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Introduction:

ERASMUS (1987-1995)

Although the Rome Treaty set the principles and facilitates the 4 freedoms, the freedom of movement of goods, capital, persons and services, educational issues were never concretely and directly tackled.
Neither the Single European Act (1987) which reemphasized the «four freedoms», dedicated any article to educational issues (1).

Nevertheless, Rome Treaty had taken care of training aspects (art.128) as training facilitated employment and mobility of the labour force.

Therefore, and despite the lack of concrete and clear statement in Treaties or actions to the very important role of Education, in 1976, European Community within the European Policy set up the first action programme for education, the «joint study programmes» , in order to support co-operation between departments of H.E.I to create conditions for development of students mobility.
The experience gained from 10 years pilot operations and funding of the Joint Study Programmes, led E.U. to the decision to launch the ERASMUS programme in 1987 (2).
ERASMUS was based on article 128 of the Rome Treaty (1957) which essentially deals with vocational training.
However ERASMUS legal base was created though a number of case-laws of the European Court (Gravier, Blaizot, e.t.c.).

ERASMUS promoted significantly students mobility (3,4), especially in departments and Institutions where academics realized the importance of this E.U. launched programme.
Therefore, although there was not any systematic campaing open - minded individual academics with international orientation views pulled up all the ERASMUS workload, academically and administratively at the beginning.
It is the first time, that co-operation mainly based in individuals contacts affected a great deal the students, the departments, the Institutes although in an amateur way and with support, of low rate grants by E.U. and that is because ERASMUS was addressed not only to the mind of the persons involved but, also, to the heart of them, to their emotional commitment to Europeanization which was expressed through networking, development of belongingness to a broader academic environment, whose aim was to improve education and contribute to the strengthening of the E.U. (2.5).
ERAMUS therefore, brought an emotional evolution to students and to staff and through this promoted:
−language competencies
−developed a European understanding for students while experiencing studies in another educational environment
– developed an open-mind approach - preparing students for a without country boundaries employment attitude
– familiarization of cultural, political e.t.c. characteristics of social environments of members
– mutual trust, transparency in educational procedures, recognition of studies abroad, especially through ECTS, enrichment of staff knowledge in didactic and methodological issues
– development of competitive spirit in terms of qualifications, research involvement, qualitative teaching
– curricula integration through joint academic activities leading to the incorporation of studies abroad into the home curricula e.t.c.
– promotion of some quality issues in education (learning and teaching e.t.c.) through communication (6) an «all-round understanding» (7), a quality students experience in the various educational institutions (8).

Therefore, ERASMUS within the 7 years of its operation managed to change the European Educational chart, due mainly, to the active, open-minded, individual academics, while revealing that H.E.I. environments had to face a new reality which means new roles for H.E.I., new tasks for staff, new learning requirements e.t.c.

A growing, therefore, need for development of new H.E.I. management models appears. It is generally accepted, that ERASMUS implementation had a significant impact on H.E.I. Institute Management (4,9) as it boosted changes in:
– decision making process at national and Institutional level (decentralization of procedures e.t.c.)
– issue of new laws as a result of ERASMUS and ECTS gained experience, for introduction of transdisciplinary and transdepartmental courses based on credits
– development of new Administrative units within H.E.I. to deal with International - European Affair
– development of a new European - oriented educational policy for H.E.I. expressed through organization of European International Conferences, meetings, participation on networks (CRE, EURASHE, Liaison Committee, EAIE, EFQM) e.t.c. in conferences, workshops e.t.c. organized by Academic Units and Professional bodies, organization of training for staff, academic and development of special library for E.U. issues e.t.c.

However, ERASMUS programme bears a sufficient number of disadvantages such as:
– Insufficient incentive for development of formal entities
– Poorly and loose commitment recognition of studies abroad
– Lack for institutional / department European educational policy, strategy
– Lack of systematic communication channels between the actors involved (students, academics, administration, departments, top management)
– lack of institutionalized activities, and lack of national or institutional structure for facilitating the European activities
– lack of clear commitment from department, facility, even institute
– lack of skillful personnel to cope with the new requirements
– weak mechanism / regulation for balance in geographic - areas and subjects
– amateurism in processes, in management of European affairs.

