

Minutes of the
3rd meeting of the Working Group on Internationalisation and Mobility
30th – 31st of October 2025
Ministry of Education, Culture and Science
The Hague, The Netherlands

List of participants

Country/ Organisation	Name and Last Name
Andorra	Jordi Llombart
Belgium-Flemish Community	Luna Janssen
Belgium-Flemish Community	Ruth Lamotte
Belgium-French Community	Adriana Gonfroid
Czech Republic	Roman Klepetko
EAIE (Guest)	Rita Dias
EHEA Secretariat (Head)	Horia Serban Onita
EHEA Secretariat	Lilia Parhomenco
ENQA	Elena Cirlan
ESU	Arno Schrooyen
EUA	Michael Gaebel
EURASHE	Ulla Preeden
European Commission	Mia Wallin Hansen
Georgia	Nino Kadagishvili
Germany (Co-Chair)	David Akrami Flores
Germany	Jonathan Dreusch
Greece	Niko Karaiskos
Hungary	Zsolt Dános
Ireland	Sheena Duffy
Italy	Maria Antonietta Ciclista
Latvia	Martins Sabovics
Malta	Adam Liwak
Netherlands (Co-Chair)	Arthur Belle
Norway	Niclas Lindahl Trosdahl
Romania	Nicoleta – Cristina Popa
San Marino	Monica Cavalli
Slovak Republic	Denis Nedelka
Slovenia	Božidar Grigić
Switzerland	Rahel Hollenstein
Türkiye	Muhammet Akif Ataman
UNESCO	Leila Loupis
United Kingdom- Scotland	Ciaran Donaghy

Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Business Europe, Cyprus, Education International – ETUCE, Finland, France, Holy See, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Republic of Moldova (Co-chair), Montenegro, Poland, Spain, Ukraine (Co-chair), United Kingdom were absent. Austria, Croatia sent their apologies.

The meeting started at 9:35 CEST.

1. Welcome by the host

The meeting opened with a brief introduction given by the Dutch Co-chair, highlighting the significance of The Hague as the administrative and political center of the Netherlands, hosting key government institutions and international organizations.

2. Welcome by the WG Co-chairs

The German Co-chair thanked the hosts for their warm welcome and expressed appreciation to the Dutch Co-chair for his efforts in organizing the meeting.

3. Adoption of the agenda

Documents: [WG on IM_DK_LI_3_3_Draft agenda](#)

The Dutch co-chair presented the agenda, outlining its main points, including the two main documents: a first draft structure for the Action Plan on Internationalisation and Mobility and the second draft for the Note on Terminology, formerly known as Glossary. The proposed agenda was adopted without changes.

4. Updates from the EHEA Secretariat

Documents: [WG on IM_PL_AL_2_Minutes](#)
WG on IM_DK_LI_3_4_EHEA Secretariat updates

The EHEA Secretariat provided an overview of the events which had taken place since the last meeting of the WG on IM, organized in May in Bonn. They also reported on the submission of the National Action Plans (NAPs), noting that 39 NAPs had been submitted so far. The Secretariat highlighted the main topics and policy priorities that could be identified in the national action plans, including on Internationalisation and mobility.

The Secretariat also reminded members about the EHEA newsletter, inviting participants to subscribe and to share information about national events and developments that could be featured in future issues. The Secretariat then informed participants about preparations for the next BFUG meeting, which will take place in Denmark in December 2025. The meeting would address several key items, including the core indicators for the 2027 Bologna Process Implementation Report, the indicators for monitoring fundamental values, the draft Note on Terminology and the first drafts of the ECTS User's Guide and the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance.

5. Updates from other BFUG working structures

The Dutch co-chair thanked the Secretariat for the presentation and further presented the interaction between the WG on IM and other BFUG working structures.

