

POLICY INPUT

Building on the success of Erasmus+

Recommendations for the interim
evaluation of the programme (2021-27)

November 2023



This publication is licensed under the Creative Commons [Attribution-NonCommercial](#) CC BY-NC

This information may be freely used, copied and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the source is acknowledged (European University Association).

European University Association asbl

Avenue de l'Yser 24

Rue du Rhône 114

1040 Brussels

Case postale 3174

Belgium

1211 Geneva 3, Switzerland

+32 (0) 2 230 55 44

+41 22 552 02 96

www.eua.eu · info@eua.eu

Introduction

Erasmus+ is vitally important to European higher education institutions and their international partners. The programme provides unique opportunities for exchange and collaboration among individuals, institutions, and systems. For many, it is the main funding source for international mobility and education cooperation. In addition to its tangible and long-lasting impact on the higher education sector, Erasmus+ also contributes to uniting Europe, within and beyond the European Union, and enhancing relationships with global partners.

As a contribution to the ongoing interim evaluation of Erasmus+ for the period 2021-27, and in view of the upcoming discussions on the next generation of the programme, the European University Association (EUA) makes the following recommendations on behalf of Europe's university sector. The recommendations are based on a broad consultation of higher education institutions and organisations and a survey,¹ carried out in 2022/23, which gathered responses from 500 higher education institutions in 49 Erasmus+ programme and partner countries.

THE PROGRAMME'S HIGH ADDED VALUE

Recommendation 1

Erasmus+ is highly valuable and provides significant impact for higher education institutions and their members. It is a crucial tool for improving the quality of education and contributing to society, in Europe and internationally. Erasmus+ must be one of the European Union's top priorities for the next multiannual budget.

CONTRIBUTION TO EUROPEAN PRIORITIES

Recommendation 2

The Erasmus+ programme's contribution to inclusion and diversity, democracy and civic engagement, digital transformation, and environment and climate action is of key importance to Europe's societies and higher education sectors. Therefore, related activities need enhancement and thorough impact assessment.

PROGRAMME ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

Recommendation 3

The Erasmus+ programme's digital tools require urgent revision and enhancement, and flexibility on all sides in the meantime. Proper testing with and consultation of institutions and national agencies could help to avoid similar problems in the future.

Recommendation 4

Consultations should be carried out properly, and outcomes should be shared and followed up. How to make use of existing senior expertise at higher education institutions should be considered.

Recommendation 5

In decentralised actions, the programme's rules and procedures across countries should be better aligned. An enhanced data sharing mechanism must be established between national agencies, EACEA and the Commission for swifter communication of selection results.

Recommendation 6

Sufficient attention should be given to the further development of EACEA, enabling a shift toward a service-oriented culture, and ensuring capacity, visibility and recognition. As such, the agency needs to be better

¹ Forthcoming.

equipped to exercise its role as the steward and guardian of the Erasmus+ programme and to interact proactively and swiftly with beneficiaries, stakeholders and policy makers.

Recommendation 7

Annual budget allocations for individual actions should be spread more evenly.

Recommendation 8

More strategic attention should be paid to the international Erasmus+ actions and frameworks.

Recommendation 9

The Erasmus+ programme's ability to cope with crises should be systematically enhanced by developing a flexible crisis response scheme. Enhanced crisis resilience could also drive a general improvement of the programme in terms of simplification. In addition, a dedicated action to support at-risk students from all countries is needed.

Recommendation 10

Erasmus+ should contribute to enhancing links between education, research and innovation, well beyond the European university alliances.

MOBILITY ACTIONS

Recommendation 11

Mobility actions are popular and receive positive feedback on most aspects, but there is an urgent need to improve the clarity of funding rules and to enhance the programme management, especially via digital tools.

Recommendation 12

The impact of the top-ups for inclusive and green mobility should be thoroughly assessed. Where necessary, the approach should be adjusted, in due consideration of the workload implications for managing units.

Recommendation 13

The regional envelopes for International Credit Mobility need to be adapted to actual student and staff demand, in addition to the international policy interests of the Union.