The improvement to these disadvantages came through articles 126, 127 (Appendix I) of Maastricht Treaty.
According to article 126 of the Treaty: «E.U. shall contribute to the development of Quality Education by encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States
for the content of teaching and the organization of education systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity».
SOCRATES programme, therefore, was launched in order to facilitate E.U. targets concerning education.

**SOCRATES 1996 up to now**

SOCRATES programme based on articles 126 and 127 of Maastrich Treaty aims to help improve the quality and relevance of education for children, young people and adults, while seeking in providing European dimension in their studies, increasing opportunities for personal experience in other E.U. countries, developing stronger sense of sharing European identity and fostering the ability for their adaptation to the changes of the socio-economic environment (9).

Although both programmes common objective is the promotion of Euro-dimension in teaching and learning their specific objectives as they are presented in the Council’s Decisions, appear significant differences (Appendix II).

The key to SOCRATES programme is the institutionalization of the cooperation process of H.E.I.’s and the presentation of all the educational activities supported by the E.U. in one institutional contract (I.C.)

The European orientation of the H.E.I.’s in expressed in the European Policy Statement (E.P.S.) which is the essence of SOCRATES programme.

**European policy statement (E.P.S.)**
The E.P.S is a declaration which adds a new dimension to the overall Educational Policy of H.E.I.’s.
It is the first time after the realization that there is need for the European component to be included in H.E.I.’s life, that H.E.I.’s are called to make a concrete presentation of themselves and to declare their autonomous strategic plans concerning their future performance and their commitment to Europeanization, and a self identification, while the commitment to European dimension, declared in EPS are a great deal of responsibility for H.E.I.’s management which is obliged to pursue the goals set and presented in EPS along with the future development of the institutes within the European educational platform (10).

**Other initiatives:**
Encouragement of full academic recognition of studies abroad, using ECTS. Practical placement is eligible only if it is included in the studies programme and it comes before or after a three months, at least, period of Studies abroad. That puts a lot of responsibility in the HEI’s management to apply ECTS in all mobility exchanges. ECTS is not a separate activity in SOCRATES programme but an integrated powerful system in students mobility facilitating transparency and quality of studies while building credibility among the partner Institutes, and securing full academic recognition of studies abroad.

Every action of SOCRATES/ERASMUS programme becomes institutionally oriented and supported while the overall responsibility for the contractual commitment and obligations lays with the Institute and not with the co-ordinators as it used to be with ERASMUS prior to SOCRATES.

The necessity for structural changes and management model development within HEI’s in order to respond to SOCRATES requirements, is obvious.

Encouragement of synergies between programmes especially with the LEONARDO DA VINCI programme for vocational training, the Youth for Europe III and various components within the
Fourth Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development. It is developed in coherence and complementarity with the programmes relating to the promotion of equal opportunities between women and men (mainstreaming) and to integration of persons with specific educational needs (17).

However, the fundamental notion in SOCRATES programme prevailing all activities is Quality of Studies as well as Quality of procedures, while evaluation activities are encouraged to be undertaken so in national as in Institutional level. (17)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERASMUS (1987-1994)</th>
<th>vs</th>
<th>SOCRATES 1996- on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS was based essentially on Article 12 of 1957 Rome Treaty concerning vocational training</td>
<td>SOCRATES is based on Articles 126 and 127 of the Treaty on EU</td>
<td>It is continuation &amp; expansion of ERASMUS which embraces all levels of education &amp; academic disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is concerns only for higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based mainly:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On ICPs</td>
<td>ICPs (?) Not, any more. They however play an advanced role under the framework of the Institutional strategy, as partnerships, which implement or develop sectional activities, within the Universities’ European Educational policy. Bilateral agreements. Elimination of cases of «sleeping» partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- semi independent,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- semi formal structures with respect to their management &amp; function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- multilateral agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Short or study visits served as a good pioneering tool but…</td>
<td>→ Institutional planned under SOCRATES</td>
<td>→ Objective / issue targeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Individually planned</td>
<td>→ outcome(s) expected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Poor outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ECTS only 145 H.E.I. in Europe participated</td>
<td>ECTS expansion is pursued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ pilot project, separate activity</td>
<td>SOCRATES calls Universities to include in their institutional proposal ECTS tasks, to use it as a common tool towards Academic Recognition of studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign languages (FL) under LINGUA partly linked to ERASMUS</td>
<td>FL are under SOCRATES in all chapters I, II, III under various forms:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- languages preparation for students and staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Integrated language courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Development of methods and tools to teach FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Assistant Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• teaching staff mobility supported, but without any efficient use</td>
<td>More formal (TS - ETF) &amp; responsible: participation in lectures / education processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EUROPEAN DIMENSION</td>
<td>- Euro-modules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ some effort through Joint curricula &amp;</td>
<td>- Joint curricula at initial / intermediate level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Intensive Programmes</td>
<td>- Joint M.Sc./DEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Action IV in Erasmus</td>
<td>- European Cooperation programmes (LINGUA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Joint Educational projects (JEP) (LINGUA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Use of ODL & associated advanced technologies (Telematics)
- Adult Education
- Networking (Thematic)
- Exchange of information & experience (EURIDICE, NARIC)
- COMPLEMENTARY MEASURES support to publication, Associations, FOR A etc.
CONCLUSIONS - RECOMMENDATION

