

Erasmus GAP Inclusivity Toolkit

Authors:

Dr. Luca Alexa ERDEI, Dr. Georgina KASZA, Mária SZULOVSZKY, Dóra LACZIK, Dr. habil. Helga DORNER

04/09/2025



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Table of Contents

ERASMUS GAP INCLUSIVITY TOOLKIT	1
TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
INTRODUCTION	3
STRUCTURE OF THE ERASMUS GAP INCLUSIVITY TOOLKIT	4
PAPER FORMAT OF THE ERASMUS GAP INCLUSIVITY TOOLKIT	4
DIGITAL VERSION OF THE ERASMUS GAP SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT.....	5
ERASMUS GAP INCLUSIVITY TOOLKIT.....	7
SECTION 1. INSTITUTIONAL AND RESPONDENT DATA	9
SECTION 2. DATA AND INFORMATION TO EXPLORE THE MOBILITY GAP	11
SECTION 3: SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS	15
Strategic Approach to Exploring and Mitigating the Mobility Gap	15
Widening Access to Student Mobility	19
Comprehensive and Inclusive Student Mobility Procedures	23
Accessible Funding and Financial Support	26
CONSENT FORM	30
COMMON TERMS.....	31
HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION (HEI).....	31
MOBILITY GAP.....	31
STUDENT MOBILITY	31
UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS.....	31



Introduction

Promoting student mobility remains a key priority in advancing inclusive and accessible education across Europe. The 2024 policy framework, *Europe on the Move*, introduces ambitious goals for student mobility, striving to ensure that **23% of higher education graduates and 20% of participants with fewer opportunities take part in mobility programs.**

The **Erasmus GAP project addresses this disparity by providing data, tools, and strategies** to help higher education institutions (HEIs) identify and overcome barriers to mobility for underrepresented groups.

In 2024, the Erasmus GAP team conducted mixed-methods research to explore and mitigate the mobility gap within higher education settings. The research findings reveal that understanding the **gap between mobile and non-mobile students is a highly complex issue** that extends beyond individual-level factors. While these factors are important, **institutional-level dynamics as well as global, regional and national trends** are equally **crucial** in shaping students' participation in international mobility. To fully grasp and address this gap, more research is needed to **explore how institutions perceive and respond to these disparities**, as well as to **identify best practices** that can help reduce barriers and promote more equitable access to international student mobility.

The barriers to student mobility are **multifaceted and context-related**, arising not only from the characteristics of the student population but also from the operational structures of higher education institutions themselves. These barriers manifest as **gaps in accessibility and inclusivity** when institutional responses fail to adequately address individual-level factors such as socio-economic status, cultural capital, and psychological readiness. By failing to recognize or adapt to these dimensions, **universities inadvertently widen the mobility gap, limiting opportunities for students from underrepresented backgrounds** to participate in study abroad programmes. The findings underscore **the critical need for a systemic and inclusive approach** in the design and implementation of mobility initiatives, one that bridges institutional frameworks with the diverse needs of students.

Based on the research findings, the **Erasmus GAP Self-assessment Toolkit** is developed for higher education institutions (HEIs) to explore the gap between mobile and non-mobile students and their inclusive practices in outbound student mobility (excluding degree mobility). The Toolkit aligns with principles of inclusivity, student-centered design, comprehensive access, and collaborative knowledge-sharing, ensuring that all vertical topics are approached with these horizontal elements in mind.



Structure of the Erasmus GAP Inclusivity Toolkit

This section provides an overview of the Erasmus GAP Inclusivity Toolkit and explains its structure for both paper and digital formats.

Paper Format of the Erasmus GAP Inclusivity Toolkit

The Toolkit consists of three main sections:

1. **Institutional and Respondent Data**

This section collects contextual information about respondents and their institutions. It includes data such as respondents' roles, affiliations, and countries to support benchmarking efforts.

2. **Benchmarkable Questions to Explore the Mobility Gap**

This section collects institutional data such as availability of mobility programs, student participation rates, and trends in outbound student mobility, with special regards to students with fewer opportunities. These insights create a baseline to compare practices and identify areas for improvement across different HEIs in the European context.

3. **Self-Assessment Questions on Mobility Strategies and Practices**

This section examines institutional strategies and practices aimed at bridging the gap between mobile and non-mobile students. It includes detailed self-assessment questions organized into thematic areas, such as:

- [Strategic approaches to mitigating the mobility gap](#)
- [Widening access to student mobility](#)
- [Inclusive student mobility practices](#)
- [Accessible funding and financial support](#)

Cross-cutting elements, including inclusivity, student-centeredness, accessibility, and effective data management, are integrated throughout. The Toolkit employs diverse evaluation scales, such as four-point scales, benchmarkable metrics, and descriptive scales, to explore the reasons behind the mobility gap.

At the end of the document, there is a consent form and a glossary of key terms to enhance clarity and compliance. The Consent form needs to be revised thoroughly in line with the implementation of the digital version of the Self-assessment Toolkit.