He reported on the discussions held within the Working Group (WG) on Monitoring regarding the inclusion of *Internationalisation and Mobility (IM)* in the upcoming Bologna Process Implementation Report (BPIR). The WG on Monitoring raised the question of whether additional indicators should be included but pointed out that it would be challenging to

introduce qualitative indicators. Since the BPIR is one of the key sources used by the group, the WG on Monitoring emphasized the need to align definitions between the BPIR and the Note on Terminology (previously known as the Glossary) and requested that key terms from the draft Note on Terminology be agreed before spring 2026.

The WG on Monitoring co-chairs also identified several differences between the Note on Terminology and the BPIR, taking into account both technical and political aspects. The WG on Monitoring committed to sending their comments in writing.

The Dutch co-chair added that the WG on Monitoring proposed including a narrative introduction at the beginning of each topic, to ensure a more qualitative and contextualized presentation of the data. He confirmed that a representative from the WG on IM would be delegated to prepare the narrative for the Chapter on IM.

Regarding interactions with other structures, the Dutch Co-chair mentioned that he had also participated at one of the TPG B on the Lisbon Recognition Convention meetings, since recognition is one of the major barriers to mobility. The goal was to explore how this group approaches recognition as an obstacle both for credit mobility and internationalization. As the meeting could not provide immediate answers, the two groups agreed to further align their work.

He also mentioned that there had been no recent contact with TPG D on the Social Dimension, and that further communication was needed to coordinate on issues related to inclusive mobility.

EUA asked whether the presentation to the BFUG in Copenhagen would consist of a report on the group's progress to date and suggested to include elements related to the Action Plan. EUA also noted that the Action Plan was a rich and comprehensive document, but it was not yet entirely clear who the intended audience was and how it should be used. The Dutch Co-chair clarified that, for the upcoming BFUG meeting, the group will present only the Note on Terminology for discussion.

ENQA suggested that the group align and synchronize the information in their work with the content of the new draft of the ECTS User's Guide, to ensure coherence across related documents. The co-chairs agreed and mentioned that further alignment is due.

6. Presentation of the 2012 EHEA Mobility Strategy

The German co-chair gave a presentation highlighting the central role of mobility within the broader internationalisation agenda. He presented the 2012 Strategy adopted at the Bucharest Ministerial Conference and outlined 10 measures for implementation, serving as a foundational reference for ongoing work. The German co-chair also discussed the 20% mobility target, explaining its significance and how such quantitative targets can support policy development at both national and European levels. He elaborated on the interpretation and use of targets, stressing the need for a balanced and realistic approach.

EUA noted that the EU Strategy on mobility was launched only eight years afterwards, emphasizing how early the 2012 initiative had been in setting a vision for internationalisation mobility. EUA further remarked that although mobility had long been a priority in discussions, it was rarely translated into formal documents or concrete actions. EUA admitted not recalling much follow-up to the 2012 Strategy, mentioning that the topic resurfaced only in Strasbourg in 2022. They cautioned that the group should ensure that the new document under development does not experience the same fate and remains active and impactful beyond its adoption.

The EHEA Secretariat added that a similar review was conducted while preparing the Tirana Communiqué. Following the 2012 Strategy, the BFUG created a WG on Mobility that worked between 2012-2015 on policy recommendations, including guidelines on portability of grants and loans and institutional guidance for mobility. However, as EUA had mentioned, after 2015 the follow-up work ceased, and the topic was only briefly revisited in Rome when mobility targets were referenced again and a new commitment added that all students should receive intercultural competencies.

The German co-chair acknowledged that the mobility targets had not been achieved but stressed the importance of ensuring that the new Action Plan does not remain “just a piece of paper.” He underlined the need for practical measures in the Action Plan and continued engagement from the BFUG to turn commitments into tangible results. The Dutch co-chair concluded by emphasizing the group’s forward-looking approach. He stated that 2027 should not mark the end of this group’s work. Rather than replicating the 2012 Strategy, the goal is to build upon it, integrating both mobility and a broader perspective on internationalisation.

7. Presentation of the Draft Structure of the Action Plan

Documents: [WG on Internationalisation and Mobility 3 DK LI 6 2012 EHEA Mobility Strategy](#)

The German co-chair presented the structure of the Draft Action Plan, with the deadline for submitting additional comments set for the 14th of November.

