

Chapter 3

Shaping the Exchanges and Mobility in the European Higher Architectural Education Area

From the 2002 Hania Meeting it became apparent that all Schools pursue mobility. It was accepted that mobility has developed so far on the basis of personal contacts and acquaintances. Schools have not adopted very clear policies on exchange and mobility in order to enhance their curricula.

It was agreed that exchanges constitute an essential mechanism for the creation of the European Higher Architectural Education Area. It was also pointed out that the ECTS is an important tool for the development of mobility and comparability of different educational environments. It was suggested that there have to be clearer strategies adopted by the schools with regard to mobility and exchange for a more direct and effective impact, of these collaborations, on school curricula. Finally, it was suggested that there is a need for structuring collaborations, between schools, respecting and appreciating the particular identity of each school.

To exhaust the investigation in the effectiveness of mobility and exchange, we need to understand the ways in which a school defines an ECTS credit. It is similarly important to identify the policies of schools on student and staff mobility. The question that emerges is whether it is possible for a common type of credit to be invented, which can cover various types of modules. Proposals on policies and strategies for the development of exchanges should be put forward so that they can contribute significantly to the improvement of architectural education

Introduction to the Session

Panel

Koenraad Van Cleempoel, Antwerp, Belgium

Michèle Michel, Bordeaux, France

Chair

Nur Çaglar, Ankara, Turkey

Discussion Group 1

Coordination by

Nur Çaglar, Ankara, Turkey

Koenraad Van Cleempoel, Antwerp, Belgium

Ebbe Harder, Copenhagen, Denmark

Discussion Group 2

Coordination by

Michèle Michel, Bordeaux, France

Guy Pilate, Brussels, Belgium

Andrzen Baranowsky, Gdansk, Poland

Exchanges and Mobility in European Schools of Architecture

Koenraad Van CLEEMPOEL, Antwerp, Belgium

Michèle MICHEL, Bordeaux, France

Introduction

Mobility of students and staff was recognised by EAAE as an important tool towards internationalisation of the discipline. In 2002 a working group was composed to work on this subject. The members are: Andrzej Baranowski (Gdansk, Poland), Nur _aglar (Ankara, Turkey), Ebbe Harder (Copenhagen, Denmark), Michèle Michel (Bordeaux, France), Guy Pilate (Brussels, Belgium) and Koenraad Van Cleempoel (Antwerp, Belgium). This group met during the preparatory meeting in Antwerp in March 2002 where the working methodology was discussed. A chart of the present situation by means of a questionnaire was considered as the right way to start. The first results hereof is the subject of the present paper.

It was apparent that a key issue in mobility, that is ECTS (European Credit Transfer System), overlapped with the contents of the working group on curriculum. But as ECTS is so important and as the results of the questionnaires show that there is still so much confusion on the subject, some repetition is justified.

Three out of the four articles of the Chania Statement 2001 refer to ECTS. Article 3, in particular, states that "EAAE will actively collaborate in developing the ECTS-credit system in their schools and considers this system as the keystone towards mobility of students, modularity, flexibility in the curricula, necessary for the cultural, regional and pedagogical diversity they think to be invaluable for the education in architecture in Europe."

Our conclusion is that this aim has not yet been achieved and that is why we put so much emphasis on the subject of ECTS in this paper.

1. Questionnaire – Results & Discussion

Student mobility

a. Statistics

Student mobility is widely accepted in European schools of architecture as all the schools responded to participate in the Socrates – Erasmus programme.

Outgoing students:

49% of the schools have between 2% and 5% of their students going abroad

31% of the schools have less than 2% of their students going abroad

14% of the schools have between 5% and 8% of their students going abroad

6% of the schools have more than 8% of their students going abroad

Incoming students:

42% of the schools welcome between 2% and 6% incoming students

41% of the schools welcome less than 2% incoming students

14% of the schools welcome more than 8% incoming students

3% of the schools welcome between 5% and 8% incoming students

b. ECTS

a. facts

The European commission devised the 'European Credit Transfer System' in 1998 as a tool for quantitative measuring workload. EU also composed an ECTS user's guide, which is available in all languages of the member states on the Erasmus-Socrates site (http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/ects_en.html). Its usage is not only limited to exchange; it is equally an instrument for curriculum composition.