Digital Version of the Erasmus GAP Self-Assessment Toolkit

The digital version of the Toolkit mirrors the structure of the paper format while introducing interactive elements. The following text describes how it is organized:

1. **Welcome Page**

Introduces the Toolkit's aims and sections, with a "Start Survey" button leading to the next section.

2. **Consent Form Page**

Ensures GDPR compliance and informs participants about data management procedures for the Dashboard. Participants must accept the terms before proceeding.

3. **Section 1: Institutional and Respondent Data**

- Questions appear on a single page.
- Pop-up notes or active links built in the statements provide definitions for [common terms](#) included in the glossary.
- Upon completion, the survey moves seamlessly to the next section.

4. **Section 2: Exploring the Mobility Gap**

- Questions appear on one page.
- Pop-up notes or active links built in the statements provide definitions for [common terms](#) included in the glossary.
- Upon completion, respondents receive a message with a link to the Dashboard (once operational) for aggregated visualized results.

5. **Section 3: Self-Assessment Questions**

- Questions are grouped into four thematic pillars, presented on separate pages to minimize data loss and reduce respondent drop-out rate:
 - a. [Strategic Approach to Mitigating the Mobility Gap](#)
 - b. [Widening Access to Student Mobility](#)
 - c. [Comprehensive and Inclusive Student Mobility Procedures](#)
 - d. [Accessible Funding and Financial Support](#)
- Pop-up notes or active links built in the statements provide definitions for [common terms](#) included in the glossary.
- A progress bar at the bottom of the page will visually indicate the participant's completion status, helping to track their advancement through the survey.



6. Feedback Page

- After completing the self-assessment, respondents receive feedback aligned with the four thematic pillars.
- Results are displayed in an interactive spider chart to visualize strengths and areas for improvement:
 - a. [Strategic Approach to Mitigating the Mobility Gap: Evaluation and feedback](#)
 - b. [Widening Access to Student Mobility: Evaluation and feedback](#)
 - c. [Comprehensive and Inclusive Student Mobility Procedures Pillar: Evaluation and feedback](#)
 - d. [Accessible Funding and Financial Support: Evaluation and feedback](#)
- On the feedback page, the results should be presented in a format that can easily be printed for reference.

7. Thank You Page

The final page thanks participants and informs them that aggregated results will be available on the Dashboard. Additionally, the final page will encourage users to stay updated by subscribing to the project's mailing list.

The message to be shown is as follows:

Thank you for your submission! To stay informed about project updates and related opportunities, we invite you to subscribe to our mailing list here: [LINK](#)



Erasmus GAP Inclusivity Toolkit

Welcome, and thank you for your interest in the Erasmus Gap Inclusivity Toolkit! This toolkit supports higher education institutions in exploring the gap between mobile and non-mobile students, as well as the practices and procedures that can influence all students' intentions and participation in student mobility.

The tool builds on two key terms: **student mobility** and **mobility gap**. (*drop-down menu point where the 2 definitions appear*)

- This toolkit focuses on **student mobility** for both study and training purposes within the context of higher education. We primarily stem our definition of student mobility from the newest version of the Erasmus+ Programme Guide. In this toolkit, mobility refers to the physical movement of students to a country other than their country of residence, potentially combined with a virtual component, to undertake studies or traineeships. The term is used to encompass the widest range of outbound mobility opportunities available to higher education students that are centrally supported by the sending institution, regardless of funding source or whether the activity is credit-bearing. While the toolkit includes mobilities implemented under the Erasmus+ KA131 action, it does not restrict its scope exclusively to Erasmus+ funded mobilities. Both long-term and short-term mobilities, including Blended Intensive Programmes (BIPs), are covered, with differentiated approaches to data treatment as required. Doctoral mobility is included when classified as student mobility. The mobilities addressed in this toolkit range in duration from a minimum of 2 months to a maximum of 12 months.
- The **mobility gap** refers to the disparity between students who have realistic opportunities to participate in student mobility and those who face significant barriers preventing access, hereinafter referred to as *students with fewer opportunities*. This gap is shaped by multiple factors, including students' individual characteristics, institutional features and practices, as well as national, regional, and global trends. Addressing the mobility gap requires inclusive strategies to ensure that underrepresented groups can access and benefit from international experiences.

If you would like to learn more about the background of the research, you can read further here: <https://www.erasmusgap.uvsq.fr/inclusivity-toolkit>

The inclusivity toolkit consists of three main sections:

- Section 1 includes questions on the respondent and their institution.
- Section 2 explores the data behind the mobility gap.
- Section 3 facilitates reflection on institutional practices and factors influencing the mobility of all students.



Erasmus GAP

All responses will remain entirely anonymous, with no personal data being stored. However, institutional identifiers are necessary to accurately aggregate results from multiple responses within the same institution.

Before starting the inclusivity, please read the [consent form](#) carefully.



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Section 1. Institutional and respondent data

The section aims to gather information about your role and institutional affiliation. Your responses will help us understand the diversity of experiences across institutions in Europe. Please answer the following questions regarding your position, the country and the name of your institution.

