

SURVEY: ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC STAFF

Executive summary.



About the Survey. 1,807 people, 1,115 academics (62%) and 692 non-academics (38%) have participated in the survey. The highest percentage of the total number of participants corresponds to the University of Kiel (36%) and the lowest to the University of Gdansk (7%). The age of the participants is mainly over 25, with the majority in the 35–44 age group (31%), but with a somewhat more homogeneous distribution between the different age groups in the case of academic staff. Of the total number of participants, the majority are female, 1,028 (57%). If we analyse this according to sectors, this trend is also observed in non-academic staff, where 69% are women; but not in academic staff, where the percentage is practically equal, 49% women and 50% men.



About the language level of Consortium staff. As far as language is concerned, they have mainly self-assessed, and 58% consider themselves to have a B1, B2 or C1 level in English, with the percentage remaining the same when it is segregated into academic and non-academic staff. 22% of participants have a C1 level of English. When segregated, this percentage is 25% for academic staff and 18.21% for non-academic staff.



About mobility. The number of people who have participated in mobility programmes is 559 (31%). Of these, 435 are academic staff and 124 non-academic. The mobility stays were carried out, for the most part, through the Erasmus programme, especially in the case of non-academic personnel (87%), while academic staff also used other types of programmes, following Erasmus programmes in 62% of the cases. The aim of these mobility stays is mainly for teaching and research activities (89%) in the case of academic staff and, mainly for training activities (84%) in the case of non-academic staff. As for the most appropriate duration for the different types of mobility programmes, there is also a difference between the two sectors. In the case of non-academic staff preferences are distributed, mainly and equally, between periods of 1 week or of up to one month (88%), while in the case of academic staff a more homogeneous distribution is observed among all the options, although with a greater predilection for stays of up to one month (38%). The institutions where mobility programmes have been carried out so far, for both academic and non-academic staff, are numerous and, in more than 90% of cases, do not belong to the SEA-EU consortium. By country, we can highlight as destinations for mobility programmes the UK with 10% and Italy with 8%. The reasons

for the choice of institution where the mobility programmes were carried out were not the same for the two sectors. In the case of academic staff, they were mainly due to *Relationships/agreements are in place with the host institution* (69%), or *Because the host institution is academically prestigious* (43%); with the other possible options being selected by fewer than 19% of participants. Meanwhile, non-academic staff have shown a greater variety and heterogeneity in the motives for their choice: *Relationships/agreements are in place with the host institution* (53%), *I wanted to improve my language skills* (33%), *I liked that country* (32%), *My co-workers recommended it to me* (29%) and *The host institution is academically prestigious* (25%).



Problems with the mobility programme. In most cases, participants in mobility programmes found no problems before their stay (83% of cases). In non-academic staff this percentage rises to 88%. In cases where problems are indicated before following the mobility programmes, they are centred around *Insufficient travel resources* (44%) and *Administrative procedures with my institution* (34%). 7% of staff who have followed mobility programmes indicate that they have had problems during their stay (8%, in the case of academic staff and 6%, in non-academic staff). The problems detected relate mainly to *Accommodation* (40%), *Poor communication with the receiving institution* (25%) and *Language* (22%). The first two are also those most indicated by academic staff (42% and 30%, respectively), whereas for the non-academic staff the most frequent are *Language* (43%), *Accommodation* and *Integration in the new environment* (both with 29%) with no cases noted of problems due to *Poor communication with the receiving institution*. People who indicate problems after the stay are a minority of those who have followed mobility programmes, around 5% of all cases. In the case of non-academic staff, the most commonly stated cause was *Lack of academic recognition of the stay* (57%), while academic staff attributed it in 52% to *Other reasons*. 79% of the total number of participants in the survey say that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the mobility programme carried out, with slightly higher values from academic staff (80%) than from non-academic (75%).



Evaluation and benefits of the mobility programme. The most positive aspects of mobility programme experience are related to *Academic benefits* (65%), *Experiencing another country/language* (56%), *Personal development* (55%) and *Strengthening personal contacts* (52%). In the case of non-academic staff, it is the *Strengthening of personal contacts* (73%) that is most highly-valued by this group.



Barriers to participating in Erasmus+. Among the most common reasons given for not participating in mobility programmes, are *Language problems* (40%) and *Lack of information about the programme* (37%), with very similar percentages in both sectors. Finally, approximately 65% of staff who have not participated in mobility programmes express an interest in doing so if the above-mentioned obstacles did not exist. About 5% of people have no interest in following mobility programmes.