ECTS is a value allocated to course units to describe its workload that is required to complete them; therefore ECTS reflects a quantity of work including:

- lectures
- practical work
- seminars
- personal study time

The latter is the most elusive and difficult to measure component. 1 credit should be at least 25 hours and maximum 30 hours, so that one academic year consists of 60 ECTS credits and one semester of about 30. This corresponds to annual workload between 1500 and 1800 hours.

ECTS offers to students:

- a guarantee of academic recognition of studies abroad
- access to regular courses alongside local students
- flexibility for further studies abroad – possibility to be awarded a degree

To institutions, ECTS should offer (in principle)

- curriculum transparency by providing detailed information on curricula by means of the course catalogue
- assistance in the academic recognition of courses followed by students abroad
- the ECTS grading scale, which helps to 'translate' the grades of the host institution as there are many different grading systems in Europe
- a catalyst for reflection on course curriculum structures, student workload and learning outcomes

The key documents are:

- the information package (ECTS guide with detailed descriptions of all courses)
- the learning agreement
- the transcript of records

b. questionnaire & discussion

The questionnaire clearly shows that very few schools operate such an ECTS system. There is also contradiction.

74% say that they apply ECTS and 96% say that will implement ECTS in the near future. Some schools in France only operate the system for incoming and outgoing students, but not for their regular students. When asking what one takes into account in calculating the value of the credits (ratio), the result is the following:

	<i>yes</i>	<i>no</i>
Contact hours only:	30%	70%
Personal study time:	15%	85%
Contact and personal study time together:	65%	35%
Studio/Exercises/Practice/Training:	53%	47%
Study visits:	23%	77%
The importance of courses:	44%	56%

One school also includes 'complexity and level' of the course, and another the 'personal progress' of a student.

It was stated that 96% intent to implement ECTS in the near future, so when asked if the school intends to have the credits related to the same components as before the results are as follows:

	<i>yes</i>	<i>no</i>
Contact hours only:	12%	88%
Personal study time:	25%	75%
Contact and personal study time together:	87%	13%
Studio/Exercises/Practice/Training:	50%	50%
Study visits:	37%	63%
The importance of courses:	50%	50%

The conclusion is that very few schools apply ECTS correctly. The ECTS user's guide mentions that 'practical works' and 'seminars' ought to be included in the calculations, whereas 50% of the schools say they will not include studio work. The aimed 'readability' of curricula of other schools will not be achieved in this way.

We believe that it would be beneficial if EAAE could take a firm position and stipulate what should or should not be taken into account when calculating ECTS credits in schools of architecture. If three out of the four articles of the Chania Statement 2001 there is reference to ECTS. It is vital that all schools understand precisely what it is meant by this, and also its implications.

c. Curriculum

a. questionnaire

The results of the questionnaire are as follows:

	yes	no
- Do you have an evaluation of the host school programme?	48%	52%
- Do you use the Learning Agreement of Study Abroad? <i>(Some schools only use this for studio work)</i>	80%	20%
- Do you insist on your students following certain courses in the host School that would be similar to yours? <i>(Some school motivate this by stating that their students have to complete the home university's curriculum, or for compatibility and professional awards)</i>	42%	48%
- Do you ever require supplementary work when the students return?	36%	64%
<i>If yes is it based</i>		
<i>On ECTS credits</i>	55%	45%
<i>On your evaluation of the performance of the host school?</i>	66%	34%
- What level of studies seems to be, from your point of view, the most appropriate for exchanges?		
Third and fourth year of study (Istanbul-Turkey) (Gazimagusa-Northern Cyprus) (Warsaw-Poland) (Diepenbeek-Belgium) (Finland); 7th and 9th semester (Athens-Greece); fourth and fifth year (Espo-Finland) (Lisbon-Portugal) (Barcelona-Spain); 4th year (Gothenburg-Sweden) (Clermont-Ferrand-France) (Copenhagen-Denmark) (Cedex-France) (HvdV-Belgium) (Grenoble-France); 4th grade (we have a 6 year program) (Setubal-Portugal); Third year (Bochum); Postgraduate BArch students (Belfast); Bachelors (Kaunas-Lithuania); Second or half of their curricula (Vallès-Spain); Postgraduate (Eindhoven-The Netherlands); In Masters and Doctoral (PhD.) level (in 5th year's study) (Bratislava-Slovakia).		
	yes	no
- Do you intend to develop mobility in the future?	100%	0%
In which way:		
Typical Erasmus exchanges	88%	12%
Bilateral agreements for common diplomas	66%	34%
Mobility for students who take their first degree or second degree in another school	62%	38%
International experience in the framework of short mobilities on the basis of joint courses of less than one month	74%	26%
Other kinds of mobility		
Mobility of students who are engaged in professional stages (Lisbon-Portugal); IAESTE scheme administered by British Council (Belfast); Intensive programs (Diepenbeek-Belgium); NORDPLUS exchanges and		

normal bilateral exchanges (Copenhagen-Denmark); International workshops, lectures and/or meetings (Antwerp, Bochum)

b. discussion

We believe that there are two important conclusions:

- that few schools are well informed about the educational programme and pedagogical visions of their exchange partners;
- that a large proportion (36%) of schools demand extra work of their outgoing students on return

The reasons for this may be threefold: because the student has not obtained sufficient credits, a negative evaluation of the receiving institution and uncertainty about the academic level of certain courses.

It is especially the latter that called our attention as it is incompatible to the Erasmus philosophy, which is based on mutual trust between partner institutions. Here the student becomes the victim of the lack of information between two schools, or from the fact that institutions think that courses from certain institutions are better than those from other without objective criteria to prove this. The student is thus expected to produce extra work at home before his/her Erasmus programme will be recognised.

This procedure is further echoed by the 42% of school that require from their outgoing students to follow a programme similar ('mirror programme') to that of the home institution. Here the sending institutions intervene directly in the selection of courses that their students will follow in the visiting institution.

A consistent and systematic usage of the 'European grading scale' can already give the sending institution objective information of how their student's scores compare to those of local students. A great discrepancy is recognised in marking students, both at the level of institutions, as well as within national traditions. Here, again, Erasmus students, in some occasion, become victims. In order to solve this problem elegantly, some schools do not give their Erasmus students a grade, just a 'pass' or 'not pass'. This is communicated to the students before their departure. In order to improve trust and confidence over curricula of partner institutions, EAAE may find itself in the right position to gather specific information and provide this on their website. In this respect it could also be recommended to make a critical comparison between the curriculum and mobility questionnaire.

d. Financial conditions for students

a. questionnaire

The results of the questionnaire are as follows:

	<i>yes</i>	<i>no</i>
- Do you have special financial programmes in addition to the E.U. grants?	50%	50%
If yes, from which sources?		
State	90%	10%
Local authorities	30%	70%
Private sources	0%	100%

Others

From the school's budget (Copenhagen-Denmark); Additional support from the rector, given to the best students (Warsaw-Poland); University grant (Gazimagusa-Northern Cyprus)

	yes	no
- Can you specify the amount of the grant for your Erasmus students?	33%	67%

300 euro per month (Athens-Greece, Bratislava-Slovakia); 600 euro per semester (Copenhagen-Denmark); It differs each year. For academic year 2003/04 - its been defined at 130 euros/month (Warsaw-Poland); 1200 euro/semester, 1700 euro/academic year (Finland); About 500 euro per month (Cedex-France); 50 euro per month (Clermont-Ferrand-France); 450 euros/month + Erasmus grant (Grenoble-France); 350 euro (Talence-France); 450-550 euro/month (Kaunas-Lithuania)

	yes	no
- How do you help incoming students?		
Financial	34%	66%
Accommodation	73%	27%

Others

Language training and a great deal of administrative and social service (Gothenburg-Sweden); Language facilities (Setubal-Portugal); Academic orientation (Barcelona-Spain); Integrate with the cohort of students in the relevant studio group (Belfast); Orientation (international tutors), free-time activities arranged by student union (Finland); Tutoring, advising (Cedex-France); Student secretary and ombuds (Diepenbeek-Belgium); Student card/food card (Athens-Greece); Student assistantship (Gazimagusa-Northern Cyprus); Languages courses (Vallès-Spain); Contacts with German students of the school (eg. Mixed studios) (Karlsruhe-Germany); Special welcome for exchange and foreign students-ECTS information package sent to them before their arrival (Grenoble, France); Intense help with composing the curriculum and finding appropriate housing / social programme by the student's council (Antwerp, Belgium)

Staff mobility

Schools' policy	yes	no
- Does your School encourage teaching mobility?	84%	12%
In which way		
For short periods of time (8 hours/1 week)	90%	10%
For long periods of time (more than 2 weeks)	28%	72%
If not why		

