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INTRODUCTION

1. The proposal for the establishment of a 'University of the Peoples of Europe was forwarded at the 4th Conference of the Ministers of Education of the Member States in the Europe Region (Paris, 21-27 September). In the Final Report, the following recommendation was made to the Director-General of UNESCO:

"that he undertake a feasibility study ... and possibly draw up a plan for the establishment, under UNESCOs auspices, of a 'university of the peoples of Europe' to be an international academic and scientific institution concentrating on studies and instruction related to major problems concerning the whole of Europe, ... operating as a collective organization of interested countries in close co-operation with other regional and national institutions, inter alia by means of equivalent exchanges and the creation of joint structures and co-operative networks, and basing its contacts and communication on the principles of an open university and on massive use of new information technology." (Final Report, 1989, p.36)

2. Support for this undertaking was given by the International Conference of Education during its 41st session held in Geneva in January 1989 (final report, resolution 76).

In addition, the Director General in his contacts with the scholarly community laid continued stress upon both the intellectual and ethical role of UNESCO and most particularly in the context of the challenges facing Europe.

3. In October 1989, the 25th General Conference of UNESCO, meeting in Paris, endorsed the proposal and called upon the UNESCO Secretariat to undertake a feasibility study (General conference, resolution 25 C /101, para 3 (b) (vii). The study was entrusted to CEPES, the UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education in Bucharest (25/C5 01251).

4. In February 1990, a General Consultation was held between UNESCO and the concerned international organizations and specially invited experts in higher education to set out and define in an operational manner the mission, purpose, functions, organization and modes of financing for an eventual University of the Peoples of Europe.

5. Subsequent discussions developed along two parallel and complementary lines, one, co-ordinated by CEPES, being concerned with the general framework within which the University of the Peoples of Europe may evolve. Another more focussed study has been concerned with the development of mechanisms of co-operation between European faculties of science and technology (25/C5 02111). This study, which was co-ordinated by the Regional Office for Science and Technology in Europe, ROSTE, in Venice and the Division of Engineering and Technology, has resulted in a proposition for a European Faculty of Engineering. The two groups of experts have maintained close liaison. The present report, however, is concerned with the former perspective.

6. A Steering Committee and a Group of Experts were set up following the General Consultation in February 1990. The Steering Committee was composed by C. Berg, Director of CEPES, F. Eberhard, Secretary General of the International Association of Universities (IAU), A. Forti, Director of ROSTE, A. de Puymège, Deputy Secretary General of the
Standing Conference of Rectors, Presidents and Vice-chancellors of the European Universities (CRE) and F. Peregudov, Minister in charge of higher education in the USSR, representing the proposing country.

7. The Expert group gathered additional experts coming both from universities and organisations, comprising Pr H. Ahrweiler, former Rector of the Academy of Paris and President of the 'Université de l'Europe', Dr L. Cerych, Director of European Institute of Education and Social Policy and Advisor to the TEMPUS programme, Pr P. Ducrey, Rector of the University of Lausanne, Dr P. Fischer-Appelt, President of the Hamburg University and of the CC-PU, Council of Europe, Pr S. Merkureyev, Rector of the Leningrad University and Pr G. Neave, Director of Research, IAU, Mr N Pakhomov, Deputy Director of "Nauka," Head of Section, Research Centre of the USSR State Committee for Public Education.

8. The general remit of the two groups was to prepare the feasibility study for the project. They met three times, once at Leningrad in May, in August at Dubrovnik and in April 1991 in Paris. The meetings were marked by their constructive spirit and by a high degree of consensus on the principal aspects involved in the setting up of a 'University of the Peoples of Europe'.

9. Support for the concept of the 'University of the Peoples of Europe' has been expressed at several meetings gathering representatives of the university world. So at Helsinki for the 9th General Conference of the International Association of Universities in August 1990, where interest in this development was expressed. Similar views emerged from the international seminar "University Today" held at Dubrovnik later that month. A further pointer in the same direction may be seen in the creation of the Soviet Fund for the University of the Peoples of Europe, the aim of which is to give support to this undertaking.

10. The meeting held at Barcelona under the joint aegis of the Polytechnical University of Catalonia and UNESCO's Division of Science and Technology in late September/early October 1990 set out the initial framework for cooperation in Engineering and Applied Science within the broader setting of a University of the Peoples of Europe.