Recommendation 14

Virtual exchanges should be further explored as a supplement to staff and student exchanges, in due recognition of added value and workload.

Recommendation 15

The impact and added value of the EU guaranteed Study Loans Facility should be properly assessed.

COLLABORATION ACTIONS

Recommendation 16

The intra-European and international cooperation actions are a valuable means for cross-border exchange and collaboration, and also for institutional and system-level development and reform. More synergies between projects and further simplification could help to maximize impact.

Recommendation 17

The new lump sum approach is principally welcome, but requires better guidance and support and clearer rules.

Recommendation 18

While serving as a testbed for higher education policies and practices, individual alliances in the European Universities Initiative should not be overburdened with objectives. The Initiative and the alliances are more than a project and need a holistic reflection on all dimensions to ensure long-term sustainability.

Recommendations

THE PROGRAMME'S HIGH ADDED VALUE

RECOMMENDATION 1

Erasmus+ is highly valuable and provides significant impact for higher education institutions and their members. It is a crucial tool for improving the quality of education and contributing to society, in Europe and internationally. Erasmus+ must be one of the European Union's top priorities for the next multiannual budget.

Higher education institutions across Europe unanimously identify Erasmus+ as the most important European initiative. Its various European and international actions for mobility and cooperation are of high added value, as they enable institutions to enhance and internationalise their educational offers. As such, Erasmus+ is crucial for improving the quality of education and enables mutual learning on a wide range of issues. The programme ably supports institutional and system-level innovation and capacity development across Europe and beyond. The increased investment that the programme has received in 2020 has clearly paid off.

However, Erasmus+ needs some enhancement, notably in terms of simplification and improvement of management and digital instruments. The Covid-19 crisis and Russia's war against Ukraine have demonstrated the potential and the limits of Erasmus+ to respond flexibly. Some actions need to be further developed, as they are quite recent, e.g. the European University Initiative. Others, such as the programme's contribution to Europe's global partnerships, are yet to receive appropriate attention from policy makers.

Looking beyond the interim review, it is now timely to start to reflect on the Erasmus+ programme's contribution to Europe's future. The negotiations on the next EU budget fall during difficult times, with increased investment in areas such as the green and digital transitions, as well as geopolitical partnerships, including commitments to Ukraine and measures to support neighbouring countries. It is vital to recall that a proactive response to these challenges is linked to continued investment in higher education and in Erasmus+. In 2027, the European Union must match its ambitions for Erasmus+ with the appropriate budget.

CONTRIBUTION TO EUROPEAN PRIORITIES

RECOMMENDATION 2

The Erasmus+ programme's contribution to inclusion and diversity, democracy and civic engagement, digital transformation, and environment and climate action is of key importance to Europe's societies and higher education sectors. Therefore, related activities need enhancement and thorough impact assessment.

The programme's four horizontal priorities of inclusion and diversity, democracy and civic engagement, digital transformation and environment and climate action are highly relevant for the higher education sector. Linking these priorities to mobility and interinstitutional collaboration contributes to awareness raising, mutual learning and the transfer of good practice in higher education institutions and societies across Europe and internationally.

Most institutions acknowledge that Erasmus+ addresses and contributes to the priorities it sets. However, there is clear scope for enhancement across all four priorities, in particular for climate change and digitalisation. For instance, the additional mobility top-ups for inclusion are welcomed by the sector and have some tangible impact. However, this might not yet suffice to enable mobility of students from low to high-cost destinations, in particular given housing costs in metropolitan areas. Top-ups for green travel have not delivered a major impact so far, as they are too low to cover additional costs for green modes of travel. Here, a different strategy and other measures might be required.

In order to enhance all four priorities, the European Commission should conduct thorough impact assessment.

PROGRAMME ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

RECOMMENDATION 3

The Erasmus+ programme's digital tools require urgent revision and enhancement, and flexibility on all sides in the meantime. Proper testing with and consultation of institutions and national agencies could help to avoid similar problems in the future.

