

Mobility: from individual to institutional responsibility?

A few comments
David Crosier
EUA

Mobility in the Bologna Process

- For a priority, it's taken a long time to get around to dealing with it..
- Not only do we have very little information (non-existent or incompatible national data sets), we also have very little policy (Conor Cradden) & it's not very coherent (CoE)
- EI initiative in organising this event, extremely welcome & very timely
- Two excellent documents to inform discussion

Issues raised

- Positive rhetoric of mobility easy, but issues are complex
- Are we heading towards a Europe of winners and losers (countries, institutions, individuals), or can mobility be of benefit to all?
- Careful to distinguish neo-liberal labour market positions camouflaging behind socio-cultural language (Connor Cradden):
 - but also need to demonstrate that making Europe competitive can only be achieved through greater social cohesion – within and between countries

Questions to actors in BP

- Do we really mean what we say?
- Clear incoherence between mobility discourse, and many national immigration policies
- Given demographic trends – declining « traditional » student numbers & ageing societies, should we maintain fortress Europe, but try to make exceptions for academic mobility? « designer immigrants »
- Or do we need overall human resources development policy for Europe
- Paradox of some neo-liberal thinking that arguments in favour of free movement of capital don't extend to movement of people

Extending our vision

- Questions all have global aspect: can't solve issues within Europe only...
- Brain drain/gain/circulation debate: needs to be discussed openly. Does each country/institution act solely in national interests in a spirit of open competition: & without a level playing field?
- Or should our values & commitment to public responsibility lead us to seek measures to support development of less competitive countries/institutions

Trends: International regions of interest

In which areas would your institution most like to enhance its attractiveness?

■ EU	86%	(T3 91%)	-
■ Eastern Europe	62%	(T3 62%)	
■ Asia	58%	(T3 40%)	+
■ US/Canada	50%	(T3 57%)	-
■ Latin America	32%	(T3 32%)	
■ Africa	26%	(T3 24%)	+
■ Arab world	21%	(T3 16%)	+
■ Australia	20%	(T3 23%)	-

Some underestimated issues to explore further

- Social security, pensions and national administration: anyone who looks into these things will end up staying at home...
- Impact of mass higher education/LLL: danger that mobility becomes a luxury feature for the wealthy, & hence need for strong equal opportunities policy within mobility support
- Changing forms of student mobility:
 - not yet using Bologna cycles effectively (problem of national institutional funding)
 - joint programmes (here to stay or preparing the way?)

Institutional responsibility

- Much to be done, & institutions have to be empowered to do it (currently disincentives for mobility in many contexts):
 - shift in attitude: need to risk opening up to outside world...
 - encourage staff and students
 - trust other institutions
 - act more in a spirit of cooperation (also to give competitive advantage)
 - monitor experience, take action to remedy problems