Executive Summary
Key Findings

Mobility demographics and activities

— 1 in 3 respondents across 50 European higher education institutions have **participated** in European mobility in the past 5 years.
— There has been a 10% **increase in participation of administrative staff** in staff mobility in the past 5 years (one third of the administrative staff who went on mobility are International Relations (IR) staff).
— The number of academic staff in engineering going on mobility has halved in the past 16 years, but the amount of **academic staff in Humanities and Social Sciences** going on mobility has slightly increased. Non-humanities scientific subjects may be less represented in mobility due to the availability of other funds covering research trips.
— The great majority of all staff who went on mobility have worked at a university for **6+ years**.
— 2 in 3 staff who went on international mobility are female. The initial **gender gap** affecting mobility has decreased over the past 27 years.
— 9 in 10 staff amongst those who went on mobility are confident about their strongest **foreign language**.

Management

— A range of factors are found to encourage the take up of mobility. These include **providing more recognition through pay rise and job promotion, linking mobility with university strategy** and, generally, showing support for staff mobility (by management). Other factors include simplifying administrative procedures, providing family support and sensible work arrangements, increasing the length of the visit, and raising awareness of the emotions associated to the mobility experience, such as curiosity and fear. A key reason for not taking up mobility once an application has been made is **funding being insufficient** to cover costs.
— Mobility's discouraging factors include **problematic work arrangements** (not being able to find replacement at work and too high a workload) and **poor promotion**: respondents lamented the lack of information about partner universities and about the programme.
— Additionally, the **key experienced individual** problem associated with mobility is **insufficient funds**, whereas the **key institutional** obstacle to mobility concerns working conditions, particularly the lack of possibility of having a replacement at work.
— The vast majority of respondents are **satisfied** to have achieved all their set goals during mobility, and the remainder have achieved them partially. Overall, 99% of people who went on mobility thought that their participation in this Erasmus staff mobility programme **met their expectations** to the fullest.
— In terms of **impact**, mobility is strongest with regard to professional development. In practice, mobility opened up a new platform for teaching observation, provided research opportunities and exposed administrative staff to different systems of management.

Promotion and dissemination

— The main source of information about the programme is through word of mouth.
— **Informal dissemination**, such as the sharing of information about the visit with colleagues, is the most popular means for disseminating the results of mobility.
— The key mobility output is in **problem-solving** i.e. using the new knowledge learnt on mobility to solve problems in an enhanced way once back at the home institution.

Recognition

— 84% of staff who know colleagues who have been on mobility recognise that Erasmus staff exchange has **helped them professionally**.
— However, **overall perceived recognition is rather low**: barely more than 1 in three people who have gone on mobility in the past 5 years feel their experience has been highly valued and acknowledged by their institution, with administrative staff feeling that their experience is slightly better valued than academic staff.
— It has been recognised that mobility's value is in enhancing the university's educational mission and improving society's sustainability, contributing to emotional well being, providing opportunities for personal development and collaboration, enhancing skills, reaching specific targets (e.g. administrative staff), and favouring problem-solving.
— Obstacles to the recognition of mobility include administrative staff themselves not being aware of the benefits of mobility. Also, the appropriateness of mobility to researchers constitutes a grey area with disagreement from the point of view of management over whether mobility has value for researchers or not.