5	12
Professional work experience	24	29	13	36	11	9	14	0	18
TOEFL Test	83	82	54	50	98	23	64	22	66
Entrance Examination/Test	28	18	66	68	23	73	37	89	44
Other admission requirements	27	16	16	4	48	9	14	22	21
No other requirements	6	5	0	7	0	14	10	3	5
Total	220	166	179	207	202	182	166	149	188
Count (n)	(127)	(38)	(68)	(28)	(44)	(22)	(98)	(37)	(462)

Question 2.1: Admission Requirements (multiple replies possible).

Entrance examination tests are most common in all CEE countries (83% of ELTDPs), in France (68%) and in Finland (66%), but they play only a minor role in Denmark (18%), the Netherlands (23%) and in Germany (28%). Written examinations, including standard test such as the American GMAT, are slightly more frequently utilised than oral examinations or personal interviews. A substantial proportion of programmes makes use of more than one type of admission test (40% of respective ELTDPs), most often a combination of written and oral examinations.

The requirement of an “extraordinary disciplinary or intellectual potential” is most common in Poland (41%), Germany (39%) and France (21%). These countries also stress most often the importance of personal and social competencies of students.

Professional work experience as an admission requirement is most frequent in France (36%), Denmark (29%) and in Germany (24%), with its high number of “applied” or “professional” non-university institutions, but does not play any role in most CEE countries. Understandably, ELTDPs at non-university institutions more often require work experience (25%) than universities (14%). On average, the duration of work experience expected is two years.

**Table 5.7**  
**Other Admission Requirements – by Degree Awarded**  
 (percentages, multiple responses possible)

	Academic degree awarded					Total
	Only Bachelor	Only Master	Bachelor + Master	Master + other	Other degree	
Extraordinary disciplinary/artistic/intellectual potential	9	28	13	33	22	22
Extraordinary personal/social potential	13	12	4	33	0	12
Professional work experience	17	19	8	0	11	18
TOEFL Test	58	72	50	33	33	66
Entrance Examination/Test	62	35	58	33	67	43
Other admission requirements	13	23	25	67	22	21
No other requirements	7	5	4	0	0	5
Total	180	194	163	200	156	188
Count(n)	(113)	(312)	(24)	(3)	(9)	(461)

Question 2.1: Admission Requirements (multiple replies possible).

The type of extra admission requirements demanded is, at least to a certain extent, dependant on the type of academic degree awarded. As Table 5.7 shows, a higher proportion of ELTDPs awarding first-cycle degrees have introduced admission tests than those at Master level (62% compared to 35%), while ELTDPs leading to a second-cycle degree more often examine the disciplinary and intellectual potential of students (28% compared to 9%) and English language proficiency by means of the TOEFL Test (72% compared to 58%).

Differences between subject areas are rather small and at least partly caused by country-specific admission requirements. However, the role of admission tests is much more important in medicine (67%) and in business studies (61%) than in engineering (28%) or in social sciences (33%). The assessment of English language proficiency (via the TOEFL Test) is, on the other hand, standard practice in most engineering ELTDPs (79%).

## 5.4 Year of Introduction

As was to be expected, ELTDPs are a rather young phenomenon. Only about one quarter of all programmes was established before 1995, while the majority (59%) was set up in the last five years (since 1998).

**Table 5.8**  
**Year of Implementation of the English-Language-Taught Degree Programme – by Country of Institution (percentages)**

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
Up to 1990	3	8	5	12	2	5	16	19	8
1991 – 1995	1	16	16	16	21	45	26	36	18
1996 – 1997	18	13	28	8	19	5	15	8	16
1998 – 1999	39	16	30	32	28	27	20	14	27
2000 – 2002	39	47	22	32	30	18	23	22	30
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(121)	(38)	(64)	(25)	(43)	(22)	(95)	(36)	(444)

Source: Degree Programme Questionnaire.

Question 1.2: Year in which the programme was set up.

To a certain extent, the age of ELTDPs differs between countries. A look at Table 5.8 reveals that more than half of all programmes in the CEE countries were introduced in the early 1990s or even before.

The proportion of ELTDPs started during the same period in Germany is only four percent, and less than a quarter in Finland, Denmark and the Netherlands. While institutions in Finland and the Netherlands started to introduce ELTDPs already in the early and mid-1990s, the development in Germany gains real momentum only in the late 1990s. The highest proportion of very young programmes (started in 2000 or after) can be found in Denmark (47%).

Type and size of institutions play hardly any role for the time of introduction of ELTDPs. This finding might be an indicator of the strong influence that general trends in internationalisation have on national and institutional policy agendas: the impact of globalisation, which in the educational sphere translates into a worldwide competition over students and into enhanced demands on the “international” qualifications of domestic higher education graduates, becomes visible here. In some instances (for example in Germany), the availability of funding programmes or other incentives to introduce ELTDPs has helped to trigger off the development.

## 5.5 Language of Instruction, Examination and Diploma

The present study addresses not only programmes entirely taught in English, but also such in which English is only partly used as the language of instruction. ELTDPs were therefore defined as “higher education degree programmes which offer, on a regular basis, at least part of the study courses in English and in which English is not the subject matter itself, i.e. not English Language, English Literature etc”. The definition also excludes programmes “which offer only a very limited number of courses in English in a rather sporadic way or only during a study period abroad”.

**Table 5.9**  
**Percentage to Which English is Used as Language of Instruction**  
 – by Country (mean of percentages)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
<b>One year degree programme</b>									
1. year	86,9	100,0	100,0	90,0	94,1	80,0	-	92,9	92,3
(n)	(16)	(6)	(4)	(14)	(17)	(1)	-	(40)	(98)
<b>Two year degree programmes</b>									
1. year	93,0	99,2	98,4	76,4	100,0	88,0	98,5	97,9	95,2
2. year	86,1	99,2	98,9	75,7	100,0	88,0	97,1	98,6	92,0
(n)	(83)	(24)	(19)	(7)	(12)	(5)	(34)	(7)	(191)
<b>Three year degree programmes</b>									
1. year	75,8	85,7	100,0	47,5	100,0	67,0	75,1	100,0	81,3
2. year	56,9	85,7	100,0	67,5	100,0	86,0	75,5	100,0	79,0
3. year	47,9	85,7	100,0	55,0	100,0	90,0	81,8	100,0	78,0
(n)	(14)	(7)	(4)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(12)	(7)	(54)
<b>Four year degree programmes</b>									
1. year	64,8	,0	97,0	22,5	91,7	100,0	42,8	100,0	80,9
2. year	32,0	,0	97,8	28,8	100,0	100,0	51,7	100,0	80,1
3. year	38,9	,0	98,0	28,8	100,0	100,0	61,1	100,0	82,1
4. year	40,9	100,0	98,3	47,5	100,0	100,0	70,0	95,0	85,8
(n)	(9)	(1)	(36)	(4)	(12)	(3)	(9)	(2)	(76)
<b>Five year degree programmes</b>									
1. year	89,0	-	94,0	10,0	,0	78,1	100,0	97,1	88,4
2. year	89,0	-	93,0	10,0	,0	76,9	100,0	96,2	87,6
3. year	89,0	-	90,0	25,0	75,0	83,0	100,0	95,2	90,0
4. year	79,0	-	88,0	25,0	100,0	83,3	100,0	94,1	88,7
5. year	79,0	-	96,0	25,0	100,0	77,3	100,0	95,7	89,3
(n)	(5)	-	(5)	(1)	(1)	(8)	(3)	(21)	(44)

Question 1.10: Please estimate the percentage to which English is used as the language of instruction in each year of study.

What was – deliberately – left open was the percentage of courses taught in English necessary for a programme to qualify as an ELTDP. Rather than deciding on the cut-off line a priori, the research team decided to take this decision in the light of the knowledge of the different language mix actually used by the providers. The cut-off point was set at a minimum of 25 percent of tuition in English in at least one year of study, which resulted in the exclusion of 20 programmes which responded to the Programme Survey.

In order to be able to paint a realistic picture of the extent to which English is used as language of ELTDP instruction, the programme coordinators were asked to estimate, for each year of study, the proportion of courses taught in English, in the domestic language and in third languages. It turned out that third languages played only a very marginal role (one to two percent of all programmes). They can therefore be excluded from any further analysis.

Table 5.9 shows that, overall, the proportion of courses taught in English is about 90 percent in both degree programmes of short duration (one or two years) and in long programmes. In ELTDPs of a medium duration of three or four years, the average percentage of English is about 10 percent lower, i.e. around 80 percent. Since these two categories are to an extent identical with undergraduate-level (three and four years) and postgraduate education (one and two years and single-cycle “long” programmes), this already indicates that the partial use of the domestic language is more widespread in Bachelor-level programmes. Comparing first-cycle and second-cycle programmes, the percentages are 86 and 92 respectively. In terms of subject areas, medicine is taught almost exclusively in English, while the percentage for the rest of the discipline spectrum is 90 on average.

**Table 5.10**  
**Proportion of English Language used in Examinations – by Country**  
(percentages)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
Up to 25%	3	3	0	4	0	14	4	3	3
26% – 50%	16	0	0	32	2	5	9	0	9
51% – 75%	6	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	2
76% – 99%	10	5	6	21	0	14	2	3	7
100%	66	89	91	43	98	68	84	94	79
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(125)	(38)	(67)	(28)	(43)	(22)	(97)	(36)	(456)
Average proportion of English	85,0	95,7	98,4	72,9	98,8	83,2	90,7	97,1	90,5

Question 1.11: Please estimate the percentage to which English is used as the language for examinations during the whole course of study.

France, Germany and, to a degree, Poland, are countries with a relatively high proportion of mixed-language instruction. The Netherlands and Finland more or less stick to English only.

In general, the proportion of courses taught in English does not differ much from one year of study to another. This observation also applies at the level of the individual countries included in the study. Still, three different types of ELTDPs can be distinguished with regard to language of instruction:

- (a) *The percentage of teaching in English remains roughly stable over time:* this is the most common ELTDP type. It is predominant in countries with rarely spoken languages (and good English-language skills of the domestic student population), such as the Netherlands and Finland.
- (b) *The use of English increases over time:* this type exists in Poland and in some of the EU and EFTA countries with a few ELTDPs only. It could be that this model was introduced, in some institutions at any rate, with a view to domestic students who would improve their English skills in the course of the programme.
- (c) *The use of English decreases over time:* the only country in which ELTDPs of this kind exist in considerable numbers is Germany. The fact is likely to be attributable to national (DAAD) programmes funding the development and implementation of ELTDPs, which allow, or even encourage, the mixed-language approach. This model is meant to ease foreign students' start period in Germany. It presupposes that students will, later on, have learned enough German to continue their studies in this language (for more information on this approach, compare also chapter 6.4.1).

It was to be expected that the language of instruction would also be, by and large, the language used in examinations. Indeed, 91 percent of all examinations are held in English, according to the Programme Coordinators. The fact that the language in examinations is largely identical with the language of instruction also applies at the level of individual countries. Thus, almost all examinations in the Netherlands, Finland and most CEE countries are conducted in English, while the share of this language is lowest in France (73%), Poland (83%) and Germany (85%).

Most ELTDPs issue the final diploma exclusively in the English language (55%). 39 percent provide this document both in English and in the domestic language. Only five percent of ELTDPs issue the diploma document in the domestic language only. A few coordinators report the use of third languages, such as the language of the student's country of origin. As Table 5.11 shows, ELTDPs in smaller countries with less widely used languages, for example Denmark or the Netherlands, more often provide the document exclusively in English, while larger European Countries with more frequently-spoken languages, such as Germany and France, more frequently provide it in the domestic language as well.

**Table 5.11**  
**Language, in which the Final Diploma is Written – by Country**  
 (percentages)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
English and domestic language	43	29	37	48	24	45	44	35	39
Only in English	56	71	57	33	62	41	53	57	55
Only in domestic language	1	0	6	11	13	9	3	8	5
Other language	1	0	0	7	0	5	0	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(127)	(38)	(68)	(27)	(45)	(22)	(97)	(37)	(461)

Question 1.12: In which language is the final diploma written (multiple replies possible)?

In order to increase transparency and recognition of higher education qualifications, the European Commission, in cooperation with the Council of Europe and UNESCO/CEPES, developed the so-called “Diploma Supplement”. This document, to be issued in addition to the “regular” diploma, provides extra information on the national higher education system, a description of the type and level of the academic degree awarded, the higher education institution which awarded the degree, the structure and content of the degree programme, and a transcript of record of the graduate. About half of all ELTDP programme coordinators report the use of the Diploma Supplement. The proportion is highest in Finland (77%), France (57%), and most CEE countries (59%).

**Table 5.12**  
**Use of the ‘Diploma Supplement’ as an Attachement to the Diploma**  
 – by Country (percentages)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
Yes	41	42	77	57	39	39	47	59	50
No	59	58	23	43	61	61	53	41	50
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(110)	(36)	(60)	(21)	(41)	(18)	(91)	(37)	(414)

Question 1.13: Do you use the Diploma Supplement as an attachment to the diploma?

## 5.6 Characteristics of the Curriculum

Experience indicates that pioneers in one particular field of reform and internationalisation, such as the creation of ELTDPs, also engage in further fields of innovation. It was therefore reasonable to expect that, next to the use of

English as a medium of instruction, ELTDP curricula would be characterised by further features typical of modern and internationalised programmes. Indeed, this turned out to be – by and large – a tenable assumption, for

- 94% of Programme Coordinators claim that their ELTDP has an “international dimension”;
- 85% of them report the use of a credit system;
- 74% of ELTDPs provide language training;
- 66% of curricula are based on a modular structure;
- 60% of programmes include a study period abroad;
- 50% of ELTDPs include an internship or work placement;
- 33% of programme coordinators report the offer of courses aimed at bringing students to a homogeneous academic level and;
- 12 % report other characteristics.

It is hardly surprising that almost every ELTDP coordinator stresses the “international dimension” of the programme. Based on an OECD typology for internationalised curricula<sup>18</sup>, the “international dimension” was broken down into the nine sub-categories below. According to programme coordinators,

- 79 percent of ELTDPs award an internationally recognised type of degree, such as a Master or a Bachelor;
- 51 percent of ELTDPs prepare students for international employment and careers, e.g. those in international business administration;
- 50 percent of programmes are on international subject matter, for example International Relations, European Law etc.;
- 45 percent of curricula address cross-cultural communication issues and provide training in intercultural skills;
- 42 percent broaden traditional subjects by means of an internationally comparative approach;
- 22 percent of ELTDPs have a content especially designed for foreign students;
- 21 percent of programmes are “area” and “regional studies” of an interdisciplinary sort (e.g. European, Nordic, South-East Asian Studies);
- 18 percent of ELTDPs award joint or double degrees; and
- 3 percent of programmes are characterised by other international characteristics.

---

18 Cf. M.C. van der Wende, “Internationalizing the Curriculum in Higher Education. Synthesis Report of Country Case Studies Conducted in Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Japan and the Netherlands” , OECD/CERI, *Internationalisation of Higher Education*. Paris 1996.

Applying these characteristics, the broadest international ELTDP profiles are to be found in the Netherlands and in Finland, while Danish programmes and those in most CEE countries were least international.

**Table 5.13**  
**International Dimension Within the Curriculum – by Country**  
(percentages, multiple responses possible)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
International subject matter (e.g. international relations)	42	45	66	64	58	55	50	35	50
Traditional/original subject area broadened by an internationally comparative approach	29	37	51	48	49	59	52	30	42
Preparation of students for international professions	49	42	59	76	60	59	48	30	51
Addressing of cross-cultural communication issues and provision of intercultural skills	43	21	57	56	58	59	45	22	45
Interdisciplinary programme such as area and regional studies (e.g. European or Asian studies)	19	18	28	20	16	14	32	5	21
Internationally recognised qualifications awarded (e.g. Bachelor or Master)	93	55	75	68	89	59	78	78	79
Joint or double degree awarded	15	8	13	24	36	23	24	8	18
Content is especially designed for foreign students	22	3	24	16	40	23	26	16	22
Other	2	3	6	8	9	9	1	0	3
None	3	26	9	4	0	5	3	11	6
Total	316	258	388	384	413	364	358	235	340
Count (n)	(127)	(38)	(68)	(25)	(45)	(22)	(98)	(37)	(460)

Question 1.5: Which of the following aspects are characteristics of the curriculum (multiple replies possible)?

As Table 5.13 shows, the frequency of individual characteristics differs much from country to country. While the introduction of internationally recognised degrees is an important characteristic of almost all ELTDPs in Germany (93%) and the Netherlands (89%), it plays a rather small role in Poland (59%) and Denmark (55%).

The teaching of international subject matter, the use of comparative approaches, a focus on cross-cultural communication and the provision of training in intercultural skills are most frequent in Finland, France and the Netherlands, while these characteristics are rarest in Denmark, in most CEE countries and in Germany.

The proportion of ELTDPs which report curricular content designed for the special needs of foreign students or the award of joint or double degrees is much higher in the Netherlands than in any other country participating in the survey.

Generally, there seems to be no link between the degree of internationalisation of a curriculum and the year of foundation of ELTDPs. However, the introduction of internationally recognised degrees, i.e. the Bachelor and Master, is a more recent phenomenon, and most certainly linked to the “Bologna Process”, which started to pave the way for such degrees in many countries in the late 1990s.

