

HANDBOOK OF GOOD PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

DocMob - Tools and good practices
for doctoral mobility



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

docmob

Authors:

Université de Lorraine : Donato Lorubio, Marie-Christine Viry-Michel

Acknowledgement:

European University Foundation : Gustavo Garcia Botero, Fabiana Minneci, Marie Montaldo, Emma Obermair, Joachim Wissling

Université de Lorraine : Valérie Borie, Céline Courdier

Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II : Marta Maciocia, Daniele Riccio

Universidade do Porto : Luisa Capitão, Elien Declerck, Lílíana Norte, Daniela Silva

Université Polytechnique Hauts-de-France : Aurélie Bac, Jonathan Brindle, Jessica Dinstel, Caroline Simon

Universität des Saarlandes : Johannes Abele, Bettina Jochum

Universitat de València : Edelia Villarroya Soler, Gavino Flore, Rosa Ortí

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Glossary.....	5
I. Introduction.....	9
II. Overall context of the DocMob project.....	11
III. Doctoral studies: Do we speak the same language?.....	12
IV. Methodology of the DocMob project.....	13
V. The DocMob survey.....	14
VI. Qualitative surveys and good practices.....	22
VII. Alternatives to Erasmus+.....	31
VIII. KA103 Erasmus+ mobility versus other opportunities for doctoral students.....	37
IX. The tools developed by the DocMob consortium.....	40
X. Our recommendations based on the DocMob project conclusions.....	43
Annex: Learning Agreement for PhD-Mobility.....	47

GLOSSARY

When we have used acronyms or abbreviations in this handbook, we have made sure that they appear in this glossary, which also lists the technical concepts mentioned in the document. All terms in this glossary are listed in alphabetical order.

The Bologna Process:

It was initiated in 1999, following on from the Sorbonne Declaration (1998) signed by France, Italy, the United Kingdom and Germany. It provides for the creation of an open European area, the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), with a twofold objective: to facilitate student exchanges and mobility in the region, and to adopt a common architecture for higher education based in particular on the harmonisation of the three levels of study: Bachelor's, Master's and Doctorate (LMD), or ECTS credits. For further information, please visit the website <http://www.ehea.info/>

Cotutelle:

A cotutelle is a partnership between two universities or similar research organisations, offering joint supervision of a doctoral degree and providing a doctoral award from both institutions

Diploma Supplement :

The Diploma Supplement is designed as an aid to support the recognition of academic qualifications according to standards agreed by the Commission, the Council of Europe and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

Doctoral fees:

Each country in Europe is free to set their own fees for doctorates and other degrees. However, EU member countries must charge the same fees to citizens of other EU countries as they do to their own students.

Doctoral student:

According to the countries in Europe, a doctoral student may also have the status of researchers and/or be a staff member of its home university.

Doctoral studies/third cycle studies:

The doctorate is the highest university degree. Doctorates (such as PhDs) are third-cycle degrees, usually taking three to four years. The doctorate is an advanced research training, which involves the writing of a thesis as an original research work. The doctorate also allows the acquisition of knowledge, know-how and soft skills.

ECTS:

The European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) is a tool of the [European Higher Education Area](#) for making studies and courses more transparent. It helps students

to move between countries and to have their academic qualifications and study periods abroad recognised.

ECTS allows credits taken at one higher education institution to be counted towards a qualification studied for at another. ECTS credits represent learning based on defined learning outcomes and their associated workload.

Erasmus+ mobility :

A mobility project performed under the Erasmus+ programme

Erasmus+ grant :

Erasmus+ grant awarded to the beneficiaries of an Erasmus+ mobility as a contribution to their travel and subsistence costs abroad

EURAXESS - Researchers in Motion (<https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu>): A unique pan-European initiative delivering information and support services to professional researchers. Backed by the European Union, member states and associated countries, it supports researcher mobility and career development, while enhancing scientific collaboration between Europe and the world.

Funding :

Includes the various sources of funding for a doctoral student during his/her international mobility (scholarships from his/her home country at national, regional or local level, scholarships from his/her host country at national, regional or local level).

HEI/HEIs:

Higher Education Institution/Higher Education Institutions

Home coordinator:

Academic coordinator of the mobility project at the student's home institution

Home Institution:

Institution where the student takes his/her principal registration during his or her mobility abroad.

Host coordinator:

Academic coordinator of the mobility project at the student's host institution

Host Institution:

Institution that welcomes a foreign student on a mobility project

ICM:

«International Credit Mobility» - ICM for short – was created within the Erasmus+ Programme in 2015 and offers to the European HEIs the possibility to set up mobility agreements with

partners around the world to send and receive students and staff. ICM is also known within the Erasmus+ Programme as KA107 (Key Action 107).

Inter-institutional agreement (IIA) :

By signing a compulsory Erasmus+ inter-institutional agreement, the institutions involved agree to cooperate for the exchange of students for studies and / or teaching staff for teaching assignment in the context of Erasmus+. In the Erasmus+ 2014/2020 Programmation, they are not compulsory neither for student mobility for placement nor for staff mobility for training.

International mobility:

A period of study, training or research carried out abroad by a student outside the country of his or her home institution

IRO:

International Relations Office of a Higher Education Institution

KA103:

Erasmus+ Key Action 103 is the Erasmus+ European Mobility Programme that enables student and staff mobility between higher education institutions from 28 member countries plus Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, the FYR of Macedonia, and Turkey.

Learning Agreement (LA) :

The Learning Agreement sets out the programme of the studies or the traineeship to be followed abroad and must be approved by the student, the sending and the receiving institution, organisation or enterprise before the start of the exchange.

Long-term mobility: A long-term mobility is a mobility that lasts more than 2 months, according to the Erasmus+ Programme.

Recognition of an international mobility :

Recognition of the results of a mobility in the home institution, mainly by the transfert of ECTS.

Short-term mobility:

A short-term mobility is a mobility that lasts less than 2 months, according to the Erasmus+ Programme.

SMP :

Erasmus+ Student Mobility for Placement

SMS :

Erasmus+ Student Mobility for Studies

STA :

Erasmus+ Staff Mobility for Teaching Assignment

STT :

Erasmus+ Staff Mobility for Training

Transcript of Records (ToR):

The third section of the Learning Agreement that summarizes the results of a mobility activity in the host institution.

I. INTRODUCTION

DocMob was a two-year Erasmus+ Strategic Partnership project (2018-2020), which was extended to 2021 due to the pandemic. Its overall purpose was to sustainably improve the implementation and management of doctoral students' international mobility and to make innovative recommendations for the next Erasmus+ Programme 2021-2027, leading, in the mid-term, to the internationalization of doctoral degrees and the reform of postgraduate studies towards integrated European systems.

More specifically, its main objectives were as follows:

1. To **identify and develop innovative practices** concerning the implementation of the mobility by doctoral students in the Erasmus+ Programme;
2. To **adapt the existing Erasmus+ templates** to doctoral mobility (the Erasmus+ inter-institutional Agreement and the Erasmus+ Learning Agreement, including the Transcript of Records) in order to facilitate the exchanges of doctoral students under the Erasmus+ Programme;
3. To **publish a handbook for the mobility of doctoral students** to serve as a supporting document for the promotion of the Bologna process to postgraduate studies.