Problem of a small number staff and organisational problems (Diepenbeek-Belgium); Staff shortage (Gazimagusa-Northern Cyprus);

Existing pressures on staff leave no time and no other staff that can assume responsibilities in absence (Portsmouth)

	yes	no
- Do you organise mobility on the basis of		
Invitation in the framework of a curriculum	87%	13%
Simple acceptance of the applicants	41%	59%
Common teaching programs	59%	41%
Research programs	46%	54%
- Do you have a policy for attracting incoming staff from abroad?	20%	80%
If yes, please specify:		

If possible we would like have more incoming staff from other schools of architecture. Funding is always a problem (Belfast); By organising an international workshop week called the 'Antwerp Design Science Lectures' (Antwerp-Belgium); Centre of Central European Training Centre in Spatial Planning (SPECTRA)-Excellence (Bratislava-Slovakia); Research and training external work place in Banska Stiavnica (Bratislava-Slovakia)

2. Mobility after Bologna

As yet, the questionnaire did not focus on this subject. What follows are some comments by members of the working group. Some of these aspects may lead to further discussion in meetings to come.

1. From horizontal to vertical mobility

So far, and in general terms, when discussing mobility we refer to 'horizontal mobility', whereby a student visits another institution for a certain length of time as part of a curriculum exchange programme. The study period is situated between two degrees. This may well change after the ongoing implementation of the two-tier degree system.

BA-MA offers a possibility for flexible choices whereby students can compose without too much administrative difficulties an individual degree. This 'vertical mobility' will result in a specific hunt for ECTS credits and perhaps even an 'education à la carte'. Mobility may not be limited anymore to a period between two degrees. The new degree system will also generate various second cycle programmes and joint programmes.

This process will make it increasingly important for students to obtain a diploma supplement at the end of their study career: a document with all the subjects the student has followed, the institutions and marks.

2. The role of the universities in the Europe of knowledge

On February 5, 2003 the European commission issued a document in which they wish to start a debate on the role of universities within the knowledge society and economy in

Europe and on the conditions under which they will be able to effectively play that role. Mobility occupies an important place in the reflections of the commission, of which a summary follows:

In the Lisbon Meeting of 2000 an ambitious target for Europe was set: 'becoming the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion'. European Universities have to play an important role to achieve this. But, the communication, continues, the European university world is not trouble free, and European universities are not at present globally competitive with those of other major partners...'. Therefore a number of areas within which reflection, and often also action needed, are raised. Central to this is the notion to rethink the ideal model of the European University as defined by Wilhelm von Humboldt. The European universities can only release their potential by undergoing the radical changes needed to make the European system a genuine world reference. The commission sees three challenges to be pursued simultaneously:

- Ensuring that European universities have sufficient and sustainable resources and use them efficiently;
- Consolidating their excellence in research and in teaching, particularly through networking;
- Opening up universities to a greater extent and increasing their international attractiveness.

Our working group supports these notions and believes that mobility can become an important tool in increasing the attractiveness of schools of architecture.

3. Conclusion – Points of Discussion

We believe that a great deal of information of the different working groups is interrelated and should be linked to one another in order for 'appropriate' exchange partners to operate mobility to be found. The EAAE website may become a useful tool in that respect. It could also enhance bilateral and/or multilateral agreements.

On ECTS, we believe that EAAE is the appropriate body to stimulate the use of a coherent system for all its members, so that we all use the same credit system and include the same ingredients for calculating them.

Issues on curriculum and mobility are related when they deal with innovative teaching methods such as e-learning, virtual mobility / Distant Education. Within 'vertical mobility' it will be the curriculum that will steer mobility, and not vice versa. The Bologna Process makes students more active in composing their curriculum (personalisation) under supervision of the institution.

Staff mobility is a problem: almost all schools agree that it is good, but difficult to operate due to obstacles of availability (both personal and institutional). This shortcoming can perhaps be solved by sharing programs at Masters level, offering integrated curricula, common diploma and shared research programmes.