**Table 5.14**  
**International Dimension Within the Curriculum – by Subject Area**  
 (percentages, multiple responses possible)

	Subject area								Total
	Bus	Eng	Mat	Med	Soc	Other nat/engsoc/hum	Other	Other	
International subject matter (e.g. international relations)	79	21	3	38	68	36	60	59	50
Traditional/original subject area broadened by an internationally comparative approach	61	13	29	42	38	47	60	51	42
Preparation of students for international professions	86	26	39	25	43	36	31	64	51
Addressing of cross-cultural communication issues and provision of intercultural skills	74	18	13	33	30	22	57	69	45
Interdisciplinary programme such as area and regional studies (e.g. European or Asian studies)	27	5	6	13	30	19	21	56	21
Internationally recognised qualifications awarded (e.g. Bachelor or Master)	77	84	74	75	73	89	79	79	79
Joint or double degree awarded	29	9	6	8	16	14	29	18	18
Content is especially designed for foreign students	17	24	26	33	16	17	33	28	22
Other	6	0	0	4	3	6	2	8	3
None	2	11	13	21	3	8	2	0	6
Total	458	211	210	292	319	294	374	433	340
Count (n)	(141)	(110)	(31)	(24)	(37)	(36)	(42)	(39)	(460)

Question 1.5: Which of the following aspects are characteristics of the curriculum (multiple replies possible)?

Internationalisation of curricular content is clearly dependant on the subject area of ELTDPs (cf. Table 5.14). This internationalisation approach lends itself most easily to the social sciences (including business and management studies) and humanities. Indeed, ELTDPs in these areas mention this characteristic in more than three quarters of all cases. In contrast, the corre-

sponding proportion of programmes in natural sciences and engineering is only about a quarter. A similar pattern emerges concerning internationally comparative approaches or the provision of training in intercultural skills.

Modular curricula are most common in Germany (84%), the Netherlands (71%) and Finland (68%). Modularisation is rarest in CEE countries and in other EU and EFTA countries which offer only a very limited number of ELTDPs (cf. Table 5.15).

**Table 5.15**  
**Characteristics of the Curriculum – by Country**  
(percentages, multiple responses possible)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and CEE	Other EFTA	
Modular structure	84	45	68	64	71	50	55	54	66
Based on a credit system	87	97	97	76	89	77	77	78	85
Work Placement	49	47	69	72	47	64	34	41	50
Study/placement abroad	61	58	76	64	62	50	55	43	60
International dimension within the curriculum	98	76	91	96	100	95	97	89	94
Language training	87	34	87	80	64	86	61	81	74
Special courses for homogenisation of different academic levels of students	32	21	26	28	47	32	40	24	33
Other characteristics	18	3	6	20	20	5	10	0	12
Total	517	382	521	500	500	459	429	411	473
Count (n)	(127)	(38)	(68)	(25)	(45)	(22)	(98)	(37)	(460)

Question 1.5: Which of the following aspects are characteristics of the curriculum (multiple replies possible)?

**Table 5.16**  
**Credit System Employed – by Country** (percentages)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and CEE	Other EFTA	
ECTS and other credit system	4	5	31	20	20	0	9	0	11
Only ECTS	77	84	35	44	36	64	42	49	55
Only other credit system	6	5	29	4	31	14	21	30	17
Credit system, but not specified	0	3	1	8	2	0	4	0	2
No credit system employed	13	3	3	24	11	23	23	22	15
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(127)	(38)	(68)	(25)	(45)	(22)	(98)	(37)	(460)

Question 1.5: Which of the following aspects are characteristics of the curriculum (multiple replies possible)?

About two thirds of all ELTDPs make use of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS), which was developed in the framework of the ERASMUS Programme in order to provide a comparable record of academic achievement and thus to facilitate recognition and, in the last resort, the mobility of students in Europe. As Table 5.16 displays, ECTS is most frequently used in Denmark (89%) and in Germany (81%), while its use is below average in the CEE countries, in EU Countries with small numbers of ELTDPs and in the Netherlands. The use of other credit systems, in some cases parallel to ECTS, is most widespread in Finland (60%) and in the Netherlands (51%), but is very rare in Germany and Denmark. Apart from “credit-abstentious” countries, ELTDPs seem to use either a domestic credit system, or ECTS.

About half of the Programme Coordinators state that an internship is either an optional (16%) or a mandatory part (34%) of the programme. The proportion is especially high in France (72%), Finland (69%) and Poland (64%).

For about two thirds of students in first-cycle ELTDPs a work placement is a mandatory part of the study programme, while the respective proportion is only one quarter in second-cycle ELTDPs. On average the duration of mandatory work placements is 7.5 months in first-cycle ELTDPs and 5.4 months in second-cycle ELTDPs.

**Table 5.17**  
**Study/Placement Abroad – by Country (percentages)**

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
Optional	34	42	51	52	33	18	29	35	36
Mandatory	27	16	25	12	29	32	27	8	24
No study/placement abroad	39	42	24	36	38	50	45	57	40
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(127)	(38)	(68)	(25)	(45)	(22)	(98)	(37)	(460)

Question 1.5: Which of the following aspects are characteristics of the curriculum (multiple replies possible)?

A study or internship period in a foreign country is part of 60 percent of ELTDPs. However, most of the periods abroad are optional. In only a quarter of programmes is the period abroad mandatory. Table 5.28 shows that the share of mandatory periods abroad is slightly above average in Poland (32%), the Netherlands (29%) and Germany (27%), while it is lowest in other CEE countries (8%), France (12%) and in Denmark (16%).

Mandatory study periods abroad are more often a feature of first-cycle ELTDPs (34%) than of second-cycle programmes (21%). Given the longer duration of Bachelor-level programmes, it is easier to integrate such periods

than in Master-level programmes of one or two years. The average duration of mandatory study periods abroad is 5.5 months in first-cycle ELTDPs and 4.5 months in second-cycle ELTDPs.

ELTDPs with a mandatory study period abroad are also unequally distributed over subject areas. While almost one third of ELTDPs in business studies and social sciences require study abroad, this is the case in only every tenth programme in engineering and medicine, and in only every fifth in the natural and other “hard” sciences.

**Table 5.18**  
**Offer of Language Training – by Country (percentages)**

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
English and domestic language	19	3	38	32	20	18	16	32	22
Only English	20	24	46	40	42	55	37	41	34
Only domestic language	48	8	3	8	2	14	8	8	18
No language training offered	13	66	13	20	36	14	39	19	26
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(127)	(38)	(68)	(25)	(45)	(22)	(98)	(37)	(460)

Question 1.5: Which of the following aspects are characteristics of the curriculum (multiple replies possible)?

About three quarters of all ELTDPs offer language training. The proportion is highest in Germany and Finland (87%) and Poland (86%) and lowest in Denmark (34%). EU and EFTA Countries with a small number of ELTDPs (61) and the Netherlands occupy a middle position.

In 22 percent of ELTDPs students are offered both domestic and English-language tuition. 18 percent provide such offers only in the domestic language. The largest group, at 34%, provides English only. As Table 5.29 shows, language tuition in English is most frequent in Finland (84%), Poland (73%) and France (72%), while domestic language training is most common in Germany (67%).

A remarkable proportion of one third of ELTDPs has introduced special courses to bring students with different academic backgrounds to a homogeneous level of content knowledge at the beginning of the study programme. Second-cycle degree programmes, which usually require a first-cycle degree for admission, are more likely to offer such courses than ELTDPs leading to a first-cycle degree and admit students on the basis of a secondary school leaving certificate (35% compared to 23%). As will become clear later, it is often the different subjects studied at undergraduate level which make this necessary.

A comparison by country shows that special courses for the homogenisation of different levels of prior knowledge are most common in the Netherlands (47%) and EU and EFTA Countries with small numbers of ELTDPs (40%).

## 5.7 Scholarships and Tuition Fees

More than half of all ELTDPs provide scholarships for at least some of the students enrolled. From the data received, it is impossible to say how large the group of scholarship beneficiaries really is.

Most often scholarships are awarded exclusively to foreign students (29% of the ELTDPs) or to both foreign and domestic students (21%). Scholarships for domestic students only are rather an exception (6%).

Scholarships are most common in Germany (70%) and in the Netherlands (68%), while in most CEE countries (17%), in Finland (34%) and in Denmark (46%) less than half of the ELTDPs provide grants to their students. Poland is the only country in which a substantial proportion of ELTDPs make scholarships available to domestic students only (32%).

**Table 5.19**  
**Availability of Scholarships for ELTDP-Students – by Country**  
 (percentages)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
Not at all	30	54	66	36	32	45	38	83	44
Only for foreign students	37	41	10	14	50	14	36	0	29
Only for domestic students	3	3	1	14	5	32	4	9	6
For foreign and domestic students	30	3	22	36	14	9	22	9	21
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(122)	(37)	(67)	(28)	(44)	(22)	(96)	(35)	(451)

Question 1.14: Are special scholarships available to students of the degree programme (multiple replies possible)?

Overall, slightly more than 40 percent of all ELTDPs charge tuition fees. Of these, 27 percent charge both foreign and domestic students. 14 percent ask tuition fees only of foreign students, and two percent charge exclusively domestic students.

Tuition fee policies differ very considerably between countries (cf. Table 5.20). Whereas almost all ELTDPs in the Netherlands and the CEE countries charge tuition fees, this is the exception in Finland, Germany and Denmark. The other EU and EFTA Countries fall somewhere between the two extremes. This is no surprise, since the Nordic Countries and Germany (for the time being) generally do not charge tuition fees, i.e. also not from students

on programmes taught in the domestic language, while the Netherlands do. The question is rather how it is possible that the minority of ELTDPs in these countries which do charge fees are able to do so at all.

ELTDPs in the CEE countries differ from those in the EU and EFTA countries in one respect: they more often charge fees from foreigners only.

**Table 5.20**  
**Request of Tuition Fees for the Degree Programme – by Country**  
(percentages)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
No fees requested	84	78	99	30	2	10	44	9	57
Only foreign students	4	0	0	7	25	52	9	80	14
Only domestic students	0	0	0	15	0	5	2	0	2
Both, foreign and domestic students	12	22	1	48	73	33	46	11	27
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(127)	(36)	(68)	(27)	(44)	(21)	(94)	(35)	(452)

Question 1.15: Are students requested to pay tuition fees (excluding fees for student unions, insurances etc.) for the degree programme?

The amount charged per year, excluding administrative fees (student union fees, insurances, etc.), ranges from an almost symbolical amount of 300 Euro at the low end, to a staggering 32,000 Euro as the maximum. On average, the fee per year is about 6,000 Euro for foreign and 5,000 Euro for domestic students. When looking only at those degree programmes which request tuition fees from both foreign and domestic students, the difference in the level of fees decreases to a mere 300 Euro (5,800 for foreign and 5,500 for domestic students).

**Table 5.21**  
**Average Amount of Tuition Fees Requested from Students in First-Cycle-ELTDPs – by Country (mean)**

	Country of institution						Total
	DK	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
Foreign students	7800	5496	2305	3179	4782	4773	3849
Count (n)	(2)	(1)	(12)	(6)	(8)	(6)	(35)
Domestic students	7800	2125	1591	2395	2319	1660	2525
Count (n)	(2)	(2)	(8)	(3)	(5)	(1)	(21)

Question 1.15: Are students requested to pay tuition fees (excluding fees for student unions, insurances etc.) for the degree programme?

A substantial difference in the price of ELTDPs exists between first-cycle and second-cycle programmes. As Tables 5.21 and 5.22 show, the average fee per year in ELTDPs leading to a second-cycle degree is almost twice as high as that for first-cycle degree programmes.

The highest average fee amount for postgraduate ELTDPs is reported by Programme Coordinators from Denmark, with more than 10,000 Euro, followed by France and Germany with about 7,000 Euro on average, for both foreign and domestic students. With only about 5,000 Euro, the tuition fees charged in EU and EFTA countries with only a small number of ELTDPs are at the lower end.

**Table 5.22**  
**Average Amount of Tuition Fees Requested from Students in Second-Cycle-ELTDPs – by Country (mean)**

	Country of institution							Total	
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
Foreign students	6999	10557	9750	7474	6906	6722	5313	6003	6516
Count (n)	(20)	(6)	(1)	(14)	(31)	(12)	(43)	(26)	(153)
Domestic students	6959	10088	9750	6945	5748	5315	4596	2143	5813
Count (n)	(15)	(6)	(1)	(15)	(24)	(5)	(40)	(3)	(109)

Question 1.15: Are students requested to pay tuition fees (excluding fees for student unions, insurances etc.) for the degree programme?

However, it must be stressed that the large majority of ELTDPs are free of charge even in the countries with the highest amounts charged (in those cases where they were charged), i.e. in Germany, Denmark and Finland.

ELTDPs in business studies clearly stand out concerning the level of tuition fees requested, with regard to both foreign and domestic students. At above 8,500 Euro, the average annual fee in second-cycle degree programmes in this subject group is twice as high as in other subject areas. Only ELTDPs in medicine request a similar amount (from foreign students only). The latter are largely ELTDPs in medicine offered in some CEE countries with the aim to improve the income base of higher education institutions by attracting foreign students for an English track of the programme provided in parallel in a domestic language track for their own students.

## 5.8 Eligibility and Regional Origin of Students

The vast majority of ELTDPs are open to both domestic and foreign students (83%). Programmes which accept only domestic students are rare exceptions (1%). But there is a remarkable number of ELTDPs which accept exclusively foreign students (16%). This is most frequently the case in CEE coun-

tries (32% of ELTDPs), the Netherlands and Denmark (27% each), while it is least common in Finland (9%) and in Germany (11%).

Almost all of the ELTDPs are open to students from all parts of the world. This applies to all host countries included in the study, i.e. there are no country differences in this respect. Only very few Programme Coordinators report a restriction, either concerning certain regions (4%) or countries (2%).

Next to restrictions and foci in admission, the important thing is obviously to find out where the foreign ELTDP students really come from. In order to figure out their geographical origin, ELTDP coordinators were asked to provide information on the total number of students, the number of new entrants and the number of graduates in the academic year 2000/01 in two ways, i.e.

- (a) in a highly aggregated form, distinguishing only between domestic and foreign students;
- (b) in a more disaggregated form, specifying the number of foreign students by region.

It turned out that about one third of respondents were not able to provide any data whatsoever on the origin of students or graduates. Most of the remaining coordinators presented data for only part of the issues addressed, or not

**Table 5.23**  
**Home Region of Foreign Students Enrolled in English-Language-Based Degree Programmes – by Country** (mean of percentages)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
Western Europe	12	17	15	26	33	26	29	21	21
Central and Eastern Europe	20	17	26	6	12	6	20	11	18
North America	3	6	4	4	3	16	5	8	5
Latin America	9	3	3	6	5	0	6	0	5
Africa	11	13	17	8	6	17	18	22	14
Near and Middle East	6	7	2	5	1	15	4	31	7
China	15	21	19	27	11	14	9	4	14
Japan	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
India	10	1	3	2	2	0	2	1	4
Asia (excluding China, Japan, India)	12	14	11	12	25	5	8	2	11
Australia and Oceania	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(63)	(20)	(36)	(15)	(20)	(14)	(53)	(15)	(236)

Question 2.4: If figures are available, please state the number of students and graduates in the academic year 2000/2001 for each region.

for the academic year requested (2001/02 instead of 2000/01). When interpreting the data obtained, these limitations must obviously be borne in mind. It is clear that, at best, the data can yield only rough indications for a geographical distribution of ELTDP students.

On average, about 60 percent of all students enrolled in ELTDPs are foreigners. The respective average proportion ranges from 40 percent in Poland and Finland, to over 50 percent in France, and to about 70 percent in Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands. A very similar pattern emerges regarding the proportion of foreign students among new entrants and graduates.

Slightly more than half of the Programme Coordinators provided information on the regional background of foreign students. According to these answers:

- on average, 21 percent of foreign ELTDP-students come from Western European Countries;
- 18 percent from Central and Eastern Europe;
- 14 percent from Africa;
- 14 percent from China;
- 11 percent from Asia, excluding China and Japan;
- 7 percent from Near and Middle East;
- 5 percent from North America;
- 5 percent from Latin America;
- 4 percent from India;
- 1 percent from Australia and Oceania; and
- less than 1 percent from Japan.

Thus, the largest contingent of foreign ELTDP students comes from European countries (39%), with the share of Western Europeans slightly higher than that of students from CEE countries. Asian students form the second largest group (29%), with China alone providing 14 percent. The Americas play a relatively minor role (10% added-up), as does the near and middle East (7%). Disregarding students from Western Europe, the vast majority of students originate from emerging-market countries characterised by a high demand for higher education, and a supply insufficient to meet this demand.

As Table 5.23 reveals, the regional origin of foreign ELTDP students differs to a certain extent between host countries. The highest proportion of students from Western Europe is reported by coordinators from the Netherlands, which also host the highest average proportion of students from Asian Countries (excluding China and Japan). Foreign students from Africa and from the Near and Middle East play an important role in CEE countries. French

ELTDPs host the highest proportion of Chinese students. Foreign students from India play a minor role in most countries. Only in Germany, every tenth foreign ELTDP-student comes from India.