The consortium was composed of seven partners, each leading one aspect of the project:

- **Université de Lorraine**, Project coordinator : project management, drafting and writing of the Handbook for doctoral mobility
- **Universidade do Porto** : Quality assurance
- **Universidad de Valencia** : draft of an Erasmus+ inter-institutional agreement for doctoral students
- **Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II** : draft of an Erasmus+ Learning agreement for doctoral students
- **Universität des Saarlandes** : Recognition of doctoral students' mobility
- **Université Polytechnique Hauts-de-France** : doctoral mobility in the Erasmus+ ICM (International Credit Mobility)
- **European University Foundation** : Communication and dissemination

The consortium also involved an associated partner, Eurodoc (European Council of Doctoral Candidates, <http://eurodoc.net/>). The Eurodoc report « Identifying Transferable Skills and Competences to Enhance Early-Career Researchers Employability and Competitiveness »

was a particularly useful source of information and helped the consortium to build the DocMob template of a Transcript of Records for doctoral mobility.

The DocMob consortium released the first version of the handbook and its policy recommendations for the 2021-2027 Erasmus+ Programme in October 2020, when the project partners organized the final conference for the project. In the months that followed, the DocMob consortium tried to update its project results to better adapt them to the known evolutions of the upcoming 2021-2027 Erasmus+ Programme, and in particular to the introduction of a new specific mobility for PhD students.

II. OVERALL CONTEXT OF THE DOCMOB PROJECT

The mobility of European doctoral students is today both a principle and a reality.

Its principle was promoted in the context of the harmonization of the European curricula through the **Bologna Process** (started in 1999) and its adoption of a common architecture for higher education, based in particular on the harmonization of the three levels of study: Bachelor's, Master's and Doctorate. The doctorate was officially recognized as the European postgraduate level and integrated into the Bologna process at **the Berlin conference** in 2003.

Beyond the principle, the reality of doctoral mobility is also confirmed. In the European Union (EU), doctoral mobility is mainly regional, as approximately one doctoral student in three who is mobile in this zone comes from an EU country¹.

Despite being concretely reinforced by the Erasmus+ Programme in 2014 and the setting up of the Euraxess national networks, doctoral mobility has been confronted to several obstacles in its implementation.

In the practice we can observe that the specific nature of the doctorate is still insufficiently considered when determining both the duration of the mobility programmes offered at doctoral level and the amount of the grants they award. Academic mobility at doctoral level has its own particularities, issues and the rules for obtaining this degree still vary enormously depending on the country, on higher education institutions' internal rules and even on the disciplinary field of the doctorate. For instance, doctoral students may receive a stipend, when others will get a scholarship, or even get no funding at all. Another example is the content of the doctoral degrees itself: there are doctoral degrees which are only based on research, when others also involve taking courses and exams, and sometimes even the obligation to teach at the university.

Based on this experience, the partners of the DocMob project decided to reflect together on how to improve the conditions for the international and European mobility of doctoral students, when this very mobility seems threatened by the lack of common backgrounds in the doctoral field, even in Europe.

1 *Les Notes Campus France*, N°60, juillet 2019, "Les doctorants à l'international : tendances de la mobilité doctorale en France et dans le monde", p.18

III. DOCTORAL STUDIES: DO WE SPEAK THE SAME LANGUAGE?

Regarding bachelor's and master's degrees, the Bologna process and the implementation of the ECTS have significantly simplified the terminology used, reduced the differences on the organization of studies and therefore facilitated the Erasmus+ mobility.

However, regarding doctoral studies, the DocMob consortium quickly realized that all participants to the project "didn't speak the same language" as they do not work for the same institution. There is indeed a significant diversity among doctoral studies within the DocMob consortium but also beyond: each country has its own national regulations and its own structure of doctoral programmes.

Dealing with mobility in this context can become more complex if partners cannot share the meaning of the rules they know and apply.

In addition, the DocMob partners underlined another need, which is to know how the partners concretely manage the mobility of doctoral students. Indeed, for bachelor and master mobility exchanges, the HEIs are already used to sharing factsheets with their partners to easily identify their respective key data and contacts before each semester. The need to determine this information also arises as far as doctoral mobility is concerned. It should facilitate the communication among partners, and enable doctoral mobility to be well prepared with a low risk of failure.

In order to map the differences and similarities, the UPHF offered, within the DocMob consortium, to coordinate the creation of a tool that will help summarize, visualize and compare key data on existing doctoral systems at both national and university levels in order to get a clear picture of each partner's reality. The methodology and the results of this specific project can be found on the DocMob project website (<https://projects.uni-foundation.eu/docmob/>) .

IV. METHODOLOGY OF THE DOCMOB PROJECT

The DocMob project was carried out in three phases.

In the first phase of the project, a survey was spread to all awarded Erasmus+ Charter HEIs in order to understand their use of Erasmus+ funds for doctoral mobility and identify the major challenges to be overcome by the next Erasmus programme. During the same period of time, project partners drafted new versions of the Erasmus+ templates already in use for the organization of student mobility to adapt them to doctoral students. These are the documents involved : the Erasmus+ inter-institutional agreement, the Erasmus+ Learning agreement and Transcript of records.

In the second phase of the project (autumn 2019 and beginning of 2020), qualitative interviews were conducted with administrative staff and potential or confirmed doctoral candidates for mobility. These interviews helped the partners to get an overview of all stakeholders' needs and to reflect on how the 2021-2027 Erasmus+ Programme could be designed to meet them.

The third phase (Spring-summer 2020) consisted in analyzing the results of both the survey and the interviews in order to draw up its guidelines and recommendations for European and national bodies. To highlight the best practices in doctoral mobility, the partners decided that it would be useful to compare the critical aspects of the Erasmus+ Programme with other international and national funds offered to doctoral students, in order to find out how other funding schemes solved the different challenges that arose during the project surveys. The results of this particular analysis can be found in this handbook, in the section "Alternatives to Erasmus+".

For each of the project's three phases, the DocMob consortium set up several working groups, each led by a project partner:

- Inter-institutional Erasmus+ Agreement; Universidad de Valencia
- Learning Agreement (LA); Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II
- Recognition of mobility (Transcript of Records: ToR); Universität des Saarlandes
- Handbook of good practices and recommendations on doctoral mobility: Université de Lorraine

V. THE DOCMOB SURVEY

The initial DocMob survey was sent to all our Erasmus+ partners in Europe and National Erasmus+ Agencies in February 2019. The EUA also published the survey on its webpage¹.

The Université de Lorraine prepared the draft of the survey in the fall of 2018, using LimeSurvey as a tool to collect participations. During the kick-off meeting of the project, the draft survey was introduced to the project partners and several adjustments were made further to their feedback. A new draft version was sent to all project partners in December 2018 so that they could test it before the planned dissemination in February 2019. Confidentiality and personal data rules were also included in the survey at this stage.

In February 2019, each DocMob project partner disseminated the survey among its Erasmus+ partners in Europe, leaving them a month to answer so that we could get and analyze the first results before the second transnational meeting of the project in April 2019.

We received the feedbacks from 110 HEIs that represent 84.809 potential doctoral candidates for an Erasmus+ mobility, e.g. more than 10% of the total amount of doctoral students in Europe².