Shaping the Exchanges and Mobility in the European Higher Architectural Education Area

Discussion

Coordination by

Nur ÇAGLAR, Ankara, Turkey

Koenraad VAN CLEEMPOEL, Antwerp, Belgium

Michèle MICHEL, Bordeaux, France

Nur Çaglar, Ankara, Turkey

I would first like to introduce the members of our working group: Andrzen Baranowski from Gdansk, Poland, Ebbe Harder from Copenhagen, Denmark, Michèle Michel from Bordeaux, France, Guy Pilate from Brussels, Belgium and Koenraad Van Cleempoel, from Antwerp, Belgium. As indicated in your programme sheets, I am going to chair the session. That is the easy part of the work and my colleagues Michèle and Koenraad are going to make the presentations. However, we have decided to take the contribution of all of the members of our working group. This is very easy for us to do, as you can see from the number of members, that we are the smallest of the four working groups.

The presentation is structured as you see on the screen. We will go through four items, starting with the questionnaires, meaning that we are going to talk about the work we have already done in Antwerp in March. Secondly, we will discuss ECTS a little bit because it's a very important tool for the future of, and the development of mobility and exchange. Then we will go through the role of the universities in the 'Europe of Knowledge' as Koenraad would like to share some important data regarding the mobility and exchange issues on a document that he recently received from the European commission, entitled: "The Role of the Universities in the Europe of Knowledge". Following this, we will draw some conclusions. So, now I will ask Koenraad to start his presentation.

This is more or less the data that we have been able to gather since the meeting in Antwerp last March, but I would like to ask the other members of our working group if they wish to make their contribution to the debate.

Andrzen Baranowsky, Gdansk, Poland

I would like to make one very short remark. The questionnaires were divided into specific European areas. One thing that is quite obvious is the inequality in terms of the exchange of incoming and outgoing students, especially in the eastern parts of Europe. There are many more outgoing students and only a few incoming students. This is understandable temporarily, but should not be continued in the long term. There is a great need for better information on what the Eastern European schools represent, what they can offer to other

European schools and what their expectations are. Therefore, the geographical regions of the exchange and mobility programs require further consideration.

Nur Çağlar, Ankara, Turkey

You can all say that we skipped the financial problems, we haven't made any comments on this issue yet.

Andrzen Baranowsky, Gdansk, Poland

Koenraad Van Cleempoel has prepared a list of problems that have been mentioned during the session and I would like it to become the basis for our discussion. We think it would be easier to have this picture on the screen, but it does not necessarily mean we have to strictly follow what is written here step by step. But to organise the discussion let us start with this list if you don't mind. Now the floor is yours.

Christian Huetz, Regensburg, Germany

You are pointing out two kinds of mobility. The future types of mobility are e-learning and curriculum based mobility. I think e-learning, virtual mobility as you call it, doesn't exist. It is just a different way of collecting information. Anyone can say they are in Hong Kong by pressing some buttons in the World Wide Web when they are actually sitting in Baden. I think mental mobility may be very important here, the mental mobility to exchange information from one country to another one.

What is also very important is physical mobility, as you refer to curriculum-based mobility. It must not just be curriculum-based mobility but can also be mobility caused by the curiosity of the student: What is going on, what can I find, can I have more of the information? Since mobility includes all of Europe, you have different cultures. You should step into the culture, get to know the people....Anyways, this is what I wanted to point out.

Heiner Krumlinde, Bochum, Germany

I have three questions or three remarks on what Michèle has presented to us. First of all, I just want to say thanks for your work; I think it is excellent. One problem is the relationship between mobility and ECTS. It is fine that we have ECTS which is comparable but it must be decided how to evaluate in different countries. For instance, if someone from Germany goes to Milano, Italy, like we have thirty times already, it is very important for the students not only to have 30 ECTS credits for half a year, but also to learn the language, take Italian courses to improve their language and to live with Italian people and with Italian students. I always recommend going into a community of students with three or four Italians. It is also important for them to find their way. It is very difficult for foreign students to know everything at once, even if they are in their third year. This is the reason why I am thinking about the "weight" of ECTS. I think it is enough that the students have half of the 30 ECTS credits when they go abroad. The other half is as important for them, so what I demand from them is to bring for instance, fifteen ECTS or two projects or two different courses equivalent to that number of credits.

students because of my efforts after Hania last year, and previously, but we have very few incoming students. I ask our colleagues from France and Holland why they don't let their students go. They have such a strong curriculum, yet you tell the students if you go out of your country you will have to study one more year. This is not correct; it is not in our sense of Europe. A lot of changes need to be made. A third point, which is actually part of the second problem, is that there are too few places for the students for their first stage in offices. We have a lot of offices of only two people that are willing to negotiate students. It is one possibility, but this is not an exchange in studies.