## 6 Introduction and Operation of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes

The previous chapter provided an in-depth description of ELTDPs in Europe. The present one addresses a number of issues which are of critical importance for the development, the introduction and the operation of these programmes. Questions addressed are: why do institutions provide ELTDPs? Who are the main actors in the introduction and running of ELTDPs, in a supportive as well as in an obstructive sense? Which efforts do providers make to inform about and to market their programmes taught in English? Which problems, if any, do students and teachers have with the English language, and with the one of the host country? Which sources of funding are available for institutions introducing and running ELTDPs? Is there already a strong culture of accreditation and quality assurance with regard to these programmes, and do the methodologies employed reflect the specificities of ELTDPs? Are there any problems with the “academic” or “content-related” prior knowledge of students on ELTDPs? And what are the intended or surprising spin-off effects which ELTDPs produce?

The facts and results presented in this chapter were obtained from various sources. Once again, the Institutional and Programme Survey provided ample information. But in this chapter, the information obtained during the site visits to 11 universities and colleges in eight countries is of the utmost importance. A substantial part of the facts presented in the two sub-chapters 6.5 and 6.6 were obtained by means of additional surveys of funding agencies and of quality assurance and accreditation agencies in selected European Countries.

### 6.1 Motivation

In the institutional survey, higher education institutions offering ELTDPs were asked about the relative importance of four different reasons for the introduction of such programmes. The response shows that,

- 87 percent aim to attract foreign students;
- 81 percent seek to make domestic students fit for global or international markets;
- 53 percent aim at providing programmes leading to degrees which are new in the country; and
- 19 percent intend to improve the income base of the institution, i.e. they try to generate revenue from tuition fees.

The motive to attract foreign students is ranked as important everywhere (and, overall, the leading motivation), but it is particularly often stated by institutions in the Netherlands (94%), Germany (92%) and Denmark. Larger differences by country can be found regarding other reasons (cf. Table 6.1).

While more than three quarters of institutions from EU and EFTA Countries consider ELTDPs as a means to prepare domestic students for employment on global labour markets, this view is either not shared or plays a comparably insignificant role in most CEE countries.

**Table 6.1**  
**Important Reasons for the Implementation of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes – by Country (percentages)**

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
To attract foreign students	92	91	85	87	94	80	80	89	87
To make domestic students fit for global/international markets	77	82	82	100	81	93	78	68	81
To improve the income base of the institution	16	18	3	21	31	33	11	53	19
To offer study programmes leading to degrees new in the country	78	27	33	56	38	47	47	44	53
Count (n)	(66)	(11)	(34)	(16)	(16)	(15)	(46)	(19)	(223)

Source: Institutional Questionnaire.

Question 4.1: How important were the following reasons for your institution to implement English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes?

The opportunity to improve the revenue base by means of tuition fees is, on the other hand, most often stressed by institutions from CEE countries. One third of Polish institutions and more than half of the institutions from other CEE countries attach a high importance to this financial aspect. Among EU member states, institutions from the Netherlands most often mention revenue motives (31%), while this aspect has no significance in Finland. This result coincides with the fact that tuition fees are a normal phenomenon in the above countries (with the exception of Finland), as could be seen earlier. Against the background of an official non-fee policy in Denmark and Germany, the fact that still 18 and 16 percent of all institutions in these countries attach high importance to income generation from fees is quite inexplicable and might suggest that there are some creative ways of dealing with the tuition-fee ban.

To offer study programmes leading to new degrees is an important issue for more than three quarters of German institutions. Besides Germany, the drive to implement new degrees is of significance for the majority of institutions in France, and for about half of the institutions in some of the smaller EU and EFTA countries and in Poland. It is least important in Denmark and Finland.

By and large, no differences in the reasons for the introduction of ELTDPs appear to exist between different types of institutions, and between institu-

tions of a different size. However, it might be noteworthy that non-university institutions more often stress the issue of making domestic students fit for the global market than universities (87% compared to 76%).

The results from the Institutional Survey are supported by the findings of the site visits, which also help to refine them.

Thus, the wish to *attract foreign students*, can, in fact, mean a variety of specific motives, which reflect the different framework conditions under which institutions operate. Often, it translates into a strategy to grapple with adverse framework conditions.

First, the intention to attract foreign students in Nordic Countries (and, to a lesser extent, in the Netherlands) by means of programmes taught in English is based on the “domestic-language disadvantage”, i.e. the realistic assumption that foreigners cannot be attracted by tuition in Danish, Swedish or Finnish. These institutions and countries simply have no other choice if they want to raise foreign student numbers beyond the modest level reached so far. And exactly this they – and their governments – are keen to do.

Second, the intention to attract foreign students can also be born out of other competitive disadvantages, and can be part of a whole modernisation package. This is typical of universities and colleges which, in their own country, at any rate, are located on the periphery – and often compete with more centrally located and better known institutions. An example is the Dutch University of Twente, a young institution on the border to Germany. In order to be able to compete with the better-known old universities of the Netherlands, which are also located in “catchment areas” with a much higher population (*Randstad*), this institution had to make special efforts to survive competition (and, in the last resort, to continue to exist). The University of Twente already many years ago decided on a robust modernisation plan<sup>19</sup>, and one of the recent features of this plan is internationalisation. While internationalisation plays a prominent role in Dutch higher education anyway, the particular motivation in Twente was not internationalisation as an end in itself, but internationalisation as a means of institutional profiling and attractiveness enhancement. A similar motive might have contributed to the fact that the University of Tromsø (Norway), an institution not visited by the team, has managed to create the largest number of ELTDPs in its country. Located in a small town north of the Arctic Circle, it needs to come up with special offers to be attractive.

Third, constraints emanating from the demographic curve contribute to the urge to attract foreigners. This influence can be felt in almost every European Country, and poses a medium-term threat if not to the further existence of whole institutions, at least to that of faculties, departments, institutes and some or all of their programmes. The influence of this factor could be identi-

---

19 For an account of the remarkable “reinvention” of the University of Twente, cf. Burton R. Clark, *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*, Paris: IAU Press 1998.

fied on every single site visit. The University of West Bohemia in Pilsen reported of drastic drops expected in the number of domestic students in as short a time-span as ten years from now, and frankly admitted that for them the attempt to enrol foreigners was also a strategy to counterbalance the effects of this trend. The danger is more acutely felt in some subject areas than in others. An example is the field of engineering, where enrolment dropped sharply in the course of the 1990s. One of the motives of every single university and college with a sizeable engineering offer was to countersteer this trend by filling the empty ranks with foreign students. In the case of the Fachhochschule Aachen, a whole site with many departments faced closure or heavy reduction of offers in the medium term.

Fourth, for the university-sector, and particularly for those universities heavily geared towards research, to attract foreign students very often translates into securing their research base. They therefore, as became apparent earlier, focus on the postgraduate segment. As was the case with a number of ELTDPs at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven and the Technical University Delft (to name only two examples), they are also seen as creating a pool of potential Ph.D. candidates, of whom not enough can be recruited from the domestic market. The trend is the same for all areas, but seems to be particularly prominent in the natural sciences, where it appears to be far from easy to attract outstanding talent.

Fifth, for a smaller segment of institutions, or rather of programmes, to attract foreigners means to provide high-level training to students from the Third World, relevant for the development of their countries of origin. These programmes tend to be concentrated in the postgraduate (Master-level) sector, and obviously exist in some subject areas more than in others (agriculture, environment and sustainable development, theology, etc.). Examples were found at the Universities of Oslo and Leuven.

Sixth, and last, there is a number of highly specialised offerings for which demand on the national level, especially in small countries, is not high enough to justify the creation of a programme. Examples found are postgraduate programmes in “criminology” and “advanced statistics” in Leuven, or “maritime law” (Oslo). In order to reach acceptable enrolment levels, such programmes need to be able to attract foreign students, and this can (almost) only be achieved by means of teaching in English. This trend is reinforced by the fact that textbooks or research literature in such highly specialised fields tend to exist almost exclusively in English, so that it would also be artificial to teach the course in the national language.

The aim to “*attract domestic students*”, mentioned as the second most frequent one in the institutional survey, is obviously related international labour-market aspects. The site visits confirmed that institutions and Programme Coordinators hope that graduates, due to the English-language expertise and the multi-cultural learning experience which ELTDPs offer, will be much

more competitive in terms of employability. The Finnish visits (Turku and Vaasa Polytechnics) displayed beyond doubt that the expectation on the “home” labour market is one of increased international demands as well. Interlocutors at the two Finnish “polytechnics” visited (Turku and Vaasa) stressed that Finnish companies with a presence on the global market, such as the telecommunications giant Nokia, expect graduates with an international profile. In fact, representatives of industry had been on the planning committees of quite a few ELTDPs introduced in Turku and Vaasa. The case is also revealing because the percentage of domestic students on ELTDPs is nowhere higher than in Finland.

According to the Institutional Survey, the aim “to offer programmes leading to new degrees” is of importance for slightly more than half of all institutions (53%). It also plays the leading role in the responses to the “international dimension” question in the Institutional Survey (cf. chapter 4.2.1). This category (“new degrees”) had obviously been introduced with the aim of finding out if there is a link between the “Bologna Process” and the introduction of ELTDPs. Not only does the “Bologna Declaration” demand the introduction of “readable” (i.e. internationally known and accepted) degrees. It is also a document that stresses the need for European higher education institutions to enhance their attractiveness, and it owes much of its existence to the emergence of an international market of higher education, and the increasing worldwide competition that goes with it.

Given this background, one would have expected the site visits to confirm the mutually reinforcing roles of the introduction of ELTDPs and the Bologna Process. But no such direct link was found. The reason seems to be that the Bologna Process did not start (in a major sense) until 1999, and that it developed its full momentum only in the years after. Since the conception and planning phase of most ELTDPs – inclusive of rather young ones – thus falls into the “pre-Bologna” period, it is not really a surprise that the Declaration on the “European Area of Higher Education” (the official name of the Bologna Declaration) did not, in the vast majority of cases, translate into a motive for the creation of ELTDPs. There are, however, indications that the two developments are starting to converge now. A good example is the Fachhochschule Aachen, where ELTDPs were first devised as *Diplom-Ingenieur* degrees. The institution thought it too much of a risk to sacrifice this degree for a Bachelor the acceptance of which was still unclear – until it became apparent that German *Fachhochschulen* would also be allowed to offer Master Degrees.<sup>20</sup> Likewise, the University of Twente decided to focus its whole range of ELTDP offers exclusively on Master Degrees when the Dutch Government decided that all degrees in the country would be either Bachelors or Masters in a matter of two years, with none of the old degrees surviving, and when it announced, very recently, that in a few years from now,

---

20 Even at that stage the Fachhochschule Aachen kept the *Diplom-Ingenieur* as a third option.

twenty percent of all programmes in Dutch higher education would be ELTDPs.

The findings made during the site visits concerning the motive to attract foreign students in order to *generate income* are largely compatible with those of the Institutional Survey. First, even institutions which do charge fees mostly insisted that they “did not do it for the money”, but simply to recover some of their extra costs. Most interlocutors added that, anyway, even quite high tuition fees would not really be fully cost-recovering. Coordinators of programmes with a relevance for developing-world students often flatly rejected the idea of fees as unethical. It is interesting to note, though, that the leadership of one institution had toyed with the idea of an increase in tuition fees, but not pursued these plans so far for fear of a strong anti-reaction of teachers and students. In the Netherlands, on the other hand, the general introduction of fees for all students has paved the way for an acceptance of charging foreign students. The only site visit to an institution in Central Europe (Pilsen) confirmed that fewer scruples exist there. However, the particular university had been able to attract only few fee-paying foreigners so far, and admitted that, unless enrolment could be increased, the cost per student by far outweighed the income generated.

National-level funding programmes can support the willingness to offer ELTDPs, too. However, today such programmes exist on a large scale only in Germany, as the survey of funding organisations revealed.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, almost all of the programmes at German institutions visited did receive start-up funds from the scheme *Auslandsorientierte Studiengänge (AS)* of the DAAD, which has been extremely well received so far. Since most of the programmes funded by means of this instrument are still in their infancy, it remains to be seen to which extent the programme-induced creation of ELTDPs will lead to sustainable products in the long run. The particular ELTDP formula brought about by the AS scheme will be discussed further on in this report (cf. chapter 5.3.4).

## 6.2 Actors and Approaches

One objective of this study was to find out in which way ELTDPs are being introduced. Who, from among the various academic and administrative actors in a higher education institution (and the outside “stakeholders”), are the main supporters? Who are the sceptics and opponents, if any? Do ELTDPs come into existence mainly as a grass-roots phenomenon, or are they introduced in a top-down style by the university leadership? Table 6.2, which encapsulates the responses to a question asked in the Institutional Survey, provides some first answers.

---

21 It is important to stress that the Programme Survey identified only programmes on offer at present. There are indications of larger-scale programme support in Finland, which existed in the years immediately prior to and after Finland's joining the EU (1995).

The above results appear to indicate that actors at the faculty and department level are slightly more often those who push the ELTDP development than central-level figures. Overall,

- 78 percent of higher education institutions mentioned staff members with a particular responsibility for international activities at the departmental level as important promoters;
- 76 percent the deans of faculties and departments;
- 72 percent the president, rector, vice-president or vice-rector;
- 69 percent academic staff members at faculty and department level;
- 68 percent the head of the central administrative unit in charge of international activities (international office);
- 43 percent a central committee in charge of international activities;
- 26 percent external “stakeholders” from industry, the private sector etc.; and
- 16 percent student associations or individual students.

**Table 6.2**  
**Important Promotors of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes**  
**– by Country (percentages)**

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
President/rector/vice-president/vice-rector etc.	76	50	75	57	67	80	73	71	72
Head of central administrative unit in charge of international activities	67	90	69	75	60	70	62	71	68
Central committee in charge of international activities	32	57	50	50	22	63	54	36	43
Dean of faculty/department	73	56	94	64	79	82	67	89	76
Staff especially in charge of international activities at the departmental level	74	75	74	100	86	82	80	72	78
Academic staff members at faculty/departmental level	67	33	72	71	73	77	80	58	69
Student associations, individual students	9	25	15	30	25	38	8	22	16
External persons from industry, private sector etc.	15	0	32	73	21	22	31	25	26
Count (n)	(65)	(10)	(33)	(16)	(16)	(15)	(44)	(19)	(218)

Source: Institutional Questionnaire

Question 4.2: What role did the following actors play as promotors of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes?

In more than three quarters of all institutions, ELTDPs are the result of an interaction between persons from both the central and the faculty/department level. As will be seen below, this is also the picture that emerged from the site visits.

An exclusive role of central-level actors can be found in only eight percent of all institutions. The share of institutions where only department-level actors were responsible for the introduction of ELTDPs is also relatively small (15%). Overall, persons from the academic units seem to be slightly more often the “drivers” of ELTDP developments than the university leadership and the central administration.

On average, key actors at the central level are most often the promoters of ELTDPs in Denmark, Poland and Finland, and least often in the Netherlands and in France (cf. Table 6.2). While the respective role of faculties and departments in Finland is also above average, it is below average in Denmark and Poland.

France is an “unusual” ELTDP country in respect of the role of external stakeholders. In 73 percent of all institutions they play an important role in France, whereas the European average, at 26 percent, indicates a rather modest role of external actors everywhere else. This share is very low in Germany (15%), and non-existing in Denmark.

The contribution of student associations to the development of ELTDPs is rather low as well. The proportion of institutions reporting an important role of students is above a quarter only in Poland, France, Denmark and the Netherlands.

The size of an institution has little impact on the distribution of roles and the division of labour between central and departmental level, students and external stakeholders. Non-university institutions report a slightly higher involvement of the private sector than their university counterparts (30% compared to 22%).

Again, the results of the site visits confirm the overall findings of the Institutional Survey, and differentiate them in some cases. In addition to the standard question about those most supportive of the introduction of ELTDPs, interviewers also enquired into the issue of opposition and resistance. Only one out of many dozen programme interviewees reported of “some considerable” resistance. In the vast majority of cases, teachers are supportive and often enthusiastic. One central level interviewee even found the attitude of professors “over-enthusiastic”, implying that sometimes offers were being put up which coincided with special professorial interests, but very little student demand. One must bear in mind that the picture of overall support emerging during the site visits is of course also influenced (in the sense of a positive bias) by the selection of universities and colleges visited: They are amongst those offering more ELTDPs than anyone else.

In those rarer cases where there are sceptics, these are usually few and tend to be among the older teachers. The largest number among this minority is, or at any rate was at the start of the programme, uncomfortable teaching in English. Most institutions deal with this problem by not forcing anyone to teach on an ELTDP (which necessitates the employment of extra staff for a limited period of time, or a programme designed around the specialisation of those who are supportive). A medium-term strategy is to recruit new teachers exclusively from among candidates who speak very good English. Most institutions also offer English training of some sort (cf. chapter 6.4 on “language proficiency”), although only one (non-university) institution, Turku Polytechnic, was identified which created a made-to-measure training package for teachers when introducing ELTDPs. In a few other cases, scepticism and opposition do not originate from a lack of proficiency in English, but from more general concerns of academic language policy (fears that small languages might not survive as a medium of scientific expression and publication), considerations of the role of a nationally-funded institution (can the taxpayer be expected to finance education for foreigners in English), or fears that higher education would retreat back from the society around it into a new “ivory tower”. Sometimes, interviewees also report opposition brought about by increased workload.