Prospects for academic co-operation in Europe

11. The benefit of closer and more sustained co-operation between higher education systems and the individuals in them cannot be underestimated. In addition to the settling in of the democratic ideas and values, the particular specialist dimensions involved are no less broad, ranging from technology transfer through to curriculum development.

12. The strategic purpose of that type of co-operation involved in the 'University of the Peoples of Europe' ought to be seen less in terms of one set of systems exporting an idealized version of themselves to another set of systems. Rather, co-operation should be conceived as a process which provides the opportunity for systems to learn from one another on the basis of self-defined needs on the one hand and training in key competences offered on the other.

13. A second, medium term strategic purpose of such co-operation ought to be the establishment of efficient and responsive higher education systems in Central and Eastern parts of the European region with a view to continuing - where not increasing - the obligations that industrialized countries have incurred in assisting the development of the Third World. In short, any strategy for strengthening intra regional cooperation in Europe should be informed by two further considerations; first, a symmetrical commitment to aid and assistance beyond that region; second, that in developing new forms of co-operation and
exchange, their possible relevance and application in the context of North South relations should constantly be born in mind.

14. Co-operation as student mobility has assumed for the first time in Western Europe of the 20th century, a mass dimension. With a target of 10 percent of all students in higher education spending some period of their studies abroad and, by 1990, with an approximate total of 50,000 students and four institutes of higher education out of ten in Community Member States involved in inter-institutional exchanges, clearly the notion of a ‘higher education space’ in Western Europe is a matter less of ambition than of fact.

15. Academic exchange and mobility are no longer a relatively marginal exercise of a predominantly cultural or pedagogical nature. They are, on the contrary, a central lever endowed with a clear strategic purpose and, as such, a new instrument in the possession of the policy-maker to accelerate technological change, to enlarge and to intensify networks of knowledge generation and thus of specialized training beyond the scope of the individual institution and, by extension, beyond the scope of the individual nation-state.

16. These programmes are then, not simply levers of mobilization and accelerators of change whether that change involves technology, or the social acceptability of technology. They are rather, exemplary of the way in which a new social order, usually presented as the integration of (Western) Europe is taking shape around the concept of a single European market.

17. As in the Member States of the European Community, so too with countries in Central and Eastern Europe, where academic contact and exchange has moved to the centre of the stage. The reasons for this revision in priorities are many; the concept of a Common European Home, launched by President Michael Gorbachev has underlined the need to seek the common and shared elements of the European cultural heritage and more particularly, its expression in the university.

18. Recent initiatives in Central Europe show very clearly that the training of future elites still retains its relevance. The creation of a Central European University is a private venture which received the backing of the Czech and Slovak governments in May 1990. Its purpose, amongst others, is to introduce the techniques and skills involved in Business Administration, Economics, Political Science and to form key personnel to consolidate the transition to a market economy.

19. A close examination of the dynamic that underlies institutional co-operation within the ERASMUS framework is especially useful in that it gives some insight into the pattern of development involved in the extension and consolidation of these agreements. It is an aspect that has particular relevance for the proposed ‘University of the Peoples of Europe’. It provides, schematically at least, a series of marker posts against which its evolution may be plotted as well as defining some of the administrative tasks to be assumed in the transition from one stage to another.

20. The proposal for a ‘University of the Peoples of Europe’ comes at a time when cooperation between institutes of higher education is taking on an unprecedented momentum, particularly in the western States of the region. Such momentum is now beginning to find reciprocal expression in the central and Eastern States. Whether one views this development as a product of changing circumstance or whether it will become a permanent feature in a species of higher education space, or as a third possibility, that it stands as a clear demonstration of the reality of a Common European home, it has profound - and favorable - consequences for the climate in which the proposed ‘University of the Peoples of Europe’ is set. In addition, and no less important, such momentum has repercussions for some of the assumptions which underlie the Feasibility Study itself.
Mission and purposes.

21. The often dramatic changes in the economic and political context of the European region that have taken place in the period intervening between the time when the idea of a 'University of the Peoples of Europe' was first broached and the launching of this analysis, it should be stressed, once again, that the basic premisses behind the concept of the 'University of the Peoples of Europe', endure. Contemporary History does not invalidate them. On the contrary, it opens up new vistas for development and inter-regional collaboration which serve to strengthen yet further the basic vision. This vision is coherent, but like any complex proposal, it has many facets that are all brought together around what are perceived as common values, as a rediscovery of a shared history and as a grounding in a common civilisation.