Overall, the programme functions well, but rules and procedures would benefit from simplification.

Major problems are caused by Erasmus+ digital processes and tools, which are not sufficiently functional, robust and reliable. This results in delays, considerable extra work and costs, and high levels of frustration amongst administrators and programme participants. This is not a new problem, and there has been no improvement over the years. Rather, the contrary is true. While technical concerns are at the root of this issue, the lack of prior consultation and the untested and unannounced introduction of some of the tools aggravate it.

In the short term, more flexible deadlines and additional funding would help. However, the European Commission should establish an expert group or network comprising staff from universities and national agencies to solve the problems and avoid future ones. The Commission should also conduct proper testing before launching digital tools.

RECOMMENDATION 4

Consultations should be carried out properly, and outcomes should be shared and followed up. How to make use of existing senior expertise at higher education institutions should be considered.

More and better consultation is needed, as already underlined in [EUA's recommendations for Erasmus+ in 2017](#). Apart from the above-mentioned digital tools, this also concerns other innovations, such as the lump sum approach, as well as the general strategy, features and processes of Erasmus+.

While the sector is formally consulted on parts of the programme, this often takes place at a late stage, leaving it open as to whether and how results are taken into consideration.

Many professionals at higher education institutions and national agencies can provide useful advice, in particular, but not exclusively, with regard to the mobility actions. Thus far, the longstanding knowledge and experience of the Erasmus+ community remains largely untapped.

RECOMMENDATION 5

In decentralised actions, the programme's rules and procedures across countries should be better aligned. An enhanced data sharing mechanism must be established between national agencies, EACEA and the Commission for swifter communication of selection results.

Most institutions are satisfied with the support that national agencies provide, but there is concern that decentralised programmes are implemented and managed quite differently across different countries. In addition, information and data on the selection results of decentralised programmes arrive late. This negatively impacts programme monitoring and planning, and also hinders synergies and collaboration among Erasmus+ projects on similar topics.

A mechanism must be established for swifter communication of selection results between national agencies, national Erasmus offices and contact points in partner countries, the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA) and the Commission. This is important for the quality management of Erasmus+, but also provides important information for the policy level and the higher education sector, in terms of synergies and collaboration. In [its contribution to the 2016 interim evaluation](#), EUA proposed that collaboration programmes should be selected and administered centrally, for quality reasons, and also to strengthen their European visibility.

RECOMMENDATION 6

Sufficient attention should be given to the further development of EACEA, enabling a shift toward a service-oriented culture, and ensuring capacity, visibility and recognition. As such, the agency needs to be better equipped to exercise its role as the steward and guardian of the Erasmus+ programme and to interact proactively and swiftly with beneficiaries, stakeholders and policy makers.

Across countries and programmes, overall satisfaction with the management of EACEA is on average lower than for the national agencies. For some actions, programme participants report considerable delays in the publication of information. Final versions of guidelines and templates are published late, often just a few days before submission deadlines. Information is not always clearly worded and transparent; at times it is contradictory. Inquiries are answered with considerable delays, not at all, or are worded ambiguously and in highly legalistic language, thereby not helping to clarify the rules.

In addition to the enhancement of staff resources, a shift from the present bureaucratic culture to a more service-oriented culture should be considered in staff training and other measures. Inspiration and good practice can certainly be found within EACEA, but also among national agency administrations. Expected benefits are enhanced quality and satisfaction among both stakeholders and EACEA staff, as well as cost- and time-savings.

RECOMMENDATION 7

Annual budget allocations for individual actions should be spread more evenly.

The practice of gradual augmentation of annual budgets for the different actions is not useful.

Smaller annual budgets and a limited number of grants might be in place for new actions, in order to test uptake and administrative processes. However, there is no good reason to take this approach for actions

which are already well established, such as Erasmus+ mobility.

Besides creating an uneven workload for national agencies and institutions from one year to the other, this practice particularly impacts individual beneficiaries: for example, a student applying for mobility had much better chances in 2019 than in 2021.

