



# **Theo Toonen**

Conference Chairman

*University of Leiden*

*The Netherlands*



## Workshop 1: EU Legislation and student support

An overview of EU Legislation and case law on student support has been presented.

In its rulings the Court decides if restrictions are in accordance to EU law. The Court is not blind for the financial implications of its rulings for the member states.

ECJ has held that:

- EU citizenship is destined to be fundamental status of all nationals of member states
- The EU Treaty attributes certain rights to EU citizens, which are subject to limitations and conditions in the Directives.
- These limitations and conditions must be applied in accordance to the principle of proportionality



Who gets what (so far)?

- EU workers and their children (included ex-workers and self-employed) can claim tuition and maintenance support
- EU students can only claim tuition support

What can EU citizens claim?

- Not entirely clear (yet)



## **Workshop 2: Student support and portability for study abroad: practice and issues**

- Study in 24 EU-countries and Norway
- Student support systems can differ in the extend to which they are attractive: there are many differences between countries in eligibility, type of support and portability



- Generally speaking:
  - Countries that have limited access to grants and loans usually have relatively generous indirect support and/or low tuition fees
  - In most countries portability is impossible or restricted
  - Most countries have a system that accounts for the parents income
- Discussion based on presented research:
  - Both arguments for home based, host based and pan European student support systems have been reviewed
  - However in the long run a European solution is desired



## Workshop 3: portability of grants and loans

- There is a tension between portability of student support and host country elements that are introduced in EU-legislation by the ECJ
- This leads to double claims and financial risks
- The Swedes have a long standing tradition of portability of student support. However, they fear the rulings of the ECJ might affect this system
- The Dutch will not introduce further portability for the same reason
- Need for more communication → e.g. network of experts
- Need for coordination on EU-level
- ‘Home country’ principle preferred by member states
- Welcome to the commission proposal to install an expert group



## **Workshop 4: A typology of higher education institutions**

- What: to group HE institutions into recognisable categories according to their similarities and differences
- Why: diversity of institutions should be transparent for multiple purposes and actors (students, labour market, institutions, etc.)
- How: multiple dimensions and flexibility
- Prevent: simplifying, quality assessment, ranking, resource allocation

O N D E R  
N O S S I M  
L T U U R  
N E T E M  
S C H A P



EU  
2004



towards the european higher education area

bologna process

## Discussion issues

- Added value? → First a pilot
- Ranking inevitable? → Multiple dimensions
- Independence clearing house?
- Department level vs. institution level
- But initiative is essential!



## Workshop 5: Quality assurance & joint degrees

- Case study: EMLE (European Master in Law and Economics)  
Erasmus Mundus
- Programme:
  - 6 institutions in 6 different countries
  - 60 ECTS in 3 terms in 2 or 3 countries
  - Workload is standardised
  - 90+ % success rate
  - 41% non-EU students
  - 7000/8000 Euro tuition fee
  - Selection of students (1 out of 4)



## Quality control

- Internal: board meetings, teachers meetings, input students and alumni
- Internal benchmarking of grading etc, lots of statistics
- External examiners, joint examination boards
  
- External: NVAO and Akkreditierungsrat accreditation, international panel.

O N D E R  
N J S I M  
L T U U R  
N E T E M  
S C H A P



EU  
2004



towards the european higher education area  
bologna process

## Discussion issues and conclusion

- Triple degree instead of single joint degree
- Accreditation in the Netherlands and in Germany proved contradictory
- Conclusion:
  - standardize criteria or
  - recognize each others decisions
  - and “organize trust”



## General conclusions

1. Shared point of departure
2. Transparency
3. Student support



## General conclusions

- Mobility for the KBE
- Transparency:
  - External quality control
  - Mapping HE institutions



## General conclusions

- Student support:
  - Portability of loans important
  - European solution necessary
  - Present situation: risk of stagnation
  - Long-term strategy for short-term progress



# Panel and feedback