22. The broad mission of the University of the Peoples of Europe (UPE) is to give institutional expression to the changes inherent in the move towards a new European order. Intended as all-European in scope, the UPE should be based on trust through mutual understanding. As a social institution, any university is rooted in the past, has its concerns situated in the present and its commitment turned towards the future. This is no less so for the UPE.

23. Co-operation between the peoples of the European region has to take full account of the range of difference in culture and history that have moulded their identity. At the same time, to lay down an enduring basis for a common Europe requires an awareness made deeper of those things shared and common across the cultures and identities of its component nations. Clearly, the study of both the cultural heritage as well as the varying historical concepts that have underlain and inspired Europe, correspond to such a purpose.

24. As nations and states grow closer together, so greater attention is being paid to those disciplines and ways of looking at the world which, in the past, gave substance to the nation-state and which now have equal importance in giving substance to the reality of "The Common European Home". Amongst the most powerful of these disciplines is History which, allied with other, often geographically-related interdisciplinary domains - European Studies, Soviet Studies etc - have sought to bring to the fore new historical and social perspectives in keeping with changes in the relationship between nations. Against this background, the mission of the UPE would be to extend the application of these new perspectives to cover the whole European region.

25. If co-operation may be placed on a firmer base by understanding our common heritage, it has also to respond to those present day concerns that are recognized as shared, as being immediate and as posing a real and genuine challenge to the region as a whole. They ought also to be practical in nature. In this connection, a clear consensus amongst the Group of Experts was expressed in favor of developing projects in relation to such issues as the European Culture and History, the Environment, Population and Health, the Economic Development of Europe as well as its Scientific and Technological progress.

26. The European heritage does not limit itself to culture and values. In higher education, the association of research and science as too, research and learning are part of that unique contribution which Europe, through the 18th century Enlightenment and through the Humboldtian vision of the university at the start of the 19th century, has given to the world of the mind. International exchange and solidarity has always been strong when it rests on these vehicles. And the explicit extension of this principle through the UPE is no less an element in shaping its mission.

*The exact title of this establishment is clearly a matter that will require discussion. Its present designation reflects the original title which was raised at the meeting of the Ministers of Education of Europe in 1988. It is retained in the interests of the convenience and continuity only.*
THE ORGANISATIONAL MODEL

The specificity of the UPE

27. If the mission identity of the UPE resides in its all-European commitment to dealing with issues of strategic and long term significance and the eradication of national and other stereotypes which stands as obstacles to mutual understanding, its intellectual identity resides in the choice of disciplinary fields, the nature of the institutions participating and the level of students. The organisational model provides the frame in which the UPE expresses its identity.

28. UPE has four clear specificities:
   > it is all European in scope;
   > it concentrates on senior research students preparing an academic career;
   > it fosters mutual understanding within a framework of excellence;
   > it is dedicated to the advance of understanding between the nations of Europe by setting particular store on their shared Histories, culture and civilisation and the common pursuit of a humanistic perspective.

Networks and participating institutions.

29. Different models of exchange and collaboration have a very specific dynamic and pattern of evolution. Various organisational models were examined and three models for networks retained for in-depth analysis by the Group of Experts. These were that the UPE should form:
   > a separate network of cooperation.
   > ties into existing networks.
   > a network of networks.

30. A network of networks does not seem to greatly contribute to the understanding of the forces involved, let alone their final confirmation. This option was not pursued further. By contrast, the setting up of a separate network of cooperation outside those already in place has, in theory at last, a certain attractiveness. However, the substantial resources required seem not to be commensurate with this level of ambition which the UPE represents.

31. Laying down links with existing networks is, clearly, an easier option. It would entail less investment than seeking to build up an exclusively UPE system. However, the present programmes are not geographically inclusive. The EC programmes do not extend to all parts of the European region, though the development later of parallel initiatives outside both the EC and the central areas of the region ought not to be discounted. From the standpoint of the UPE's linking up with existing programmes, such programmes cannot provide more than a partial solution, albeit a most important one.
32. In this juncture, the procedures for joining the programmes which provide networks with material support, as distinct from existing networks, become crucial. Clearly, for the UPE to be recognized as having a formal right to participate in, say, the EC programmes will require negotiations at the highest level. And whilst such a task would be high upon agenda of the UPE, it is by no means sure how protracted such negotiations would be.