In 2021, this approach led to a shortage of Erasmus+ grants for mobility and collaboration in many institutions, particularly in comparison to the final years of the previous programme with relatively high funding levels. Therefore, EUA has called for a [more even dissemination of funds](#).

RECOMMENDATION 8

More strategic attention should be paid to the international Erasmus+ actions and frameworks.

The integration of the international (third country) strands for mobility and cooperation into Erasmus+ in 2015 was a major achievement and has brought many improvements. Nonetheless, there is scope for enhancement, in terms of organisational integration and linkages to the EU's higher education and research policy aspirations.

As for all other actions, representatives of stakeholders should be consulted regarding the third country actions via a dedicated working group. Moreover, there is no good reason to start these actions a year later than all other actions, as experienced in the current and previous programme rounds (where they commenced in 2021 and 2015, instead of 2020 and 2014).

The international programmes could benefit from a closer interaction with the goals and strategies of the EU's higher education and research policy. Take the [European Strategy for Universities](#),² which aims to reinforce universities as drivers of the EU's global role and leadership and to link member states, universities and other stakeholders to jointly “leverage the strong and unique basis of Europe's higher education sector and bring its missions – education, research, innovation at the service of society”.

To bring this to life, more and more visible and proactive initiatives are required to establish organisational frameworks and platforms - as previously was the case under some regional “structural projects”. This should take place not only for Africa, but also for other partner regions and countries. It may also be useful for certain topics and themes, such as inclusion and diversity and environment and climate action, or to link them with existing structures and initiatives, such the [Digital Education Hub](#). This should not result into a resurrection of the pre-2014 regional programmes; Erasmus+ should be kept open for global cooperation. These initiatives should be integrated in or synergised with the initiatives of National Erasmus+ Offices and the newly established Erasmus National Contact Points in partner countries. Aside from connecting policy and practice, it would enable information flows and synergies among different actors.

RECOMMENDATION 9

The Erasmus+ programme's ability to cope with crises should be systematically enhanced by developing a flexible crisis response scheme. Enhanced crisis resilience could also drive a general improvement of the programme in terms of simplification. In addition, a dedicated action to support at-risk students from all countries is needed.

The present Erasmus+ programme had to respond to two major crises, the Covid-19 pandemic and the war in Ukraine. While this deserves more thorough analysis, the need to have well-functioning communication channels and to grant higher levels of flexibility and subsidiarity was confirmed. This should guide further

² European Commission (2022). Commission Communication on a European Strategy for Universities (2022). p. 8.

simplification of all actions. In addition, a dedicated scheme to support students at risk should be established, allowing them to continue their studies in Europe. This should be flexible, enabling EACEA, national agencies and beneficiaries to react to crises without delay.

Covid-19 crisis solutions naturally took some time to be put in place and remained difficult to handle due to the varying and quickly changing situation across Europe. Good communication channels and greater flexibility in the management of the actions were needed, from reallocation of budgets to newly designed activities, as well as pivoting everything, including mobilities, online. This was more successful for individual mobilities than for cooperation programmes.

Adapting Erasmus+ in the context of the war in Ukraine enabled institutions to continue, and sometimes even enhance, collaboration with Ukrainian partners. This is much appreciated by many institutions. However, many also express a preference for national funding sources, which require significantly less administrative effort.

Sadly, the case of Ukraine has again proven that there is a distinct and urgent need for a dedicated Erasmus+ action for students with a refugee(-like) or at-risk background, as called for by EUA and many others for several years³. This should be a dedicated action of Erasmus+, country agnostic, and flexible enough to react to new crises once they emerge.

Overall, Erasmus+ needs additional flexibility regarding the budgets and design of emergency actions. This would allow the programme to better and more rapidly react to crises of any nature. This could inform a general review of the actions and their rules, in terms of simplification. The lump sum approach is already a step in this direction.

RECOMMENDATION 10

Erasmus+ should contribute to enhancing links between education, research and innovation, well beyond the European university alliances.