Table 1: Number of respondents to the survey

Number of HEIs that answered the survey	110
Number of doctoral students represented	84.809

Most answers came from Germany, France, Italy, and Romania while there was a lack of contributions from northern countries, Baltics, Ireland, UK, Greece, Netherlands, and Belgium. Yet, with 110 HEIs taking part in the survey, we were able to provide a global analysis of the situation of doctoral mobility in Europe.

Table 2: Number of survey responses per country

Germany	16	Luxembourg	1
Bulgaria	1	Norway	1

1 <https://eua.eu/partners-news/270-survey-on-the-organization-of-doctoral-studies-and-doctoral-erasmus-mobility-in-europe.html>

2 There is an estimated number of 764 400 doctoral students in the European Union - Source : Eurostat https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Tertiary_education_statistics#Participation_by_level

Croatia	1	Netherlands	2
Spain	5	Poland	5
Estonia	2	Portugal	5
Finland	2	Czech Republic	4
France	14	Romania	13
Greece	1	UK	1
Hungary	2	Russia	1
Island	1	Slovania	1
Italy	16	Sweden	1
Latvia	2	Turkey	3
Lithuania	1		

In the following pages, we share the global trends in managing doctoral mobility in Europe brought to light by the DocMob survey. Of course, this is a global approach as there are also individual differences to consider if we study the doctorate system of each European country.

Studying the results of the survey helped us raise several questions. The most significant ones are listed below with the comments they induced.

1. TYPES OF THIRD CYCLE INTERNATIONAL MOBILITY COMMONLY USED THROUGHOUT EUROPE

Table A - Which kind of doctoral international mobility is fostered by your institution?

Joint degree programmes and cotutelles	64%
Short periods of mobility (less than 2 months)	61%
Internship in the laboratory	49%
Other	25%

The table above is extracted from the survey. It shows diverse and variable needs in terms of the duration of doctoral mobility : from cotutelles that require a long mobility period to very short-term mobility projects (less than 2 months).

2. FUNDING OF DOCTORAL INTERNATIONAL MOBILITY IN EUROPE

72 % of the HEIs that answered the survey declared that they use Erasmus+ to fund international mobility at doctoral level. At the same time, it appears that half the HEIs that use the Erasmus+ funds find them not sufficient to cover the participants' needs.

Table B - Who funds (or co-funds) the international mobility of your doctoral students?

The ERASMUS+ national agency	72%
The student himself/herself	57%
Your institution on its own funds	54%
Other	31%
National Agencies (other than the ERASMUS+ agency)	30%
Companies	18%

3. CURRENT USE OF ERASMUS+ MOBILITY FOR DOCTORAL STUDENTS IN EUROPE

Not all HEIs use Erasmus+ for their doctoral mobility, but if they do, then they tend not to favor any particular kind of Erasmus+ mobility but rather choose the best option on a case-by-case basis. Often, the same institution will use both academic (SMS) and traineeship mobility (SMP), while it will prefer teaching (STA) or training staff mobility (STT) in other situations. This led the DocMob consortium to draw several hypotheses to explain why the HEIs may sometimes use STA and STT rather than SMS or SMP for their doctoral students :

- In some European countries, a doctoral student also has the status of a staff member in his/her home institution, which makes the switch between student mobility to staff mobility very easy. This is the case, for example, in Italy ;
- The SMS or SMP status may not be allowed for doctoral student by national regu-

lations. It is the case, for example, in France, where traineeships are not allowed to doctoral students¹ ;

- STA and STT allow very short-term stays when SMS and SMP are more adapted to longer stays.

In the context of the 2014-2020 Erasmus+ Programme, the HEIs seem to take advantage of all available opportunities offered to organize the Erasmus+ mobility of their doctoral students, regardless of the core objectives of a doctoral mobility. The downside of this approach is that the mobility period is not scoped to the needs of a doctoral candidate and this appears to be somewhat counterproductive, as the tools seem to take precedence over the goal to achieve. This clearly shows the need for a specific doctoral mobility strand in the Erasmus+ Programme, adapted to the specific objectives of doctoral studies, and flexible enough to enable a variety of lengths and purposes of mobility periods. This new mobility strand should be flexible in its duration and in its objectives, and result in a mix of academic, traineeship, teaching and staff mobility, so that eventually the tools should be at the service of the specific needs and goals of doctoral mobility.

Table C - Which kind of ERASMUS+ mobility do you organize for your home doctoral students?

	% [all]
Student mobility for studies (SMS)	64%
Traineeship mobility (SMP)	59%
Teacher training mobility (STA)	32%
Staff training mobility (STT)	30%

4. USE OF THE ECTS CREDITS FOR DOCTORAL STUDENTS IN EUROPE

The ECTS user's guide² clearly shows that ECTS credits are not automatically used for the third cycle studies. Still, the specific case of doctoral mobility is treated in less than a page (half of page 27) when the guide itself is 105 pages long, which may discourage the HEIs

1 See <http://www.enseignementsup-recherche.gouv.fr/cid111561/la-formation-doctorale-renovee-par-l-arrete-du-25-mai-2016.html> and <http://www.enseignementsup-recherche.gouv.fr/cid111561/la-formation-doctorale-renovee-par-l-arrete-du-25-mai-2016>

2 https://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/education/ects/users-guide/index_en.htm

willing to apply the ECTS rules to their doctoral mobility. The DocMob survey indicates that a clear majority of European HEIs use the ECTS for third cycle studies. However, the non-users tend to think the ECTS is not the appropriate frame to assess doctoral studies. The Diploma Supplement is even less applied among the European HEIs. This could be a major obstacle to encouraging Erasmus+ doctoral mobility.

While the Erasmus+ Programme should be flexible enough to tailor academic recognition to the study level involved in the mobility, the rules of such recognition at doctoral level should also be clearly defined in the ECTS guide whatever the type of recognition used. It would enable to secure the appropriate recognition of the grant mobility periods performed by doctoral students in their doctoral training, and prevent the prevailing lack of information on how to actually implement and recognize doctoral mobility.

Table D - Which kind of academic credits does your institution use for doctoral students?

	n	% [all]
Another type of credit system	4	7%
ECTS	38	63%
Not applicable	18	30%
Total	60	100%

63% of the respondents reported using the ECTS credits for doctoral training, but unlike at bachelor and master levels, the use of the ECTS for third cycle mobility is not yet generalized and may vary, mainly depending on the country.

Table E - If your institution does not use the ECTS system for its doctoral students, could you tell the reasons?

	n	%
We don't use it yet but we intend to in the near future	4	6%
We face some difficulties in applying the ECTS system to doctoral students	7	10%

We believe that doctoral studies must be assessed in an entirely specific manner	13	18%
We use another type of academic credits which we find efficient for both our home and incoming doctoral students	3	4%
My country does not use ECTS	1	1%
Other	6	8%
I don 't know	3	4%
Total	37	54

The main criticism to the use of ECTS for doctoral studies is the way they assess the knowledge acquired during the mobility. Doctoral studies are composed by a great variety of activities (research, courses, training, etc). The translation of these activities in credits is not an easy task. For this reason, HEIs often use ECTS only to assess for the courses taken by doctoral students just as they do for Bachelor and Master levels, which means it amounts to much fewer than 30 ECTS per semester.