With a view to the supportive side, a set of questions asked during the site visits enquired who are the main initiators of ELTDPs, and where they are to be found: among the institutional leadership (rectors, vice-rectors) and the central administration, or at the academic base. The overwhelming majority of interlocutors stated that the original impetus for introducing an ELTDP came from the academic base, i.e. from one or more teachers eager to introduce a particular programme. The bottom-up approach is predominant, particularly with regard to the very first programmes started at an institution. At this early stage, central management mostly behaves in a passively encouraging or at least neutral way, but it does not initiate programmes itself, nor does it develop an institution-wide “ELTDP policy”. Institutions which do not increase their number of ELTDP offerings beyond the initial one or two are very likely to keep up this approach. If and when the programme range widens, which often comes about through the model function of a particularly successful ELTDP, the role of the central management frequently changes. University leaders then see a chance to turn ELTDPs into a distinctive trait of their institution (profiling), and start to offer incentives for the creation of new programmes. However, the emergence of an ELTDP policy at that stage can also entail a raise in expectations, and the development of a more discerning attitude. The Universiteit Leuven is one such example: once a critical mass of ELTDPs existed, it carried out an evaluation of existing programmes. This revealed, amongst other things, that not all of the university’s “strongest departments” were amongst ELTDP providers, and that a fair number of highly specialised programmes attracted few students only. It decided to

actively encourage selected departments not yet providing ELTDPs, and it decided to withdraw support from some existing ones, and to continue support for other programmes only if certain changes were put in place.

The evidence from the site visits suggests that the above development is by far the most common one. Clear-cut top-down approaches, on the other hand, are very rare. Still, one rather fascinating one was identified. This was the case of the Fachhochschule Aachen, where the rector employed a *fait accompli* strategy to push his institution (and the Ministry of Education) into innovation. In a matter of a few days, he wrote more or less single-handedly five applications for ELTDP start-up funding to the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), which were all successful. The funding thus made available was a strong argument with the help of which he managed to persuade partly sceptical departments to start into the new venture. Finally, and some time after the launch of the programmes, they were “legalised” by the Ministry of Education. The success of the surprise strategy was, however, also eased by the fact that the Fachhochschule Aachen, an institution with a strong emphasis on engineering, had to find an answer to the challenge of dropping enrolment in engineering, and the possible closure of some programmes and departments. It is otherwise a highly unusual strategy, and not likely to succeed in most European institutions with their relatively weak “steering core” and the concept of an institutional leader as a *primus inter pares*.

### 6.3 Marketing

About three quarters of all ELTDP coordinators report special marketing activities with the aim to attract students. Foreign students are the principal target group. 29 percent of all ELTDPs target them exclusively, and 43 per-

**Table 6.3**  
**Target Groups of Special Marketing Activities – by Country**  
(percentages)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
Foreign and domestic students	57	17	52	35	42	32	43	14	43
Only foreign students	26	31	19	15	42	27	23	59	29
Only domestic students	2	3	6	15	0	36	6	5	6
Not at all	15	50	22	35	16	5	28	22	23
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count (n)	(122)	(36)	(67)	(26)	(45)	(22)	(96)	(37)	(451)

Source: Degree Programme Questionnaire.

Question 3.1: Do you conduct any special marketing activities in order to attract foreign or domestic students to the Degree Programme (multiple replies possible)?

cent target them alongside domestic students. Only 6 percent focus their activities exclusively on domestic students.

Only in Poland and in France is the percentage of ELTDPs exclusively targeting domestic students of a size worth mentioning (36% and 15% respectively). In Germany and Finland, it is most common to address both foreign and domestic students. However, a quarter of German coordinators and a fifth of Finnish coordinators also state activities focusing foreign students only. Marketing activities to attract foreign students only are most frequently mentioned in the Netherlands (42%) and some CEE countries (59%).

**Table 6.4**  
**Especially Successful Marketing Activities and Strategies – by Country**  
(percentages, multiple responses possible)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
No special marketing activities conducted	15	49	21	35	16	5	28	22	23
Information events abroad (students fairs, conferences etc.)	34	0	16	15	24	55	16	19	22
Information events in home country/home institution	20	14	22	27	22	45	14	27	21
Entry in programme guidelines of national exchange agencies	21	0	10	23	9	0	3	19	12
Internet/Web sites	60	30	35	23	56	45	24	54	42
Information material/brochures etc.	22	16	10	15	13	23	17	5	16
Use of personal contacts of professors and students	15	5	7	12	9	14	16	8	12
Use of networks/partnerships of the university	14	0	18	0	29	5	8	5	12
Advertisements in newspapers/public media	30	16	32	12	31	41	25	38	28
Other activities	5	11	4	0	4	5	8	8	6
Total	235	141	176	162	213	236	158	205	194
Count (n)	(122)	(37)	(68)	(26)	(45)	(22)	(96)	(37)	(453)

Source: Degree Programme Questionnaire.

Question 3.2: Which kind of marketing activities or strategies would you consider especially successful?

The target group differs to a certain extent by type of institution. While non-university institutions most often try to attract both foreign and domestic students (54%), the universities have a stronger focus on foreign students. Universities report in one third of all cases special activities focusing on foreign students, while the corresponding proportion of non-university institutions is only one fifth.

How active are institutions in marketing and what are their preferred instruments and activities? First of all, it is noteworthy that almost every fourth Programme Coordinator reports that there are no marketing activities at all. Denmark has the highest proportion of such “marketing-abstentious” programmes (49%).

Asked about the kind of marketing activities or strategies they consider especially successful,

- 42 percent of the programme coordinators mention information provided via the internet;
- 28 percent advertisements in newspapers or other public media;
- 22 percent the presentation of the programme at student fairs, conferences etc. abroad;
- 21 percent information events at the own institution or in the home country;
- 16 percent the provision of information material, brochures etc.;
- 12 percent the inclusion of their ELTDP in programme guidelines of national exchange agencies or other national overviews;
- 12 percent the use of networks of partner institutions;
- 12 percent informal ways of marketing by professors and students; and
- 6 percent stated other means.

It can safely be concluded that ICT has reached higher education marketing: the internet, and particularly the institutional and programme websites, is the single most-employed marketing instrument, as Table 6.4 shows. In Germany, in the Netherlands and in CEE countries, this category even reaches percentages between 50 and 60. Only Denmark, France and the smaller EU and EFTA Countries believe less in this technology-supported approach (under one third). But traditional forms of advertisement have an important share too, as the second-largest group (newspapers and other media) underlines. Student fairs, the third most-often mentioned instrument of marketing, are especially popular with Polish (55%) and German (34%) programme coordinators.

The use of networks of partner institutions is considered as a successful way to attract foreign students by more than a quarter of the Dutch and each fifth of the Finnish coordinators. In most other countries, this measure was either not used or not viewed as especially effective.

The broadest range of marketing activities is reported by Polish and German Programme Coordinators. It appears that ELTDPs in these two countries subscribe to a “the-more-the-better strategy”, and employ a multi-instrument approach.

The site visits again provided findings which complement and deepen the understanding of the results obtained in the Programme Survey.

The different types of activities used in the Programme Survey do indeed constitute the bulk of marketing and promotional activity. The leading role of the internet was confirmed by interviewees. A few instruments and approaches not used in the survey typology were mentioned, although rather rarely, such as the use of consultants in the target countries, and the use of alumni. All but one institution's approach to marketing can be described as state-of-the-art, in terms of the use of modern technology, design, and the use of intermediaries and contacts all over the world. Though not necessarily from the beginning, these institutions had also integrated the marketing of individual programmes into an overall presentation at institutional level (web-site and brochures). It is interesting to note that the vast majority of interviewees spoke exclusively about international marketing, and hardly at all about promotional activity in their own countries. This stands in slight contrast with the results of the Programme Survey, from which marketing in the home country also emerged second to international marketing, but was regarded as very important still. Only Finnish interviewees stated the necessity to also promote ELTDPs and recruit students in their own country.

The site visits also indicate that quite a few of the 23 percent of institutions which reported no marketing activities in the Programme Survey might, after all, still be active in this field. Many interviewees started out with a "no-marketing" statement, but it turned out in the course of the interviews that they engaged in various of the activities in the above typology. However, they regarded them as standard practice not worthy to be labelled a "marketing measure".

At the same time, marketing was not perceived by many interviewees as a very serious issue. This attitude was largely the result of the fact that, with the exception of one institution (the only one with little to no activity in this field), and a number of individual ELTDPs, it was not at all a problem to attract sufficient numbers of foreign students. This also explains the fact that no single institution, or anyone responsible for an individual ELTDP, had carried out any market research prior to the introduction of the programme. This practice proved to be a problem only in the few cases where overly specialised programmes, which reflected the particular enthusiasm of their initiators rather than anything else, failed to produce satisfactory enrolment levels.

Despite the generally satisfactory (and often high) volume of marketing activity, the site visits revealed that marketing practice can still be improved. The challenge is epitomised in the following quote of a central-level administrator at Fachhochschule Aachen: "The problem is not to attract enough foreign students. We are being flooded with applications. The problem, very

often, is to attract the right ones". The "right ones", it turned out, in Aachen as everywhere else, meant

- (a) those with the best academic potential possible, and with a decent command of English, and
- (b) a good mix of different nationalities and cultural backgrounds.

To control the quality of the students to be admitted is, of course, partly a matter of adequate entrance requirements and selection, with regard to which many institutions have learnt some lessons the hard way (cf. chapter 6.7). But it is also related to the way an institution markets itself. In the post-graduate sector of education, experience has taught most ELTDP coordinators to avoid education fairs altogether, and predominantly collaborate with a fixed set of preferential foreign partner institutions with high standards. In the undergraduate sector, where the target group consists of school leavers, a "filter" of this sort is obviously not available.

The issue of an adequate mix of students from different countries and cultures is illustrative of the fact that targeted marketing requires, on the side of the marketing institution, a clear idea of which students it wants to attract. Most institutions stated serious problems with too large single-nationality groups, for reasons of a lack of integration, language improvement, and other problem areas. Only when almost no students from anywhere else but the Near and Middle East enrolled at the University of Pilsen did those responsible become aware that they would have preferred a balanced intake from all over the world, with a sizeable proportion of Europeans. Other institutions found that, to their surprise, enrolment was dominated by Chinese and other Asian students, and that Latin Americans stayed away. But none of the universities and colleges had targeted promotional work specifically at the desired source regions. Having learned the lesson, most institutions now intend to introduce marketing measures particularly focussed on their preferred (i.e. so far under-represented) target regions and countries.

For completeness' sake, it should be added that national-level organisations engage in international higher education marketing, too. In a minimum sense, this applies to every European Country. Information about study opportunities, mostly of the written type, is available at embassies, foreign cultural institutes and internationalisation agencies (if the latter operate branch offices abroad). However, this type of activity is rather low-key, it is the prospective student who needs to make the first move, and the information provided does not exclusively concern ELTDPs, but the entire range of offerings of the universities and colleges of the country in question.

With particular regard to ELTDPs, some countries make an extra effort. The German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), the Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education (NUFFIC), the Finnish Centre for International Mobility (CIMO), CIRIUS of Denmark, and EduFrance

annually publish, in paper form and on their websites, a catalogue of ELTDPs available in their countries.<sup>22</sup>

It is also the latter organisations (NUFFIC, DAAD and EduFrance, which was set up with the sole purpose of marketing French higher education), which, in cooperation with their countries' institutions, carry out fully-fledged marketing campaigns. Their activities go beyond information provision, in that they reach out to the potential "customer", through activities like participation in education fairs, "road shows", and the operation of a network of branch offices in key markets worldwide.

## 6.4 Language Proficiency

Teaching and learning in a foreign language is the object of considerable debate and concern. Is the quality of learning outcomes lower when students are taught in a language other than their mother tongue? Will the quality of teaching not suffer if teachers have to use a foreign language? A recent Dutch study suggests that this is not the case<sup>23</sup>, but there are also other opinions. The worst fear is obviously that in ELTDPs, students not able to properly understand, speak and write English might be taught by teachers incapable of expressing themselves in English. Given these worries, the Institutional and the Programme Survey addressed these issues. They also figured prominently in the interviews conducted during site visits.

### 6.4.1 Students

Does the English-language proficiency of students enrolled in ELTDPs pose a problem? And, if so, how serious is it? In answering these questions, this section will first discuss the result of the Institutional and Programme Surveys, and then report on the results obtained through the site visits.

One question in the Institutional Survey enquired into the relative importance of nine possible problems. Three of them concern language problems of ELTDP students. Respondents were asked to indicate the seriousness of a problem on a scale from one to five (1 = very serious problem, 5 = no problem at all). Table 6.5 displays the percentage of answers indicating categories 1 and 2 (classified below in the category "significant difficulties"), by problem field and country.

---

22 NUFFIC, *Study in the Netherlands 2003/04. Catalogue of International Study Programmes and Courses*, Den Haag 2002 ; DAAD, *International Degree Programmes in Germany* (Edition 2002), Bonn 2002; CIRIUS, [www.ciriusonline.dk/eng.studyprog](http://www.ciriusonline.dk/eng.studyprog); CIMO, *Study in Finland. International Programmes in Finnish Higher Education 2002-2003*.

23 Renate G. Klaasen, *Challenges in English-Medium Engineering Education*, Delft 2001. This study was conducted at one single institution, the Technical University of Delft (Netherlands). It also addresses an unusual form of ELTDPs, in which the entire student group, as well as the teachers, is Dutch, but teaching is in English.

The three categories relevant for the language abilities of ELTDP students are (1) insufficient English language proficiency of foreign students, (2) insufficient English language proficiency of domestic students, and (3) insufficient proficiency of foreign students in the domestic language of the host institution. Out of all nine potential problem areas, difficulties of domestic students with English are rated as least important. Difficulties foreign students have with the English language are viewed as of medium importance. The most interesting finding is that the problems foreign students have with the domestic language are the most serious of all nine categories.

**Table 6.5**  
**Significant Difficulties Encountered with Regard to the Implementation of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes – by Country**  
(percentages\*)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
Lack of interest (enrolments) of foreign students	7	0	12	0	7	29	5	20	9
Lack of interest (enrolments) of domestic students	18	13	18	19	21	8	18	25	18
Lack of cooperation of domestic teaching staff	11	0	29	12	0	0	8	22	13
Insufficient English language proficiency of foreign students	11	33	38	18	53	17	18	5	21
Insufficient English language proficiency of domestic students	10	0	6	19	0	8	5	6	8
Insufficient English language proficiency of teaching staff	19	0	21	6	27	0	8	11	14
Insufficient proficiency of foreign students in the domestic language at your institution	55	29	48	20	29	25	26	28	39
Large differences in the academic level/ability of foreign students	42	56	33	19	33	15	25	5	30
Last minute withdrawals of foreign or domestic students	26	22	35	19	33	8	19	11	24
Count (n)	(64)	(9)	(34)	(17)	(15)	(14)	(41)	(20)	(214)

Question 6.1: Did your institution encounter significant difficulties in any of the following areas with regard to the implementation of the English-Language-Taught Degree Programme(s)?

The finding that problems with the language of the host country (domestic language) are classified as most important highlights the important fact that teaching in English does not do away with the language barrier of the host country. Students do not only live in the classroom, but in a wider institutional environment often functioning exclusively in the domestic language, as well as the town and region, to which the same applies. The fact that prob-

lems with the domestic language are classified as significant in Germany far more often than in anywhere else (55%, followed by Finland (41%)) is most certainly due to the high number of mixed-language ELTDPs in this country (cf. Chapter 5.5). In this type of ELTDP, foreign students are de facto required to master two foreign languages in the classroom. The site visits confirm that this type of ELTDP produces a serious language challenge (cf. also below).

Problems of foreign students in mastering English are comparatively less serious (21% of all institutions), but differ widely between countries. The percentage of institutions complaining about insufficient English is astoundingly high in the Netherlands (53%) and also considerable in Finland (38%) and in Denmark (33%). It is very low in CEE countries (5%), and only a minor problem in Germany (11%). It is interesting that non-university institutions tend to regard their foreign students' level of English more often as a problem than the universities (30%:15%). From this it can also be concluded that the fact that two thirds of all institutions require evidence of their prospective students' level of proficiency in English, mostly by means of the TOEFL Test (cf. Chapter 5.3), does not rule out every problem with the English language.

Domestic students have hardly any problems with the mastery of English, according to the results of the Institutional Survey. France is an exception in this regard.

What do universities and colleges do to solve their students' problems with the English language? This issue was addressed twice in the Institutional and Programme Surveys.

First, as Table 5.18 (cf. chapter 5.6) shows, a considerable proportion of ELTDPs contain language training elements as an integral part of the curriculum. This is the case with English (66%), and, to a lesser extent, also with the domestic language (40%). Programmes which do not include any language training are relatively rare (26%). Germany, Finland and Poland almost always provide language training, while this is rather the exception in Denmark. Training in the domestic language is most common in Germany (67%), which is understandable given the high number of mixed-language ELTDPs in this country.

The issue of language training was further addressed in the Institutional Survey, where the question was asked whether the institution as a whole provided language courses which were not specifically put up for ELTDP students (or teachers, for that matter), but nonetheless open to them. It should be noted that the question concerns *availability* of such offers, and says nothing about the extent to which the offers are actually taken up by ELTDP students and teachers. The answers to the question are contained in Table 6.6 below.