The third problem is staff mobility. I think about this every time I have contact with colleagues from other countries. The problem is that they are bound to their families. I can't find any solution to this problem for the long term. To go away for two weeks and do a workshop or a short course like a compact course is fine, but you can't go for a long period or you would have to change wives or husbands. Otherwise, I think there is no solution.

Guido Onorato Morbelli, Torino, Italy

I would like to say that one of the most important things that came out after Bologna is the three plus two. We have discussed the possibility of students attending courses at different universities around Europe. It might not be agreeable that students start with the three systems; they could get the first diploma in a school in Germany or Italy, and then if they find an exciting program at another European school more valuable, they can choose to go there.

Then of course there is the problem with learning the language of another country. English is already much practised, so maybe there could be some lectures done in English. I think this is a challenge and EAAE should foster and help in this direction.

In Torino we developed a model for students to be able to complete their final courses in another school. Eventually I have been able in my course of studies of which is in the second faculty to arrange to have a double diploma with the College of Director of Marseille. A contract was signed in the beginning of April stating that our students may spend the fifth year in Marseille (which we now call the second year of specialised courses and for Marseille, the first year of the first cycle) and Marseille students at our university. There have been some difficulties matching the Italian system with the French system, but the reality is we have students going there, following courses of the last year and in the end they will have a double diploma that is valuable both in France and in Italy. This system of double diplomas might be a good system and maybe will help make the students more enthusiastic about going abroad. The Shanghai Treaty says that if you are already a member of an institution then you can practise architecture anywhere. This is linked with the very important fact, also as a cultural point of view, that people have a very complete experience abroad and can start to have links in order to have a profession here or there and can also, perhaps, have an academic career in both countries. This is quite a challenge and I think EAAE should be getting this kind of result.

Patrick Labarque, Gent, Belgium

I wanted to say something about the mobility of teachers. We have had bad experience with this, especially when you go abroad. From time to time, a lot of you will recognise

the feeling that you are condemned to be a tourist. There are different reasons for making it difficult to enter into a programme. It can be that the time isn't suitable, or the institution where you want to go may not be prepared to have a Flemish teacher, Spanish teacher, or you don't speak the language in the curriculum at that moment. I would like to make a proposition that perhaps can act as a trigger to take more advantage of this possibility. The institutions could cover the cost of guest teachers between the programs. Each of the institutions that have an exchange program should have a period in their curriculum, in a certain year, for guest teachers. It can be a workshop, a conference, or other different formulas, but that there is a place for an English or a French speaking person, depending on their language. You can offer a guest teacher a sense of purpose for his visit, that he is not only going there to visit the students, but that he can do something valuable when he is there. Perhaps this can be discussed. It is a very simple proposition. I don't think it is a perfect one, but it is perhaps a start to help solve some of the problems with staff mobility. If it can start with a short period, the long-term exchanges can come after that.

Andrzen Baranowski, Gdansk, Poland

Maybe before there are other speakers, I would like to make a short comment about the first remarks. We can draw the conclusion that we should not over estimate the administrative or bureaucratic parts of the issue, but should also be concerned with the curiosity and the learning of cultures of different countries, habits and heritage, which are in fact important parts of the mobility programs, and are not even calculated within the ECTS system.

Ebbe Harder, Copenhagen, Denmark

Just a little comment about staff exchange. It is rather important that we, as an EAAE organisation, can do more than we do to establish better communication about staff exchange. We already have the possibilities in some links. In my opinion, the thematic networks are very, very important. Maybe we can create more thematic networks. For example, there is one person in our school who is responsible for doing work in the field of Architectural Photography. I don't think many schools have a person like him, maybe there are ten, but we could create a thematic network on such a specific theme, with these ten people. They can gain from this network; they can exchange their experience, and maybe also be some part of a staff exchange. Creating thematic networks will also create more possibilities for exchanging staff. We should also go a little further, now that we have heard the ideas about the EAAE guide presentation to the schools. Can we also create more information about staff in the website? In the future, if you would like to know about a specific person that knows about a certain topic, it would also be an information base in that direction. So the EAAE website can create a better base for staff exchange. I think that most of our doctorates in the curriculum already have a period where they are going to be apart. So that is also a part of what we can collaborate about having staff exchange specifically for people who are doctorates.