No	Question	Answer options	Question type	Additional information
1.1.	What is your position within your higher education institution ?	Academic Coordinator (Erasmus, institutional, international, mobility or other type) Head/Director of the International Office Inclusion Officer/Coordinator Manager (project manager, research manager etc.) Other Prefer not to specify	Single Choice Question	Offering the "other" option would be useful to integrate different responses from universities. Due to data processing and data visualization, the "other" option will remain close-ended.
1.2.	Which country is your higher education institution based in?	Dropdown list of EU countries (Member states and Erasmus+ programme partner countries) with an "Other" option	Dropdown (single choice) Question or Click map question	Offering the "other" option would be useful to integrate different responses from universities. Due to data processing and data visualization, the "other" option will remain close-ended.
1.3.	Please specify the location characteristics of your institution.	Urban (located in the capital) Urban (located in a city, a large town, but not in the capital)	Single Choice Question	



		Suburban (located in a small town or residential areas near cities) Rural (located in the country)		
1.4.	Please indicate the type of your institution based on ownership.	Public Private Other (please specify)	Single Choice Question	
1.5.	Approximately how many members of staff (including faculty and administrative) are employed in your institution?	Less than 499 500-999 1,000-1,999 2,000-2,999 3,000-3,999 4,000-4,999 More than 5,000	Single Choice Question	
1.6.	Which <u>higher education institution</u> do you work for?	Dropdown list of Higher Education Institutions in Europe with "Other" and "Prefer not to say" option	Dropdown (single choice) Question	You can add condition on this question. For example, if respondent select "Hungary" in the previous question, the Hungarian Universities should appear in the list.



Section 2. Data and information to explore the mobility gap

In this section you can provide data and information on outbound student mobility at your institution. We recommend that you read these questions carefully. In the first question, please indicate the year of reference for your data sharing related to **your institution** with a special focus on student mobility of up to 12 months. At the end, your results will be visualized to give you an opportunity to compare and benchmark your data in order to explore the mobility gap in a comparative way.

No	Question	Subquestions	Answer options	Additional information, suggestions
2.1.	Please indicate which types of student mobility are available at your institution and at which level(s) of study by selecting all that apply in the matrix below.	Student mobility for studies Student mobility for traineeship Blended mobility Other type of mobility	EQF5 Tertiary Education (Short-cycle): EQF6 Bachelor's or Equivalent Level: EQF 7 Master's or Equivalent Level: EQF 8 Doctoral or Equivalent Level:	
2.2.	Please select the calendar year of reference for your data and information sharing.		2025 2024 2023 2022 2021	Dropdown question
2.3.	Please enter the total number of students who are enrolled in your higher education institution .	This question asks the survey participant to enter a single number.		Numerical input Benchmarkable question
2.4.	Please indicate the number of students by academic level, both in the overall student population and among those participating in student mobility.	EQF5 Tertiary Education (Short-cycle): EQF6 Bachelor's or Equivalent Level: EQF 7 Master's or Equivalent Level: EQF 8 Doctoral or Equivalent Level:	[Overall population: Number] Mobile population: Number]	Numerical input Benchmarkable question



	If the data is not available or you are not aware of it, please indicate NDA.			
2.5.	<p>Please indicate the number of students by academic discipline, both in the overall student population and among those participating in student mobility.</p> <p>If the data is not available or you are not aware of it, please indicate NDA.</p>	<p>Generic programmes and qualifications: Education: Arts and humanities: Social sciences, journalism and information: Business, administration and law: Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics: Information and Communication: Technologies: Engineering, manufacturing and construction: Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary: Health and welfare: Services:</p>	<p>[Overall population: Number]</p> <p>Mobile population: Number]</p>	Numerical input Benchmarkable question
2.7.	<p>What is the age distribution of students at your institution?</p> <p>If the data is not available or you are not aware of it, please indicate NDA.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 20 years: • 20-24 years: • 25-29 years: • 30-34 years: • 35-39 years: • 40 years and above 	<p>[Overall population: Number]</p> <p>Mobile population: Number]</p>	Numerical input Benchmarkable question
2.8.	<p>What is the gender distribution of students at your institution?</p> <p>If the data is not available or you are not aware of it, please indicate NDA.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Female • Male • Non-binary/other 	<p>[Overall population: Number]</p> <p>Mobile population: Number]</p>	Numerical input Benchmarkable question



2.9.	<p>How many students at your institution have a disability?</p> <p>If the data is not available or you are not aware of it, please indicate NDA.</p>		<p>[Overall population: Number]</p> <p>Mobile population: Number]</p>	Numerical input Benchmarkable question
2.10.	<p>How many students at your institution come from minority or migrant backgrounds?</p> <p>If the data is not available or you are not aware of it, please indicate NDA.</p>		<p>[Overall population: Number]</p> <p>Mobile population: Number]</p>	Numerical input Benchmarkable question
2.11.	<p>How many students at your institution come from low-income or disadvantaged backgrounds?</p> <p>If the data is not available or you are not aware of it, please indicate NDA.</p>		<p>[Overall population: Number]</p> <p>Mobile population: Number]</p>	Numerical input Benchmarkable question
2.12.	<p>How many students at your institution are first-generation higher education students?</p> <p>If the data is not available or you are not aware of it, please indicate NDA.</p>		<p>[Overall population: Number]</p> <p>Mobile population: Number]</p>	Numerical input Benchmarkable question
2.13.	<p>How many students at your institution originate from rural or remote regions?</p> <p>If the data is not available or you are not aware of it, please indicate NDA.</p>		<p>[Overall population: Number]</p> <p>Mobile population: Number]</p>	Numerical input Benchmarkable question