Conclusions

The contrast between ERASMUS - SOCRATES programmes reveals that SOCRATES programme is really a dynamic and promising program which even in its 2 years of implementation brought significant changes in the H.E.I’s management (11,12) due to:
→ the strategic plan described in the E.P.S.
→ the commitment to the activities including in the I.C.
→ the central control of the European activities which means set of priorities of co-operations in terms of institutes, subject areas, type of activity e.t.c.
→ the need for development of communication techniques among departments faculties, responsible persons e.t.c.
→ the need of development of a feedback mechanism with partner institutions, staff, and other actors involved
→ the need for developing a financial model for supporting activities undertaken under I.C., in complementarity with the E.U. funds (10).
→ the need for developing a managerial structure for SOCRATES programme integrated in the overall management structure of the H.E.I.

while:

→ increasing students mobility
→ integrating ECTS in students mobility and therefore ensuring full academic recognitions of studies abroad.
→ ensuring quality of studies, through ECTS (13) e.t.c.

However, in SOCRATES implementation, some weak points arose, which are addressed to various levels, Institutional level, national level, commission level.

I. There is lack of incentives for persons involved in SOCRATES implementation process. The implementation of activities had an effect the demotivating of the individual staff, mainly academics. (Institutional level)

II. There is lack of a system assessing the commitment to certain activities declared in EPS and included in I.C. in relation to the outcomes of these activities, as there is no need for proofs as it happens in Leonardo Da Vinci programme or in RTD projects. (all levels)

III. There is lack of skillful administrators in international issues and European affair. (mainly Institutional level)

IV. There is lack of clear managerial structures which results to a confusion either in terms of academic and administrative tasks or in terms of departments’, faculties’, Institution’s share of involvement and contribution to decision - making concerning SOCRATES activities. (Institutional level)

V. There is no provision of a system facilitating dissemination European - wide of activities such as E.M., CDI, CDA e.t.c. (mainly commission level)

VI. There is no provision for development of a mechanism to feed EM, CDI, CDA with the outcomes of Thematic Networks. (commission level)
VII. There is no system developed in the H.E.I.’s to promote synergies between SOCRATES and LEOANARDO DA VINCI mainly, as well as with the other European Programme youth for Europe e.t.c., despite the commissions encouragement for synergies. (all levels bear a degree of responsibility)

VIII. There is a slow pace in ECTS integration in the students mobility schemes, of the departments involved. (national, Institutional level)

IX. There is a slow pace in ECTS integration in the students mobility schemes, of the departments involved. (national, Institutional level)

X. There is low rate funding while there is no policy or system to check and promote co-funding from H.E.I. or complementarity from other sources. (national, Institutional level due to subsidiarity)

XI. There is lack of concrete students involvement in SOCRATES management neither in national nor in institutional level (14). (Institutional level)

XII. There is no provision linkage between SOCRATES and the European project for Evaluating Quality in H.E.I.’s in the E.U. (commission level)

Recommendation

Development and adoption of a Quality system (the ones under the number). Most of the weakness in the implementation of SOCRATES programme could be cured with a Quality Management System put in place either for the H.E.I. as a whole or for SOCRATES programme activities.