8. Plenary discussion on the Draft Structure of the Action Plan

Upon a question from Slovenia, the Dutch co-chair clarified that the co-chairs submitted a clean version of the document, and that all the comments received online and in written form had been integrated into the document.

EUA raised a question about the intended audience of the policy recommendations and noted that while the text referred to several other documents, it did not explicitly link to the Principles and Guidelines on the Social Dimension, particularly regarding inclusive mobility. EUA suggested making stronger connections to core Bologna Process documents and other working structures.

ESU also highlighted that the issue of student housing was not addressed in the draft and proposed including specific references to housing challenges as an important factor affecting mobility.

The German co-chair confirmed that the group would review additional relevant documents to strengthen the coherence of the text, with the Dutch co-chair acknowledging that there had been no recent contact with the TPG D on Social Dimension but assured that such coordination would be pursued in the future. He agreed that housing was a valid and important point, and that additional missing aspects would be incorporated in the next revision.

Supported by the Czech Republic and the Dutch Co-chair, EAIE pointed out several barriers to mobility and their division into different mobility phases, including administrative costs and challenges in the post-mobility phase, when students often find themselves disconnected from society and career development pathways. The EAIE representative asked whether the group plans to take into account new initiatives from the European Commission, particularly those under the Erasmus+ and Horizon programmes. The Dutch Co-chair mentioned that the EC’s presence in the group supports alignment efforts and referenced the upcoming study on

balanced mobility. EUA welcomed the improvements in the revised draft yet noted that the document was too detailed and in need of reshaping. EUA emphasized the importance of clarifying the overall purpose and the specific role of institutions. It was suggested that the focus should remain on what the BFUG and individual members can undertake, rather than prescribing actions for higher education institutions, which already follow their own strategic approaches. EUA also suggested that the text should refer to EHEA commitments rather than recommendations, emphasizing a stronger and more action-oriented tone. EUA also proposed that the document could be revisited in five to six years. Two main priorities were highlighted: virtual exchange and the ways in which the EHEA can support it, and the mobility benchmark, which might merit greater emphasis. Given that mobility targets at the master's and doctoral levels are nearly achieved, further attention could be directed to the bachelor level.

The German Co-chair noted that the revised version will include stronger focus on the mobility target and referred to the “Europe on the Move” 23% benchmark, which should also be considered.

EURASHE stressed that certain actions are dependent on national policies and therefore cannot be implemented solely by institutions. In this regard, the Action Plan should primarily target countries rather than HEIs.

The EHEA Secretariat emphasized that since the document would be adopted by ministers, its wording should reflect the language that ministers themselves would use. He noted the importance of aligning all documents to be adopted in Iași and Chișinău to ensure coherence in both content and tone. Regarding the style and focus, the Secretariat recalled that the 2012 strategy was considerably more specific in its guidance, including towards HEIs. He also pointed out that Transnational Education (TNE) and internationalisation professionals are currently missing from the draft, highlighting the need to address not only academic staff but also administrative and support staff working on internationalisation. The Dutch co-chair confirmed that the language of the document will be reviewed and adopting the voice of ministers would help clarify the overall framing and scope.

The European Commission supported the integration of the “Europe on the Move” target into the document. The EC also supported ESU's point on ensuring consistency with the Bologna Process principles on the social dimension and with the future Erasmus+ programme which was being renegotiated.

ENQA cautioned against making the document overly detailed and recommended keeping the focus on the most critical priorities. The current draft, ENQA observed, shifts inconsistently between recommendations for governments and for institutions, which creates confusion. ENQA supported the idea that the Action Plan should primarily address ministries and questioned the rationale for presenting barriers as a separate section. ENQA further proposed considering how the work could be consolidated after adoption, possibly through the establishment of a Thematic Peer Group (TPG) on this topic.

Slovenia agreed on the importance of maintaining focus on the mobility target but stressed the need to clarify what is being measured as mobility. The Slovenian representative expressed reservations about counting virtual exchange or blended mobility toward the mobility target. Slovenia also asked whether internationalisation should be referenced in relation to all missions of HEIs or only particular ones.