Table F - Does your institution deliver the Diploma Supplement to doctoral students?

	n	%
No	26	45%
Yes	22	38%
I don 't know	6	10%
Partly	4	7%

5. THE OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED IN ORGANIZING DOCTORAL INTERNATIONAL MOBILITY IN EUROPE

A list of the main obstacles that usually prevent mobility projects to take place was elaborated by the project's partner during the first project meeting. This list was used in the survey so that the respondents could choose from the list the most appropriate items corresponding to their own situation.

The list enclosed the following items :

- Financial issues (for home institution)
- Financial issues (for doctoral students)
- Legislative and regulatory barriers
- Bureaucratic obstacles
- Social security issues
- Language issues
- Family-related issues
- Lack of support from the doctoral student’s supervisor
- Lack of experience
- Lack of international networking
- Lack of recognition of period of mobility abroad
- Lack of reintegration prospects in the country of origin
- Lack of common backgrounds with partner universities to organize efficient doctoral international mobility

Table G - What are the obstacles met by your institution in organizing doctoral international mobility ?



This table shows the main difficulties HEIs have to face when setting up doctoral mobility (red bar means difficult, green bar means not difficult or rather not difficult).

According to DocMob’s survey, the main challenges encountered are the following:

- Financial issues for home institution: Close to 50% of the respondents shared the same concern for this item, as was observed during the individual interviews that were conducted after the survey (whose methodology and results will be presented later in this handbook). We believe it could mean that there is not enough allotted Erasmus+ funds to

cover mobility at bachelor/master levels and mobility at doctoral level at the same time. For example, in some of the project partners' institutions, and until recently, the possibility of organizing doctoral mobility in the Erasmus+ Programme was simply not spread among the university's doctoral schools for that very reason. The choice was eventually clearly made to favour the bachelor and master mobility.

- Financial (related to family issues) for doctoral students: Over 50% of the respondents declared this was an obstacle. The students themselves frequently put this argument forward; it would be interesting to analyze the specific financial needs that the doctoral students meet and compare their situation to that of bachelor and master students. Our hypothesis is that while the amount of the SMS and SMP Erasmus+ grants do not vary regardless the study level of the student involved, doctoral students' personal situations nonetheless often differ from bachelor and master students'. For example, we can presume that because they are usually older, they may be in a different life stage that might involve a spouse, children and a job position; or that they may not live with their parents anymore; or even that they may not be able to get grants that bachelor and master students receive. All these specific situations imply that doctoral students preparing a long-term mobility probably often need higher grants to move with their families or compensate the loss of their job position. This is comforted by the fact that close to 50% of the respondents declared family-related issues to be an obstacle to doctoral mobility.
- Bureaucratic obstacles: The high rate of respondents choosing this item in the DocMob survey suggests that administrative procedures involved in organizing Erasmus+ mobility may be too rigid for doctoral students. Our hypothesis is that their peculiar status at their home university makes it difficult to associate them either as students or staff members, for in most countries they are at the same time students, trainees, teachers and researchers. When in mobility, they may also participate in these very different activities in which they are already used to being involved at their home institution. However, the 2014-2020 Erasmus+ Programme does not explicitly reflect this reality. Erasmus+ was developed for the needs of studies and therefore focuses on the student and its training activity, but in reality, the doctoral students are involved in many other activities than training. The core of their doctoral programme itself, that is, the need to follow a research plan, is not well taken into account in the 2014-2020 Erasmus+ Programme either.
- Other issues: It is interesting to note that in the DocMob survey, social security, language barriers and reintegration prospects for homecoming students are among the least chosen options with regards to them being an obstacle to student mobility.

VI. QUALITATIVE SURVEYS AND GOOD PRACTICES

The DocMob survey showed the need to collect more qualitative data to get a better understanding of its results and the confirmation of the hypotheses already made. The project partners therefore decided to conduct interviews based on the questions that arose further to the quantitative survey.

Although using the same frame of interview set up by the DocMob consortium (see below), the project partner chose their own methodology to organize these interviews and identify the different stakeholders to whom the interviews should be addressed. This autonomy given to each partner in the organization of the interviews helped the consortium to get as many various experiences and good practices as possible.

All project partners agreed that the interviews should be conducted informally as face-to-face interviews. The best time to organize them seemed to be during the international events that each partner attended/organized in the summer and fall of 2019 (EU Open space, UPorto staff week, EAIE, etc.), but some partners rather opted for phone calls or private discussions. Each partner was expected to lead 3 to 5 interviews. It was decided that the interviews should not exceed 15 minutes to give precise and concise answers. Each partner was free to determine when to conduct them as well as the numbers and the position of the interviewees, as long as they were chosen among the colleagues in charge of the doctoral mobility or the Erasmus+ mobility. The project partners also tried to respect a geographical balance so that a majority of European countries could be represented among the interviewees.

All partners agreed that it was necessary for all interviews to have the same format and focus on the same issues, in order to have comparable data. The Université de Lorraine prepared the draft of qualitative interviews, and each partner tested it with a colleague to check its effectiveness. The project partners validated the last template, below, in June 2019.

DocMob Interview

Country:

Contact:

Position:

- 1. Duration of the mobility:** Do you think that current student mobility duration is flexible enough for doctoral students?
 - 1.1. What should be the minimum duration?
 - 1.2. What should be the maximum duration?
- 2. Fundings:** Do you think that current Erasmus+ scholarships for doctoral mobility are sufficient?
 - 2.1. Do you think there should be a difference between short (few days) and long mobility (ex. more than 3 months)?
 - 2.2. What should be an optimal amount for short stays?
 - 2.3. What should be an optimal amount for long stays?
- 3. Tools:** In which way existing Learning agreement and ToR could be modified/improved?
 - 3.1. Do you think that LA and ToR should be a sort of mix between traineeship (for research work), studies (for courses and seminars attended), teaching (for classes and seminars taught), staff (for transferable skills) ?
 - 3.2. How do you think activities (research, seminars, publications, teaching, etc.) should be recognized (Ex through ECTS)?
- 4. New mobility:** Do you think the new Erasmus programmeme should include a new kind of mobility for doctoral students? If yes, what should be the difference with existing mobility, apart from the duration and funding?

In the following sections, we share the results of the interviews done by the project partners, based on the frame above.

1. EAIE (IROs STAFF)

The Universität des Saarlandes and the Université de Lorraine conducted several interviews at the EAIE in Helsinki in September 2019. This event brought together more than 5000 IRO staff from all around the world, which offered a good opportunity to meet various mobility managers. During this event, we also gathered feedback on the first DocMob templates of the doctoral learning agreement and transcript of records.

The interviews led by the Université de Lorraine and the Universität des Saarlandes at the EAIE purposely concerned the following countries that are outside the DocMob consortium: Netherlands, Denmark, Lithuania, Slovakia, Hungary, Poland and Belgium.