The European Union aims to enhance synergy and interaction between the European Education Area and the European Research Area. The “knowledge square”, which ties together education, research, innovation and service to society, requires “more policy and funding synergies between education and training, research and innovation, namely in the context of the ERA and the European Education Area, while ensuring consistency with the European Higher Education Area”⁴.

The European Strategy for Universities puts a strong emphasis on the European Universities Initiative. This is a start, but it would be important to pursue this goal of strengthening the links between education and research and innovation more horizontally and also through other actions, under the present and certainly in view of the next Erasmus+ and the tenth framework programme for research and innovation (FP10).

This is of major importance for the entire higher education sector, also with regard to their contribution to skills development and lifelong learning, as well as cross-sector cooperation on green and digital innovation.

³ e.g. [Proposal for an Erasmus+ grant to welcome international talent](#), EUA 2017; [How Erasmus+ could benefit refugees](#), EUA 2017; [Proposal for EU actions in support of students at risk](#), DAAD 2022.

⁴ Council Resolution on a strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training towards the European Education Area and beyond (2021-2030) 2021/C 66/01 (OJ C, C/66, 26.02.2021, p. 1, CELEX: [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32021G0226\(01\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32021G0226(01)))

MOBILITY ACTIONS

RECOMMENDATION 11

Mobility actions are popular and receive positive feedback on most aspects, but there is an urgent need to improve the clarity of funding rules and to enhance the programme management, especially via digital tools.

Higher education institutions assess the Erasmus+ programme's mobility actions positively, both for intra-European and third country exchanges (International Credit Mobility). After the Covid-19 crisis, interest in physical mobility seems to have fully recovered and enjoys high popularity and demand. Furthermore, institutions indicate that they will continue to use the new virtual exchange opportunities as an additional feature, rather than as a replacement for physical mobility.

However, almost half of institutions point to major problems in the implementation of mobility actions, mainly concerning aspects of digital tools for programme management. In particular the Beneficiary Module is received negatively by almost three-quarters of institutions. This proportion even higher in certain countries, reaching 86%. Immediate solutions must be found to ensure smoother management and further simplified administration of the mobility actions (see also Recommendation 3). The European Commission may consider the establishment of a dedicated task force, involving experienced colleagues from higher education institutions and national agencies.

About one fifth of institutions also report issues related to funding: rules are not sufficiently clear and travel cost ceilings are too low or rigid.

RECOMMENDATION 12

The impact of the top-ups for inclusive and green mobility should be thoroughly assessed. Where necessary, the approach should be adjusted, in due consideration of the workload implications for managing units.

The top-ups for inclusion are principally welcome, and also seem to achieve some impact. Besides supporting students with fewer opportunities, they also contribute to the mobilisation of other resources, awareness-raising and changes of practices and regulations at institutional and national levels. In many systems and institutions, it raises questions as to how to recognise disadvantage, and award the top-ups, as also confirmed by a [2020 report](#) on the situation in selected partner countries.

Almost half of the institutions participating in EUA's survey found that Green Mobility top-ups, did not bring any change in the travel behaviour of staff and students. A €50 top-up fails to cover the often significant price difference between trains and flights.

For both issues, a proper impact assessment, but also exchange of national and institutional practices and experiences could be valuable to better understand how useful the measures are in different national and institutional settings.

In addition, the extent to which top-ups increase the workload of national and institutional level administrations should be considered. Again, consultation of and co-creation with the sector in programme development will be essential for uptake and success.

RECOMMENDATION 13

The regional envelopes for International Credit Mobility need to be adapted to actual student and staff demand, in addition to the international policy interests of the Union.

Regarding International Credit Mobility, half of respondents to EUA's survey state that student demand for outgoing mobility to some regions by far exceeds the available funding. The European Commission has put a strong emphasis on Africa and the Western Balkans, to the detriment of exchanges with other regions. This needs to be revised to better reflect mobility demand.

