EMREX Stakeholder Forum - Summary

Helsinki, Ministry of Education and Culture, 1 February 2017

Participants

Name	Title	Organisation	Country
Valère Meus	International Relations Expert	Ghent University, Erasmus Without Papers	Belgium
Susanne Suhr Andersen	Special Adviser	Ministry of Higher Education and Science	Denmark
Anders Bøgebjerg Hansen	Special Adviser	Ministry of Higher Education and Science	Denmark
Janne Santala	Head of Student Services	Satakunta University of Applied Sciences	Finland
Kirsi Aalto	Head of Student Services	Tampere University of Technology	Finland
Mats Lindstedt	Project Manager	CSC - IT Center for Science	Finland
Simona Ciani	International Relations Officer	University of Siena	Italy
Francesca D'Auria		University of Siena	Italy
Stefano Russo	Project Coordinator	KION	Italy
Espen Dybwad Kristensen	Senior Adviser	UiT The Arctic University of Norway	Norway
Geir Magne Vangen	Head of System Development, FSAT	National service center for IT-development and student administration	Norway
Richard Borge		University of Oslo	Norway
Lene Oftedal	Senior Adviser	Ministry of Education and Research	Norway
Inger Johanne Christansen	Senior Adviser	Ministry of Education and Research	Norway
Janina Mincer-Daszkiewicz	Associate Professor	University of Warsaw	Poland
Mauritz Danielsson	CEO	Ladok	Sweden
Pamela Engström	Degree Officer	University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Karin Åström		University of Gothenburg	Sweden

Agenda

1. **Should we be satisfied with our results so far?**
2. **What can we do to get more students to use EMREX before the Field Trial is over?**
3. **Future of EMREX, new projects/Scaling up**

Below is a summary of the discussion, for the full input see the working document on the event page at www.emrex.eu.

1. Should we be satisfied with our results so far?

SUMMARY

The bigger picture is that EMREX is a part of automatic recognition and a step in the right direction. It is at the moment more difficult to get an exchange place than to get a study place, which is rather ironic. This should change. Different points in the process of working with exchanges should be identified and they should as far as possible be standardized.

There is a big demand for having links from results to course descriptions, but this could be a difficult task, since it's done very differently and up to the different institutions. But at least the coursecodes should be put into the learning agreements. Course descriptions should be worked into ELMO. The data can be send, but the implementation of the processes should be left to the universities. Direct notifications should be send to the right people and institutions should be able to send more data. The students should have lifelong access to their data.

A suggestion was to move the process of choosing courses from the NCP to the SMP. The problem is that the place that wants the data is not the same place that is given the data. It could also be considered to tell the administrative personnel if the student has not selected all courses to be transferred. But it should be quite clear from the agreement which courses/results should be transferred. EWP-users and EMREX-users should be in the same registry it was argued. ERASMUS mundus coordinators should get information about the possibilities of EMREX. Getting the Netherlands onboard will be a great opportunity, since they are having huge amounts of students going out to and coming in from EMREX countries.

Questions:

- Easy built (preferably!) ideas for EMREX to further smoothen the administrative procedu
- Which main obstacles do you see for less timeconsuming administrative procedures concerning mobility?
- "Do you see EMREX as a step towards automatic recognition? Why/why not?"
- "Do you see administrative obstacles in that it is students that initiate the transfer of their results? Which - if any?"

2. What can we do to get more students to use EMREX before the Field Trial is over?

SUMMARY

Depending on how the system is implemented in each country tries to contact students directly from both sending and receiving institution. If it's possible make EMREX the "de facto" standard at HEIs. Make sure that all HEIs have the right information to send to students about testing and how. It's important that students make their log in directly after the results have been registered du to short accesses to some student portals. All countries involved should write EMREX in to their Erasmus+ Midterm Evaluation reports (in positive way) and also get support from National Agencies. Contact people responsible for Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degrees-program and Nordic Master Program

Questions:

- How do we get more students to test EMREX during Field Trial?
- Best strategy to get students to use EMREX after Field Trial?
- How to spread the word about EMREX?

3. Future of EMREX, new projects/Scaling up

SUMMARY

The key focus should be on getting more EU countries to join, especially one of the big ones like Germany, Spain, France or UK. However, as a lot of exchange is ongoing with e.g. China it would make it easier to get HEIs interested if non-EU countries are included in some way. Admission services and diploma supplements are of interest. EMREX should focus on what it does best and rather integrate with other services then try to solve all problems itself. A good way to accept newcomers is to either look at those part of the Erasmus Charter, or then accept partners that are recommended by at least two existing partners. All partners should also use the Ersmus+ midterm evaluation as an opportunity to market EMREX and to request more focus on digitalization of Erasmus.

Questions:

- Most important EU countries to get to join?
- Should EMREX reach out globally? To whom?
- Most important focus of EMREX 2.0 project application?
- Are there any interesting other processes/services EMREX should look at?
- What should EMREX NOT do?
- Should we have criteria for accepting new HEIs in EMREX? What check-ups should be done? Who would make the decision?