Five major issues were raised during these interviews:

- **The lack of Erasmus+ funding at institutional level** : The universities don't have enough funds to cover all their needs in terms of Erasmus+ mobility at bachelor and master levels. As a result, they give priority to the first two cycles and don't encourage doctoral mobility. If the next Erasmus programme gives them additional funds, they will be able to develop doctoral mobility as well. This was a common problem especially for Western Europe universities.
- **National or local funding versus Erasmus+ funding** : Some countries have national or local funding for doctoral mobility that are more interesting in terms of their amount than the Erasmus+ grants (like the DREAM scheme at the Université de Lorraine - a university's source of funding that is described on this link: <http://doctorat.univ-lorraine.fr/en/international/dream-en> - or a national fund from Slovakia (<https://scholarships.msqfon.com/national/>))
- **A long-term job and a salary versus a mobility with a limited grant** : In some countries like Eastern and Northern countries, it seems that doctoral students often have a job, which prevents them from undertaking a long-term mobility. This could explain why they tend to favour mainly staff mobility for it is a shorter mobility period. A specific doctoral short mobility programme would therefore fit their needs very well.
- **Research-based mobility** : Doctoral students mainly want to lead research activities during their mobility and not take training courses. This aspect should be taken into account in the learning agreement and the ToR, but is missing in the 2014-2020 Erasmus+ Programme.
- **Short-term mobility versus long-term mobility** : The Erasmus+ funding of short-term mobility seems to be suitable. However, most interviewees think that the funding schemes need to be adapted for long-term mobility, for the current grants are considered as very low for this type of mobility.

All interviewees showed a good interest in the templates of the Learning Agreement and the Transcript of Records offered by the DocMob consortium; there was quite a consensus on the good work done by the project partners.

2. WORKSHOP WITH DOCTORAL STUDENTS

In the fall 2019, the Université de Lorraine organized a workshop with seven doctoral students who undertook or were willing to undertake a mobility activity abroad. One of them had received an Erasmus+ scholarship. Four of them had used the Université de Lorraine's funding scheme called "DREAM", that was already mentioned in the above section of the hand-

book. The last two doctoral students were candidates for an international mobility, through either the Erasmus+ Programme or the “DREAM” Scheme.

A list of questions was discussed with them:

1) **Reasons for undertaking a mobility activity:** For most of them, the mobility had been integrated since the beginning of their research programme. They found a host institution thanks to the network of their doctoral supervisor. As a result of the mobility, they worked on a new chapter of their thesis. In all cases, it was a research-based mobility.

2) **Choice of funding:** Those who used the Université de Lorraine’s DREAM scheme did so because of the higher funding it offered and because they lacked information on the Erasmus+ Programme as a possibility for doctoral mobility.

3) **Encountered obstacles:** The doctoral students who benefited from the DREAM Scheme did not meet any major administrative obstacles. Unlike them, the doctoral student who used the Erasmus+ Programme found its administrative procedures too heavy. He also suggested that the Erasmus+ inter-institutional agreement should not be compulsory at doctoral level, as his supervisor found it difficult to establish such an agreement that requires anticipating collective figures when a doctoral mobility is very much an individual project. For a minority of participating doctoral students, and whatever the programme they used or planned to use to perform their mobility, another major obstacle was to convince their supervisor of the interest of such mobility. This fact is little reflected in the DocMob survey results though, where only 15 HEIs stated this to be a problem. It would probably require addressing a similar survey to doctoral candidates to draw conclusions on this specific issue.

4) **Duration of the mobility:** Doctoral students in France only have 3 years to complete their thesis. The doctoral students attending the DocMob workshop thought that in this context, a doctoral mobility period could hardly last more than 6 months. We believe that the 2021/2027 Erasmus+ Programme, if a specific strand is set up for the third cycle of studies, should focus on rather short mobility activities for this very reason.

5) **Amount of the scholarship:** The doctoral students who had benefited from the DREAM scheme declared being very happy about the funding: they actually thought that it was more than they needed to cover their expenses. On the other hand, the participant who took part in an Erasmus+ mobility period stated that his Erasmus+ grant was just enough to cover his needs, and that he was lucky to get other sources of funding to conduct his doctorate. Otherwise, he would not have managed to secure his budget.

The same participant gave another interesting detail, but this time not limited to doctoral mobility. He underlined the fact that his mobility being a long-term one, it enabled him to leave his apartment in Nancy (rental in the home city) and not to pay two accommodation rents at the same time (one in Nancy and one abroad). For the same reason, he thought that the Erasmus+ grant might not be sufficient for the shortest mobility periods allowed under the SMS mobility (that is, 3 months), as in this situation, most students still have to pay for their usual rent to secure an accommodation in their home city upon their return, while paying for

another accommodation in the host city as well. Facing two rents to be paid at the same time is really only possible for very short mobility periods.

6) **Learning agreement and transcript of records:** The participant who benefited from Erasmus+ completed his LA once in mobility by adding two courses and a general sentence stating that he was doing research work, but without any further description. At the time of the workshop, he had not yet received any ToR from his host institution. For the DREAM students, the LA was mainly a research work (scientific description), and their supervisor recognized their mobility as a new chapter of their research thesis.

- We shared the new templates of the LA and ToR proposed by the DocMob project with all the participants to the workshop. They found them very interesting and complete. The list of transferable skills in Eurodoc (<http://www.eurodoc.net/news/2018/press-release-eurodoc-report-on-transferable-skills-and-competences>) was estimated by all participants to be a useful tool to consider, but if used in the ToR these skills would need to be largely explained and detailed (How did the Ph.D. student acquire them? When? Etc.).

3. UNIVERSIDAD DO PORTO'S INTERNATIONAL STAFF WEEK

Brief description:

The interviews led by the Universidad do Porto took place during its International Staff Week (from 22nd to 26th of July 2019). During the Staff Week, the Universidad do Porto divided the audience into 4 groups to obtain the most accurate information possible and for the different groups to exchange ideas with each other. In addition, the majority of the participants had no relation with the implementation of student mobility and was slightly apprehensive; therefore, the group work met their expectations.

The results of the interviews:

From the interviews and the doubts expressed by the participants, the Universidad do Porto could conclude that there was a general lack of information and experience regarding the implementation of doctoral mobility. In addition, it appeared that in the majority of the HEIs represented in the Staff Week, the opportunities for doctoral students were scarcely encouraged by the institutions either due to the lack of interest on the part of the students themselves or the lack of both the adequate information and the right tools to support the application of doctoral students to the Erasmus+ grants. Nevertheless, participants from Germany, UK, Czech Republic, Poland, Romania, Italy and Lithuania were able to suggest some interesting ideas on how to improve the interest among this target group, such as adapting the traineeship model, the scholarships and durations to the doctoral mobility experience, as well as working on the right tools for the recognition of the work developed.

4. WORKSHOPS AT THE UNIVERSITY POLYTECHNIQUE DES HAUTS-DE-FRANCE (UPHF) ON DOCTORAL MOBILITY: A NEED FOR ADAPTATION TO THE INTERNAL CONTEXT

Since 2015, the UPHF has applied to the Erasmus+ International Credit Mobility (ICM or KA107) calls and has already been successful in 2016 with Russia, Moldavia, Kazakhstan, in 2017 with Indonesia, Vietnam, Tunisia, Algeria and USA and in 2018 with Moldova. If the European rules for ICM are clearly defined, the difference between French and foreign backgrounds for doctoral studies required at least to think in depth about some adaptations to set up a more relevant procedure and meet the needs of each partner as much as possible.

Moreover, the ICM created a new window of opportunity for rethinking ways of dealing with doctoral mobility at the UPHF. It actually created new funding opportunities offering more possibilities abroad, especially at doctoral level, as this level of study was the core interest from partner universities (in terms of impact or previous relations) or in some cases the only allowed level of cooperation. It also gave an official and institutionalized framework for specifically sending and welcoming students at doctoral level. However, the Erasmus+ framework also brought to doctoral mobility its new and own specific constraints (preplanned partner, restricted area of studies, minimum duration and limited project duration).