Finally, we should have a programme in the EAAE like the one that has gone on for years in Drama, Greece. It is a pedagogical exchange for young teachers and is also a kind of knowledge base that could be exchanged. Maybe it shouldn't be Drama that does it in the future, but other schools, in other places, could host it and in that way it could increase the possibilities of staff exchange. We should not only pay attention to staff

exchange, as I mentioned here, but also to ask what we can develop as an organisation to create a better base for mobility.

Spyros Raftopoulos, Athens, Greece

I would just like to say that we do support student mobility in our school without ignoring that there are certain problems. Some are very practical problems that we try to solve, such as the language barrier. We organise separate groups to teach some of the students our language, our difficult language, as far as it can be taught in a short period of time. These are the minimal sort of problems that are being solved by the efforts of certain staff, voluntary most of the time, to try and enhance as much as possible, the mobility between students.

I think we have more important problems. Such problems arise with the quality of the contents of each subject that are being taught in different schools, in different countries. I may exaggerate with an example when I mention that. But how can we prevent a student from traveling around Europe, taking subjects in different schools that have a high degree, or a higher number of credits, much more than what is required in the school of origin. In that case, finishing studies, getting the credits that are required, but having studied less, and having a lower quality of education in the end. That is one of the problems and when I say I am exaggerating the example, it is a system where somebody can more or less circumscribe a system that is being applied all over Europe.

We replied positively to the question of whether we require supplementary work when the students returned. We do that on our evaluation of the performance of the host school. It is not an arrogant sort of approach, where we say our school is of higher quality, but it is a way of comparing the contents of each subject that is being taught in different schools and trying to set a standard of what is required for our students when they finally graduate from our school. This is not a formality of the credit system or the ECTS system (like promised, we are going through the process of trying to apply the system). The problem is the quality of the contents rather than the quantity and this is what was meant when we answered in such a way. I don't know if it was understood or not but we should try to discuss this problem. There is such a variety in our schools all over Europe that I don't think we could ever require, and, it shouldn't be necessary, to try and bring everything to the same level. There are so many different parameters in our countries: there are cultural, scientific and professional differences, or whatever else you may consider, that we couldn't achieve this. So what is the reaction, or the approach of the different people, of different schools, from different countries?

Andrzen Baranowsky, Gdansk, Poland

Thank you very much. I think this was a very important comment because it is a very controversial issue concerning the recognition of the system as such, and some sort of mistrust in specific cases, which may undermine the system again. But the question remains, nevertheless.

Jan Westra, Eindhoven, The Netherlands

I think we should ask ourselves what makes the architectural student? In Eindhoven, it is

really very simple; we don't talk about the ECTS problems. It is very important that you know the other party and you can communicate with the other schools. We have many students that go to Brazil, South Africa; they go all over the world. If you make constraints you will hinder the students from going abroad. I remember as a foreign exchange student in the United States, I took drawing classes for example that had nothing to do with the classes that I took at home, and nobody asked the question whether I would be less qualified at my school back in the Netherlands when I returned. There are some limits, but you can discuss these limits with the other party.

We are here at this conference, as I understand, because it is my first year, as heads of schools of Architecture. So the solution is right here. I take it I can call on anyone who is sitting in this room and say "you are getting a student from Eindhoven, he is doing a programme, and we understand that you have such and such a programme, and that you deliver so many ECTS credits." If you trust the other party, then everything will work out. There are of course limits in the sense that on entering, the student should be fit and he or she should not be put in a negative position. All of these discussions about ECTS shouldn't be done here, but we should actually say to each other: all heads of schools of architecture in the future, in the next ten years, will swap places for at least two weeks. It would be very interesting to see how things work in other schools.

We should also try to get more acquainted with the production of the architectural work that is done in other schools. We, for instance, make little books. I don't know whether all of these books from universities are available in quantities so that we can look at projects that they do and can communicate with the people that are guiding these projects.

Then there is the matter of personal communication, and it is very motivating for the students if you say you really should go there instead of asking, beforehand, how does this work with the ECTS scheme in architecture.

Christian Huetz, Regensburg, Germany

Along the same line, why should we always take the worst point and say that the student will study at a poor level and disregard everything which is in the process. So, I don't see this point because we have the possibility, you were right, to look for schools that offer some programmes that are compatible to our programmes. You have the possibility of what schools will be accredited and this is a sort of quality. Why should we think that a student is not a smart boy or a smart girl, I don't accept that. Well you see, George Orwell is everywhere, it's a question of egalitarianism. I think we are equal but we are not "more equal" and there are no people that are "more equal" than others. There are no schools that should be "more equal" than other schools. I think it is a problem of profile. Just yesterday we talked about the problem of profile: what does a school offer and what goals does the school set for its students? I think that students will move, they will take what they want, and not always at a very low level.