	aware of it, please indicate NDA.			
2.14.	<p>How many students at your institution have cultural or national minority backgrounds?</p> <p>If the data is not available or you are not aware of it, please indicate NDA.</p>		<p>[Overall population: Number]</p> <p>Mobile population: Number]</p>	Numerical input Benchmarkable question
2.15.	<p>How many students at your institution are from migrant or refugee backgrounds?</p> <p>If the data is not available or you are not aware of it, please indicate NDA.</p>		<p>[Overall population: Number]</p> <p>Mobile population: Number]</p>	Numerical input Benchmarkable question
2.16.	<p>How many students at your institution have caregiving responsibilities or family-related constraints?</p> <p>If the data is not available or you are not aware of it, please indicate NDA.</p>		<p>[Overall population: Number]</p> <p>Mobile population: Number]</p>	Numerical input Benchmarkable question



Section 3: Self-Assessment Questions

The Self-assessment Tool for higher education institutions consists of 38 statements on four thematic pillars. We recommend you read these statements carefully and then assess on a scale to what extent your higher education institution can be described by the statements. Please evaluate the statements based on your personal experience and knowledge of your institution's practices. Select the level that best represents your assessment. Use the scale below:

- **Not at all:** This statement does not describe your institution at all.
- **Slightly:** The statement describes your institution to a limited extent, in smaller part.
- **Moderately:** The statement describes your institution moderately, to a greater extent, but not entirely.
- **Completely:** The statement fully describes your institution.
- **I do not know:** You are not sure, or you do not have sufficient information to answer.

Please answer all questions in order to give us enough information to provide more accurate feedback. Based on the responses submitted, a data visualization of the results will be created and assessed. The inclusivity tool is designed to raise awareness of specific factors that may have a significant impact on exploring and reducing the mobility gap. It is recommended that the results are considered and integrated into everyday practice at your institution. It should be noted that the results are completely anonymous; no personal data will be stored.

Strategic Approach to Exploring and Mitigating the Mobility Gap

This thematic pillar includes statements on the **strategic approach to exploring and mitigating the mobility gap** at the institutional level. We recommend you read these statements carefully and then assess on a scale to what extent your higher education institutions can be described by the statements. Please answer all questions in order to give us enough information to provide more accurate feedback.

No	Statements	Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Completely	Not applicable / Do not know
	Scores	1	2	3	4	
1.	My institution has established a wide range of active partnerships with other higher education institutions in Europe and beyond, reflecting its commitment to fostering international mobility of students.					
2.	My institution has a clearly defined institutional strategy regarding outgoing student mobility, which					



	includes specific objectives aimed at reducing the mobility gap and encouraging all students to participate in student mobility programs.					
3.	All members (academics, administrative staff) of my institution are strongly committed to increasing the share of underrepresented groups to participate in student mobility.					
4.	My institution has an executive body involving representatives from all stakeholder groups of the HEI (academics, staff, students) responsible for overseeing the institutional strategy, ensuring its effective implementation and regularly reviewing its outcomes.					
5.	My institution has a clear Erasmus+ policy that focuses on increasing students' participation in outbound student mobility by actively addressing barriers faced by mobile students.					
6.	Based on our institutional strategy, my institution segments student groups based on their needs and opportunities when communicating about mobility opportunities.					
7.	The diverse socio-economic composition of the student body at my institution has an impact on the achievement of the student mobility goals.					
8.	My institution applies a clearly defined criteria for identifying underrepresented groups.					
9.	My institution employs a systematic approach to the monitoring of data pertaining to student mobility, with a particular emphasis on underrepresented groups.					
10.	My institution regularly monitors relevant international and national surveys, and statistical data to inform and enhance its student mobility					



strategies and practices, with a focus on addressing the mobility gap.						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

STRATEGIC APPROACH TO EXPLORING AND MITIGATING THE MOBILITY GAP PILLAR: EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK ON THE RESULTS

The feedback below highlights your institution's current standing, identifies areas of strength, and suggests some practical steps to address the mobility gaps.