Before the ICM, the International Relations Office (IRO) managed few doctoral mobility projects in the Erasmus+ framework. Doctoral mobility (of all kinds) was mainly organized outside the Erasmus+ Programme, and at either research laboratory level or individual level (e.g. within teachers-researchers' networks). The Research and Development Office managed the funding available for doctoral students (excluding Erasmus+ KA1 funding), implementing the rules and regulations for short doctoral mobility and thesis co-supervisions. Moreover, in the IRO, no specific focus within the framework of the Erasmus+ Programme was planned in order to prioritize doctoral level exchanges over bachelor and master levels.

In addition, as in other French universities, the UPHF does not deliver ECTS for doctoral studies, but specific credits called "Crédits de Formation Doctorale". Most of them are granted for the writing of the thesis and the other part for various activities related and more perceived as learning about research than doctoral training (participation and presentation in conferences, investigation, and bibliographic research). Finally, another particularity of the UPHF is the absence of 'Ecole doctorale' (Doctoral School) within the institution: the authorization from the 'Ecole doctorale of Lille' is required for the pedagogical content and recognition of doctoral mobility.

In this overall context, the implementation of the ICM thus required several adjustments in the UPHF strategy to meet the needs of partner universities and the requirements of the Erasmus+ Programme.

The ICM gave a first impulse for the IRO to rethink its strategy for successful doctoral Erasmus+ mobility, such as promotion, internal organization, distribution of responsibilities between partners, authorized activities and recognition, while respecting the above constraints but also national and institutional specificities.

To manage the first ICM project, the UPFH organized several meetings gathering both the UPHF staff and outside structures involved in doctoral mobility (among them the Ecole Doctorale de Lille). At the onset, this work defined the authorized activities related to doctoral Erasmus+ mobility for academic purposes, and led to a first quality assurance procedure for the ICM projects at the UPHF. This procedure summarizes the incoming and outgoing doctoral mobility organization loop (selection, validation of the learning agreement and signature, supervisor's and Chancellor's authorization, laboratory specific organization and requirements).

A workshop organized during the ICM staff week (June 2019): Doctoral mobility and international relations at research level

In June 2019, the UPHF K107 staff week gave a good opportunity to organize a two-hour workshop about doctoral mobility (both incoming and outgoing) with international relations officers.

The objectives of the workshop were to inform participants about doctoral mobility in France: its landscape and its challenges, and then to discuss the issues regarding doctoral mobility in the countries that are outside Europe.

Participants from non-European HEIs had the opportunity to brainstorm in smaller groups about their home situation, using a post-it method. Two topics of discussion were proposed to the different groups:

- a. What are your home institution's challenges regarding international cooperation at doctoral level?
- b. What are your home institution's challenges regarding doctoral mobility?

Participants raised the following issues during this session:

- Difficulty to raise funding: doctoral students have to find scholarships on their own;
- No existing bridge between Erasmus+ mobility and 'cotutelles';
- Linguistic barriers, both for the doctoral students and the researchers;
- Difficulties in finding common research topics requested for a mobility;
- Insufficient existing link between research laboratories and the IRO;
- Administrative issues, visa, insurance, etc.

Workshop with internal staff (October 2019)

The UPFH organized a second workshop with its internal staff in October 2019. It focused on the topic of outgoing doctoral mobility. All actors related to doctoral mobility at the UPHF received an invitation to the workshop: teachers-researchers, directors of a research laboratory, current doctoral students, research project officers, and the administrative staff involved in doctoral mobility or in charge of advising doctoral students.

The workshop was divided into 4 key topics:

- [Interactive] What comes to your mind when you think of «an international mobility for doctoral students”?
- [Interactive] According to you, who are the key actors involved in the international mobility of the doctoral students?
- [Interactive] What are the constraints of international mobility for outgoing doctoral students?
- [Final presentation] Introduction to the Erasmus+ opportunities for doctoral students.

Again, administrative issues were raised and brought negative feedbacks from the participants, complaining about the complicated procedures. Still, low financial funding was thought to be the main obstacle to outgoing doctoral mobility. In addition, the participants raised new issues concerning the bad timing of the mobility procedure when applied to doctoral students, the general feeling of a lack of information (whom to contact, when, what to do next...), as well as the problems encountered by doctoral students to get their doctoral supervisor’s approval to leave on mobility. The participants also raised the question of what a “mobility activity” actually involves at doctoral level: a cotutelle, the participation in a conference, a research work, a study visit, other?

Further details of the UPHF experience can be found specifically in annex 1.

5. THE UNIVERSIDAD DE VALENCIA’S INTERVIEWS

During its interviews, the Universidad de Valencia mainly focused on the role of the thesis supervisors in doctoral mobility. This approach enabled the DocMob consortium to have an alternative point of view, after getting those of the doctoral students, the IROs staff, and the international partners within the ICM. Six interviews based on the DocMob template were conducted by the Universidad de Valencia, including interviewees coming from different study fields.

The opinions of the interviewees were classified in four topics: the duration of the mobility, the scholarships available, the learning agreement/transcript of records and the perspectives for a new kind of mobility. The summary of the results is as follows:

- The 2014-2020 Erasmus+ Programme is not flexible enough as far as the duration of the mobility is concerned. The interviewees thought that for a doctoral student, a short mobility should last from a minimum of one week up to 3 months, and a longer one

should last one year. Short-chained stays should also be made possible to meet the needs of the research for the doctoral thesis.

- Funding is insufficient. Three types of mobility activity should be considered for funding: a) short stays (1 week to 15 days); b) medium stays (from 1 to 3 months) and c) long stays (3 months to 1 year). In addition, they should be adapted to the needs of the research for the doctoral thesis.
- Concerning the LA and ToR, the activities should be recognized as hours of training within the doctoral programme. They could be differentiated according to the purpose of the mobility activity or could also be of a unique model in which the nature of the activity is specified by the tutor of the doctoral thesis. Some kind of training test could be included, such as issuing a concise report explaining the skills that the doctoral students have acquired or the publications that they have prepared in relation to their thesis.
- A new type of mobility should be included, specific to doctoral studies. Doctoral studies indeed have characteristics that make them different, such as:
 - a) They are very demanding, and for this reason should be supervised by tutors very closely. An obvious difference with other types of mobility is that it is a work of close collaboration between the student and the doctoral thesis tutor. Therefore, the mobility scheme thought for doctoral students should also take into account the necessity for the doctoral student and the tutor to meet during the mobility, which in turn involves the need to cover the resulting travel fees.
 - b) They involve a much greater involvement from the student's part, because doctoral students have to obtain a return on their training translated into research results.
 - c) They should be adapted to the needs of the thesis research to be effective;
 - d) They should also be adapted to the work life of the doctoral student;
 - e) They should be recognized activities in each doctoral programme;
 - f) They need to be assorted with flexible mobility activities with agile management for both the students and their tutor.

VII. ALTERNATIVES TO ERASMUS+

In order to understand what improvement could be done in the 2021-2027 Erasmus+ Programme as far as doctoral mobility is concerned, it is important to analyze other existing funding schemes for such mobility. As confirmed by the DocMob interviews and survey, a large part of the mobility of doctoral students takes place outside the Erasmus+ framework for various reasons. In this section, we would like to highlight some good practices in other funding systems and explain why participants tend to use them rather than the opportunities offered by Erasmus+.

