



Reporting for the XCVI BFUG Board meeting
4 November 2025 in Liechtenstein

Working Group on Internationalization and Mobility
(WG I&M)

WG I&M Work Plan 2024-2027 (1)

- Reporting to the BFUG

BFUG number	BFUG XCV	BFUG XCVII	BFUG XCIX	BFUG CI	BFUG CIII	BFUG CIV
Host	Poland	Denmark	Cyprus	Ireland	Lithuania	Lithuania
Period	February 2025	December 2025	Spring 2026	Autumn 2026	Early Spring 2027	Late Spring 2027
WG on Internationalisation and Mobility		Note on Terminology		Draft I Action Plan on Mobility	Draft Action Plan on Mobility II	

Three WG Meetings held

- #1 Chisinau (27 -28th of January 2025)
- #2 Bonn (27-28th of May 2025)
Including PLA on 26th of May 2025)
- #3 The Hague (30-31st of Octobre 2025)
Including PLA on 29th of Octobre 2025)

- And ad hoc Subgroups held in between

Note on Terminology (1)

Timeline:

- Draft 1.1 first discussed at #2 WG in Bonn (May 2025)
- Draft 2.1 circulated to BFUG Board and also discussed at #3 WG in Hague (last week)
- Draft 2.2 to be finalised and circulated to the BFUG

Note on Terminology (2)

Method:

- Drafted a list of concepts to be included
- Identified existing sources and compared definitions when multiple sources exist. Consulted sources:
 - BPIR
 - Erasmus+ Glossary
 - ECTS Users Guide
 - EQAR Glossary
 - GRC/LRC Glossaries
- Selected best suitable definitions and where necessary and appropriate revised them
- Where no widely accepted definitions were available, the WG has developed original drafts

Note on Terminology (3)

Content:

- Structure: Introductory note + 3 sections:
 - Internationalisation
 - Mobility
 - Barriers to mobility
- The Note will be further developed in parallel with the Action Plan, and synchronously to EC study on balanced mobility, the ECTS Users Guide update, and the BPIR Glossary

Note on Terminology (4)

Discussion:

- Should we make the selection criteria for “best suitable definition” more explicit? Should we document how we resolved conflicting definitions across sources?
 - For reasons of conciseness and conceptual clarity we’ve opted not to do that.
- We’ve had to make choices between being descriptive (in the Note on Terminology) and normative (in the Action Plan).
 - Some existing definitions were rather normative, we’ve attempted to make them more descriptive.
- We’ve been reluctant to make changes to existing and already widely used definitions, however sometimes we deemed it necessary. Does this require further justification?
 - We’ve added the reference “based on”