Date: December 21, 2012

***1st Meeting of the Mobility and Internationalisation Working Group***

**Berlin, 6-7 December 2012**

***Venue: Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, Hannoversche Straße 28‐29, Gartenhaus, 10115 Berlin***

**Draft minutes**

**Participants**

**Co-Chair: Austria Gottfried Bacher**

**Co-Chair: Germany Peter Greisler**

**Co-Chair: Spain Luis Delgado**

Support to the Co-Chairs Kathleen Ordnung

Support to the Co-Chairs Anna Fleischmann

BFUG Secretariat Gayane Harutyunyan

BFUG Secretariat Hayk Sargsyan

Armenia Lusine Madoyan

Belgium / Flemish Community Magalie Soenen

Belgium / French Community Kevin Guillaume

Cyprus Christos Pouyioukkas

Denmark Line Verbik Byriel

France Hélène Lagier

Germany Birgit Galler

Lithuania Jolita Butkiene

The Netherlands Robin van IJperen

Poland Anna Majda

Slovenia Alenka Flander

UK Matthew Brown

BUSINESS EUROPE Irene Seling

Council of Europe Jean-Philippe Restoueix

EI María Luisa Sánchez Simón

ENQA Maria Kelo

EQAR Eric Froment

ESU (Germany) Tinja Zerzer

EUA Elizabeth Colucci

European Commission Maria-Kristín Gylfadóttir

European Commission Ragnhild Berg

Consultative Member Siegbert Wuttig

Consultative Member (ACA) Irina Ferencz

Apologies were received from: Patricia Pol (France), Marzia Foroni (Italy), Ludmila Pavlov (Moldova) and Gerry O’Sullivan (Ireland).

**Introduction and adoption of the agenda**

The Co-Chair, Peter Greisler (Germany) welcomed the participants and informed that, as agreed at the Nicosia BFUG meeting, the Mobility and Internationalisation Working Group (WG) will be co-chaired by Germany, Spain, Austria and Romania. Yet there has not been any information received from the Romanian side since the Nicosia BFUG meeting, thus only three Co-Chairs were present at the first meeting of the WG. The Austrian Co-Chair will inform the Board accordingly at its next meeting in January 2013.

Additionally, he informed that during the Co-Chairs pre-meeting they agreed on the way of sharing the general responsibilities as well as that the Austrian Co-chair, Gottfried Bacher would represent the Mobility and Internationalisation WG at the Board meeting in Zagreb, 14-15 January, 2013.

The agenda was adopted with one change: *“Mobility benchmark – update on progress to date on Eurostat data administrative collection”* presentation by EC was included in the agenda of the second day of the meeting.

The adoption of the agenda was followed by the Tour de Table introduction of all members of the WG.

Before the discussions on the WG’s draft Work plan 2012-2015 (WP) started the representative of the Council of Europe (CoE) noted that the work of the WG would benefit from the involvement of the non-EU members that, unfortunately were not present at the meeting (Kazakhstan, Moldova and Turkey). Sharing the concern of the CoE the Co-Chair underlined that the countries in question were informed but for various logistical reasons were not able to join the meeting.

**Discussion of an agreement on the draft Work Plan**

The German Co-chair reminded that the Work Plan included all the topics to be considered in the next meetings of the WG and suggested to discuss them one by one. Also the members were informed that the responsibilities for the Work plan topics are divided between the three Co-Chairing countries while all members are supposed to contribute actively to the work of the WG, i.e. the different topics each Co-Chair is responsible for. Mainly, Germany will be responsible for the following topics:

* To propose to the BFUG guidelines on staff mobility, including a definition of “staff” and an analysis of current barriers to staff mobility, as well as a set of potential measures to overcome them;
* To examine options of assessing and improving the international attractiveness of the EHEA inter alia by examining whether a target on mobility into the EHEA is feasible and to be recommended;
* To explore whether a common approach on the portability of grants and loans in the EHEA is feasible and to be recommended.

Austria will be responsible for the topics on:

* Liaison with the reporting working group.
* Increasing the quality of mobility;
* Balanced/imbalanced mobility flows;
* Promoting mobility of underrepresented groups.