58 percent of institutions offer English-language training to foreign students, and even more provide this service to domestic students (65%). The latter is

**Table 6.6**  
**Offering of English Language Training to Students or Teaching Staff**  
**Participating in English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes**  
**– by Country (percentages, multiple reply possible)**

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
No language courses offered	22	64	9	18	25	27	33	32	25
Foreign students	66	27	71	47	69	47	50	53	58
Domestic students	77	27	74	76	56	60	57	58	65
Teaching staff	35	36	76	35	56	47	39	37	45
Total	200	155	229	176	206	180	178	179	193
Count (n)	(65)	(11)	(34)	(17)	(16)	(15)	(46)	(19)	(223)

Question 5.2: Does your institution offer English language courses to students or teaching staff participating in English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes?

surprising, to say the least, given the fact that the overwhelming majority of institutions sees no problem with the English-language proficiency of domestic students.

The proportion of institutions offering no English-language training at all is low, but still noteworthy. Again, it is astonishingly high in Denmark (64%).

No systematic deviation from the above findings was found with regard to type or size of institution.

It should be noted that the vast majority of institutions also offers training in the domestic language (79%). Such training is available at every single Finnish institution, as well as at four out of five Dutch universities and colleges. Once again, Denmark is an under-average provider (55%).

The results of the site visits do not, concerning most issues, radically diverge from those of the institutional survey, but they help to better understand the exact nature of the problems there are.

The impression gained is that, in most cases, problems with the English language concern a minority of students only. We are not talking of a landslide problem, and it can safely be said that the horror scenarios of students sitting through years of instruction of which they barely understand a word are simply massive overstatements. To be clear, this does not mean that the command of English of most students reaches Shakespearean heights. In ELTDPs English is not a subject of study in its own right. Perfection is not the aim. Language is regarded as a tool, which must be mastered at a level where it does not interfere with the process of understanding and learning. The communication going on in ELTDP classrooms probably very often offends the ear of linguists, but it is mostly fit for its purpose.

An appreciation of the level of English was gained in the interviews conducted with students during site visits. Of course, it has to be borne in mind that these student interview partners were selected by their institutions, and that they therefore probably belong to the group of performers rather than the opposite. Communication was easy and precise in most cases. The team of interviewers found only one institution with students who had clear problems in comprehending questions and expressing themselves understandably. Not surprisingly, this university belongs to the minority of those without any language-related admission requirement.

At the same time, communication is not, in all cases, problem-free. All colleges and universities visited have made the experience that the requirement of a TOEFL score of 550 or above alone does not rule out every problem. Problems stated mostly concern oral expression, and the ability to engage in direct dialogue (communicative abilities), rather than written expression. Quite a few institutions and ELTDP coordinators are therefore considering to interview applicants in the future, or are already doing so, rather than admitting them on the basis of paper credentials only. These interviews are also, and often predominantly, meant to test content knowledge, where paper credentials pose the same problem.

Language problems very often concern strong accents difficult to understand. Asian students seem to be over-represented among those with a very strong accent, but Europeans and other nationalities appear to be by no means unaffected. In some cases, these peculiarities of oral expression lead to severe communication problems not only with teachers, but more frequently with fellow students. The latter feel that the communication problem interferes with the speed and quality of learning. In some cases, these frustrated students have written letters of complaint to the head of the institution or programme.

Heterogeneity in a learners' group command of English also poses problems for teachers, and ultimately for the speed of learning and learning outcomes. In the case of one ELTDP (University of Delft), a professor had experimented with the use of a very basic ("infantile") English, in order for linguistically weaker students to be able to follow. Obviously, more complex concepts could not be expressed this way, leaving the better performing students dissatisfied, and entailing the danger of a downward adaptation of quality expectations. This approach cannot be recommended, according to the university, and has therefore been given up again.

Large single-nationality groups, particularly of non-European students, appear to aggravate the problem of inadequate command of English, although they are, of course, not the prime reason. The experience with these large groups is that their members stay amongst themselves outside the classroom ("ghetto effect"), speaking only their native language amongst each other, and thus not progressing in their mastery of English.

All institutions visited reported the availability of English-language training, although these offers had rarely been put up for the sole use and the specific language problems of ELTDP students. Mostly, what the interviewees referred to was the general foreign language programme available to anyone studying or teaching at the institution. Interviewees also rarely knew who of their students made use of these classes, and if there was sufficient capacity to accommodate every student.

The insights gained during the site visits also underlined the relative importance of the domestic language for a successful ELTDP experience. It is naive to believe that an understanding of the domestic language, at least at an elementary level, is unnecessary simply because classroom instruction takes place in English. Even inside the academic institution, most administrative support services (libraries, housing and welfare services, student secretariat, etc.) function in the domestic language, apart from the international relations office. Outside of the academic sphere, this is even more the case. In the Nordic Countries and in the Netherlands, where the majority of the population, and thus of staff in administrative units of higher education institutions, usually have an acceptable command of English, this might be a problem of smaller dimensions, but it also exists. As will be seen further on in this study, most institutions have realised this and are working towards improvement.

The mastery of the domestic language can, however, become a major challenge for foreign students if they find themselves on a mixed-language ELTDP. As became apparent earlier, this type of ELTDP is particularly common in France and in Germany. Since no French institution was visited, the findings related here reflect largely the German situation, at the Technical University of Hamburg-Harburg, and the Fachhochschule Aachen. In Germany, this type of ELTDP owes its existence at least partly to the *Auslandsorientierte Studiengänge* Programme of DAAD. The idea was to ease the transition of foreign students into a German-language environment by an initial programme phase taught in English, succeeded by a second (usually longer) period in German. Students who manage to complete a programme of this type in the time foreseen command respect. Not only do they have to follow a demanding academic programme, they also have to do so in two different foreign languages, in at least one of which they are mostly beginners only. The site visit report of the Technische Hochschule Hamburg-Harburg states that the mixed-language model can “create problems, stress and confusion”. It appears that, at best, students usually take longer than foreseen to graduate. The major stumbling block in this type of programme is mostly not the English language, which is anyway perceived as a transition instrument mainly, but the domestic language. Indeed, it was not easy to encourage interviewees to discuss problems related to the English language, because the mastery of German was clearly the bigger challenge.

Next to language problems, the site visits also revealed that the issue of intercultural communication deserves some attention. Problems in this area are by no means huge. Living and learning in a multi-cultural classroom is a challenge that can be mastered. Teachers have to be aware that the prior education experience of non-European students differs from that of their (northern) European fellow students. Most of these non-European students are used to highly guided learning styles (rote learning), and may thus find it difficult to deal with high expectations on independent learning typical of a European higher education setting. The European approach is often misunderstood by these students as posing no demands. Complaints of teachers also concern practical matters, such as breaches of a code of conduct (punctuality, respect of deadlines, leaving classrooms with no serious reason), but more serious misunderstandings as well, such as the failure to comprehend that oral examinations can count as much towards a student's marks as written tests. Teachers agree that the best strategy is to be very precise and explicit in stating expectations, and to conduct regular learning success controls. Some institutions (University of Delft, Fachhochschule Aachen) have also started to offer introductory courses of an intercultural sort, which are to explain to students the "logic" of study in the particular institution and country ("Studying in the Netherlands", "Studying in Germany").

#### **6.4.2 Teachers<sup>24</sup> and Administrative Services**

The impression gained during the site visits is that, in most cases, teachers have no major problems with teaching in English. Of course, readers must be reminded that site visits were carried out at institutions and in countries with a sizeable ELTDP offer, so that the situation elsewhere might be a slightly different one.

All institutions visited simply assume that their teaching staff has sufficient English-language skills. No single case was found where these skills were tested (which stands in some contrast to the findings of the Programme Survey, with a test rate of 13 percent). However, the University of Twente is considering the introduction of English tests for teachers in the future. Professors and lecturers teaching on ELTDPs are selected on their content-related abilities rather than on linguistic skills, as most institutions report.

Most institutions justified the assumption that their teachers master English well enough to deliver a quality education by the charmingly simple reasoning that any "serious" teacher is by definition also an active researcher, and that the only language suited to widely spread research results is English. Especially in very rarely spoken languages, such as Finnish or Danish, any

---

24 The term "teacher" is employed throughout this study to denote a member of the academic staff. It should not be misunderstood as meaning that the persons concerned do not engage in research.

other approach is doomed to fail, interviewees maintained. Additionally, numerous interviewees stressed the fact that many of their teachers had themselves been students, researchers or teachers in English-speaking countries, and had thus learned to effectively communicate through English.

This coincides with the findings of the Institutional Survey, where overall only 14 percent of respondents felt that the English-language proficiency of teachers was a significant problem. Only the Netherlands (27%), Finland (21%) and Germany (19%) were more self-critical in this respect.

This notwithstanding, almost every university and college reported occasional complaints by students over insufficient English-language capabilities of individual teachers. These complaints are usually investigated into and the faculty members taken off the programme if the problem is serious.

All institutions reported that they had a policy of not forcing anyone to teach in English who expressed that he or she felt uncomfortable doing so. Most universities and colleges made use of visiting professors to reinforce their pool of excellent speakers of English. Finnish institutions reported their intention to give a priority to native speakers of English when recruiting new teachers.

Despite the fact that faculty rarely have real problems teaching in English, it became clear that teaching in a foreign language is for most of them a more demanding task than teaching in their native language. One teacher at the Technische Universität Hamburg-Harburg described the act of teaching in English as conscious lecturing, the speed of which was slower than that of teaching in German. "I do not say what I want to say, I explain what I want to say."

Only one institution, the Polytechnic of Turku, reported of targeted English-language training for ELTDP faculty. This college had brought in a trainer from England to help improve the English of everyone expressing the need. As stated earlier already (cf. Table 6.6 in chapter 6.4.1), 45 percent of all institutions responding to the Institutional Survey stated that they offer remedial English classes for their teachers, with Finland (76%) and the Netherlands (47%) above average. However, it can be assumed that these classes are part of the general language programme of the institutions, and not made-to-measure offers for the particular needs of lecturers teaching in English.

Three studies which address the quality of "international" programmes, carried out at national level in the Netherlands, in Germany and in Finland, suggest that the level of mastery of English might, after all, give rise to concern more often than only in isolated cases.<sup>25</sup> Generally, the debate on what is

---

25 Cf. Klaasen, op. cit.; DAAD (ed.), *Evaluation von Studienprogrammen des Demonstrationsprogramms "International ausgerichtete Studiengänge"* (Abschlussbericht), Bonn: DAAD Dok + Mat 41, 2001; S. Tella, A. Räsänen, A. Vähäpassi (eds.), *Teaching through a Foreign Language. From Tool to Empowering Mediator*, Helsinki : FINNHEC 1999.

and what is not a sufficient mastery of English (for teachers and students alike) at times takes rather ideological forms. One group, consisting mainly of linguists, has high standards and therefore more often arrives at critical judgements than their counterparts, who represent the subject itself. The critical group has a tendency to view the command of English as an end in itself. The non-linguists, on the other hand, care little about linguistic perfection. They view language as a “tool” only, the required minimum level of which is defined by the ability of teachers (and students) to still be able to communicate without misunderstandings. This latter view was also supported by some interviewees, who even warned against a too idiomatic or “perfect” English, with its frequent use of rare expressions which most non-native speakers (and not only those) would not comprehend without difficulties.

What is the level of English ELTDP students can expect from their host institutions outside the classroom? Can the administrative units of institutions be approached in English, and would they be able to communicate satisfactorily in this language? The impression gained through the site visits suggests that this is possible in most cases, but not without reservation. All administrative staff speak reasonable English, particularly the Nordic, Dutch and Flemish institutions insisted. If and where this is not the case, the international office usually acts as a go-between and interpreter (it is the only unit which takes on this task with regard to dealings with off-campus authorities and bodies).

At the same time, none of the universities and colleges visited have internationalised their service units to a degree where all relevant information and communication is automatically provided in English. Information necessary to effectively use the library, or the computer centre, to take two examples, is very often provided exclusively in the domestic language. The same goes for general university announcements. Based on the experience of the site visits, it can be concluded that, in the present situation, foreign students need at least a minimum knowledge of the domestic language in order to “survive” their host institution.

## **6.5 Financial Support**

Do Europe’s universities and colleges receive any financial support for the development, introduction, and running of ELTDPs? This question was addressed in the Programme Survey, as well as in a separate survey of internationalisation agencies at national level, and also during the site visits.

Nearly half of the ELTDPs which provided detailed information on funding in the Programme Survey have received financial support. The most important provider of funds overall (35%), but also in each single country other than Poland, is national or regional government. The European Union reaches a modest eight percent only, and the private sector comes last, with a mere six percent (though rising over time). The majority of ELTDPs (55 percent) receive no such support at all.

**Table 6.7**  
**Sources of Financial Support for the Implementation of the Degree Programme – by Country** (percentages, multiple responses possible)

	Country of institution							Other		Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	EU and CEE	EFTA		
Not at all	32	77	60	50	70	59	56	84	55	
National/regional government	61	14	40	43	16	0	31	8	35	
European Union	4	11	0	7	14	27	10	8	8	
Private organisations	9	0	5	4	0	9	10	0	6	
Other sources	5	0	5	0	2	18	9	5	5	
Total	111	103	110	104	102	114	115	105	109	
Count (n)	(124)	(35)	(63)	(28)	(43)	(22)	(93)	(37)	(445)	

Source: Degree Programme Questionnaire.

Question 1.3: Did your institution receive financial support for the implementation of the Degree Programme?

The exact picture differs substantially between countries. In Germany, national and regional government plays a very dominant role (61%) in providing start-up funds for ELTDPs. The governmental sector is also an important sponsor in France (43%) and in Finland. The governments in CEE countries, Denmark and the Netherlands leave institutions offering ELTDPs more or less to their own devices (cf. Table 6.7).

It is difficult to further specify these findings beyond the breakdown into the above categories (no funding – national/ regional – EU – private). Very few institutions specified the exact source or funding programme they received support from. It is easiest to gain an overview in Germany, where the DAAD is a major funder (through instruments such as the afore-mentioned *Auslandsorientierte Studiengänge Programm*, the *Master-Plus Programm* but also the *Aufbaustudiengänge mit entwicklungsländerbezogener Thematik*), and also regional government (ministries of education of the Länder). In Finland, at 40 percent another country with high public support for ELTDPs, the Ministry of Education figures prominently. In France (43%), the *conseils régionaux* play a strong role. Across countries, development cooperation agencies (DANIDA-Denmark, NORAD-Norway, SIDA-Sweden, VLIR-Flanders) are an important source of support, for those ELTDPs which are particularly relevant for developing countries.

As to the exact nature of EU funding, the result is surprising: it was not predominantly the curriculum-development component of the ERASMUS Programme, as one would have expected, which grew the seeds of most EU-funded ELTDPs. According to the specifications made by respondents, it is rather a wide range of programmes, amongst others, Interregg, TEMPUS, and the Jean Monnet Project, which helped start off programmes taught in English.

**Table 6.8**  
**Sources of Financial Support for the Implementation of the Degree Programme – by Year of Implementation**  
 (percentages, multiple responses possible)

	Year of implementation					Total
	Up to 1990	1991 - 1995	1996 - 1997	1998 - 1999	2000 - 2002	
Not at all	56	55	47	53	60	55
National/regional government	39	27	46	37	31	35
European Union	11	15	9	8	4	8
Private organisations	3	4	4	8	8	6
Other sources	0	11	6	3	5	5
Total	108	112	111	109	109	110
Count(n)	(36)	(74)	(70)	(117)	(129)	(426)

Source: Degree Programme Questionnaire.

Question 1.3: Did your institution receive financial support for the implementation of the Degree Programme?

The financial support pattern over time displays some fluctuations, but by and large the relative share of the individual sponsors does not change dramatically. It is interesting to note, though, that the relative importance of the European Union as a promoter of ELTDPs decreases considerably after 1995. The share of private sources doubles, but it still remains modest in absolute terms. Readers should be aware that the rise and fall in percentage values over time does not necessarily indicate the extent of any of the actors' engagement at a given time. To illustrate this: the governmental share of support stands at 39 percent in the period up to 1990, and thus higher than the over-time percentage of 35. However, the percentage values refer to the number of ELTDPs started in a particular period. Since the number of ELTDPs started before 1990 is quite small, as became obvious earlier, the overall engagement of the governmental level was smaller in these early years, not larger.

The *survey of national-level organisations* responsible for internationalisation in higher education added little to the knowledge gained from the Institutional Survey. Agencies in Flanders/Belgium (VLIR and VLHORA), Denmark (CIRIUS Danmark), Finland (CIMO), Germany (DAAD), the Netherlands (NUFFIC), Norway (SIU) and Sweden (International Programme Office) had been asked to report

- Programmes which provided funding specifically or amongst other things for ELTDPs offered by themselves, and
- Programmes which provided funding specifically or amongst other things for ELTDPs run by other organisations in their countries.

The programmes and funding sources reported were more or less identical with those mentioned by institutional respondents. In the case of two countries, Finland and the Netherlands, programmes or funds available earlier (for example through the Dutch STIR scheme) did no longer exist in that form. However, the survey drew attention to different approaches possible to stimulating ELTDPs. Setting its own country's internationalisation policy off from that of programme-induced philosophies (such as in Germany), the Dutch response stated: "...project funding goes against the grain of Dutch higher education lump-sum funding of universities and *hogescholen*..."<sup>26</sup>, which aims at giving institutions "maximum ability and responsibility in making their own choices". Sweden seems to follow a similar approach. One of the guidelines on which the budget negotiations between government and higher education institutions are based is the following: "Universities and university colleges shall increase international mobility through the provision of internationally attractive education programmes".<sup>27</sup> The policy approaches finding expression in these statements appear to aim at turning the provision of ELTDPs into a regular institutional responsibility. The German seed-fund model, on the other hand, pursues a stimulation approach, in the hope that a spirit be created which will, in the medium and long run, make ELTDPs a "normal" feature of German higher education.