Scores	Evaluation
The score is below 50%	Your results indicate that your institution is at the beginning of its journey toward a comprehensive and inclusive strategy for international student mobility. While this may feel like a challenge, it also represents a great opportunity to build strong foundations. Starting now, you can set a clear institutional commitment by formulating a written policy that defines inclusivity as a central goal. This includes identifying which groups of students face the greatest barriers at your university and committing to support them specifically. Establishing a cross-unit working group with leadership, academic staff, administrative teams, and students will help anchor this commitment institution-wide. Even small steps – such as mapping where dropouts occur in the mobility process or holding focus groups with non-mobile students – can yield valuable insights. Developing these structures is essential because research shows that, without targeted planning, mobility mostly benefits those who already have resources, while others remain excluded. By starting to collect and use data, experimenting with pilot inclusion measures, and creating visible leadership commitment, your institution can take its first big steps toward turning mobility into a truly accessible opportunity for all students.
The score is between 50% and 84%	Your institution demonstrates a solid baseline of commitment to widening participation in mobility, with certain policies or communication strategies already in place. This is a valuable starting point, showing that inclusion is recognised at the strategic level. However, the next step is to connect the dots more systematically. Policies



	<p>need to be translated into practice across all faculties and programmes, with responsibilities clearly assigned and monitored. Consider setting up faculty-level action plans, supported by regular data collection on who applies, who is selected, and who drops out. Involving students and staff in co-creating these measures strengthens ownership and ensures solutions are grounded in real needs. Expanding the use of external data sources, such as national surveys or European benchmarks, can help you compare your progress with similar institutions and sharpen your targets. By refining your strategy and making it data-driven, you will not only close the mobility gap more effectively but also send a strong message that your institution values every student's right to an international experience. This makes your mobility offer more credible, more attractive, and more resilient in the long run.</p>
The score is 85% or higher	<p>Congratulations – your institution demonstrates a high level of maturity and leadership in strategically addressing inclusivity in mobility. The existence of robust policies, wide-ranging partnerships, and effective monitoring systems shows that inclusion is not an afterthought but a recognised institutional value. This achievement should be celebrated internally and communicated externally as a marker of excellence. At the same time, strong systems bring with them the responsibility to maintain momentum and innovate further. Consider publishing annual inclusion reports that transparently present progress and challenges and explore setting ambitious new targets in fields or student groups that are still underrepresented. You may also wish to mentor or partner with other institutions that are earlier in their journey, reinforcing your role as a sector leader. Continuously engaging staff and students in reviewing and refreshing your inclusion strategy will help prevent complacency and keep inclusivity at the heart of internationalisation. In a changing global environment, this strategic commitment ensures that your university remains a place where mobility is a right, not a privilege, and where every student can benefit from the</p>



	life-changing opportunities of international experience.
--	--

Widening Access to Student Mobility

This thematic pillar invites institutions to reflect on their approaches and actions in widening access to student mobility. We recommend you read these statements carefully and then assess on a scale to what extent your higher education institutions can be described by the statements. Please answer all questions in order to give us enough information to provide more accurate feedback.

	Statements	Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Completely	Not applicable / Do not know
No.	Scores	1	2	3	4	
1.	My institution takes steps to widen access to student mobility, ensuring that all students, regardless of socio-economic background, lived experiences and individual access needs, can participate.					
2.	My institution effectively promotes international student mobility opportunities ensuring that all information is transparent, comprehensive and easily accessible for all students, including underrepresented groups.					
3.	My institution provides additional information on student mobility opportunities (grants, administrative preparation) for underrepresented groups.					
4.	My institution fosters an international academic environment that encourages underrepresented groups to consider student mobility as an integral part of their education.					



5.	My institution promotes student mobility through both academic and administrative staff, ensuring that student mobility is embedded in both the academic culture and the operational procedures of the institution.					
6.	My institution maintains a live network of partner institutions and offers diverse mobility destinations, accommodating the various needs and preferences of students.					
7.	My institution actively takes steps to address barriers that arise from limited mobility choices by broadening the scope and types of mobility programmes available (e.g., in terms of length and modality) in its mobility portfolio.					
8.	International student mobility opportunities at my institution are available to students across all fields of study and academic disciplines.					
9.	International student mobility opportunities are introduced early in study programmes to encourage students to consider participation from the start of their academic journey.					
10.	My institution ensures that the curriculum aligns with student mobility opportunities, providing students with flexible and accessible pathways (e.g. mobility windows) to participate in mobility without delaying their academic progress.					
11.	My institution systematically collects detailed information on previously mobile students' experiences to design more inclusive student mobility strategies and procedures.					
12.	My institution regularly conducts various types of data collection to gather feedback from non-mobile students,					



including underrepresented student groups about their expectations and obstacles in relation to student mobility.						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

WIDENING ACCESS TO STUDENT MOBILITY PILLAR: EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK ON THE RESULTS

The feedback below highlights your institution's current standing, identifies areas of strength, and suggests some practical steps to widen access to student mobility.