Andorra reiterated a comment previously made at the BFUG meeting in Stockholm regarding the use of the term “strategies”. For smaller countries, developing comprehensive national

strategies can be challenging and the term can cause confusion. Therefore, the recommendation to “develop national strategies” should be rephrased to avoid prescribing an unrealistic requirement. The Secretariat suggested to use the terminology from the indicators on social dimension which were already agreed by the BFUG.

UNESCO supported the Secretariat’s earlier remarks about emphasizing the global dimension of internationalisation and mobility, noting that regions outside Europe should be explicitly mentioned. The UNESCO representative referred to the recent meeting of the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) Committee, which produced new language that could be incorporated into the document, as well as to recent developments from the Global Recognition Convention.

Participants recalled that during the Chişinău meeting, around 20 barriers to international mobility were identified. It was emphasized, however, that the task of the group is not merely to list barriers, but rather to propose ways to remove them and provide guidance on overcoming the obstacles identified. EUA questioned whether the Action Plan needs to list all barriers explicitly, suggesting that the focus should instead be on actionable solutions.

Greece stressed that the achievement of policy objectives is contingent to data-based approaches and underlined that better, more consistent and qualitative data collection should be encouraged as a recommendation.

The European Commission (EC) informed the group about an ongoing study on balanced and inclusive learning mobility, with preliminary results showing that without national-level data collection, comprehensive analysis is difficult. The EC advised countries to strengthen their national data collection systems.

Greece further highlighted that Erasmus+ authorities should ensure the use of homogeneous and accessible data, and universities should receive clear guidance on what information to collect. The EC responded that such guidelines already exist, though the Commission remains open to further support. Greece also noted that while some information, such as income data, was sensitive, it remained necessary for understanding inclusive mobility.

Italy raised the issue of branch universities and supported the integration of TNE in the Action Plan, considered relevant both for mobility flows and the QA perspective

ENQA noted that significant data gaps regarding TNE remained, though existing information indicates that the main sending countries are France, the United Kingdom, and Germany. ENQA recalled that Quality Assurance (QA) of TNE was explicitly mentioned in the Tirana Communiqué and informed participants that ENQA had applied for a project specifically focused on QA in TNE. The representative also underlined that many countries do not permit TNE activities, and this variation should be taken into account when deciding how and to what extent TNE should be reflected in the documents. It was suggested to refer to the UNESCO/OECD Guidelines for Quality Provision in Cross-Border Higher Education (2005), which include relevant definitions of TNE, while UNESCO recalled the more recent guidelines on TNE adopted by the LRCC. The Secretariat also added the commitment in the Rome Communiqué that standards for QA of TNE should be those for domestic provision.

9. Introduction to the break-out sessions and plenary reporting from the break-out sessions

3 break-out sessions had been organised on the following topics for the action plan: internationalisation, learning mobility and barriers to mobility. The rapporteurs then presented the conclusion of the discussions in the plenary.

Discussion Summary – 1st Group: Internationalisation (Rapporteur: EURASHE)

The group's first task was to approach the Action Plan from the perspective of a minister, considering whether they would be ready to sign the document. Participants agreed that this exercise was useful and that it was timely to review the 2012 Action Plan, noting that while the 2012 version focused primarily on mobility, the current draft takes a broader approach, addressing internationalisation in a more comprehensive way.

The group discussed the idea of internationalisation as a core institutional mission, suggesting that the section on Quality Assurance should be more visible and integrated across different actions, and possibly moved toward the beginning of the document.

It was observed that some elements are missing or insufficiently developed, including the goal of bringing all stakeholders together, which should be clearly emphasized. Members also called for greater clarity regarding the target audience of the document — specifying for whom the Action Plan is primarily intended. Additionally, funding was identified as a completely absent element, and participants stressed the need to address national measures more concretely.