The responses were, however, helpful in widening the originally narrow concept of "support" and "funding" underlying the survey of national-level organisations. Respondents drew attention to the fact that other support initiatives, such as those aimed at international marketing, which are underway in a number of countries, indirectly support the creation of ELTDPs, because hardly any educational provision other than that taught in English can be marketed internationally.

## 6.6 Accreditation and Quality Assurance

Quality assurance (QA) and accreditation are fast becoming regular features in European higher education. But has this trend also reached the particular area of ELTDPs? And, if so, have special methodologies and tools been developed for programmes taught in English, or are ELTDPs subject to the "ordinary" QA and accreditation measures in place in European countries?

Accreditation is (or is to become) standard practice almost everywhere in Europe, according to the findings of the Programme Survey. More than three quarters of all Programme Coordinators report that their ELTDPs have been accredited or will soon undergo an accreditation process. In 57 percent of all cases, the accreditation (to be) obtained is exclusively national. 13 percent are or will be accredited by both national and foreign accreditation bodies,

---

<sup>26</sup> Letter from Mr. Kees Kouwenaar/NUFFIC.

<sup>27</sup> Letter from Ms. Margareta Sandewall/International Programme Office.

and nine percent by foreign bodies only (cf. Table 6.9). Although accreditation remains a national stronghold, there is thus a sizeable minority of ELTDPs which receive accreditation from abroad (22%). The authors do not avail of comparative figures for programmes taught in the domestic language, but the percentage appears to be rather high and could be indicative of the fact that providers of “international” programmes such as ELTDPs find it more natural to seek foreign accreditation than those delivering a “traditional” programme. The country comparison, however, displays considerable differences. Foreign accreditation is very common in the Netherlands (47%), where the creation of a proper national accreditation agency is still under way, whereas Germany, Denmark, and most other EU and EFTA countries seek accreditation predominantly at the national level.

Generally, some care is advisable when interpreting the responses to the Programme Survey, with respect to both accreditation and quality assurance. Both practices are quite recent in many European Countries, and many non-specialists find it difficult to understand the exact difference between QA and accreditation, as well as between the different modes of quality assurance and evaluation.

As is the case with accreditation, quality assurance and evaluation appears by now to be (or to become) a regular feature of ELTDPs, according to the Programme Survey. Internal forms of evaluation, i.e. such carried out by staff and teachers of the own institution, are more common than external ones. 31 percent of programmes report evaluations carried out exclusively by internal experts. In almost as large a number of cases (31%), mixed teams of internal and external experts carry out the evaluation. The exclusive use of external experts is, by contrast, rather rare (12%).

Evaluation is most common in the Netherlands (91%), Denmark (87%) and most CEE countries (86%). France (54%) and Germany (65%) report a comparably low evaluation culture. The use of external evaluation experts is more or less standard practice in the Netherlands (58%) and in some of the CEE countries (56%), but it plays only a marginal role in Poland (23%) and in Germany (29%).

At a first glance, the information collected during the site visits diverges considerably from the above picture of a thriving quality assurance culture. “Regular evaluations” carried out by “experts” were rather rare. Most programmes asked students, at the end of each year, to give their opinion on the (academic and administrative) quality of single courses or the whole ELTDP. However, these quality control measures were mostly of a rather “home-made” sort, and lacked (but did also not aspire to) the methodological rigour as well as the scale of an exercise meriting the label “evaluation”. In some cases, though, institutions offering a wide range of such programmes (such as the University of Leuven), carried out an institution-wide evaluation of all their ELTDPs when a critical mass had been reached, in order to de-

cide about which to continue, and to develop an institution-wide ELTDP policy. However, the divergence between the results of the Programme Survey and the site visits can possibly be explained by the fact that in the survey, institutions were asked about current practice *as well as plans for the near future*. It might well be that many of the positive answers in the survey concern plans and intentions rather than the present state of affairs.

In the Programme Survey, ELTDP coordinators were asked if they used any further measures linked in one way or another to quality assurance practice. Respondents stated that in

- 85 percent of all cases students regularly assessed the performance of teachers;
- 57 percent of all cases alumni networks had been established;
- 50 percent of all cases follow-up surveys to measure the success of graduates on the labour market were being conducted;
- 13 percent of all cases teachers' mastery of English was tested, and
- 7 percent of all cases other means were applied.

Again, these results would have to be viewed as a surprise if they were to describe present practice only, and not also intentions for the near future. For if respondents really meant to express that in 85 percent of cases each individual teacher's performance is already today assessed by students, Europe would have reached a US-level of student-based assessment. The percentage of ELTDPs which track their graduates through the labour market is also astonishingly high, especially given the very young age of most ELTDPs, and can therefore again only be explained by intentions rather than present reality. The same goes for alumni work at the level of the single ELTDP, where many Programme Coordinators interviewed during the site visits stated that there were no resources to carry out such work for the time being and the utmost to be achieved today was to keep up informal contact with some graduates. Even the low percentage of ELTDPs which, according to the survey, tested the English-language abilities of its teachers appears high against the experience of the visits, and might concern once again the future rather than the present.

The above results of the Programme Survey and the site visits shed some light on the question to which extent and in which way ELTDPs are subject to procedures of accreditation and quality assurance. But they do not tell us anything about whether or not the accreditation and QA measures are particularly geared to the specific type of programme, i.e. to ELTDPs. This latter issue was pursued in a separate survey, which addressed accreditation and QA agencies in countries with a high proportion of ELTDPs (Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden). In a written survey, the respective agencies were asked:

**Table 6.9**  
**Means of Accreditation and Quality Assurance Applied – by Country**  
 (percentages, multiple responses possible)

	Country of institution							Total	
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
The programme has been/will be accredited by a national accreditation body	75	74	69	68	60	68	58	94	70
The programme has been/will be accredited by a foreign accreditation body	11	24	19	18	47	27	26	17	22
The programme is/will be regularly evaluated by internal experts of the institution	54	74	47	39	82	68	67	69	61
The programme is/will be regularly evaluated by external experts	29	45	50	50	58	23	44	56	43
Teachers on this programme have to provide evidence of their English language proficiency	9	5	25	29	13	18	9	8	13
The performance of teachers is/will be regularly evaluated by the students	82	92	95	75	91	82	87	69	85
Follow-up of graduates has been/will be undertaken in order to measure the success of graduates on the labour market	43	53	69	68	47	68	45	28	50
A network of alumni has been/will be established	68	63	48	57	64	68	54	25	57
Others	12	0	6	4	4	9	5	8	7
Total	383	429	428	407	467	432	395	375	408
Count (n)	(119)	(38)	(64)	(28)	(45)	(22)	(93)	(36)	(445)

Source: Degree Programme Questionnaire.

Question 3.3 Which of the following means of accreditation and quality assurance are applied or will be applied to the Degree Programme (multiple reply possible)?

- (a) if there were QA and/or accreditation procedures in place “specifically devoted to higher education programmes taught in English or another foreign language”, and
- (b) if the above was not be the case, whether the “standard” accreditation and QA procedures in place reflected, at least partly, the specificities of these programmes.

The result of this survey is fairly straightforward. Of those responding (about 60 percent, but at least one from each country), no one reported any ELTDP-specific accreditation procedures. ELTDPs are measured against the same standards as “traditional” programmes.

At the same time, there appears to be a growing tendency to integrate “international” items into standard accreditation guidelines, especially in Germany and the Netherlands. Amongst these standards, foreign languages in general and English in particular play a prominent role. This tendency is especially visible with regard to programmes which, in terms of the content taught or the employment of graduates, are in one sense or another internationally oriented (comparative studies, European Studies, MBAs, and the like). But “international” requirements are also not totally absent from demands on programmes without an explicit international orientation.

Germany’s *Akkreditierungsrat* (accreditation council), which sets general standards with which the different accreditation agencies operating in the country must comply, requires that “international” programmes seeking accreditation inform about the extent of courses taught in a foreign language, and the extent to which native speakers and foreign teachers are part of the team delivering a programme. The guidelines of the individual accreditation agencies operating under the *Akkreditierungsrat* reflect this requirement.

FIBAA, an international accreditation agency<sup>28</sup> specialised in the field of business studies (MBA), expects that the MBA Programmes it is to accredit will admit only students with a high proficiency in English (550 TOEFL points) and that part of the programme will be taught in English. Obviously, MBA graduates are expected to work in a highly international environment, which explains these rather advanced demands.

The Dutch HBO Raad, which is in charge of accreditation (or an accreditation-like practice) for the *hogescholen* (non-university) sector in the Netherlands, likewise requires in its guidelines for peer reviews that graduates of any programmes taught in the Netherlands should acquire an intercultural competence and should be prepared for an international labour market.<sup>29</sup>

The situation in the field of evaluation does not differ very much from that in accreditation. There does not seem to be, in any European Country, a separate procedure for the regular evaluation of programmes taught in English. However, there have been cases of one-off evaluations, usually carried out to assess the experiences gained in a set-up phase of such programmes at national level.

In 1999, the Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council (FINNHEC) published the results of an evaluation of 15 ELTDPs offered by polytechnics, and one provided by a university. This evaluation had been agreed between FINNHEC and the Ministry of Education in response to the rapidly growing number of ELTDPs in the country. According to the publication, “the purpose

---

28 though mainly operating in German-speaking countries

29 cf. HBO-Raad, *Het Basisbeoordelingskader dat door de HBO-Raad wordt gebruikt voor het Visitatiestelsel in het Hoger Beroepsonderwijs*, Den Haag 2001.

of the evaluation is to analyse the value of the programmes taught through foreign languages, their advantages and disadvantages, and their strengths and weaknesses in the Finnish institutions of higher education. The basic aim is to improve the quality of such programmes".<sup>30</sup> However, the evaluation focuses almost exclusively on the role of the foreign language in the teaching and learning process, and related linguistic and intercultural concerns. While coming to the conclusion that the programmes in question have been a success, the report displays an at times dramatic undercurrent of concern over the full mastery of the foreign language by students and teachers alike, and it demands that the foreign language should be more than a "tool", but rather an end in itself.

In 2000 and 2001, an evaluation of 20 programmes that had been funded under the *Auslandsorientierte Studiengänge* scheme in 1997 and 1998 was conducted on behalf of the DAAD and the German Rectors' Conference (HRK) by one of the country's evaluation agencies, ZEVA, and HIS, a higher education research institute.<sup>31</sup> Since the *Auslandsorientierte Studiengänge* funded the introduction of programmes defined as "international", not all of the 20 programmes included in the sample were ELTDPs in the strict sense. Moreover, the assessment focused not only on the success of the programmes, but also on that of the funding programme itself. Generally, the study concludes that the *Auslandsorientierte Studiengänge* are a success. But it also highlights areas of possible improvement. One such area is that of quality assurance itself: the study demands the introduction of regular quality assessments to assure a high level of teaching and learning. Other points concern the "international competence" of teachers (English-language proficiency, intercultural competence), targeted marketing and recruitment (to attract academically stronger students, and to create a better mix of foreign and domestic students), as well as the counselling and integration of foreign students.

A similar evaluation was carried out by the Dutch HBO-Raad in 2001, focusing on "international programmes and specialisations" at Bachelor level in Dutch *hogescholen*.<sup>32</sup> The evaluation report underscores the good quality of these international Bachelor programmes, but it also recommends improvements. These concern quality assurance itself, in that the general guidelines for peer reviews of hogescholen-delivered Bachelor programmes should be adapted to the particular needs of international programmes.

---

30 S. Tella et al., op.cit., p. 9.

31 DAAD (ed.), op.cit.

32 HBO-Raad (ed.), *Kwaliteitsborging van internationale opleidingen en internationale trajecten*, Den Haag 2001.

## 6.7 Academic Level of Students

Since they attract students from very different parts of the world, the homogeneity of learner groups in ELTDPs is much lower than of those in “traditional” programmes. This applies to a number of factors, such as language issues, which have been discussed above, and intercultural challenges. Another factor relevant in this respect is the heterogeneity of the “academic” (content) knowledge of students, which reflects the different educational backgrounds and pathways ELTDP students come from.

In which way does the heterogeneous content knowledge of ELTDP students affect the learning situation? According to the Institutional Survey, it poses a problem which should not be underestimated. Asked about the relative importance of nine problem areas, respondents to the Institutional Survey ranked the “large differences in the academic level and abilities of foreign students” as the second-most important challenge (30%), only surpassed by problems that foreign students have with the language of their host country (39%), and more severe than foreign students’ difficulties to master the English language (21%). ELTDP providers in Denmark (56%) and Germany (42%) encountered the highest degree of difficulties related to academic knowledge heterogeneity.

How do institutions tackle this problem? Admission policies would appear to be an obvious instrument of reducing the extent of diversity. According to the results of the Programme Survey, 44 percent of all ELTDPs require, on top of the “regular” admission conditions applying to all programmes and often regulated by law, admission examinations and tests (cf. Table 5.6 in chapter 5.3). This is the second most often used admission requirement, after the TOEFL Test (66%). Such tests are most frequently applied for admission to Bachelor-level ELTDPs (58%), which is understandable given the fact that applicants for a first-cycle programme cannot be judged on the basis of an earlier higher education degree.

The results of the site visits substantiate the survey findings, and provide a number of facts which help to explain them. ELTDP coordinators who had originally relied on school leaving certificates and other credentials very soon noticed that such official documentation is not sufficient to effectively measure an applicant’s real qualifications. Fraud, and forged documentation, is not rare in this field, as many ELTDP coordinators report. But even genuine documents provide, at best, only an indication of the applicant’s true knowledge and skills. As a result of unhappy experiences made, the vast majority of ELTDPs had, by the time of the visits, adopted one form or another of an entrance exam. In very many cases, teachers conducted written and oral examinations in the countries of origin of applicants, at least in the case of such countries where large quality differences inside the secondary school (or undergraduate) system or between that system and the one of the host country were expected (primarily China, India and other parts of Asia).

Although this practice is obviously resource and cost-intensive, interviewees generally agreed that the effort paid off. In most cases, the gap between the available number of ELTDP places and the demand for study in an ELTDP is so wide that rigorous selection does not endanger the necessary level of enrolment. Quite the contrary, the application of demanding standards guarantees not only that future students avail of the qualifications minimally necessary for success in an ELTDP, but also underpins the “only the best” recruitment approach often found with research-oriented institutions (but by no means only by them), which ultimately aim at attracting and keeping bright young researchers.

Another means of creating homogeneity, and assuring a high academic level of students is to cooperate with high-quality providers, i.e. with carefully selected academic partner institutions abroad. In these cases, the level of education provided is known at the receiving end. This approach, which is also applied frequently by institutions which paid the price for a less elective admission policy at an earlier stage, lends itself obviously only to Master-level programmes. There are also signs that international (American) tests such as the GRE or the GMAT are increasingly used, although they are often found to be culture-specific (US bias) and thus not ideally geared to the particular requirements of the host institutions and countries.

However, the site visits also revealed that difficulties arising from a different academic level of students do not in every single case result from the international composition of the learning group. In a number of highly specialised postgraduate programmes, heterogeneity is a “normal” feature. In these programmes, where undergraduate education is often not available, the students come from different academic disciplines, and are therefore better or worse prepared for the various components of the programme.

In a similar vein, it is not only the different level of academically relevant knowledge (and language skills) which makes the learning situation in an ELTDP classroom different from that in single-nationality ones. Many interviewees stressed the different age and experience of students as another important factor, as well as gender differences, and, of course, cultural orientations.

Overall, the institutions visited have, in the vast majority of cases, found ways to reduce heterogeneity and thus to form learner groups with similarly equipped students. At the same time, it must be stressed that it would be unrealistic to hope to achieve the same level of homogeneity that institutions are used to when teaching groups coming from one single education system. In this respect, as in many others (language, culture), universities and colleges entering into programmes taught in English must be aware that one cannot hope to attract the youth of the world and come out of this experience unchanged. ELTDPs ultimately require adaptation at the providing end, too.

## 6.8 Workload and Services

The common assumption is that ELTDPs are more resource and labour intensive than “normal” programmes, from a point of view of teaching, but also in terms of administrative support services. Is that so? And if so, do Europe’s universities and colleges make the extra resources available?

During the site visits to 11 higher education institutions, administrative staff and, above all, teachers, were asked whether they felt that teaching an internationally-composed student group in a foreign language required an extra effort, and if and how they and their departments were compensated for the extra work.

The vast majority of teachers insisted that there was this extra effort. Their students have enhanced needs, resulting in more frequent contact (outside teaching hours) than with “ordinary” students, they maintain. Preparation is more time-intensive. As quoted earlier, the act of teaching itself is more demanding (“conscious act”). There were only very few interviewees who found no difference to “normal” teaching. Mostly, these were representatives of highly specialised subject matter, in which domestic programmes did not exist, and where English was the exclusive language of communication anyway.

