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Question 1

How do the EM Partnerships manage to implement in the partner countries a socially inclusive approach in favour of the most socially and economically vulnerable groups of the society?

- 2 good practice examples
- 2 main obstacles encountered
- 2 policy recommendations
- 1 recommendation to the EU

Brussels, 8 & 9 February 2017
Best Practices

- Involving local NGOs, student organizations, alumni
- Some framework for guidance, institutional help, counseling, ...
- Doing direct outreach to disadvantaged communities, or using local media (news, radio)
- Using some national instruments/database, using community contacts
- Using the experience of consortium partners
- Pre-departure orientations
Challenges

- Dissemination of opportunities to disadvantaged
- Identification of ‘vulnerables’; documentation or proof of TG3; country policy
- Misunderstanding of TG3
- Visa policy particularly strict for disadvantaged people
- Integration of vulnerable groups in EU
Recommendations

- Raising awareness among vulnerable and disadvantaged communities
- Publicize opportunities through EU delegation
- Some database of EU institutions providing facilities for disabled
- Guidelines for disadvantaged should be region specific; flexibility in recognizing TG3
- Support for disabled scholar + a family member
Question 2

What makes the mobility experience of an EU student different from the one of his/her partner country fellows? To what extent are the benefits different?
Best Practices

- Domain of activity related to EU scholars/staff
- More research oriented mobilities
- Using staff mobility to encourage student mobility
- Discovering new cultures, apart from education
- Motivation: region, university, funding, special programs, future careers
- Degree requirements to study abroad
- Flexibility
Challenges

- Attracting EU students: EU students prefer US, Canada, etc.
- Level of expectation of EU students for certain services
- Quality of education
- Recognition of degrees / credits
- Difficulty with local languages
Recommendations

- Increase institutional support at Non-EU hosts
- Network between IROs
- Use alumni association for visibility / motivation
- Support existing / long-term cooperations
- Internships in enterprises
- Work toward breaking stereotypes
- Returning EU students to present at home univ
- Pre-departure orientations
Question 3

To what extent mobility of university staff had an impact on their home institutions. How was this experience abroad being recognised and valued at institutional level upon return?

2 good practice examples
2 main obstacles encountered
2 policy recommendations
1 recommendation to the EU
Best Practices

- Staff involved in sustainable bilateral cooperation
- Formal recognition of their mobility for professional advancement
- Implementation of new university services and systems by the returning staff
- Introduction of new courses + methodology
- Good impact on research and institutional regulations + competencies
- Long-term academic ties
Challenges

- *Sometimes mobility is too long to manage along with the workload ... (although long-term is good)*
- Family dynamics
- *Competition: several scholarship schemes*
- *Difficulty for some ‘administrative’ units*
- Training of staff can be challenging
- Language barriers
- Staff repetitions
Recommendations

- Possibility of shortening or splitting the mobility (splitting one month into two visits)
- Increase staff mobility and align with institutional priorities
- Some policy for academic + administrative staff mobility recognition
- Emphasize on impact and dissemination for sustainability (experience transfer)
- Strategic monitoring of staff mobility by institutions
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