Finally, in line with EUA's earlier suggestion, the group proposed creating a repository of good practices, drawing on analyses of relevant articles, policy documents, and examples from various countries to support implementation and mutual learning.

Discussion Summary – 2nd Group: Learning Mobility (Rapporteur: Slovenia)

The Leuven 20% mobility target had been discussed, without an agreement on whether the group should recommend using this benchmark or adopt the “Europe on the Move” target instead. Participants debated what forms of mobility should be included in the measurement — full degree mobility, credit mobility (e.g., 15 ECTS), and whether short-term, blended, or virtual exchanges should also be reflected in the targets. A key issue raised was how to ensure quality across these different types of mobility experiences.

The group then turned to inclusive mobility, examining how the term was understood in different contexts. For instance, within Erasmus+, inclusiveness focuses on ensuring opportunities for students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Participants also discussed housing challenges, access to student support services at host institutions, and the need to raise awareness about exclusion and promote inclusive practices across all mobility schemes.

On the topic of balanced and green mobility, participants noted the complexity of achieving these objectives. Questions were raised about how realistic they are, and to what extent higher education institutions (HEIs) can ensure balance at their own level. The group discussed whether the Action Plan should prioritize degree mobility or credit mobility, and where balance should be ensured — between countries, regions, or types of institutions.

The concept of brain circulation versus brain drain was also examined, with reference to an OECD study showing that relatively few students remain in the country where they studied abroad. This led to a discussion about the potential need for a monitoring system to better track and understand such trends.

Regarding green mobility, participants emphasized that it should be understood in a broader sense than just sustainable travel. Institutions themselves should become greener overall, and sustainability education should be integrated across curricula. The discussion concluded with reflections that some aspects of green mobility touch upon infrastructure and policy areas beyond education, underscoring the need for cross-sectoral cooperation.

Discussion Summary – 3rd Group: Barriers to Mobility (Rapporteur: Greece)

The group began by discussing the types of barriers students face in pursuing mobility and considered whether these barriers fall within the same policy areas or require different levels of responsibility. It was noted that ministries of education are not solely responsible for all implications of mobility, as many issues extend beyond their mandate.

Following this reflection, the group agreed not to include a separate chapter on *Barriers to Mobility* in the Action Plan. Instead, these elements should be integrated into the section on Learning Mobility, ensuring a more coherent and solution-oriented approach.

Participants then worked on prioritizing barriers, identifying five main policy areas under which the barriers could be grouped:

1. Administrative barriers – including issues related to admissions, bureaucracy, visas, insurance, health, and grant mobility procedures.
2. Financial barriers – covering housing costs and the adequacy of grants and financial support.
3. Recognition barriers – concerning the transfer of ECTS credits, degree recognition, curriculum alignment, and language-related challenges.
4. Social barriers – addressing unequal participation and limited access for certain student groups.
5. Policy and structural barriers – linked to the incomplete implementation of EHEA commitments and the need to promote clear, reliable information to students participating in mobility programmes.

The group emphasized that the main principle should be to avoid a separate chapter on barriers, but to embed them within the discussion on Learning Mobility, coupled with practical guidance on how to overcome them.

The Dutch Co-chair thanked the rapporteurs for their contributions and noted that the next meeting of the Working Group is expected to take place towards the end of April, during which the outcomes of this discussion will be further developed.

End of Day 1

Day 2, 31st of October

Session starts at 9:30 CET

10.1 Presentation of the Note on Terminology

The Dutch Co-chair provided an update on the Note on Terminology, explaining that since Bonn, the Subgroup had addressed previous comments, incorporated suggestions from members, and produced a new draft. A clean version was sent to the BFUG Board and will form the basis of discussions at the upcoming Board meeting in Liechtenstein.

The Dutch Co-chair added that after the 14th of November, the co-chairs will reconvene to finalise the draft for presentation to the BFUG in December in Copenhagen. This will be the first time a deliverable from the WG is presented to the BFUG, and it will provide an opportunity to reflect on how to continue the process. Further circulation and updates on the draft will follow as the WG meeting in Vienna would get closer.