RECOMMENDATION 14

Virtual exchanges should be further explored as a supplement to staff and student exchanges, in due recognition of added value and workload

Overall, the sector's feedback on all formats of virtual exchange and collaboration is positive. This is particularly true for the Blended Intensive Programmes, which 75% of EUA survey respondents find fully, or to some extent, an attractive opportunity. However, universities also point to the considerable workload required for the management of this type of action.

Institutions welcome the virtual opportunities as an additional format, not a replacement for physical mobility, very much in line with the 2020 [European Parliament CULT Committee briefing](#).

RECOMMENDATION 15

The impact and added value of the EU guaranteed Study Loans Facility should be properly assessed.

EUA has followed the development and implementation of the European Study Loan up to 2020. At the time, it assessed a [lack of take-up and impact, but also that the approach as such raises many questions](#), which has also been confirmed by the European Commission's 2018 interim evaluation report and the related staff working paper. This seem to be the most recent evidence. Since 2020, the initiative has continued outside of Erasmus+, although it is still funded by the EU.

Therefore, EUA can only reiterate its reservations and concerns regarding the Loan Facility. There should be a proper assessment to consider its overall impact and cost-benefit, given that the loans thus far enjoy very limited uptake across European countries. Do they really contribute to enabling study participation, and how inclusive and fair is this measure, given that students take loans at a relatively high interest rate from for-profit bank institutions?

A question is whether European taxpayers' money is not better invested in other ways. EUA has proposed a [European study trust fund](#), open to public and private (industry, foundations) contributions. This would be a more visible measure, within and beyond Europe. It would also better suit the European Union and might become a versatile and future-oriented instrument. Similar trust funds have already been used by the EU in other contexts.

COLLABORATION ACTIONS

RECOMMENDATION 16

The intra-European and international cooperation actions are a valuable means for cross-border exchange and collaboration, and also for institutional and system-level development and reform. More synergies between projects and further simplification could help to maximize impact.

According to data collected by EUA, practically all institutions confirm the added value of KA2 cooperation partnerships and capacity building and that they will continue using such collaboration opportunities. These actions should remain flexible, while contributing to the programme's horizontal priorities of inclusion and diversity, democracy and civic engagement, digital transformation and environment and climate action, to allow institutions and their members to work with diverse partners in and outside of higher education, in Europe and internationally.

More could be done to enhance synergies and cooperation between projects. Project participants often only learn about the existence of other projects on the same or similar topics at a late stage. Prompter communication of selection results is needed. The Commission should organise meetings of project participants, considering not only management, but also content. This could create important synergies and enhance the policy and general societal impact. The attention given to the European Universities Initiative showcases what can be done.

RECOMMENDATION 17

The new lump sum approach is principally welcome, but requires better guidance and support and clearer rules.

The Commission will gradually replace the unit-based approach with a lump sum approach. From first impressions and experiences, many institutions principally see this as a positive development. They expect it to bring major advantages, such as easing project management and enhancing cost-coverage. Only a small minority wants the unit-cost approach to return.

However, there is still a high level of uncertainty on how the lump sum approach will work in practice: Only a third of EUA survey respondents finds the financial reporting requirements sufficiently clear, and only a quarter fear no problems with internal and external accounting and audits. A frequent complaint is that the written guidance provided by EACEA is not sufficiently clear, or even contradictory. Requests for clarifications often remain unanswered.

RECOMMENDATION 18

While serving as a testbed for higher education policies and practices, individual alliances in the European Universities Initiative should not be overburdened with objectives. The Initiative and the alliances are more than a project and need a holistic reflection on all dimensions to ensure long-term sustainability.

The European Universities Initiative (EUI) and the alliances that it supports are too recent for a thorough assessment. The measure has been welcomed by the higher education sector, as it draws attention to the university as an institution, and its ability for transnational cooperation in learning and teaching and other fields. The EUI also stimulates institutional and system-level reflection on and assessment of higher

education reform implementation in the context of the European Education Area and the European Higher Education Area.