For a more complete overview of these programs, we listed a number of European, international and national grants in a separate document, available on the DocMob project website.

1. THE EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION'S SURVEY ON NATIONAL AND REGIONAL FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

In April 2020, the European University Foundation (EUF), also a DocMob partner, launched an online survey whose objective was to collect information on national and/or regional funding opportunities that are made available to doctorate candidates to spend some time abroad. The information was to be published as a booklet and made available on the DocMob and PhDHub websites (PhDHub project: <https://phdhub.eu/>). The survey enabled the DocMob consortium to gather information on alternative or complementary funding options that support the mobility of doctoral students.

The database resulting from the survey was complemented by more information received from the Universität Trier (Germany), Eurodoc and the Université of Lorraine, leading to, respectively, 10, 10 and 6 additional entries to the database.

A total of 237 responses, with a completion rate of 40%, were collected. Of these responses, unfortunately, only a part was relevant for the production of the final database. The resulting database includes 73 grants, of which 64 are active, for 8 it is unclear whether they are active and for one it is not obvious whether doctoral candidates or only senior researchers can apply. In addition, information on non-mobility-related doctoral scholarships was submitted on several occasions. In terms of eligible countries, 8 scholarships in the database are independent from the country of the Higher Education Institution (HEI) involved.

Although not being entirely comprehensive, the database, which includes a minimum of one scholarship per EU country, provides a good overview of the state of the art of doctoral grants in Europe. For a more detailed overview of the amounts of scholarships per country of HEI, see Table 1 below.

Table J: Amount of scholarships per country of higher education institution

HEI country	Amount of doctoral scholarships
Austria	3
Belgium	17
Bulgaria	5
Croatia	5
Cyprus	2
Czech Republic	5
Denmark	4
Estonia	5
Finland	4
France	7
Germany	15
Greece	3
Hungary	5
Ireland	1
Italy	5
Latvia	4
Lithuania	5
Luxembourg	2
Malta	1
Netherlands	3
Poland	6
Portugal	3
Romania	4
Slovakia	5
Slovenia	4
Spain	3
Sweden	5

The average amount of available scholarships surveyed per country is 4.85. The two highest values are those of HEIs based in Belgium and Germany with, respectively, 17 and 15 available scholarships. Ireland and Malta are on the other end of the distribution with respectively only one available scholarship. These figures exclude scholarships which are not granted at national level in the country of the HEI. It should also be noted that some scho-

larships are specifically intended for doctoral candidates of certain targeted nationalities, irrespective of their place of study.

More than 55% of the surveyed funding opportunities are dedicated to outgoing mobility, 21.92% to incoming mobility and 17.81% for both incoming and outgoing mobility. For three funding authorities it was unclear whether their funding opportunities applied to incoming mobility, outgoing mobility or both.

The highest maximum grants, among the surveyed scholarships that indicated it, are offered by the “Fellowships for doctoral Research in the U.S.A.” and the “Fellowships for Study or Research in Belgium” of the Belgian American Education Foundation, and amount to respectively \$30,000 and \$28,000. The highest maximum duration of funding offered by the surveyed scholarships is 18 months (the Swiss National Science Foundation), closely followed by 12 months, which is the maximum duration of several grants.

Unfortunately, the information about the number of grants available per year, the average granted funding and the total funding available could not be evaluated in a reliable manner. This is partially explained by the fact that respondents themselves did not have the information at hand, and therefore did not give an answer, or the information provided could not be verified. As such, the few answers collected for these three questions were mostly inconclusive and, thus, not included into the database.

This work was completed by each partner’s research for other national and international institutional grants. This allowed us to have a better overview of the institutional funding schemes, not including bilateral cooperation to avoid a longer list. For example, in order to identify unfamiliar financing opportunities, the Université de Lorraine used the open4research platform. In the next section of this handbook, we will give an overview of other European funding schemes; but a more complete list produced in the framework of DocMob can also be found in another document available on the DocMob project website¹.

2. EUROPEAN FUNDINGS

COST Action²

COST Action is a network dedicated to scientific collaboration, complementing national research funds. A COST Action is organised by a range of networking tools, such as meetings, conferences, workshops, short-term scientific missions, training schools, publications and dissemination activities. Funding covers the cost of COST Action networking tools.

For doctoral mobility, the main opportunity offered by COST action are the training schools.

1 <https://projects.uni-foundation.eu/docmob/>

2 Source : <https://www.cost.eu/>

Training Schools aim to facilitate capacity building on a topic relevant to the theme of the respective COST Action through the delivery of intensive training on a new or emerging subject. They can also offer familiarisation with unique equipment or expertise and are typically, although not exclusively, considered to be for the benefit of ECI and PhD students. They are not intended to provide general training.

Training Schools are recommended to last a minimum of 3 days.

Both Trainers and Trainees can be reimbursed for their long-distance travel expenses. The reimbursement of incurred accommodation, meals, and local travel expenses in the country where the meeting takes place is paid as one item known as daily allowance. The daily allowance considers the participant's travel start and end dates and hours. The daily allowance rate is determined based on the country where the event takes place. The daily allowance rates can be found on the COST website at www.cost.eu/daily_allowance.

The daily allowance goes from 200€ (UK) to 160€ (Moldova)

Trainees shall be engaged in an official research programme as a doctoral student or postdoctoral fellow or can be employed by, or affiliated to, an institution, organization or legal entity, which a clear association with performing research has within its remit.

H2020

The Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions (MSCA) provide grants for all stages of researchers' careers – should be they doctoral candidates or highly experienced researchers – and encourage transnational, inter-sectorial and interdisciplinary mobility.

The Innovative Training Networks (ITN) aims to train a new generation of creative, entrepreneurial and innovative early-stage researchers, able to face current and future challenges and to convert knowledge and ideas into products and services for economic and social benefit.

ITN supports competitively selected joint research training and/or doctoral programmes, implemented by partnerships between universities, research institutions, research infrastructures, businesses, SMEs, and other socio-economic actors from different countries across Europe and beyond.

There are three types of Research networks:

- European Training Networks (ETN);
- European Industrial Doctorates (EID);
- and European Joint Doctorates (EJD)

European Training Networks help researchers gain experience of different working environ-

ments while developing transferable skills.

European Training Networks help researchers gain experience of different working environments while developing transferable skills.

European Industrial Doctorates help doctoral candidates step outside academia and develop skills in industry and business.

This type of network is provided by at least one academic partner and partners from the business world. Individuals are enrolled in a doctoral programme and jointly supervised by the academic and non-academic partners.

European Joint Doctorates promote international collaboration that goes across different business and research sectors.

They are run by a minimum of three academic organizations forming a network to supervise joint, double or multiple degrees.

The supervisor and each early-stage researcher recruited by the selected network should establish a Career Development Plan jointly. In addition to research objectives, this plan comprises the researcher's training and career needs, including training on transferable skills, teaching, planning for publications and participation in conferences.

Attention is paid to the quality of supervision and mentoring arrangements as well as career guidance. Joint supervision of the researchers is mandatory for EJD and for EID, and encouraged in ETN.