Regarding the content of the Note on Terminology, the Dutch Co-chair emphasized that the work must align with the AG ECTS outputs and the Working Group on Monitoring and should also take into account the forthcoming EC study on balanced and inclusive mobility.

The floor was opened for general comments on the Note on Terminology. No general comments were raised, and it was agreed to proceed step by step through the document.

INTERNATIONALISATION

The discussion focused on the definition of “internationalisation” and whether a transnational dimension should be explicitly added to the term.

The EC suggested adding the word “transnational” after “international” to reflect collaboration between countries within the Erasmus+ Programme, clarifying that while *international* had a broad meaning, *transnational* was specific to the EU context. EUA expressed concern that introducing *transnational* could create confusion, as the term is used differently in various contexts. The Dutch Co-chair concluded that, in line with previous discussions, it is preferable to avoid adding specific details to widely used definitions, as *international* already encompassed cross-border, regional, transnational, and global dimensions. Thus, the definition of internationalization would remain as currently written, with the Note on Terminology updated if necessary to include *transnational* for clarity.

INTERNATIONALISATION AT HOME (IH)

The discussion focused on the definition of Internationalisation at Home, noting that the current draft included references to staff and non-mobile students. Ireland raised a question about whether the definition was too narrowly focused on teaching and learning, suggesting that other activities at higher education institutions, such as research and the campus environment, could also be included. Slovenia added that IH should encompass the curriculum, campus environment, and community engagement, with EURASHE considering that the current definition contained too many examples. On another note, EUA asked whether IH should be understood as an approach or as a strategy.

The Dutch Co-chair responded that IH was intended as a holistic concept and that the definition could be expanded to capture its broader dimensions, with the subgroup considering the points raised by members.

VIRTUAL EXCHANGE

A subphrase was added to the definition of Virtual Exchange to clarify that it was completely distinct from physical mobility. No further comments were raised.

HYBRID LEARNING

The term Hybrid Learning was included following discussions in Bonn. The definition adopted is based on the version provided by EUA and it was included to clearly distinguish it from Virtual Learning and Blended Learning.

INTERNATIONAL CLASSROOM

Following discussions in Bonn, elements of the International Classroom definition that were considered normative had been moved to the Action Plan, resulting in a now more descriptive definition. The EC noted that the term may be unclear to some, particularly regarding what is meant by the educational experience, with the Dutch co-chair clarifying that the definition was intended to encompass the variety of experiences students and staff may have in an international classroom setting.

STAFF MOBILITY

Staff Mobility was not included in the previous version of the Note on Terminology, as the group had been unable to identify a clear and coherent source definition. Andorra asked why Staff Mobility was not included under the Mobility section and noted that the definition included no clear limit on what is considered staff mobility.

The Dutch Co-chair explained that the separation of Staff Mobility from Learning Mobility was intentional. Staff mobility was placed under Internationalisation as the term reflect a broader scope than mobility and ensures its framing within the strategic internationalization context.

INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE

The group revisited the definition of Intercultural Competence, which had been extensively discussed in Bonn. A key challenge noted was distinguishing between normative and descriptive elements. The current suggestion was to remove certain sentences from the definition and explore these normative aspects more fully in the Action Plan, where there is sufficient space for prescriptive guidance.

EUA proposed also deleting the third sentence, as it was not directly linked to intercultural competences. To a remark by the Dutch Co-chair that international competencies and personal development are part of the overall model framing international experience, EUA considered that personal development should not be labeled together with intercultural competences.

UNESCO suggested breaking down the term and adding a clarifying sentence to make the concept more explicit, while on the contrary ENQA noted that the existing text, particularly the phrase “*can further contribute...*”, already conveyed how the experience supports students, and additional information may not be necessary.

Supported by San Marino and Belgium (French Community), EUA reiterated that intercultural competences and international experiences are distinct concepts, and the connection between

them should be carefully considered, whereas Belgium (French Community) suggested modifying the subject of the second sentence for clarity and Slovenia suggested that the footnote stating the interchangeability between the terms be deleted.