33. To lay down links with existing programmes and networks ought to involve a dual strategy: on the one hand, the pursuit of negotiations with governmental authorities; on the other, the seeking out, on an individual case by case basis, of individual institutions whose substantive profile corresponds to the interests, priority disciplines and issues enumerated above.

34. Presuming that, at this juncture, UNESCO may not wish to undertake substantial investment in UNESCO Chairs associated with the UPE, it is recommended that cooperation with the university world be based on linking up with existing networks.

35. It is also recommended that in the first instance, emphasis be placed on individual institutional contacts, pending the outcome of negotiations with the appropriate authorities, governmental and inter governmental, for recognition to be given to the UPE formally and officially to take part in these programmes.

36. The consultation of disciplinary networks has already demonstrated its relevance in the case of the proposed European Faculty of Engineering which is exemplary in its approach of involving key institutions at a very early stage in laying down the groundwork for future collaboration.

The choice of disciplines and target groups

37. The choice of disciplinary fields was determined primarily by the key role they are to play in the integration of certain Western parts of the European region as too by the equally vital part they assume in the transition from a centrally planned to a market economy in the central and eastern areas. In addition, the Group of Experts took the view that the disciplinary fields should be chosen in keeping with the high degree of mutual benefit that could be derived.

38. Accordingly, the following fields as 'start up' disciplines are recommended: Economics, Law, Management Studies, Health Sciences, Informatics, Engineering.

In the light of the mission and purposes of the UPE, "European studies" was also discussed as an initial subject area. Given the nature of these studies, this was felt to be a question rather for the participating institutions, which would decide how to approach such studies. The same is valid for other inter-disciplinary areas such as the environment, which were rather conceived to be a further pattern of development, evolving from the mono-disciplinary networks.

39. The priority target group to participate in the UPE should be research students under training and more specifically those destined for a career in higher education. The laying down of a new European identity depends not only on collaboration between higher education institutions. It is more likely to take root quicker if, in the first instance, it involves future members of what one writer has called 'the key profession', namely, academia itself. The UPE accordingly would propose to start with research students in the last years of their training.
40. The delineation of some six initial disciplinary fields as the initial basis for cooperation has a central importance in this venture, for without such a focus there can be no concept of excellence. Both the Steering Committee and the Group of Experts are conscious that excellence is not defined by administrative fiat, still less by policy analysis. It resides in the level of knowledge purveyed, in the originality and creativity of staff and students, and in their productivity. It is also, by the nature of academic work, something that the academic community, both collectively as well as singly, alone can define. This is the Ark of Covenant of the universities in Europe and goes under various terms, Lernfreiheit, Lehrfreiheit, scholarly freedom and scholarly self responsibility.

41. Excellence, like freedom itself, is conditional upon mutual trust and understanding. Those who later will come together to give substantive content to the start up priority disciplines will do so in keeping with the most rigorous standards demanded by their particular specialist field.

**Participating Institutions**

42. To define the level of qualification for participation in the UPE as corresponding to the "highest degree" awarded in a country's higher education system will not result in a formal homogeneity in respect of the number of years already accomplished by, and still less of the age of, the student body. Such variety reflects the natural diversity of higher education systems with very different traditions and structures. With a wider definition, the institutional pool is broader and deeper and thus the number of possible partners increases.

Preference should be given to a policy which enables a rapid growth in the number of institutions participating. Viewed from this perspective, it would appear preferable to be able to draw from a broader rather than a narrower, institutional universe.

43. In the first stage of the UPE's development, between 12 and 15 participating centres would constitute a viable minimum. This figure has been reached on the basis of the six subject areas identified earlier as 'start up disciplines' - effectively two or three establishments per discipline. It would be desirable to have some 30 establishments included in the network at the end of five years.

**The implications of duplication**

44. An earlier view held that the mission of the UPE should be drawn up to avoid any hint of duplication with the tasks performed by other establishments. Yet there are excellent grounds for justifying duplication rather than avoiding it.

45. The first of these justifications concerns the amount of existing linkages. Because the number of these is so vast, it is not possible to examine them all with view to avoiding overlap. Logically, there must be some degree of overlap even amongst existing programmes. Yet the presence of overlap appears not to have prevented them contributing to the intensification of academic cooperation in the European region. Rather the contrary.