Spain will be responsible for:

* Proposing to the BFUG guidelines for further internationalisation developments in the EHEA, including continuation of the cooperation with 3rd countries in the framework of the Bologna Policy Forum;
* Exploring options of improving the information on study and admission systems of EHEA countries.

The deliberations of the WP revealed the need to address the following important topics:

* The global dimension is not very well elaborated in the draft WP and it was suggested to the members of the WG to present their proposals how to further the issue.
* The role of ‘staff’ which is not yet enough investigated when it comes to the Mobility Strategy and there is a need for clear definition of staff mobility.
* Lack of data on staff mobility was underlined. Additionally, was mentioned that presently, Eurydice is updating data on staff mobility.
* Missing concentration on specific tasks and their concrete outcomes.
* The need to understand which priorities need to be reflected in the WP: it was stressed that staff mobility is not a high priority in the Bucharest Communiqué while issues such as joint programmes, doctoral mobility and quality of mobility are in the focus of ministerial document.
* The need to link the works of the WGs on Implementation and Mobility and Internationalisation with regards to data on staff mobility as well as input related to the questionnaire. It was agreed that a group of the WG’s members (Denmark, France, Slovenia and EC) draft a questionnaire on mobility and internationalisation and address it to the WG on Bologna Process Implementation.
* To discuss measures of involvement of underrepresented groups in mobility, to stimulate these groups to be more mobile (link to quality of mobility).
* EC suggested that the working group creates an inventory, which will include information on the all research initiatives, projects and studies that were carried out by the member countries and organisations of the WG.
* There are other players (e.g. International Association of Universities (IAU), European Training Foundation (ETF) doing different projects in other parts of the world in the context of internationalisation and there is a need to share their studies and mappings.
* Generate specific cases on quality mobility and how those cases are defined and implemented on institutional level. EUA, DAAD, CoE and EC representatives volunteered to follow this initiative.
* The topic of imbalanced mobility needs to be linked to quality mobility and common challenges for countries have to be investigated concerning this issue.
* Nationally, countries have information on incoming mobility, but this issue is more complicated on the EHEA level. It is also important to propose a target for incoming mobility .
* EUA volunteered to contribute to stocktaking of regional cooperation initiatives in terms of internationalisation and global dialogue. The EC and DAAD also volunteered to participate in this initiative.
* It was stressed the need to have innovative ideas for enhancing internationalization of HEIs and regarding international cooperation mechanisms, which can foster ministerial dialogue.

The group debates led to the final version of the Work plan as inserted below.



**Discussion on the agreement on the Terms of Reference**

It was decided that the second bullet of the ToR’s purpose and/or outcome section, saying “To support countries in their national implementation efforts regarding the mobility strategy” should become a part of the questionnaire.

While discussing the specific tasks of the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the WG it was emphasized that feasibility of the task “develop a policy proposal for a specific European accreditation approach for joint programmes, which should be applied to all those joint programmes that are subject to compulsory programme accreditation at national level” will be decided depending on the outcome of a seminar proposed by ENQA or a thematic session on quality assurance prepared by the Netherlands, ENQA and EQAR that possibly can be organised linked to the BFUG meeting in Vilnius 7-8 November, 2013. It was also noted that this is an issue of importance to both the Mobility and Internationalisation WG and the Structural WG. It was proposed that while the Mobility WG would deal with the topic strategically in terms of internationalisation, it would be more appropriate for the Structural WG to deal with the technicalities of a joint accreditation approach.

The discussions on the draft Terms of Reference led to the version of the ToR as inserted below.