Therefore, student mobility, for example, could be organized according to ISO 9001 guidelines (13) (Appendix IV), resulting in operating with:

− clear objectives and competencies among the units and persons involved

− with well described procedures which eliminate confusion and diminish time and work to get to the target

− respects to the expectations and the interest of all parts, mainly the students of HEI.

− It contributes to high level of suitability, and reaches a high level of transparency and recognition

− provides arrangements and concrete procedures within the Institution which make working life easier

− clarifies for everybody involved in student mobility, competencies roles, responsibility, e.t.c. and therefor it, time saving, cost effectiveness

while for the successful and direct implementation of ECTS there could be follow well described steps, (15) in the framework of a manual of good practice which could be, also, included in a overall Quality system for SOCRATES. Each Higher Education Institute according to its autonomy should establish its own Quality System and manual.
Therefore the procedures for organization and implementation of SOCRATES could be grouped as follows:

The result of the implementation of a Quality System based either in ISO 9001 or using Quality indicators (16) could be:

- elimination of tasks confusion by clarifying concretely the tasks of academics as well as the tasks for administrators while through steps well defined and documented (manual of procedures) the workload would be diminished.

As far as the requirements for skillful personnel serving SOCRATES activities is concerned, again, a Quality system (guidelines 9001, in clause 18) anticipates systematic training procedures for updating and upgrading staff knowledge e.t.c.

- Development of a management model which could merge the top - down (institution rector / vice rector e.t.c.) and the bottom - down (departments, ex - ICP co-ordinators) approach and transform it into a potential and effective body «SOCRATES BOARD» (Appendix III) responsible for SOCRATES organization, monitoring and evaluation of SOCRATES activities, assessing the outcomes against the commitment for the activities described in the EPS.

- Students participation in such a body could be considered as essential as students are «the end users» and the ones who feed-back the system with information - recommendation e.t.c. through a continuous improvement (14).

- Financial management
  Universities and H.E.I. should plan their European - oriented educational Policy regardless of the funding issues and especially regardless of E.U. funding. The up to now experience shows that H.E.I. practice the opposite way, that means, they plan, only, according to the E.U. funding concerning Socartes.
  However, the overall European Policy can be based on complementarity from various programmes as well as the H.E.I. own co-funding.

A proposed model is the one shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity</th>
<th>Overall budget</th>
<th>H.E.I. %</th>
<th>SOCRATES %</th>
<th>MINISTRY OF EDUCATION Community's Support Framework (ESF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g. OMS - Students grants</td>
<td>500ECU / per student once through</td>
<td>250ECU/per student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using this model in students grants in TEI of Patra, for example, a student going to U.K. gets an amount of 250 ECU/per month, from Socrates grant, complemented with an amount of 500 ECU/once through from TEI’s funds (special account).

Therefore students low rate grant reaches to a descend level

In the Greek case, a new «special account» was put in operation under the law 2413/97. This special account operates as a complementary financial source for students grants.

- As far as the dissemination of the outcomes of CDI, CDA, EM, Networks is concerned a first approach could be the issue of a publication, such as a kind of Compendium like the COMETT one.
  However, there is not a concrete proposal for this issue and the paper aims only to tackle it.
  There is, also, need for elaboration of proposals:
  → concerning the development of a policy offering incentives to academics, mainly, involved in SOCRATES activities. It is well known that in the majority of Institutes academics serving Socrates activities with the one or another way are usually self-motivated, as they are neither extra paid nor having any other benefit, bonus or compression apart from, obviously, a self-satisfaction.
  → the establishment of a unit within the H.E.I. which through a special sector - or person (depends on the size of the H.E.I.) would deal with the synergy of various E.U. programmes in order to maximize the effects for the stakeholders. Specifically the systematic development of synergy with Leonardo Da Vinci program could promote professional recognition alongside with the academic one.

- Finally, the European dimension and the results of the evaluation of the activities serving it should be presented in each H.E.I.’s annual report.
  It is taken into account that the continuous improvement is based in reviews and it constitutes the cornerstone for not only the E.U. declared in 126 article of Maastricht Treaty, but target which is traditionally interwoven with education in terms of standards of excellence (6).

Concluding, I would like to share with you my enthusiasm for the impact SOCRATES had so far on our H.E.I.’s overall life, helping us to work close together on the promotion of a Quality education within an economically, socially culturally strong E.U.