The Dutch Co-chair noted that in the previous version the terms were combined as ‘international/intercultural’ competencies and concluded that while international experiences differ from intercultural competences, these experiences can help students develop intercultural competences, and further refinements of the definition may be needed to enhance clarity. Furthermore, he added that cultural differences exist within a single country as well, which supports the relevance of intercultural competences locally.

Czechia reflected on the PLA discussions, observing that the last sentence (referring to flexibility, adaptability, etc.) aligned more with international competences rather than intercultural ones. They also mentioned their support for keeping the sentence about fundamental values, which had been deleted.

EUA argued in favour of keeping intercultural competences in the definition, noting that they enrich the understanding of internationalisation. They highlighted that students who cannot have an international experience can still develop intercultural competences within their own country.

The Dutch Co-chair concluded that the subgroup would refine the definition in a more precise way, providing greater conceptual clarity.

JOINT DEGREE

The definition of Joint Degree was newly included in the Note on Terminology. The subgroup identified four definitions from different sources, which overlapped but were not identical, and initially proposed to adopt the Erasmus+ definition. EC expressed reservations about using the Erasmus+ definition, suggesting that the definition from the European Approach for the QA of Joint Programmes (EAJP) may be more appropriate. They proposed modifying the second sentence by removing “recognized officially” and replacing it with “nationally acknowledged”.

EUA also expressed concern about the second sentence, particularly the phrase “must be signed by the competent authorities”, which may not reflect current practice. Belgium (French Community) noted other sources, such as the Erasmus Mundus Joint Degree, which allowed for a single degree signed by all participants or multiple degrees. ENQA further added that the EAJP definition was closely aligned with EQAR, and joint degrees should not need to be signed by all institutions, reflecting practical implementation.

Supported by EUA, the Secretariat suggested liaising with the authors of the EAJP and being proactive in proposing definitions if the WG sees fit, with ENQA offering to facilitate the liaison.

JOINT PROGRAMME

Andorra expressed a preference for alternative definitions, noting that in their country there is often a misconception between dual degrees and joint programmes. They clarified that dual degrees involve two separate degrees awarded individually, each reflecting its own curriculum with one or more institutions responsible for their respective parts. This differed from a joint programme, which integrates curricula across institutions into a single coherent programme.

LEARNING MOBILITY

The Dutch Co-chair recalled that in Bonn the group had identified some tricky aspects regarding the definition of *learning mobility*, and that the subgroup had since developed a revised proposal.

Andorra suggested that a *minimum workload* should be included in the definition to help countries distinguish what qualifies as mobility and what does not. The Dutch co-chair acknowledged that this issue was not addressed in Bonn and mentioned that discussions with colleagues from the *Working Group on Monitoring* highlighted the difference between considering, for instance, 3 ECTS and 15 ECTS. The current document aims to provide conceptual guidance, and specifying the workload in ECTS might not be necessary at this stage, since no agreement was reached. Andorra clarified that while it is not essential to include a minimum workload in the definition, *monitoring might become difficult* without such a reference, as countries could interpret it differently.

Supported by Slovenia and the European Commission, the Secretariat underlined that while a Note on Terminology cannot set a threshold for what learning mobility means, the ministers can and did set a minimum workload for what learning mobility counts towards the target, that is 15 ECTS. The Secretariat added that such a decision is a political rather than a technical one, with its place in the Action Plan. The European Commission further clarified that *staff mobility* is indeed included under the term *learning mobility* in the *Council Recommendation "Europe on the Move"*.

Belgium (Flemish Community) observed that for *learning mobility* the definition explicitly referred to activities *outside the country*, whereas *staff mobility* may also occur *within the same country*. Slovenia also suggested specifying *student learning mobility* in the current definition to ensure clarity.

The Dutch Co-chair confirmed that the *Action Plan* will address how mobility is measured and reported and agreed that it might be appropriate to explicitly refer to the *movement of students*.