Ebbe Harder, Copenhagen, Denmark

I would like to make a comment about the ECTS points that you mentioned. Maybe you could say the problem is that the students are very aware about what they can obtain by staying in another school. So, in the first place, they will know from the coordinators in your own school that if they go there, they can get enough ECTS points for the study

programme at that school. Maybe that is one of the "borders" we have to fight. I am not sure of the students, but I think that most of us have had this experience: the idea is not only to have study programmes, but also to be a part of another culture and another language. This means something to the student and when a student is a serious one, it will always be something he or she will gain from. This is a discussion that we have had for many years but I think that the point we are saying is that exchange mobility is good but now we have to find ways to increase mobility.

The other point I would like to mention is that the results from the questionnaire about mobility were very low and I am not quite sure if the figures show us the correct picture. If you take the amount of students coming from abroad to your school, and combine that to the number of students that you have at that school, it is not the right percentages you had at that time. You know that students will be there for five or six years. I am not sure, because I haven't seen the calculations, but I think that it was a very, very low percentage and in my opinion it is higher than the statistics. I do think it is a very good idea to increase the number of exchange students and I don't know if there is anything more to say in this session. I would like you to pay attention to what said: that you are very, very welcome to contribute ideas to the organisation and also to ask what we as an organisation can do to increase the mobility of students and better the staff exchange.

Michel Paulin, Lyon, France

In my opinion, the networks operate only if there is a degree of confidence between all the institutions working together. So, this confidence is based on the cooperation and recognition shown by interaction with teachers and deans, as well as an awareness of each study programme on offer and not simply based on student choice. In other words, institutions will have to invest time and commit themselves before sending/receiving exchange students. That is very important. On the other hand a problem can appear if some students compose their programme only with their elective subjects. In each school there are more important courses and some less important, for example, courses like photography or dance. Maybe some students can travel through all of these secondary subjects and asked to be evaluated exactly as they have completed a main course. Maybe we have to think about a general framework of European architectural programs showing many kinds of abilities; a percentage of design, practice or research, and a percentage of cultural experience or learning gained from each foreign country and so on. If this framework works it is not important to assess each specific course, in each contract that we have with each student.

Christian Huetz, Regensburg, Germany

We have the agreement of the EAAE and the Accreditation System. There is a very decent framework of what an architect's skills should be so I don't think there is anything to discuss on this matter. It's all in the proceedings.

Spyros Raftopoulos, Athens, Greece

I would like to clarify something, because I think what I said may have been misunderstood. What I meant about the possible differences between schools is not a problem of mistrust

or lack of confidence; it is a matter of the emphasis that certain schools put on certain subjects. This is the problem, actually, what I am talking about (remark from audience)

Andrzen Baranowsky, Gdansk, Poland

You mean the profile, the profile.

Spyros Raftopoulos, Athens, Greece

(continuation of discussion) obviously is the final profile of the architect and what is expected of a student to graduate from a certain school. Let's take for example, the case of a student who may have the subject of Building Construction in a certain school in Europe. He or she may get the three, five or ten credits that are required in this subject, but the content that a certain school may give in this subject may be higher or even lower than what we may require. So it is not a matter of lack of confidence that we require the student to bring back the work that he or she has done. We look at the work, and if it is equivalent, with similar content, quality or quantity, we accept it and the student gets the credits required.

If I may take a little more of your time without trying to monopolise the discussion, I would like to talk about the circumscription of the system. We have cases in the past few years where Italian universities send us Greek students that are studying in Italy, to spend time in Greece in our university. Now, in a way this is circumscribing the system because as it was mentioned earlier, when we have this mobility, we expect not only the academic relationship of the student but also the cultural, social, and so on. It is circumscribing the system when Greek students that have permanent residence in Greece come from an Italian university and study a certain time in Greece. We have to accept them because they have been sent to us. These are some of the problems that we are trying to face.

Nur Çağlar, Ankara, Turkey

Any more comments? I understand there is not enough time to make conclusions out of all of these comments but perhaps tomorrow there will be more time to summarise what has been said during the workshop. So if there are no more comments thank you very much for attending the workshop.