However, I would, also, like to communicate my concern about the need of working seriously, on SOCRATES improvement as well as on H.E.I.’s management changes or improvements in order to prepare an adequate platform where «Quality» will be consolidated, characterizing every procedure and every educational outcome, fulfilling the traditional motion which requires education to be synonym to excellence.
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Appendix I

TREATY ON EUROPEAN UNION

* * * * *

Education, vocational training and youth

Articles 126 & 127
Article 126

1. The Community shall contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organization of education systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity.

2. Community action shall be aimed at:

   − developing the European dimension in education, particularly through the teaching and dissemination of the languages of the Member States;

   − encouraging mobility of students and teachers, inter alia by encouraging the academic recognition of diplomas and periods of study;

   − promoting cooperation between educational establishments;

   − developing exchanges of information and experience on issues common to the education systems of the Member States;

   − encouraging the development of youth exchanges and of exchanges of socio-educational instructors;

   − encouraging the development of distance education.

3. The Community and the Member States shall foster cooperation with third countries and the competent international organizations in the field of education, in particular the Council of Europe.

4. In order to contribute to the achievement of the objectives referred to in this Article, the Council:

   − acting in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 189b, after consulting the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, shall adopt incentive measures, excluding any harmonization of the laws and regulations of the Member States;

   − acting by a qualified majority on a proposal from the Commission, shall adopt recommendations.
Article 127

1. The Community shall implement a vocational training policy which shall support and supplement the action of the Member States, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content and organization of vocational training.

2. Community action shall aim to:

   – facilitate adaptation to industrial changes, in particular through vocational training and retraining;

   – improve initial and continuing vocational training in order to facilitate vocational integration and reintegration into the labour market;

   – facilitate access to vocational training and encourage mobility of instructors and trainees and particularly young people;

   – stimulate cooperation on training between educational or training establishments and firms;

   – develop exchanges of information and experience on issues common to the training systems of the Member States.

3. The Community and the Member States shall foster cooperation with third countries and the competent international organizations in the sphere of vocational training.

4. The Council, acting in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 189c and after consulting the Economic and Social Committee, shall adopt measures to contribute to the achievement of the objectives referred to in this Article, excluding any harmonization of the laws and regulations of the Member States.'
Appendix II

Erasmus Objectives vs Socrates Objectives

ERASMUS main objectives were:

- to achieve a significant increase in the number of students from universities spending an integrated period of study in another Member State, in order that the Community may draw upon an adequate pool of manpower with first hand experience of economic and social aspects of other Member States, while ensuring equality of opportunity for male and female students as regards participation in such mobility;

- to promote broad and intensive co-operation between universities in all Member States;

- to harness the full intellectual potential of the universities in the Community by means of increased mobility of teaching staff, thereby improving the quality of the education and training provided by the universities with a view to securing the competitiveness of the Community in the world market;

- to strengthen the interaction between citizens in different Member States with a view to consolidating the concept of a People’s Europe;

- to ensure the development of a pool of graduates with direct experience of intra-Community co-operation thereby creating the basis upon which intensified cooperation in the economic and social sectors can develop at Community level.

SOCRATES specific objectives as they laid down by the Decision (8) are:

- to develop the European dimension in education at all levels so as to strengthen the spirit of European citizenship, drawing on the cultural heritage of each Member State;

- to promote a quantitative and qualitative improvement of the knowledge of the languages of the European Union, and in particular those which are least widely used and least taught, leading to greater understanding and solidarity between the peoples of the European Union, and to promote the intercultural dimension of education;

- to promote wide-ranging and intensive cooperation between institutions in the Member States at all levels of education, enhancing their intellectual and teaching potential;

- to encourage the mobility of teachers, so as to promote a European dimension in studies and to contribute to the qualitative improvement of their skills;

- to encourage mobility for students, enabling them to complete part of their studies in another Member State, so as to contribute to the consolidation of the European dimension in education;

- to encourage contacts among pupils in the European Union and to promote the European dimension in their education;

- to encourage the academic recognition of diplomas, periods of study and other qualifications, with the aim of facilitating the development of an open European area for cooperation in education;
to encourage open and distance education in the context of this programme;

to foster exchanges of information and experience so that the diversity and specificity of the educational systems in the Member States become a source of enrichment and of mutual stimulation.
Appendix III

SOCRATES Board
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Appendix IV: FLOW-CHART CONCERNING STUDENTS MOBILITY

HEI decides on setting up a Quality system for OMS under its European Policy Statement.