46. A second argument may be advanced to support a more positive view on duplication. There is nothing wrong with duplication so long as there is a real and, sustained demand for what is duplicated. Viewed from this angle, duplication is simply the response of individual institutions or, for that matter, of whole systems, to a demand which cannot be fulfilled within the limitations of one institution or perhaps even one nation.
Without disciplinary focus, there can be no excellence. By the same token, excellence without the test of visible competition to demonstrate it, has meaning only for insiders - those who are intimate with and initiates of, the substantive field in which it takes place.

Certification, diplomas and awards

Two possibilities, both of which draw upon certification procedures currently employed in systems that may be described as confederal or dispersed, were considered.

The National Technological University in the United States - a distance teaching body - retains a system of centrally defined awards for courses that are developed by participating units and diffused by satellite.

The second model is that at present used by EUROPACE (Programme for Advanced Continuing Engineering Education), a satellite network based in Amsterdam, and using a distance teaching format. EUROPACE does not deliver its own diplomas. Such responsibility falls rather, to the participating establishments.

In weighing up the strengths and the shortcomings of the two systems, it was retained that mutual recognition is a most flexible arrangement. It is therefore recommended that a recognition of time spent with UPE should be credited towards the research degree awarded by the student's home establishment.

Thus the UPE should be founded upon a decentralized system of certification and awards. It is also recommended that steps be taken to explore the possibilities for a course credit transfer system to serve as a major element in the system of certification of the future UPE.

Development and evaluation

The first five years of the UPE should be regarded as a pilot phase. During this period, the main task would involve building up and consolidating mono-disciplinary linkages as well as preparing for interdisciplinarity. Whatever the profile of activities that will develop it is recommended that a thorough-going evaluation, to review progress to date, to ascertain how far goals have been met, five years after the start of the project. Such an evaluation should mark the end of the pilot phase. One should make plain, however, that the end of this phase does not mean the end of the University of the Peoples of Europe. It would continue to develop, subject to the findings and recommendations which would result from such an evaluation.

ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE

Background

The General Consultation in February 1990 underlined the importance for any future structure of the UPE to be flexible and to avoid bureaucratic heaviness. From the standpoint of its initial student body, the UPE is best conceived in terms of an Institute of Advanced Study. As part of a "nodal point" of a series of networks, it will require a core of administrative personnel as well as staff whose task it will be to ensure efficient academic liaison with other establishments part of that network.
53. Two models for the organisational structure were considered. The first is grounded upon an intergovernmental structure and in all probability would require the drawing up of a formal intergovernmental agreement, regulating such matters as the distribution of representatives on its supreme governing body.

54. The second option lays greater emphasis upon the UPE's status as a university, and whilst due importance is laid upon the role of governments, such a model of governance lies more closely akin to that found in the university world itself. Alongside a strong university interest represented on the governing bodies, that of governments stands as one constituency amongst others. In this profile, the role of UNESCO is to act as guarantor for the part played by civil society, acting through its various manifestations one of which is the university world. The principle feature of this model which stresses institutional autonomy, is the substantial presence of representatives of the scholarly community. As such it gives clear expression to the concept of the UPE as an emanation of the universities of Europe rather than an intergovernmental body. In the view of the Group of Experts, the advantages contained in this alternative are significant.

55. With the strengthening of autonomy in Europe's higher education systems on the one hand, and the phenomenon of what some have termed "the withdrawal of the state" on the other, it is desirable that the UPE's structures of governance and management should, as far as the possibilities admit, be in harmony with those already present or emerging in, their future partner institutions.

56. A further advantage of the second arrangement is that it ought to permit the rapid identification by the university world with the UPE. Such credibility is central to the rapid and successful launch as too in consolidating good relations with partner universities.

Governance and management structures: Stage I

57. One basic consideration has been to separate the development of the UPE into two clear stages. These stages have been termed the "Start Up" period and the "Development period". Henceforth, they will be termed "Stage I" and "Stage II". As its name implies, the former will involve the drawing up of the basic frameworks, statutes, procedures and legal embodiments on which the later evolution of the UPE would rest. The second stage would see the UPE expanding its linkages with the university world in keeping with its mission, the response other establishments make towards it, and in keeping with the resources it has at its disposal.

58. The development of the governance and management structure logically follows the same profile. Stage I will require a small and uncomplex structure. It should consist of two bodies - the Foundation Advisory Body and the Foundation Executive Body. Stage II will call for a more complex organization.