This is all very positive as a preliminary outcome, but institutions also report concerns and challenges, such as the high investment required, as well as high external policy pressures. The present interim evaluation is an occasion to adjust, also as the terms for the next generation of the action will soon have to be drawn up. Beyond this, a holistic reflection about the future of the initiative and the alliances is needed. This should look at all dimensions of cooperation including learning and teaching, research, innovation and engagement with society and how to support this in the future.

A relatively high number of institutions assess the grant as insufficient to fulfil project aims. Participation in an alliance absorbs major resources and attention, to the detriment of other forms of transnational cooperation.

The EUI also erects an artificial separation from the rest of the institutions' transnational collaboration. Most institutions stress the need for easier integration and collaboration with HEI in partner countries.

The EUI are a testbed for enhanced transnational collaboration. While institutions principally support most of the policy goals that the Commission allocates to the initiative, there is a danger of overload. Rather than having to fulfil everything, an alliance should be entitled to prioritise. In particular the vision of becoming one "European university" is not shared by all. The scope and degree of integration of the partner institutions' activities with the alliance must be determined by the universities involved and in full respect of their institutional autonomy. The academic purpose of cooperation should shape the form, scope and scale of cooperation (following the principle "form follows function").

The EUI should not be perceived as representative of the higher education sector. While interest in the initiative is high among Europe's universities, it is important to remember that only a small number - not more than 10% - of the sector may eventually get involved in an alliance. Therefore, it is important to cherish the diversity of collaboration actions that exist, within Erasmus+ and beyond. As EUA has stated many times⁵, collaboration can take different forms and sizes, and there are no reasons to prioritise the EUI over others.

What will be required to continue and sustain the alliances is an open question, and as discussions are starting on a future investment pathway, it will be important to look into different options and programmes at different levels. That said, the need for further investment should not lead to more "funding concentration", to the disadvantage of other parts of Erasmus+. All Erasmus+ actions and strands need to be sufficiently funded, and also receive the necessary attention and support by the Commission and EACEA.

⁵ For example *European Universities Initiative: Towards a holistic approach for assessing progress*, 21/03/2023; *European Universities Initiative: EUA warns against top-down steering and calls for further action to remove barriers*, 18/05/2021

EUA'S PAST AND ONGOING WORK ON ERASMUS+

For all the reasons mentioned above, EUA is closely monitoring those parts of the Erasmus+ programme, which are of interest for the higher education sector.

- ◆ EUA [Membership Consultation 2016 survey report](#) and [recommendations](#) as a contribution to the Erasmus+ Mid-term review (November 2016)
- ◆ Call for [Erasmus+ support for refugees](#) (March 2017)
- ◆ Discussion of [virtual mobility opportunities in the context of 2020](#) (June 2020)
- ◆ Review of the [EU guaranteed study loans approach](#) (September 2020)
- ◆ Call for more [even annual budget allocation](#) (December 2021)
- ◆ [Review of the European Universities Initiative and its impact on system level reforms](#) (October 2022)
- ◆ 2023/24 Erasmus+ midterm review:
 - ❖ EUA ran a survey in the period of Dec 22 to Feb 2023, with responses from 500 institutions from 31 programme and 18 partner countries. The survey was modularised, hence institutions only answered questions on Erasmus+ actions they themselves are familiar with.
 - ❖ All figures mentioned below – if not stated otherwise – are from so far unpublished survey results.
 - ❖ A report and recommendations to feed into the Erasmus+ public consultation will be published in the 3rd quarter of 2023.
 - ❖ An ongoing webinar series presents the results - one with key findings already available [here](#); one on student mobility [here](#)

The European University Association (EUA) is the representative organisation of universities and national rectors' conferences in 49 European countries. EUA plays a crucial role in the Bologna Process and in influencing EU policies on higher education, research and innovation. Thanks to its interaction with a range of other European and international organisations, EUA ensures that the voice of European universities is heard wherever decisions are being taken that will impact their activities.

The Association provides unique expertise in higher education and research as well as a forum for exchange of ideas and good practice among universities. The results of EUA's work are made available to members and stakeholders through conferences, seminars, websites and publications.