

More pupil mobility!

...through partnership between schools and exchange organisations.

Results of Survey on International Mobility @ School in Europe

29.01.2020

1. Introduction

The survey has been conducted between 26 November 2019 and 20 January 2020 among **92 upper secondary schools** from 9 countries: France, Italy, Portugal, Serbia, Latvia, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Belgium (French and Flemish speaking community). Most of the schools that filled in the survey had less than 1000 pupils.

The survey aimed at investigating what types of learning mobility programmes schools are involved in, how they manage the different tasks which ensure quality mobility, including whether they receive or wish for support. Finally, the survey explores whether schools would like to engage more with Erasmus+ and what they would need in order to do so.

The mobility programmes under the scope of the survey are: Long term individual pupil mobility (2-10 months), Short term individual pupil mobility (up to 2 months), Class exchanges, Teacher placement abroad, International teacher training.

The questionnaire can be consulted [here](#).

2. Results

Learning mobility programmes

Around 23% of the schools interviewed run only one type of mobility programme. The most common projects are both long and short term individual pupil mobility. Only three schools manage all the options of mobility provided and other three schools manage at least four types of mobility programmes. The next most popular project would be the teacher international training. Most of the schools that send to teacher training are also involved in some other type of pupil mobility.

For **long term individual pupil mobility**, **pupil exchange associations is the most used framework**. Companies and Erasmus+ frameworks are also often used but with less frequency.

Regarding **class exchange** the most used frameworks are **bilateral agreements**, followed very closely by Erasmus+. National funding and Associations or non-profit organizations are also popular.

Erasmus+ is, with a large difference, the most used framework for **short term individual pupil mobility**, **teacher placement abroad**, **training** or any other kind of mobility programs.

More pupil mobility is a campaign launched by EFIL, EEE-YFU, OBESSU, ATEE and ESHA
Check www.pupilmobility.eu



More pupil mobility!

...through partnership between schools and exchange organisations.

Involvement of third parties in implementation of learning mobility

It seems that schools are more keen to involve a third party when finding host families -which is also the task that a quarter of the schools have problems with - and maintaining a communication with them. A third party is also in demand when managing the pre-departure of pupils, drafting cooperation agreement, risk management, travel arrangements, support of pupils during their experience abroad or to invest in their culture adaptation. In particular, 43% ask for support to draft cooperation agreements with the partner school, and 45% would like support to maintain and improve the **cultural adaptation and conflicts** that may come up during the experience abroad of both teachers and pupils.

On the other hand, 63% of the schools say that the task they manage by themselves with success is the preparation and the communication with the parents of pupils. Also, just a bit more than half of the schools successfully manage the pre-departure of both teachers and pupils.

Finally, an average of 35% of schools claim not to perform the debriefing with teachers and pupils, or drafting cooperation agreements.

Just about 40% of the interviewed schools perform all the tasks for a successful mobility programme.

A large number of schools, would like to have some sort of support and in almost 100% of the cases this support is wanted from a non-profit association. Support from a public sector actor is also quite demanded, but with less popularity, and less than 10% of schools would prefer a company.

However, many schools that claim they do not to want any extra support, they are already helped by a third party.

In conclusion, **most of the schools, including those who are already supported by third parties, and those who do not specifically say they have any sort of problem, ask for extra support from a third party, especially from a non-profit association.**

Erasmus+

Most of the school do not run any project from Erasmus+. About **40% needs support from a third party to run more Erasmus+ projects, most of schools prefer an NGO expert in mobility.** More than $\frac{2}{3}$ of the schools would like to run more Erasmus+ projects and out of these schools, most run 2 or less Erasmus+ project per year. The tendency is that if a school is already running more than 3 Erasmus+ projects (21 out of the 92), then they would not need extra support to run more projects, as only one third of them asks for further support.

100% of the schools claim that they need changes in the Erasmus+ programme in order to run more projects. These changes involve mostly higher lump sums for mobility, higher lump sums for staff costs of teachers, multiple deadlines for applications per year.