59. The Foundation Advisory Body would be composed of a limited number of personalities prominent in the world of higher education, of those having similar responsibilities amongst the appropriate international organizations within the region. Chaired by a full-time Chief Executive Officer or President ad interim, it would advise the Foundation Executive Body on such matters as the form of legal embodiment or Charter, on the drawing up of administrative procedures, and on the strategic development of the UPE. The Foundation Advisory Body would have a limited duration of not more than two years.

60. The Foundation Executive Body, also of an interim nature, would be headed by a full-time Chief Administrative Officer with line responsibility to the Chief Executive Officer. As with
the Chief Executive Officer so with the Chief Administrative Officer, the appointment would be ad interim for the duration of Stage I. Three Academic officers would have responsibility for seeking out partner institutions and for drawing up the academic structures and proceedings. The Foundation Executive Body may be conceived as an executive committee of the Foundation Advisory Body and as such would be endowed with a formal legal status.

61. The Foundation Executive Body would submit for advice from the Foundation Advisory Board proposals that bear upon all procedures - administrative and academic - involved in the setting up of the UPE. The Foundation Executive Body would have the responsibility for finalizing and putting in place, the legal instruments necessary for the establishment of the UPE, the development of its budgetary procedures, and the drawing up, approval and execution of the UPE's strategic plan. It would negotiate with the appropriate authorities and other instances, the financing of the UPE.

62. Both the Advisory and the Executive Bodies would be served by a secretarial staff of some 6 persons. Formal responsibility for the task definition of the secretarial staff and general oversight would be exercised by the Chief Administrative Officer.

63. The primary tasks of the Foundation Bodies would be:
   > to prepare a Charter for the UPE;
   > to put in place the Executive Body and its administrative support;
   > to draw up model agreements on the basis of which the detailed development of the European University network could later be elaborated;
   > to identify institutions liable to become partners of the network;
   > to put in hand procedures for financing the UPE;
   > to seek out forms of financial support;
   > to find an appropriate location, office space, etc.

Transition to Stage II: role of a Constituent Assembly

64. The possibility of June 1993 as appropriate for holding a Constituent Assembly of the UPE was retained. At that juncture, Stage II in the development of UPE's governance and management structures ought to be initiated. The principle elements involved in the transition would be the establishment of a more elaborate organizational structure. The principal purpose of the Constituent Assembly would be to authorize this transition and, in the case of the Senate, to elect representatives of external interests from amongst such constituencies as the university world, international organizations.

Governance and Management structures: Stage II

65. The permanent management structure, put in place at the start of Stage II, would be based on four main bodies:
   > a Senate;
   > an Executive Council;
Six Subject Boards;

> a Secretariat/ Registry.

66. The Senate would act in an advisory capacity to the UPE. It brings together representatives of outside interests and constituencies. Its membership would be nominated from amongst international organizations as well as from Regional and National Rectors' Conferences. Nominations would be for a period of four years. The Senate thus constitutes the main representative body inside the UPE, as is the case of the universities of Europe. It would advise on major policy developments concerning the UPE in general. It would advise on the development of new initiatives. It would advise as requested by the Executive Council, on the formal agreements of cooperation with partner universities. The Senate would be chaired by the Chief Executive Officer who at the same time would be the titular head and Rector of the University of the Peoples of Europe with a mandate for a term of two years with possibility of re-appointment for one further term of two years.

67. The Executive Council exercises the main operational control of the UPE and draws up the UPE's strategic plan. In the academic domain, it examines and gives formal recognition to cooperation agreements initiated or negotiated by the Academic Officers with other establishments. It ratifies all measures involving academic research and teaching personnel. It is chaired by the Chief Executive Officer as President and is serviced by the Chief Administrative Officer as head of administration.

68. Subject Boards seek out and develop contacts between UPE headquarters and other partner establishments which may, later, form the discipline-based network. They are responsible for negotiating the place of the UPE in a network and for setting out the academic conditions under which the UPE participates in that network or develops links with an individual university. Subject Boards are responsible for the maintenance of high academic standards.

69. The Secretariat discharges the day to day management of the UPE. Under the responsibility of the Chief Administrative Officer or Registrar, it reports to the Executive Council. It provides administrative support to the Executive Council and, following instructions received from the Executive Council, is responsible for the distribution of all central resources.