While demands therefore generally appear to be higher, teachers are not, in most cases, compensated for their extra work. Class sizes are not usually smaller than in domestic language programmes, and where this is the case, it is not always the result of a conscious compensation policy, but sometimes simply due to lower-than-aimed-for student numbers. Reductions in teaching loads are occasionally to be found, but they are far from being the rule. Salary top-ups are rare exceptions, although they do exist. Additional funds for the department as a whole (mostly for material expenses) are also very rare. One exception to this rule was found, though. Turku Polytechnic does, in most cases, compensate teachers with fewer teaching hours, and (modest) salary top-ups. Sometimes class sizes are smaller, too. In the majority of institutions where such compensation is not available, there are occasional complaints from teachers, who feel that it is them who are paying the price for an otherwise very welcome curricular innovation.

Next to teaching, what are the additional demands on the administrative side? According to the Institutional Survey, these demands, or anyway the services put up to meet them, are not at all negligible. Foreign students attending ELTDPs are being provided with assistance, guidance and advice in various respects. Moreover, ELTDP students are more often provided with such services than “ordinary” foreign students. According to the Institutional Survey,

- 90 percent of institutions provide substantial academic counselling;
- 82 percent assist in the provision of accommodation, or do provide accommodation;

- 78 percent give advice in personal matters;
- 70 percent support students to obtain a visa;
- 68 percent support students to obtain a residence permit;
- 61 percent offer services related to leisure and culture;
- 39 percent advise students on financial matters and
- 31 percent help their students to obtain work permits.

There are some national differences, as becomes obvious from a look at Table 6.10. Overall, German institutions claim to provide substantial support most often. The respective proportions are above average for every aspect addressed in this question of the survey. Support and advice in relating to financial matters and work permits are reported by German institutions more often than by their counterparts in any other country. The Netherlands come second on the list of service providers. Dutch institutions most often stated support for obtaining visas, and they range above average in most other aspects, too. Poland finds itself at the other end of the table, with a low level of (reported) services. Especially regarding financial matters, work and residence permits, ELTDP students can apparently not expect any substantial support from their Polish host institutions. The service culture is also developed below average in Denmark, Finland and in CEE countries.

As indicated above, ELTDP students also enjoy better services than other foreign students, although the difference is not huge. Institutions appear to regard ELTDPs as a special offer, where enhanced efforts are required and justified. This applies to every single aspect of the survey. It is most marked with regard to academic counselling and advice (90% of ELTDP students, but only 78% of foreign students in general) financial matters (38%:27%), the provision of accommodation (82%:72%) and support to obtain a visa (68%:59%). Exceptions with regard to individual aspects exist in Denmark, where “ordinary” foreign students seem to get a better service with regard to personal matters, and in Poland, where it seems to be harder for ELTDP students to receive support to obtain a visa or a work permit than for foreign students in general.

As Table 6.11 shows, the difference in support levels provided to foreign students in general and to ELTDP students is larger in small institutions than in large universities. This could be explained by the fact that a critical mass of students is necessary for an institution to create or strengthen the units which provide these special services.

The site visits showed that ELTDP students frequently also receive a more methodical introduction into study and life at their institution than their domestic counterparts. Induction weeks and student “mentors” or “advisors” to guide them through the first phase of their studies are not at all rare.

**Table 6.10**  
**Proportion of Institutions Providing Substantial Assistance/Guidance/Advice to Foreign Students Enrolled in ELTDPs and to Foreign Students in General – by Country (percentages\*)**

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
<b>Academic advice and counselling</b>									
ELTDP students	97	100	88	80	88	87	86	90	90
Students in general	73	100	82	60	75	80	86	70	78
Difference	24	0	6	20	5	7	0	20	12
<b>Help and advice in personal matters</b>									
ELTDP students	86	70	62	75	88	71	89	50	77
Students in general	71	80	59	69	75	64	86	45	70
Difference	15	-10	3	6	13	7	3	5	7
<b>Offer of social/leisure activities</b>									
ELTDP students	75	30	53	40	50	50	75	45	61
Students in general	62	40	56	40	44	43	70	45	56
Difference	13	-10	-3	0	6	7	5	0	5
<b>Provision of accommodation</b>									
ELTDP students	86	60	74	88	75	86	89	75	82
Students in general	56	70	76	81	63	71	89	80	72
Difference	30	-10	-2	7	12	15	0	-5	10
<b>Support and advice in financial matters</b>									
ELTDP students	55	30	21	40	38	7	40	30	38
Students in general	31	40	12	27	31	7	33	25	27
Difference	24	-10	9	13	7	0	7	5	11
<b>Support to obtain visas</b>									
ELTDP students	78	60	47	69	81	50	72	70	68
Students in general	53	60	47	63	81	57	70	55	59
Difference	25	0	0	6	0	-7	2	15	9
<b>Support to obtain residence permits</b>									
ELTDP students	77	50	47	93	81	36	67	70	67
Students in general	63	50	44	93	81	29	65	60	61
Difference	14	0	3	0	0	7	2	10	6
<b>Support to obtain work permits</b>									
ELTDP students	42	20	24	31	38	0	34	15	30
Students in general	34	20	15	23	31	8	32	20	26
Difference	8	0	9	8	7	-8	2	-5	4
Count (n)	(64)	(10)	(34)	(16)	(16)	(15)	(44)	(20)	(219)

Question 5.1: To what extent does your institution provide assistance/guidance/advice to foreign students in general and to foreign students enrolled in English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes in particular?

\* Points 1 and 2 on a scale from 1 = "very substantial" to 5 = "not at all".

**Table 6.11**  
**Proportion of Institutions Providing Substantial Assistance/Guidance/Advice to Foreign Students Enrolled in ELTDPs and to Foreign Students in General – by Size of Institution (percentages\*)**

	Overall number of students						Total
	Up to 500	501 - 1,000	1,001 - 2,500	2,501 - 5,000	5,001 - 10,000	10,001 and more	
<b>Academic advice and counselling</b>							
ELTDP students	91	100	97	86	86	92	90
Students in general	91	100	87	77	72	75	78
Difference	0	0	10	9	14	17	12
<b>Help and advice in personal matters</b>							
ELTDP students	64	100	87	74	72	80	78
Students in general	73	100	77	67	60	73	71
Difference	-9	0	10	7	12	7	7
<b>Offer of social/leisure activities</b>							
ELTDP students	36	45	63	65	47	73	61
Students in general	36	55	57	53	40	71	56
Difference	0	-10	6	12	7	2	5
<b>Provision of accommodation</b>							
ELTDP students	91	73	77	86	67	90	82
Students in general	91	73	77	79	53	73	72
Difference	0	0	0	7	14	17	10
<b>Support and advice in financial matters</b>							
ELTDP students	44	36	47	35	40	37	39
Students in general	44	27	30	26	30	23	27
Difference	0	9	17	9	10	14	12
<b>Support to obtain visas</b>							
ELTDP students	100	64	74	67	60	73	70
Students in general	100	55	68	67	49	56	61
Difference	0	9	6	0	11	17	9
<b>Support to obtain residence permits</b>							
ELTDP students	91	64	77	63	60	69	68
Students in general	91	55	67	63	53	59	61
Difference	0	9	10	0	7	10	7
<b>Support to obtain work permits</b>							
ELTDP students	70	20	45	21	28	29	31
Students in general	70	20	34	19	19	27	26
Difference	0	0	11	2	9	2	5
Count (n)	(11)	(11)	(31)	(43)	(43)	(72)	(211)

Question 5.1: To what extent does your institution provide assistance/guidance/advice to foreign students in general and to foreign students enrolled in English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes in particular?

\* Points 1 and 2 on a scale from 1 = "very substantial" to 5 = "not at all".

The results of the site visits suggest that most of the above services are being provided by specialist central units, such as typically the international relations office. It certainly makes much sense to centralise particular administrative support tasks in this way. For a number of the services in question, a specific expertise must be created (visas, residence and work permits), and it is not cost-effective to decentralise such services. There have been however, also indications that these special units often have to compensate for the lack of delivery of other administration units (admission, student services). These further units often justify such “delegation tactics” with the argument that they are not linguistically and culturally able to deal with foreign ELTDP students. The latter trend is to be discouraged, to say the least. It prevents institutional change by defining ELTDPs as an exotic phenomenon, and declaring it to be the responsibility of non-traditional service providers. If an institution decides to enter into ELTDP provision on a sizeable scale, it must recognise that the task description of all of its constituent parts and members will undergo a transformation, which necessitates a learning process and the acquisition of new skills.

It must also be stressed that specialised units, such as international relations offices, need to be resourced for their extra service tasks on a sustainable basis. In no few cases, especially in countries with incentive funding schemes, such as Germany, institutions have created extra positions with the help of external seed funding, which will cease to flow after the start-up years. The institutions themselves must then shoulder this responsibility using their own resources, if they take their ELTDP engagement seriously.

## **6.9 Spin-Offs and Outcomes**

Which wider effect has the introduction of teaching in English on a higher education institution, on its different units, and on teachers and students? Are there any spin-offs, be they of an expected or unexpected sort? Both the Institutional and the Programme Survey addressed this question.

In the Programme Survey, ELTDP coordinators were required to state, in an open form, the “most important successes and outcomes” of ELTDPs. In their answers, most respondents refer to outcomes and impacts for the institution or its constituent units. Somewhat less often, coordinators mention student-related outcomes. The smallest number of responses highlighted outcomes and impacts for teachers.

At the level of the institution and its faculties and departments, answers concern predominantly the supportive function of ELTDPs for the overall process of internationalisation, the increased influx of foreign students and teachers, and a strengthening of collaborative links with other institutions at home or abroad. Many coordinators also perceive a contribution of ELTDPs to the profile building of the institution as a whole. A small number of coordinators report that a positive experience has led to the development and introduction of new ELTDPs.

Concerning students, the most important impact is the development of disciplinary, personal and social skills, which coordinators expect to enhance students' employment and career prospects. A few coordinators also consider a low drop-out rate as a success. For teachers, enhanced opportunities for professional development are often named, alongside the improvement of social and foreign language skills.

The Institutional Survey addressed the issue of spin-off effects which the introduction of ELTDPs might have occasioned. The most important effects identified this way are provided below, in the order of priority.

- increase in marketing activities (59 percent);
- improvement of services for foreign students, i.e. assistance, advice, guidance (52 percent);
- introduction of a credit system (51 percent);
- targeted recruitment of students (44 percent);
- increased flexibility in the admission of foreign students (39 percent);
- increased offer of English-Language training (36 percent);
- other spin-offs (6 percent).

**Table 6.12**  
**Spin-offs Resulting from the Implementation and Running of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes – by Country**  
 (percentages, multiple reply possible)

	Country of institution								Total
	DE	DK	FI	FR	NL	PL	Other EU and EFTA	Other CEE	
Increase of offers for English language training at the institution	32	27	47	28	38	44	24	57	36
More flexibility in the admission of foreign students	43	36	38	11	38	56	33	62	39
Increase of marketing activities of the institution	74	45	59	44	50	69	47	57	59
Implementation of a credit system (e.g. ECTS)	49	64	47	39	69	56	49	52	51
Improvement of assistance/guidance/advice for foreign students	59	55	59	39	44	56	41	52	52
More targeted recruitment of students	41	45	38	56	50	44	39	57	44
Other	12	9	6	6	6	13	0	0	6
Not ticked	6	18	18	17	13	13	20	14	14
Total	315	300	312	239	306	350	253	352	300
Count (n)	(68)	(11)	(34)	(18)	(16)	(16)	(49)	(21)	(233)

Question 6.2: Are there any spin-offs resulting from the implementation and running of English-Language-Taught Degree Programme(s)?

Since marketing (top rank) and recruitment (rank n° 3) are intricately related, it appears that ELTDPs have started to change European universities and colleges particularly regarding the importance they attach to their image vis-à-vis the (student) clientele.

Below the level of the overall (across all countries) result, there are some remarkable differences between countries (see Table 6.12). German institutions put the stress on marketing (74%) and the improvement of services (59%). Denmark gives top priority to the introduction of a credit system (64%), followed by the improvement of services (55%). The latter tops the list of spin-offs in Finland, together with marketing (59% each). In France, recruitment leads the table (56%), while the Netherlands' perceive the introduction of a credit system as the most important side effect (69%). Polish institutions view a progress in marketing as the most important spin-off (69%).

**Table 6.13**  
**Spin-offs Resulting from the Implementation and Running of English-Language-Taught Degree Programmes – by Type of Institution**  
 (percentages, multiple reply possible)

	Typ of institution		Total
	University	Non-university	
Increase of offers for English language training at the institution	37	34	36
More flexibility in the admission of foreign students	41	37	39
Increase of marketing activities of the institution	60	58	59
Implementation of a credit system (e.g. ECTS)	47	56	51
Improvement of assistance/guidance/advice for foreign students	51	53	52
More targeted recruitment of students	44	43	44
Other	5	8	6
Not ticked	15	12	14
Total	299	301	300
Count (n)	(134)	(99)	(233)

Question 6.2: Are there any spin-offs resulting from the implementation and running of English-Language-Taught Degree Programme(s)?

By and large, higher education institutions from CEE countries report more often ELTDP spin-off effects than institutions from EU and EFTA Countries. The difference is largest regarding an increase of flexibility in the admission of foreign students (59% compared to 36%) and an increase in the provision of English language training (51% compared to 33%). It is possible that these are areas where universities in CEE countries had particular deficiencies and needs.

Spin-offs do not, according to respondents, differ much between universities and non-university institutions (cf. Table 6.13). The introduction of a credit

system is, however, more frequently stressed by college-sector institutions (56% compared to 47%).

Surprisingly, neither the number of ELTDPs nor the size of its population of ELTDP students seems to have a systematic impact on the frequency in which spin-offs emerge.



## 7 Conclusions and Recommendations

The study that led to the following conclusions and recommendations explores the phenomenon of ELTDPs in Europe. This is why the recommendations below focus exclusively on this form of tuition.

In order to avoid any misunderstanding, the authors want to stress that they are not suggesting that ELTDPs are the only means of internationalisation and innovation. ELTDPs are one element of a large arsenal of internationalisation and innovation measures, which can and should exist side by side. Teaching in the domestic language will of course always form the bulk of higher education offerings in Europe. It would be a grave misunderstanding if the authors were seen to advocate the reduction of the variety of linguistic and cultural approaches existing in European higher education today.

### ***Europe Needs More ELTDPs***

The offer of ELTDPs in European higher education is marginal. The present level of provision is sadly insufficient, even among countries with a relatively high number of ELTDPs.

- The present level of provision constitutes no adequate response to the rapidly increasing demand for education on an emerging world market, with around two million “international students” already today. If Europe does not step up its supply of ELTDPs considerably, it will miss a crucial market opportunity.
- Present provision levels are no adequate response to the future needs of European societies and economies either. In order to secure prosperity and social stability, Europe must engage in a “brain gain” attempt. The ageing of European societies is only one – negative – reason for this. Already today, many of the best young brains opt for Europe’s competitors rather than our continent.
- ELTDPs are also an important instrument for preparing domestic students for a global labour market. The low provision of ELTDPs across Europe, and especially in the south, does not make European students competitive on the international market for highly qualified specialists.

Governments in Europe with a responsibility for higher education – at national, regional and supranational level – need to put in place active policies encouraging the supply of high-quality education taught in English. This applies to all parts of Europe, but particularly to Southern European Countries, where ELTDPs are largely absent.

Implementation policies can and will differ according to national settings, ranging from separate seed-fund incentive programmes to the inclusion of ELTDP provision in the lump-sum funding of higher education institutions.

Given the (desirable) trend towards greater institutional autonomy, the latter approach could be more promising in the long run.

### ***Institutions Need More ELTDPs***

For higher education institutions, there are many good reasons to engage in ELTDPs. They are a means to secure the research base of a university. They help to sharpen the profile of institutions, particularly those which find themselves in a “peripheral situation” (in linguistic, geographical or other sense) with a competitive disadvantage. They can also be a “defensive” instrument to sustain an institution’s continued existence in the light of demographic downturns and fluctuations in domestic demand.

More importantly, however, this study has shown that there is a strong link between the supply of ELTDPs and other forms of innovation in higher education. ELTDPs therefore have the potential to force universities and colleges to constantly develop themselves further and to function as a catalyst of change.

- They build on a strong commitment in other areas of internationalisation, and they reinforce this commitment.
- They can and should be introduced alongside other educational innovations, such as new degree structures (Bachelor/Master), credit systems, and quality assurance measures.
- They have the potential to increase an institution’s range and quality of services, and its service-mindedness, through the heightened demands of discerning customers.
- They have the potential to increase the quality of teaching, by forcing teachers to improve their English-language skills, and to diversify their teaching styles (intercultural competence).
- They will, in the medium and long run, influence the current debate on the introduction of tuition fees in many European countries.

### ***Institutions Need a Strategic Approach to ELTDPs***

This study has shown that most ELTDPs come into being as grass-roots creations. The academic base will always have a strong role to play in the development, introduction and delivery of this sort of education. At the same time, and at the latest when a critical mass of ELTDPs has emerged in a university or college, higher education institutions need to develop an institution-wide policy, and a strategy to implement it. This is also important in view of the fact that many ELTDPs enroll very few students only, and are therefore barely sustainable. An institutional policy on ELTDPs should address the following issues:

- An analysis of the market/demand for the various offers they (intend to) provide;

- An analysis of their particular strengths on this market, and of their weaknesses;
- A definition of success indicators, and a regular monitoring of performance measured against these indicators;
- The preparedness to close down programmes which are not successful/ do not meet with a demand.
- The preparedness to “push” faculties and departments with a high demand potential but no ELTDPs into creating such offers.

An institutional steering policy must go hand in hand with the allocation of realistic staff and material resources to those departments and faculties offering ELTDPs.