Scores	Evaluation
The score is below 50%	Your institution's results suggest that many students – especially those from underrepresented groups – still find international mobility difficult to imagine or pursue. This does not signal failure but rather highlights an exciting opportunity to reshape how mobility is presented and accessed. The first priority is to make mobility visible, understandable, and flexible for all students. This means providing clear, jargon-free information (online and in person), showcasing different mobility formats (short-term, blended, and virtual), and introducing opportunities early in the study journey. Simple steps such as inviting returnee students to share their experiences in first-year classes or redesigning your website so students can filter options by cost, length, or recognition, can have a big impact. Collecting feedback from non-mobile students will help you understand hidden barriers and address them directly. Research shows that students are more likely to participate when opportunities are communicated early, tailored to their study programme, and offered in flexible formats. By taking these steps, your institution can start opening doors for groups who might otherwise never consider mobility, laying the groundwork for a truly inclusive mobility culture.
The score is between 50% and 84%	Your institution demonstrates a genuine commitment to widening access, with several initiatives already underway. Students may already see diverse mobility options and receive tailored guidance, but the challenge now is ensuring



	<p>consistency and scale. Some faculties or programmes may be more proactive than others, creating unequal access across the university. To move forward, make inclusivity a shared responsibility across units: for example, develop standard advising practices so every student receives the same quality of guidance, or introduce a “no wrong door” approach where any staff member can direct students to mobility opportunities. Strengthening peer-to-peer initiatives is another powerful way to build confidence: students who are first-generation, working alongside their studies, or living with disabilities can serve as inspiring ambassadors for others in similar situations. Survey data shows that institutions with broad portfolios and early, proactive promotion achieve higher participation across student groups. By embedding these practices and monitoring uptake across different fields of study, your institution can transform good initiatives into a comprehensive and equitable mobility offer.</p>
<p>The score is 85% or higher</p>	<p>Congratulations – your institution already excels at making mobility accessible and visible to a wide range of students. A diverse portfolio of formats, transparent communication, and integration into the study journey are clear strengths that set your institution apart. This strong position allows you to innovate even further. One possible next step is to co-create discipline-specific mobility playbooks, developed with faculties, to show how mobility fits seamlessly into different study programmes, including those with heavier curricular demands. Embedding mobility in this way ensures that no field or group of students feels left behind. You may also consider sharing your best practices externally, positioning your institution as a model of inclusive internationalisation. By continuing to expand, refine, and communicate your mobility portfolio, you can ensure that every student recognises mobility as a realistic, supported, and valuable part of their academic journey.</p>



Comprehensive and Inclusive Student Mobility Procedures

This thematic pillar invites institutions to reflect on their **practices supporting inclusive, student-centered participation** in international student mobility. The statements focus on transparent and accessible processes, including efficient information systems, clear selection criteria, comprehensive academic and administrative preparation as well as transparent regulations of student mobility experiences. We recommend you read these statements carefully and then assess on a scale to what extent your higher education institutions can be described by the statements. Please answer all questions in order to give us enough information to provide more accurate feedback.

	Statements	Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Completely	Not applicable / Do not know
No.	Scores	1	2	3	4	
1.	My institution offers comprehensive student support, providing guidance for all students throughout the mobility phase, from the initial decision-making stage through to the completion of the mobility period.					
2.	My institution provides broad administrative support, ensuring practical and organizational preparation for students before their student mobility journey.					
3.	My institution offers extensive academic preparation, including intercultural preparation and study-related academic guidance before embarking on student mobility.					
4.	My institution evaluates its academic and administrative preparation programs regularly to ensure they meet the diverse needs of student mobility participants.					
5.	My institution integrates student mobility into academic programs through structured frameworks, such as mobility windows, to ensure it aligns seamlessly with the curriculum.					
6.	My institution balances competitiveness with inclusivity in its student mobility selection process, ensuring that					



	opportunities are accessible to students with diverse academic and personal backgrounds.					
7.	My institution regularly evaluates and revises its student mobility selection criteria and processes to identify and mitigate potential barriers to participation.					
8.	My institution ensures that academic regulations and credit recognition procedures support student mobility participation by minimizing potential barriers (e.g., risk of prolonged studies or academic misalignment).					

COMPREHENSIVE AND INCLUSIVE STUDENT MOBILITY PROCEDURES PILLAR: EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK

The feedback below highlights your institution's current standing, identifies areas of strength, and suggests some practical steps to provide comprehensive and inclusive student mobility procedures.

Scores	Evaluation
The score is below 50%	The evaluation shows that your institution could take important steps to strengthen its framework for guiding and supporting students throughout the mobility process. At present, students may not receive sufficiently comprehensive or tailored support, and this can create particular challenges for those from underrepresented backgrounds. Building inclusive procedures means ensuring that students are guided from the moment they begin exploring mobility opportunities through to their return and credit recognition. Administrative and academic preparation should anticipate the real-life barriers students face, for example, balancing work and study, limited financial means, or lack of confidence in intercultural contexts. Equally important is a critical look at selection procedures: overly rigid or merit-only criteria can unintentionally exclude students with fewer opportunities. Finally, embedding mobility pathways into curricula, for example through mobility windows or seamless credit recognition,