COST ESTIMATES

70. It is not foreseen that UNESCO should provide the financial input which the launching and subsequent development of the UPE will require. Indeed, one of the most important tasks which the Foundation Advisory Body will have to assume, is the location and mobilisation of financial support. Conceivably this may lie with governments, international organisations, foundations and other benefactors. Financial input from UNESCO should concern the early months of the 'start up' period, and be associated with the steps involved with the setting up of the Foundation Advisory Body.

The Resourcing of Stage I

71. It is desirable that the Chief Executive Officer, as too the Chief Administrative Officer be from the first, full-time appointments. It is upon these two key appointments that the major burden of preparing and drawing up the permanent administrative structures and procedures, will fall.
72. Estimates for the salary element are based on UNESCO pay scales, current as of July 1990. They take into account social security in addition to the salary scale. The determination of the remuneration is, self evidently, to attract high quality applicants in keeping with the fundamental objective of the UPE, becoming a centre of excellence and being associated with institutions of the same status. Salary levels should then be competitive with the type of remuneration current for the exercise of similar responsibilities in higher education systems of the European region.

73. Following these considerations, the annual salary element by level of personnel during the 'start up' phase would thus amount to approximatively US$ 800 000. It will be noted that staffing at all levels during the start up period which may be upwards of two years, has been reduced to the strict operational minimum.

74. To this amount should be added equipment, meeting, running and travelling costs. These costs have been calculated to an additional US$ 150 000 per annum. The total financing required annually for stage I thus amounts to approximatively US$ 1,000 000.

The Resourcing of Stage II

75. The ratification of new appointments and the general increase in the size of the operation at the start of stage II will, not surprisingly, raise the staff salary element. The annual salary element would be in the order of approximatively US$ 1,800,000.

76. In addition to the usual staff and operational costs associated with the UPE Headquarters, there are the expenses incurred with holding the Executive Council and Senate meetings. The total expenditure for these meetings will depend on the number of members of the two bodies, and the frequency of their meetings. Only those members who are not associated with Headquarters staff have been included in budgetary estimates. These estimates include a 5 percent inflation rate and are carried forward over the first three years of Stage II. They are in the order of US$ 50 000 per annum.

77. By the start of the 3rd year of operation - that is, in the first year of Stage II - the UPE ought to be in a position to operationalize agreements with other establishments and networks and begin the process of student exchange. Estimates for this element are also included in the form of a project development profile. Such projects will involve the development of networking links, the negotiating of agreements between establishments, the administrative and personnel expenses in-built to each project. The Group of Experts reckoned each project would be in the order of US$ 100,000.

78. By the end of the pilot phase which was fixed at some five years, the number of projects under way should be in the order of 30 - that is, five for each of the six disciplinary fields. In estimating the project cost profile over time, three assumptions are made in respect of first, the number of project starts made each year; second, their duration; and third, the rhythm of expenditure.

79. Annual overall expenditure will rise from just short of US$ 1,000,000 at the start of Stage I to approximately US $ 2,800 000 by the third year of Stage II, that is some five years along from the start of the whole project. Also inbuilt into these calculations is an inflation factor of some five percent per year.
The Financing of Students

80. Estimates based on data derived from the European Community student mobility scheme ERASMUS, suggested that the cost per student per year is in the order of ECU [European Currency Units] 7,000 (circa US$ 10,000). Assuming that student exchange is profiled in keeping with the project profile mentioned above, the total outlay would be around US$ 2,300,000 per year for Years 1 and 2 rising to US$ 6,650,000 for Year 3.

81. The initiative taken by the Soviet Government to establish the Soviet Fund for the University of the Peoples of Europe points out that a possible solution to this aspect of the UPE could well lie in the creation of parallel funding sources at national level.

82. However, the issue of student finance, like that of the UPE generally, depends heavily on securing medium term commitments, perhaps by means of contributions from governments in the European region, perhaps by seeking private funding sources. In either case, it is unlikely that such commitments would be indefinite.

SITING OF THE UPE

83. Where the UPE should set up its headquarters was seen as a matter best left until later. However, in determining the choice of location, it is well to bear in mind, that the UPE will be one amongst a series of nodal points where a number of networks meet. For this reason, it is desirable that good communications and transportation facilities be available and that a good telecommunications infrastructure exists as well. Because the UPE’s mission is to assert a shared European cultural heritage, it follows that considerable attention should be given to the historical symbolism and significance of the location itself.