All Students, Staff, Administrators etc. are informed about both.

International Relations Office or the SOCRATES Board secretariat in collaboration with the departmental coordinator(s) continuously and systematically announce student placements. Announcement appear in all areas students have access (eg. Laboratories, libraries, etc.)

Students ask participation in OMS grants according to calls and announcements.

International Relations Office (I.R.O) & Departmental coordinator (D.C)

Student & I.R.O & D. C. discuss on availability and suitability of courses offered by partner HEIs. Basic Information is taken by the Info-packages, in the special library set up. The tripartied meeting take place in a special room at scheduled times.

Student makes choice(s) about the host Institutes and courses, advised guided by the departmental Coordinators Home & Host H.E.I.

I.R.O advises students
  - to prepare CV
  - to complete the application form on the courses to be followed in the host Institute(s). (Departmental coordinator’s agreement is necessary.)

I.R.O prepares all the ECTS documentation
  - draft learning agreement (student’s participation in the learning agreement process is necessary)
  - transcript of students record (data are collected from Department’s secretariat)

The validity of all the above documentation is checked by the head of I.R.O assigned by the D.C and the Institutional Coordinator, (i.c) and it is signed by the D.C. and the i.c.

I.R.O sends to partner H.E.Is the documentation and the draft learning agreement.

I.R.O receives answers and possible comments from host Institutes.

No
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Yes

I.R.O informs student and D.C

Student with the advice of D.C and I.R.O finalize about the host Institute, and the courses student will follow abroad.

The Departmental coordinator introduces each student case to the Departments’ appropriate body which decides upon the recognition of students studies abroad. The Department’s Council gives an approval.

I.R.O sends the above documentation to the host Institute.

The three parts (student, D.C and I.R.O) prepare in collaboration the final learning agreement and supplementary material, if necessary, demanded by the host Institute.

I.R.O sends the above documentation to the host Institute.

I.R.O receives final learning agreement signed by the host Institute with other possible documents. I.R.O sends all the documentation received to the Department.

I.R.O provides a dossier to student including information about preparatory language courses (at home and host Institute), accommodation facilities, lifestyle in host country, cultural issues in the host country, dates student has to be in the host Institute, dates concerning the beginning of courses to start in the host Institute e.t.c.

D.C, when appropriate, advice student upon additional preparation in subject areas to help the academic integration in the host Institute.

Student goes abroad and starts studies in the host Institute. Possible changes in the learning agreement.

Yes

D.Cs of home and host Institute agree upon learning agreement

No

Continuous assessment and monitoring of students’ progress by host. H.E.I.

D.C of the host Institute submits interim report concerning students’ progress to SOCRATES Board and IRO which then sends the report to the students’ home Institute.
Finally, overall students’ studies/project are evaluated in host Institute and credits are awarded for each course.

Host I.R.O, collects all student’s academic data from the host Department (transcript of records, etc.), develops the relevant material to be accessed by the SOCRATES Board and sends all the documentation to home Institute.

Home I.R.O receives the above documentation. Keeps a copy for its files and sends the documentation to the Departmental Coordinator.

Departmental Coordinator is getting informed and submits the documents to the Departmental Secretariat while he informs the Departmental Council about student learning achievements, credits and grades awarded abroad.

Department’s Council approves the transcript of records of the host Institute and validates the recognition approval given before students placement abroad.

Home Department’s secretariat integrates recognized studies into student records transferring grades into national system.

Home Department’s secretariat keeps student record, and according to internal regulations issues a supplement of records for student’s studies abroad.

D.C evaluates the effect of student’s studies abroad and reports to SOCRATES Board for each student case.

SOCRATES Board evaluates the overall ECTS students mobility and informs the H.E.Is authorities (top management), while making suggestions for improvement.

H.E.I authorities consider the evaluation of students mobility and the impact to the Institute life and decide on necessary improvements, extension of collaborations, etc.

NEW PROCESS STARTS
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