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**9:00 - 9:15 Welcome and introduction**

The chairman, Peter Greisler, opens the first meeting of the working group and welcomes the participants. Apologies had been received from Armenia, Georgia, “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” and BusinessEurope. All participants introduce themselves.

**9:15 – 12:15 20% target and data issues**

*(Input: Paper on data issues from data collectors)*

The chairman thanks the data providers for the prepared document. The goal of the meeting is to agree on the definition and scope of the mobility target indicator as an input for the meeting of the implementation working group in Luxembourg on 21 January 2010, and afterwards for the BFUG.

The EU Commission will decide on their mobility benchmark in spring. Then BFUG can again react, before the EU council decides on the EU-benchmark in November. To make the process transparent, the chairman asked all EU representatives to inform their colleagues, who prepare the EU-council decision.

**By way of introduction** Fernando Reis gives a presentation on the background document of the data providers.

In relation to the 20% target indicator the group decided

* Credit mobility shall be taken into account starting from one credit. Apart from the definition of the 20% target. more differentiated data on the length of the period abroad/the number of credits awarded would be appreciated. Similarly, information on other types of short term mobility and how many students chose what kind of short time mobility should be collected. This can be achieved by other data collecting tools (Eurostudent)
* Both diploma and credit mobility shall be included in the indicator. The group recognizes the differences in intensity and motivation for the two types of mobility, and therefore asks for additional and separate information on degree and credit mobility.
* Relating to the origin of students included in the indicator, the group asks the data collectors to clarify the definition of origin (place where previous degree was deserved, residence, nationality) for the benchmark proposal for the WG implementation in Luxembourg. Discussions focussed on the treatment of “homecoming students” and non-EHEA students that start their studies in the EHEA
* The group also discussed whether inward mobility should be included in the indicator or not. While some members referred to the wording within the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué (“students graduating within the EHEA”), others pointed out that inward mobility is an important factor for measuring the attractiveness of education within the EHEA but that the concepts of inward and outward mobility should not be mixed. The original idea of the last mobility group was to develop two separate indicators for incoming and outgoing mobility.

In conclusion the group agreed that it is important to have data both on inward and outward mobility, while the target indicator should focus on outward mobility. The question whether a second target for inward mobility is needed may be decided at a later stage.

The chair will give a summary of the discussion in Luxembourg.

* On the regional scope of mobility the group saw two different areas of destination that are relevant for the mobility target: the EHEA and the world.

While international mobility to any destination worldwide may be considered desirable in terms of personal development, it is not clear, whether it is a target to send Europeans out to graduate outside the EHEA, unless they come back to be employed in Europe. Discussions on this point will have to be continued.

As a preliminary result, it was agreed that the indicator should include credit mobility and degree mobility within the EHEA, and credit mobility within and outside the EHEA.

Data collectors pointed out that data on degree mobility are collected in the destination country. Mobility data for the world are therefore limited to the data available (OECD countries and possibly some other countries). Data collectors will provide a list of countries for which data are available.

As additional information, but not within the mobility target, the working group would like to have data on degree mobility to destinations outside the EHEA.

* The group agreed to include mobility during the first, second and third cycle. For PhD students the group was in favour of including the data, but recognised difficulties in measuring “credit mobility” due to the fact that credits are not used in the third cycle at all or for the mobility phases within the third cycle.
* Short (2-year) programmes should be included if they are recognised by the government of the country, but differences in data because of these programmes and BA-MA-PhD should be visible.
* For the indicator only mobility during the programme the student is completing should be taken into account. The reason behind this is that only countries with student registers can gather the data about the history of the student and know if they already went abroad in a previous programme.
* The group clarifies that mobility within joint degree programmes should be counted. It is a growing number and the group asks the data collectors to find a way to count these data.

**The group also discussed supplementary indicators as proposed in 8.2 of the document.**

The main outcomes of the discussion were:

The indicator on socio-economic background is relevant, but other issues such as gender, disabilities, migrants, should be included as well. Eurostudent will look at this.

It was suggested that private and social returns of mobility should be measured. It may be difficult to gather data. Eurostudent and DAAD volunteer to take a look at the issue and come up with a proposal.

An indicator that measures the balance between inbound and outbound mobility is considered necessary. In the discussion the group points out that different kinds of mobility (e.g. 1 student for 10 months, 1 student for 2 weeks) are compared. Data collectors will think about this.

The need for data on staff mobility is underlined. Data collectors will try to collect some data as exercise. If we only take Erasmus data, it is possible to measure staff mobility, but this is only partial data. It is worthwhile to start investigating.

The group will discuss the more detailed proposals for supplementary indicators in November. If the data collectors need some information earlier, they will contact the group. In the meantime, comments to the data collectors on the supplementary indicators are welcome.

**13:15 – 14:45 Work plan 2010-2012**

The chair introduces into the topic by pointing out that the group should profit from former work, in particular the results of the former working group and the EU green paper on Mobility, and use and integrate the work where possible

In order to develop a mobility strategy, he proposes that all members of the group should come up with proposals of problems related to mobility and possible solutions in a kind of brainstorming exercise. In a next step, the items mentioned will be grouped, and working papers on the issues mentioned shall be developed by the various members of the group.

The strategy that will be proposed in the end should be short and should focus on some central messages to the ministers. It will contain proposals of how to reach the mobility target but will include other proposals as well. In preparing the strategy, the group will focus on issues that can be changed by the ministers, perhaps in consultation with their colleagues in the cabinet. The number of proposals should be limited so that each proposal can be discussed by BFUG.

As a second input to the strategy, it is proposed that the working group develops a questionnaire to the BFUG members on mobility obstacles, good practice examples for increasing mobility and for encouraging a balanced flow of mobility. Depending on content and time tables this work might be coordinated with the stocktaking and/or Eurydice questionnaire,

The group agrees, that for the next meeting of the working group, DAAD will analyse the information available on mobility obstacles and good practice and will make a first draft of a questionnaire. The draft version will be sent to the members of the working group end of February. Members will have time to react and decide in the April/May and decide if it is necessary to have a questionnaire or not, and if so, with which questions. Relation to the stocktaking (and Eurydice) will be investigated.

The group agrees that

* All BFUG members will be asked to give the relevant and up-to-date information/studies on mobility issues that are available by 15th February..
* All working group members will be asked for a short description of a problem and a solution concerning mobility (end of February/beginning of March).

The Bologna Secretariat will send out both questions.

**14:45 – 15:45 first ideas on the issue of balanced mobility**

 ***Input: non paper on balanced mobility***

As an introduction to the topic of balanced mobility the group mentioned some of the issues that will have to be discussed.:Issues mentioned were

Is balanced mobility desirable? What are the reasons for and chances of imbalances? Sometimes imbalance has nothing to do with preferences, but with obstacles for mobility in some countries. There is an imbalance between east and west, between north and south. One answer to imbalance is being more competitive. The problem is not only the quality of the HE, but language problems are an important factor, as well as communication/marketing. It is also very difficult to interfere in the motivation of students. Differences can be observed depending on the programme you look at: Erasmus or free mover or worldwide mobility. Also within countries there might be mobility imbalances: Spain, Germany, Belgium were cited as examples. Finally, brain drain and brain circulation are also important issues to look at.

Discussion on balanced mobility will be continued in future meetings of the group.

**15:45 – 16:00 any other business**

**Dates working group meetings:**

**- 12/05/10: 9.00h-16.00h, Berlin**

**- 04/11/10: 9.00h-16.00h., Berlin**