SCHEDULE AND TIMING

84. Stage I would begin around January 1992 with the creation of the Foundation Advisory Body. This body would establish a sub-committee which would eventually take the form of the Foundation Executive Body. Prime amongst the tasks of both bodies will be the preparation of the Charter with a view to its presentation to the Unesco Executive Board in June 1992. The final ratification of this fundamental document will take place at the meeting of the Constituent Assembly, scheduled for June 1993. The Constituent Assembly will effectively mark the completion of stage I and the transition to stage II.

85. Stage II will last until June 1997. It is at this point that the evaluation exercise will take place. It will assess the development of the UPE over the preceding five years and make recommendations where necessary for future development. Stage II, as foreseen, is marked by the transition to a more elaborate governance and management structure and by the setting up of the Senate, the Executive Council and their supporting groups.
Summary

Background
The circumstances for establishing a University of the Peoples of Europe are favorable. Cooperation between institutes of higher education is a matter of high priority for the States in Europe. Four developments support this estimation:

> In the European Communities increasing public resources are being concentrated on student mobility. Around four higher education establishments out of ten in the EC are currently involved in cooperation schemes;
> EFTA countries are also expanding this aspect of their higher education systems and the EC has now put in place an outreach programme, TEMPUS, which involves a certain number of States in Central Europe;
> Economic and political reconstruction in all areas of the European continent - though especially in Central and Eastern Europe - places a high priority on knowledge exchange, mutual assistance in developing skills for the transition to an information-based society;
> Current patterns of intra regional cooperation are in process of radical redefinition. This has been precipitated in part by events over the past year and a half.

Mission of the UPE
The UPE has four clear specificities:

> it is all European in scope;
> it concentrates on senior research students preparing an academic career;
> it fosters mutual understanding within a framework of excellence;
> it is dedicated to the advance of understanding between the nations of Europe by setting particular store on their shared Histories, culture and civilisation and the common pursuit of a humanistic perspective.

The organizational model
Against this background, the Group of Experts whose opinions form the basis of this Feasibility Report make the following recommendations:

i. that the UPE start with some six disciplines:

> Economics; Law; Management Studies; Health Sciences; Informatics; Engineering.
From these mono-disciplinary networks, inter-disciplinary arrangements would evolve, addressing such areas as European Culture and history, the Environment, or the Economic development of Europe.

ii. that the priority target group should be research students and those destined for an academic career in higher education, as teacher or as researcher.

iii. that the UPE should start with research students in the last years of their training;

iv. that the UPE be developed on a decentralized system of certificates and awards and that attention be paid to exploring the possibilities of adopting a system of course credit transfer to serve as a major element in the UPEs system of certification;
v. that cooperation with the university world be based on existing networks;

vi. that circa 12 participating centers should constitute the viable minimum to be attained within the first four years, with the minimum target of 30 - 36 link schemes four years after the project starts;

vii. that a thorough-going evaluation take place five years after the start of the project.

**Governance and Management structures**

viii. that the future UPEs governance and management structures be in keeping with the emergent trends towards strengthening institutional autonomy;

ix. that the project get under way in two Stages. First, with the creation of a Foundation Advisory Body, together with a Foundation Executive Body; This Stage would last some two years from the start up date;

xi. That Stage II, lasting a further 3 years, set down a permanent governance structure based on:

> a Senate;
> an Executive Council;
> six Subject Boards;
> a Secretariat.

**Cost Estimates**

Financial input from UNESCO should concern the setting up of the Foundation Advisory Body and the holding of its first meetings. The further financing of the UPE should be sought from different sources, such as goverments, international organizations and foundations.

Personnel costs per year for the Start up Stage: US$ 850,000;
Running, Equipment, Travel and Meeting costs per year: US$ 150 000;
Total annual costs for Stage I: US$ 1,000 000

Personnel costs per year for Stage II: US$ 1,800,000;

Total Budget including operational expenses, project costs costs etc. are estimated at US$ 2,000 000 in year 1 of Stage II, rising to around US$ 2,800 000 by year 5. This also takes account of some 30 projects, starting at different times and lasting each five years.

Student costs: Following estimates based on data from ERASMUS, the total outlay would be US$ 2, 300 000 for year 1 and 2, rising to US$ 6,650 000 for year 3.

**Schedule and proposed start**

Schedule and decision chart are set out in annex.
Subject to the views of the 26th General Conference of Unesco to be held in October November 1991, the project could begin in January 1992.