	<p>can help reduce fears of study delays. Strengthening these areas is crucial because evidence shows that when procedures are predictable, transparent, and student-centered, participation broadens significantly. By investing in inclusive guidance and systematic process reviews now, your institution can ensure that mobility becomes both achievable and appealing for all students.</p>
The score is between 50% and 84%	<p>Your institution is making encouraging progress in building an inclusive framework for mobility. Students are already receiving guidance across the process, and preparation opportunities exist, but there is still room to personalize and expand support. For example, intercultural training, tailored academic advice, or one-to-one mobility coaching could make the experience more accessible for students who lack prior mobility capital. Administrative and academic preparation programs would benefit from being reviewed regularly with feedback from students, so they can better reflect diverse needs. Selection procedures are in place, yet systematic evaluation and refinement are necessary to ensure fairness and inclusivity, especially so that underrepresented groups are not overlooked. Finally, efforts to align mobility with curricula (such as mobility windows or optimized credit recognition systems) should be consolidated across faculties to avoid uneven access. Strengthening these elements matters because they help students trust the system, plan confidently, and feel that mobility is designed with their realities in mind. By building on your current achievements, your institution can move from a good framework to a comprehensive, inclusive model of mobility support.</p>
The score is 85% or higher	<p>Your institution has established a well-developed and inclusive mobility framework. Students benefit from comprehensive guidance at all stages of the process, and there is clear evidence that academic and administrative preparation addresses diverse needs. Importantly, your institution demonstrates a commitment to providing personalized guidance, including tailored academic advice and intercultural preparation, which supports students in</p>



	<p>overcoming potential barriers. Regular evaluation and revision of selection criteria ensure that access is fair and inclusive, reflecting international best practice. Additionally, mobility pathways are effectively embedded into curricula, with the use of mobility windows and efficient credit recognition systems helping to minimize study delays. These achievements place your institution in a strong position of leadership. To go even further, you are encouraged to refine and innovate: for instance, expanding digital guidance tools, piloting new models of recognition in complex disciplines, or offering more faculty-specific preparation modules. Continuing to adapt and share your practices will ensure that your institution remains at the forefront of inclusive mobility and can inspire others. Ultimately, this commitment sends a clear message that mobility is not just available but is actively designed to include every student.</p>
--	--

Accessible Funding and Financial Support

This thematic pillar includes statements on **the role of cost-related and financial factors in exploring and mitigating the mobility gap** at the institutional level. We recommend you read these statements carefully and then assess on a scale to what extent your higher education institutions can be described by the statements. Please answer all questions in order to give us enough information to provide more accurate feedback.

No	Statements	Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Completely	Not applicable / Do not know
	Scores	1	2	3	4	
1.	At my institution, financial and cost-related factors (including lack of sufficient funds and concerns about losing current employment) are considered to be significant factors that discourage students from participating in outbound student mobility programs.					
2.	My institution prioritizes the removal of financial and cost-related obstacles faced by students in the decision-making process					



	regarding participation in student mobility programs.					
3.	In developing its institutional strategies, my institution considers the specific financial needs of students with fewer opportunities, with the objective of supporting them effectively.					
4.	Effective financial resources and grants (such as top-up grants, inclusion support, etc.) are available to students with fewer opportunities.					
5.	My institution provides adequate financial assistance to address specific obstacles, including economic challenges and additional expenses for students with disabilities.					
6.	The application procedures for financial assistance are managed in a transparent and accessible way to all students, ensuring equitable opportunities.					
7.	My institution regularly collects and monitors data on students' financial needs and concerns related to student mobility.					
8.	At my institution, the results of international and national surveys related to financial and cost-related barriers of student mobility are regularly monitored.					

ACCESSIBLE FUNDING AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT PILLAR: EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK ON THE RESULTS

The feedback below highlights your institution's current standing, identifies areas of strength, and suggests some practical steps to provide accessible funding and financial support.

Scores	Evaluation
The score is below 50%	The evaluation indicates that your institution may still face some challenges in removing financial barriers to student mobility. Students from underrepresented groups are often the first to be discouraged when funding appears insufficient, unclear, or difficult to access. This is not a weakness but an opportunity to take impactful action: prioritizing financial inclusivity



	<p>will allow a much broader range of students to benefit from mobility. Immediate steps could include mapping the true costs of mobility (travel, accommodation, living expenses, visa/insurance fees) and comparing these to the grants currently available. Simplifying and streamlining grant application procedures is another powerful way to lower entry barriers, particularly for underrepresented groups, who may find complex processes discouraging. Collecting and analysing data on financial needs will help tailor support to different student realities. Research shows that financial insecurity is one of the most decisive factors in preventing mobility. By investing in financial transparency and targeted funding, your institution can ensure that money is never the reason why a student decides against going abroad.</p>
<p>The score is between 50% and 84%</p>	<p>Your institution demonstrates a moderate level of commitment to addressing financial obstacles, and some valuable initiatives are already in place, for example, grants or top-ups for students with fewer opportunities. However, gaps remain in ensuring that funding is accessible to all who need it and that student needs are systematically tracked. To strengthen your support framework, make sure that information about grants and financial aid is clearly communicated and easy to navigate. Proactive outreach (e.g. reminders, workshops, one-stop information pages) can make a big difference in student awareness and application rates. Regularly analysing survey data or feedback on financial challenges will help you adapt funding models to evolving realities. Transparent and student-friendly application procedures are essential to build trust, especially for students who may already feel disadvantaged. These improvements are crucial because even modest grants, when visible and accessible, can tip the balance between exclusion and participation. By refining and expanding your approach, your institution can ensure that financial support truly reaches those who need it most.</p>
<p>The score is 85% or higher</p>	<p>Your institution shows a strong commitment to financial inclusivity in student mobility. Offering diverse funding options, ensuring transparent and accessible application processes, and regularly monitoring students' needs demonstrates that you</p>