****

**Audit “Internationalisation of Universities” – presentation by the German Rectors’ Conference (HRK) and discussions**

Dr. Rolf Peter thanked the WG for the invitation and made a presentation on the *Audit “Internationalisation of Universities”*. Mainly, the presentation touched such important topic, as evaluating the internationalisation status of a university and told that the audit offers an independent and systematic, tailor-made advisory process, considering all the stakeholders, structures, and processes related to internationalisation. Since the beginning of the project (09/2009) more than 120 higher education institutions applied to participate in the audit project financed by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research of Germany and 30 were audited by now. For more information on the presentation please follow the link:



The presentation was followed by an intensive discussion during which were made the following important points:

* In perspective of the WG interests the most controversial point was related to the sets of indicators that are being used for the audit “internationalisation of universities”. In reflection to this Dr. Peter mentioned that several projects and initiatives were organized in advance in order to define sets of indicators to measure the internationalisation of the universities. He also noted that the indicators are not the main instruments for research and that it is important to combine these indicators with qualitative review in order to come up with the results.
* Another concern raised by the WG members was the cost of these audits and whether it is feasible for universities to pay that much from their own resources, as Dr. Rolf Peter underlined that the Government paid 45.000 euro for one audit and the re-audit cost was 18.000 euro, but in near future the project is planning to carry audits on HEIs own finances.

***17.30 - End of meeting***

***Second day of the meeting – 7 December, 2012***

On the second day of the meeting the Austrian Co-Chair Gottfried Bacher took over the moderation of the WG meeting. He thanked the members for the great work that was done yesterday and also thanked the German hosts for the wonderful dinner served in the evening. He outlined that there are three presentations on the agenda of the second day of the meeting.

**“Steeplechase Project – Plans for and obstacles to temporary enrolment abroad in an international comparison” – presentation and discussions**

Presentation by Mr. Nicolai Netz  mainly stressed the results of a EUROSTUDENT - related investigation of the plans for and obstacles to temporary enrollment abroad in Austria, Switzerland, Germany, The Netherlands and Poland. “Lack of aspiration to go abroad” and such deterrents as “separation from partner, children, and friends” were mentioned as the first obstacles in the hierarchy of obstacles. For more information on the presentation please follow the link:



The Co-Chair thanked Mr. Nicolai Netz for the presentation and underlined that the findings of these studies are relevant for the work of the WG and can be used as basis for similar investigations in individual Bologna countries. The Co-Chair opened then the floor for the discussion.

In particular, it was noted that mobility doesn’t always depend on funds, though students with high income are more mobile. Also, it was pointed out that it is important to offer to students shorter and earlier stays abroad.

Following the discussions of the presentation some main conclusions were made by the WG members:

* Eurostudent data is very valuable, but not used enough;
* In order to raise the popularity of mobility there is a need to reach less mobile individuals;
* The role of teachers is very important in promoting mobility and there is a need to internationalise teacher training in order to prepare them and their pupils/students for the international environment.

**Mobility benchmark – update on progress to date on Eurostat data administrative collection – presentation and discussion**

The presentation was made by Mrs. Maria Kristin Gylfadottir representing the European Commission.The presentation stressed the recent developments concerning the mobility benchmark (20% benchmark). Mainly, an agreement was reached on the provision of higher education mobility data at Eurostat working group level (ETS) on 8 November, 2012. Moreover, proposals for future data collection at WG level were presented. For more information on the presentation please follow the link:



**Balanced Mobility: Dutch Study “The economic effects of internationalisation in higher education” – presentation and discussion**

The last presentation for the WG members was done by Mr. Robin van Ijperen on a Dutch study on the economic effects of internationalisation in higher education, showing that above a certain stay rate of foreign students (2.5%) the money accrued from taxes and other revenues is higher than the cost of providing a university education to international students. The study does not include the qualitative advantages of benefits like enhanced intercultural and linguistic competences, which are difficult to quantify. For more information on the presentation please follow the link:



Following this report it was recommended by the German Co-Chair to put this presentation in the inventory. He also stressed a disappointment that in most cases, only the economic side of education matters were highlighted political as opposed to cultural and social benefits. The discussions led to some important points such as:

* There is a need to prove soft benefits of internationalisation and that the institutions should be involved in this discussions;
* Balanced and imbalanced mobility should be tackled from the point of view of openness of the educational system;
* More researches and experiences from other countries on brain drain and brain gain are needed in order to put them to the inventory.

**Any other business**

No particular issue was raised at this point.

**The next meeting of the WG will take place in Berlin on 15 and 16 April 2013.**