INCLUSIVE MOBILITY

The Dutch Co-chair introduced the topic, recalling that there had been two versions of the definition and that elements from both were merged into a consolidated version now included in the document. Ireland asked about the inclusion of the term "*broad*" in the definition and whether there was a specific rationale behind it. The Dutch Co-chair confirmed that the word was intentionally included, as it helped to distinguish the concept of *inclusive mobility* from that of *internationalisation*. He added that the *Action Plan* will provide room to define the normative aspects of the different related terms.

European Commission (EC) referred to the second-to-last line of the definition and asked whether the intended concept was equity or equality. The Dutch Co-chair, supported by ESU and UNESCO, clarified that equity was chosen deliberately, as it is considered the more inclusive concept of the two.

Belgium (Flemish Community) remarked that good inclusive measures ultimately benefit everyone, not only specific target groups. The Dutch co-chair considered this an important *normative* element which should be addressed in the *Action Plan*, while the current definition remained *descriptive* in nature.

GREEN MOBILITY

The Dutch Co-chair introduced the revised definition, explaining that it had been broadened to go beyond the aspect of transportation alone. San Marino referred to the last line mentioning

“physical cross-border mobility” and suggested using this term also in *point 13* instead of “mobility abroad” for consistency. The German Co-chair proposed either *removing the second sentence* or *integrating it into another definition* to streamline the text.

EAIE reminded the group that the European Commission had launched Guidelines for Green Mobility the previous year and recommended checking that document for alignment. Supported by Slovenia, UNESCO agreed on ensuring coherence but stressed the importance of retaining the clarification that green mobility is not limited to transport. Slovenia also asked whether green mobility should also cover learning content focused on sustainability.

ENQA proposed adding a clarification at the end of the first sentence, such as “by the mobile student, academic, and the institutions,” to reflect shared responsibility. EURASHE raised the question of terminology, asking whether *green* and *sustainable mobility* mean the same thing, as “sustainable” is a more widely used term. The Dutch Co-chair acknowledged that *sustainable* is broader but noted that the term “green mobility” should be kept, as it appears in the *Tirana Communiqué*. Belgium (French Community) cautioned that “sustainable” might be too broad a term, while UNESCO explained that while the two terms are often used interchangeably today, originally “sustainable” covered *climate, economic, and social dimensions*, while “green” referred specifically to the *environmental* aspect.

European Commission supported ENQA’s proposal to include institutions but pointed out that in some countries, housing is not under institutional responsibility and that this nuance should be reflected. Slovenia suggested using the word “participants” instead of “students”, to ensure inclusiveness of both *staff and learners*.

BALANCED MOBILITY

The Dutch Co-chair introduced the topic, noting that the proposed definition is a consolidated version combining several earlier formulations. EURASHE emphasized that *balanced mobility* should also encompass the concept of responsible mobility, highlighting the importance of ensuring that mobility flows are mutually beneficial and sustainable.

The European Commission informed the group that it was conducting a study on balanced and inclusive mobility. An interim report has already been received, which reflects the key elements discussed in this meeting. The Commission explained that, based on the study findings, the goal is to develop a shared definition of *balanced mobility*. Many countries were increasingly defining it not only in terms of *numbers* but also in relation to policy objectives, taking into account financial considerations and the broader impact of mobility.

EC further raised a question regarding the reference to “degree mobility” in the draft definition, asking whether it is necessary to also mention “certificate.” The Dutch Co-chair responded that he would be *open to removing* the term “certificate”, but the subgroup will need to review how this aligns with the *Erasmus+ definition*, which currently includes it.

No further comments were raised during the meeting for the following definitions:

- Credit Transfer
- Recognition of Credits
- Learning Mobility
- Mobility Agreement
- Mobility Window
- Portability of Student Support, Grants, and Loans



**Danish
Presidency**
Council of the
European Union



The Co-chairs thanked everyone for the work done and informed the participants that there had been several requests for hosting the following Working Group meetings in the current cycle. As such, in the nearest future an arrangement would be reached on the schedule and locations of the meetings.

The meeting ended at 12:45 CET.