### ***ELTDPs Require Targeted Marketing***

Marketing of ELTDPs at European higher education institutions has reached a professional level in many respects. But the fact that many institutions are surprised (and disappointed) about the students they attract shows that marketing needs to become much more targeted than it is today. In order for this to happen, universities and colleges must first of all become aware and decide which student target audience they want to attract. This is not always the case today. Elements to be considered in this process are:

- Is the aim to attract the largest number of students possible, or does the institution want to apply a selective approach, going for the best candidates only (quantity or quality)? We would strongly advise to aim at quality, but this is ultimately a strategic decision an institution has to take itself.
- Does the institution want to attract foreign students only, or does it also/ mainly try to reach domestic students? If the latter is the case, what does it regard as an ideal “mix”?
- From which parts/countries of the world does the institution want to attract students? From Europe, from Asia, from the Americas, from Africa, or from all over the world, and in which proportions?

### ***ELTDPs Should Target the Best Students Possible***

It is ultimately up to each institution to decide if they want to attract quality or quantity. However, given that there appears to be no scarcity of student applicants, we would strongly advise a quality approach. The American example shows clearly that a quality approach need not be prohibitive in terms of application numbers, and can even increase demand.

On the positive side, a selective admissions policy will help to

- Raise the profile of European higher education as a top-quality provider;

- Attract into Europe highly-skilled human resources badly needed and often not available on the domestic labour market;
- Secure the research base of universities, by attracting future Ph.D. candidates and young scientists, who are already becoming a scarce commodity in Europe (at any rate in some subject areas, such as the natural sciences).

### ***ELTDPs Should Select Their Students Carefully, Supported by Standardised Admission Instruments (which Need to be Developed)***

To want to attract the best students possible is one thing, to be able to identify and select them is another one. Selection and admission procedures are not yet in a state of development guaranteeing the attainment of this goal. Admission on the basis of educational credentials is often a gamble. Next to forged documents, the problem is the heterogeneity in quality in many countries. TOEFL and similar tests alone cannot guarantee that students avail of the necessary mastery of English in every respect. Institutions should therefore, with a view both to English-language proficiency and content knowledge:

- Organise examinations and interviews with promising candidates in their country of origin, after drawing up a shortlist based on paper credentials. This is a considerable extra initial effort, but it pays off in the long run.
- Cooperate (in the postgraduate segment) with a set of preferred and established academic institutions in the source countries, with which they have regular contacts.

Additionally, we strongly advise to explore the feasibility of two measures at national/European level, i.e.

- The creation or further development of national expert centres for foreign credentials (inclusive of their genuineness), as they already exist, for example, in the Netherlands. It makes sense to pool expertise in this highly specialised field, in order to create economies of scale for everyone involved.
- The development of a standardised European aptitude test (probably in separate versions for different subject groups), along the lines of the American GMAT or GRE tests, but geared to the particular quality requirements of European higher education institutions.

### ***ELTDPs Should only be Taught by Teachers with an Advanced Knowledge of English***

In most cases, the English proficiency of teaching staff in Europe seems high enough to deliver quality education. But there are exceptions, which regularly lead to complaints. Institutions should make sure that anyone teaching on an

ELTDP has an advanced knowledge of English, by means of the following measures:

- Institutions should test the English skills of staff teaching on ELTDPs.
- Institutions should develop and offer to teachers upgrading courses specifically designed for the particular task of *teaching* in English.
- These courses should be made obligatory for teaching staff with deficits.
- Every teacher on an ELTDP should have taken part in an introduction into intercultural communication.
- When recruiting new academic staff, institutions should hire only candidates with a good command of English.
- Visiting lecturers from English-speaking countries can be used to reinforce the teaching base of ELTDP-providing institutions. However, they should complement, but in no case form the major part of the teaching body, in order to secure continuity.

### ***ELTDPs Require Service-Minded Institutions***

The demands of a multi-lingual and multi-cultural classroom are difficult enough to meet. But demands go beyond the narrow confines of the classroom. Foreign students – not only those on ELTDPs – need a wider range of services, and different ones, than their domestic counterparts.

- Administrative service units must be able to communicate in English. Basic information and documentation of a written sort must be available in English, too.
- On-arrival pre-study “induction courses”, providing a basic introduction to the institution, should become the rule.
- An introduction into “studying in ....” must be a mandatory part of the programme.
- English language training must be made available and places be reserved for ELTDP students. The same goes for courses in the domestic language, in which students tend to often have considerable difficulties. Such courses are essential for an integration of students into the life of the host country and its culture.
- Each foreign ELTDP student should be allocated an “academic study advisor” from among the teaching staff.

### ***ELTDPs Require a Realistic Curriculum Planning***

ELTDPs place heavy demands on foreign students. They need not only accommodate to a radically different cultural environment and learn in a

foreign language. They also have to acquire, in a very short time, a basic grasp of the language of the host country. This, and not only this, requires that curricula cannot be simply the same as in “standard” programmes. The additional workload, “informal” for the adaptation process, and “formal” for additional introduction and language courses, need to be taken into consideration. New and realistic curricula must be designed. The use of a credit system, to measure student workload, is helpful in this regard, if not indispensable.

### ***ELTDPs Have Special Quality Assurance Needs***

In many respects, quality education in ELTDPs does not differ from that in “traditional” programmes. In some, however, it does. For this reason, we would not suggest the creation of altogether separate quality assurance and accreditation procedures for ELTDPs. However, the specificities of ELTDPs should be reflected in quality criteria for the wider field of “international programmes”, which quality and accreditation procedures in some countries contain already. Specific points to be covered are:

- Targeted marketing;
- Admission of students (language and content knowledge);
- Availability of and access to English and domestic language courses for students;
- Testing of English-language knowledge of teachers / availability of courses on “teaching multinational student groups in English”;
- Availability of academic and practical support services for students (tutoring, academic counseling, support in practical matters, such as housing, residence permits, and psychological help if needed) and the guarantee to be able to communicate with any part of the administration and support services in English.

### ***ELTDPs Require Extra Resources – and Institutions Willing and Able to Change***

Institutions must know that ELTDPs cannot be had on the cheap. They require more resources than “traditional” programmes. The teaching process itself is very demanding. Tutoring of students takes extra time. An extra effort is necessary regarding student testing and selection. Support services are required at a level above that for domestic students. Marketing is a necessity, not a luxury. Alumni work is to be recommended.

Next to these workload-related aspects, ELTDPs require an attitudinal change of institutions. It is simply not possible to invite the youth of the world, and to come out of this process unchanged.

Institutions offering ELTDPs must make sure that the necessary extra resources are being provided, without which quality programmes cannot be delivered. They must sensitise every member of the institution that it is not only the foreign students who need to change, but that they need to adapt to a new clientele and situation, too.



## **ANNEXES**

## **Annex 1**

### **Institutions Visited and Persons Interviewed**

---

#### **Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium**

- Ms. **Ann Carbonez**, Lecturer, Interfaculty Centre for Statistics
- Professor Dr. **Luc Delbeke**, Head, International Relations Office
- Professor Dr. **Frank Delmartino**, Institute for International and European policy, Department of Political Science
- Professor Dr. **Jacques Haers**, S.J., Centre for Liberation Theologies, Theological Faculty
- Mr. **Piet Henderikx**, International Relations Office
- Professor **Guido Langouche**, Vice-Rector International Affairs
- Ms. **Hilde van Lindt**, Centre for Advanced Legal Studies, Faculty of Law
- Director, Centre for Advanced Legal Studies

#### **Zapadoceska Univerzita v Plzni, Czech Republic**

- Professor **Zdenek Ryjacek**, Pro-Rector International Affairs
- Dr. **Vlastimil Vacek**, Department of Mechanics
- Ms. **Monika Vecerova**, Head, International Office
- 2 students

#### **Syddansk Universitet, Odense, Denmark**

- Associate Professor **Richard Jones**, Department of Marketing, Chairman International Committee Faculty of Social Science
- Associate Professor Dr. **Jan Guldager Jørgensen**, Department of Economics
- Associate Professor Dr. **Lars Jørgensen**, Department for Organisation and Management
- Professor Dr. **Henrik Pedersen**, Dean, Faculty of Science and Engineering
- Ms. **Lisbeth Pinholt**, Director, International Relations Office
- Ms. **Lone Poulsen**, Secretary for International Studies, Faculty of Science and Engineering
- Ms. **Kristina Ringkjøbing**, Advisor International Students, Faculty of Social Sciences

- Associate Professor Dr. **Mikael Søndergaard**, Department of Organisation and Management
- Mr. **Frands Voss**, Director, Mads Clausen Institute
- Students from different countries, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Faculty of Social Science

### **Fachhochschule Aachen, Germany**

- Professor Dr. **Hermann Josef Buchkremer**, Rector
- Ms. **Britta Grünberg**, International Relations Office, Jülich Campus
- Mr. **Thomas Lex**, Head, International Relations Office
- Professor **Dr. Hans-Jürgen Raatschen**, Dean, Department of Electrical Engineering
- Mr. **Burkhard Müller**, Coordinator Bachelor Degrees, Jülich Campus
- Ms. **Ritzer**, International Relations Office, Jülich Campus
- Ms. **Kay Stone**, International Relations Office, Jülich Campus
- Professor Dr. **Ulrich Scherer**, MSc Nuclear Energy
- Professor Dr. **Schweger**, MSc Energy Systems
- Professor Dr. **Hans-Joachim Weber**, MSc Biomedical Engineering
- 5 students from different countries

### **Technische Universität Hamburg-Harburg, Germany**

- Professor Dr. **Wolfgang Bauhofer**, Vizepräsident Lehre
- Mr. **T. Blume**, Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter, Electrical Engineering
- Mr. **Matthias Buntenkötter**, Akademisches Auslandsamt
- Dr. **Dietmar Dunst**, Vorstandsbereich Lehre und Studium, Projektkoordinator
- Professor Dr. **Volker Kasche**, former Coordinator Process Engineering
- Professor Dr. **Uwe Neis**, Coordinator Environmental Engineering
- Professor Dr. **Karl Schulte**, Vorsitzender Ausschuss der Studiendekane für Master-Studiengänge
- Ms. **Angela Steffen**, Prüfungsamt
- Dr. **Elvira Wilberg**, Leiterin, Akademisches Auslandsamt
- 3 students

### **Vaasan Ammattikorkeakoulu (Vaasa Polytechnic), Finland**

- Mr. **Vesa-Matti Honkanen**, Senior Lecturer and Head of Programme Design in Built Environment
- Mr. **Hans Frantz**, Head of Programme Health Care and Social Services
- Ms. **Tuula Hietikko**, Lecturer, Department of International Business
- Mr. **Erkki Kokkonen**, Development Director, International Relations Office
- Ms. **Tuija Tammi**, International Coordinator, International Relations Office
- Dr. **Pasi Tuominen**, Head of Department, Information Technology
- 5 students

### **Turun Ammattikorkeakoulu (Turku Polytechnic), Finland**

- Professor Dr. **Raimo Hyvonen**, Vice-Rector International Affairs
- Ms. **Anniki Matikainen**, Head of Programme International Trade and Financing
- Ms. **Elina Nupponen**, Head of Programme International Business
- Ms. **Päivi Nygren**, Head of Programme Business Information Technology
- Ms. **Kirsti Virtanen**, Head International Relations Office
- Mr. **Foster Ofofu**, Lecturer, International Business Management
- Ms. **Ossi Vaananen**, Head of Programme Information Technology
- 8 students from different countries

### **Universitet I Oslo, Norway**

- Professor Dr. **Olav Bjerkholt**, Department of Economics, Faculty of Social Sciences
- Ms. **Denese Brittain**, Senior Executive Officer, Department of Special Needs Education, Faculty of Education
- Professor Dr. **Sigle Horn Fuglesang**, Centre for Medieval Studies, Faculty of Art
- Ms. **Melanie Etchell**, International Coordinator
- Ms. **Karen Crashaw Johansen**, International Coordinator
- Ms. **Eivind Killengreen**, Senior Executive Officer, Nordic Institute of Maritime Law
- Professor Dr. **Helge Kvanvig**, Faculty of Theology

- Professor Dr. **Peter Maassen**, Senior Researcher, Department of Education Research, Faculty of Education
- Ms. **Gøril Mellem**, Senior Executive Officer, Department of Education Research
- Ms. **Esther Mollen**, Senior Executive Officer, Department of Education Research
- Ms. **Hanne-Gerd Nielsen**, Senior Executive Officer, Academic Affairs Office
- Ms. **Miriam Segal**, Senior Executive Officer, Norwegian Institute of Human Rights, Faculty of Law
- Ms. **Miriam Skjørten**, Senior Lecturer, Department of Special needs Education, Faculty of Education
- Professor Dr. **Terje Spurkland**, Centre for Medieval Studies, Faculty of Arts
- Professor Dr. **Arild Tjeldvoll**, Department of Education Research
- Professor Dr. **Olav Torvund**, Norwegian Research Centre for Computers and Law
- Ms. **Hélène Ullerø**, Head, International Relations Office
- Ms. **Therese Uppstrøm**, Department of Education Research
- Ms. **Ann Sofie Winther**, Senior Executive Officer, Department of Media and Communication, Faculty of Arts
- 8 students from different countries

#### **Delft University of Technology, Netherlands**

- Dr. **Renate G. Klaasen**, Faculty of Technology
- Ms. **Annemarie Rima**, Head, International Relations Office
- Ms. **Marietta Y.M. Spiekerman-Middelplaats**, Senior Policy Officer Internationalisation
- Dr. **B.A. Reith**, Director of Education, Faculty of Aerospace Engineering
- 2 students

#### **Universiteit Twente, Enschede, Netherlands**

- Mr. **Frits Spoek**, Head, International Relations Office
- Ms. **Hanneke Teekens**, Senior Policy Advisor
- Ms. **Lies van de Veen**, Cartesius Institute
- Professor Dr. **Huib de Jong**, Member of the Board (Internationalisation)

### **Kungl Tekniska Högskolan, Stockholm, Sweden**

- Mr. **Hakan Bergdahl**, Administrator, Internetworking and System-on-Chips Design
- Professor Dr. **Helena Dubrova**, Head of Programme System-on-Chips Design
- Professor Dr. **Lennart Edsberg**, Head of Programme Scientific Computing
- Ms. **Christina Ek**, Administrator Environmental Engineering and Sustainable Development
- Ms. **Anita Elksne**, Administrator, Sustainable Energy Engineering
- Professor Dr. **Anders Flodström**, Rector
- Mr. **Anders Graad**, Lecturer MSc Land Management
- Professor Dr. **Jan Erik Gustafson**, Head of Programme Environmental Engineering and Sustainable Development
- Professor Dr. **Björn Pehrson**, Head of Programme Internetworking
- 4 students

## ***Annex 2***

### **Funding Organisations Surveyed**

#### *Belgium*

- Vlaamse Interuniversitaire Raad (VL.I.R.), Brussels
- Vlaamse Hogescholenraad (VLHORA), Brussels

#### *Denmark*

- Cirius Danmark, Copenhagen

#### *Finland*

- Centre for International Mobility (CIMO), Helsinki

#### *Germany*

- Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD), Bonn

#### *The Netherlands*

- The Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education (NUFFIC), Den Haag

#### *Norway*

- Centre for International University Cooperation of the Norwegian Council for Higher Education (SIU), Oslo

#### *Sweden*

- International Programme Office for Education and Training, Stockholm

## **Annex 3**

### **Accreditation and Quality Assurance Agencies Surveyed**

---

#### *Belgium*

- Vlaamse Interuniversitaire Raad (VL.I.R.), Brussels
- Vlaamse Hogescholenraad (VLHORA), Brussels

#### *Denmark*

- Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut, Copenhagen

#### *Finland*

- The Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council (FINHEEC), Helsinki

#### *Germany*

- Akkreditierungsrat, Bonn
- Geschäftsstelle Evaluation der Universitäten in NRW, Dortmund
- Geschäftsstelle Evaluation der Fachhochschulen in NRW, Gelsenkirchen
- Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (HRK)
- Stiftung Evaluationsagentur Baden-Württemberg (Evalag), Mannheim
- Zentrale Evaluations- und Akkreditierungsagentur (ZEVA), Hannover

#### *The Netherlands*

- Vereniging van Universiteiten (VSNU), Utrecht
- HBO-raad, Den Haag
- Inspectorate of Higher Education, Utrecht

#### *Norway*

- Network Norway Council, Oslo

#### *Sweden*

- Högskoleverket (HsV), Stockholm

#### *International*

- Foundation for International Business Administration Accreditation (FIBAA), Bonn

European higher education is increasingly confronted with competition on an emerging world market of higher education. At the same time, the need is apparent to add an international dimension to the education of domestic students. One obvious answer to this double challenge is the provision of programmes in taught English, the major world language of academe. Such programmes have in the recent past indeed been launched in many countries where English is not the domestic language. But little is known about them. Is there a sizeable provision at all? Which are the leading countries? In which subject areas are such programmes being offered, by which types of higher education institutions, and at which level – Bachelor or Master? Is there a real demand at all? Are there serious quality issues? This study answers these and related questions on “English-language-taught degree programmes” (ELTDPs) in Europe for the first time. It is based on two large-scale surveys of nearly 1,600 higher education institutions across Europe. The study also contains a set of recommendations for universities which intend to enter into the “ELTDP business”.

**ISBN 3-932306-47-3**