	<p>treat financial barriers as a priority. This commitment is a significant achievement and a clear signal that mobility is not only for the most privileged students. To build on this strong foundation, consider expanding the scope of financial support, for example, by introducing targeted schemes for specific groups (working students, caregivers, or those with disabilities) or by piloting flexible solutions such as short-term mobility stipends. Strengthening partnerships with external stakeholders (e.g. employers, municipalities, foundations) could further increase the resources available. Finally, continuing to share outcomes transparently and engaging students in designing improvements will help keep support systems relevant and trusted. By maintaining and expanding your financial inclusivity agenda, your institution ensures that mobility remains equitable, sustainable, and accessible to every student, regardless of their background.</p>
--	--



Consent form

Thank you for your interest in the Erasmus GAP Self-assessment Toolkit. This toolkit is designed to support higher education institutions in identifying and addressing gaps between mobile and non-mobile students by assessing inclusive practices for outbound student mobility. Your participation is entirely voluntary, and we appreciate your contribution to the Erasmus GAP initiative.

Purpose of the Toolkit

The Erasmus GAP Self-assessment Toolkit provides instantaneous, evidence-based feedback to help institutions understand their strengths and areas for improvement. Aggregate results from all participants will contribute to a visualized, anonymized dataset, showcasing the state of play across Europe and supporting the development of strategies to reduce the mobility gap.

Data Collection and Use

- **Anonymity:** All responses to this tool are completely anonymous. No personal data, including identifying information, will be collected or stored.
- **Data Use:** The anonymized, aggregate data will be used to generate insights and trends to inform institutional practices and broader strategic frameworks within Europe. It may also be used for research purposes. Individual responses cannot and will not be traced back to you or your institution.

Participation

- Your participation is entirely voluntary. You may choose to proceed with or discontinue the assessment at any point without any consequences.
- There are no risks or direct benefits to you for participating, but your input will contribute to improving inclusive mobility practices across Europe.

Feedback

Upon completing the self-assessment, you will receive immediate, evidence-based feedback tailored to your institution's responses. This feedback is for informational and developmental purposes.

Consent

By proceeding with the self-assessment tool, you confirm that you:

1. Understand the purpose of the tool and how your responses will be used.
2. Agree that your responses will be anonymized and used solely for the purposes described above.
3. Voluntarily consent to participate in this assessment.

If you agree to participate, please click "I Agree" to proceed to the Self-assessment Toolkit.

If you have any questions or concerns about this tool or your participation, please contact us at [Contact Email].

Thank you for your contribution!



Common terms

Higher Education Institution (HEI)

An institution that, in accordance with national law or practices, provides recognized degrees or other tertiary-level qualifications. It also includes comparable institutions that national authorities deem eligible to participate in the programme within their respective territories.

Mobility Gap

It refers to the disparity between students who have realistic opportunities to participate in student mobility and those who face significant barriers preventing access. This gap is shaped by multiple factors, including students' individual characteristics, institutional features and practices, as well as national, regional, and global trends. Addressing the mobility gap requires inclusive strategies to ensure that underrepresented groups can access and benefit from international experiences.

Student Mobility

This toolkit focuses on **student mobility** for both study and training purposes within the context of higher education. We primarily stem our definition of student mobility from the newest version of the Erasmus+ Programme Guide. In this toolkit, mobility refers to the physical movement of students to a country other than their country of residence, potentially combined with a virtual component, to undertake studies or traineeships. The term is used to encompass the widest range of outbound mobility opportunities available to higher education students that are centrally supported by the sending institution, regardless of funding source or whether the activity is credit-bearing. While the toolkit includes mobilities implemented under the Erasmus+ KA131 action, it does not restrict its scope exclusively to Erasmus+ funded mobilities. Both long-term and short-term mobilities, including Blended Intensive Programmes (BIPs), are covered, with differentiated approaches to data treatment as required. Doctoral mobility is included when classified as student mobility. The mobilities addressed in this toolkit range in duration from a minimum of 2 months to a maximum of 12 months.

Based on the Erasmus+ Programme Guide, student mobility can be carried out in any study field and cycle (short cycle/bachelor/master/doctoral). To ensure high-quality mobility activities with maximum impact on the students, the mobility activity must be compatible with the student's degree related learning and personal development needs.

Underrepresented Groups

Based on the Erasmus+ Programme Guide, the term refers to a group or groups of individuals who may face barriers to participating in international education. These are students who face challenges that may impede their full participation in education, especially in international settings. Such obstacles may include physical, mental, or sensory impairments; severe health issues; cultural differences; educational challenges; social barriers; economic disadvantages; or discrimination based on gender, ethnicity, or other factors.