In EID and EJD, fellowships offered to early-stage researchers should lead to a doctoral degree. EJD result in joint, double or multiple doctoral degrees awarded by institutions from at least two different countries, primarily within Europe.

Grants (for individuals) cover:

- Recruitment and training of each researcher for up to three years. The researcher is hired under an employment contract and benefits from a monthly living allowance, social security cover, plus a mobility and family allowance.
- Research costs including the organization of joint activities and conferences.

COFUND

The COFUND scheme aims to stimulate regional, national or international programmes to foster excellence in researchers' training, mobility and career development, spreading the best practices of the Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions.

Doctoral programmes address the development and broadening of the research competencies of early-stage researchers. The training follows the EU Principles on Innovative Doctoral Training. Substantial training modules, including digital ones, addressing key transferable skills common to all fields and fostering the culture of Open Science, innovation and entrepreneurship will be supported. Collaboration with a wider set of partner organizations (including from the non-academic sector, which may provide hosting or training in research or transferable skills, as well as innovative and interdisciplinary elements of the proposed programme) will be positively taken into account during the evaluation.

Each researcher must be enrolled in a doctoral programme. Attention is paid to the quality of supervision and mentoring arrangements as well as career guidance. The selection procedure for doctoral candidates must be open, transparent and merit-based. The vacancy notice must include the minimum gross salary offered to the researcher, as set out in the proposal.

The EU contribution to the researcher costs must be used exclusively for the living allowance provided for the benefit of the researcher appointed under the programme. In addition to the researcher unit cost, there will be an EU contribution for institutions based on unit costs.

VIII. KA103 ERASMUS+ MOBILITY VERSUS OTHER OPPORTUNITIES FOR DOCTORAL STUDENTS

1. THE EXPERIENCE OF INTERNATIONAL CREDIT MOBILITY (ICM OR KA107)

The DocMob survey and interviews raised the issue of choosing between national and Erasmus+ funding to organize doctoral mobility, which we will also explore further in the next section. In addition, it underlined the difference of use of the KA103 (intra-European mobility) and the ICM within the Erasmus+ framework itself.

In the KA103, the HEIs get a global budget for all types of outgoing mobility (students, staff, teaching, traineeships) and all hosting institutions, whatever the country to which they belong. Using this global and centralized budget, the HEIs then decide of the allocation of the funds, according to the needs of the participants. This means that if the HEIs usually address the possibilities of KA103 mobility to all students, most of the time they will not make any specific communication to doctoral students as a specific target.

The implementation of KA103 to doctoral mobility meets several obstacles, which we already pointed out in the previous sections of this handbook:

- There are not enough KA103 funds to promote massive doctoral mobility, so the priority is often given to bachelor and master students. During the interviews at the EAIE, it seemed that the same problem arises mainly in the Western European HEIs.
- KA103 grants are identical whatever the cycle of study is. This implies that at doctoral level, Erasmus+ often competes with local/regional funds, which offer higher amounts of scholarships with less administrative burden.

In the ICM, the situation is largely different:

- The ICM funds are allocated upon a call for proposals and on a project-by-project and country-by-country approach. In this respect, the ICM calls give the possibility of building several structured projects rather than managing a broad fund including all three-study cycles and all host countries without distinction. Every ICM grant is used to serve a targeted activity and host country, defined as soon as in the application stage. This allows institutions to better anticipate the needs in terms of which kind of mobility they want to promote within their ICM projects.
- Most ICM projects make links between education and research, which enable to build a well thought-out and structured doctoral mobility.
- The amount of the ICM grants is much higher than it is in KA103, and as such is almost

similar to other funds’.

- The ICM projects include the funding of incoming mobility, and to a greater extent than outgoing mobility. For non-European students, the ICM grants are already sufficient to come and live in Europe without the need for other sources of funding.

2. BEST PRACTICES FROM OTHER FUNDS

The DocMob consortium also analyzed other European/national/international funds in order to find out some possible best practices. Coherently with the project work, the consortium identified the duration of the mobility and its funding as the core topics of analysis.

Best practices: Duration of the mobility

Some funds allow shorter mobility periods than Erasmus+: the most common minimal duration is of 1 month. This is the case, for example, of national funds in Estonia, Slovakia and Poland (1 to 10 months), of DAAD’s (Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst) funds in Germany (1 to 6 months), of the Coimbra Group scholarships (1 to 3 months), and also of the grants offered by the Utrecht network (1 to 6 months).

Other funds enable even shorter periods, and allocate grants on a daily basis: this is the case in the CEEPUS programme, where the length of mobility allowed is less than 3 months and of at least 6 days, but also in the PROM program in Poland (5 to 30 days) or in the PHC launched by Campus France. The European programme COST enables mobility periods of a minimum of 3 days, in the form of intensive programmes. The UniGR funds reimburse mobility from 1 day on real costs.

But the need to finance short periods of mobility is not the only issue, and the maximum length of mobility allowed by the mobility programmes is as much an important question to consider: 12 months, in the Erasmus+ Programme, is not sufficient to cover the whole need of funding in the case of cotutelles, where the study/research period abroad often exceeds this duration. Of course, in this case, the reference is Marie-Curie actions, that is joint supervision oriented. Another good example comes from the DAAD: in the case of a cotutelle, financing can be provided for up to 18 months. In addition, an interesting case, the Eiffel scholarships offered by Campus France give the possibility to split the mobility into several periods.

Best practices: Financing

The other main issue with doctoral mobility, as underlined by the DocMob survey and interviews, is the amount of the grants offered. Many doctoral students and IRO’s staff believe that the Erasmus+ grant (for either studies or traineeship) is not sufficient for doctoral students, due to their generally specific family and professional situation compared to bachelor

and master students. What is the amount of other mobility grants for doctoral students? As far as national grants dedicated to doctoral mobility are concerned, here are some interesting figures: 900€/month (Italian national fund), 670€/month (Latvian fund), 468€/month (Lithuanian fund), 660€ (Estonian fund for incoming students, 734€/month (Slovakian fund), 1200€/month (German fund) and 1500€/month (Finnish fund). Japan offers 16000€/year with its Vulcanus programme, and 1600€/month with the JSPS (Japan Society for the Promotion of Science). Other programmes give lower amounts of scholarships, but offer other advantages in reality: it is the case, for instance, of Slovenia, whose scholarships only amount to 300€/month but also include free accommodation, meals (2, 63€/day) and insurance for its beneficiaries.

If we try a comparison, those funding schemes seem more similar to the ICM than to KA103. This explains perhaps the use of national funds over KA103, and the good use of the ICM for doctoral students.

For shorter stays, many programmes offer a daily rather than monthly allowance and the Programmes Hubert Curien (France) actually offers both possibilities. The amount and the grant conditions may again vary according to the country. Here are some examples, such as the Colciencias (40, 30€/day up to 60 days), the BUP total scholarships that are up to 3000€ plus a support for travel and accommodation with no time restriction, and the UniGR mobility scheme that reimburses on real costs.

A unique case, but interesting to be highlighted, is the Commonwealth Doctoral Scholarships, which include a family allowance in the form of a spouse's and a child's allowance. It is the only grant we know of that explicitly takes into account the specific family situation of the doctoral students.

IX. THE TOOLS DEVELOPED BY THE DOCMOB CONSORTIUM

The DocMob consortium set up three working groups, each of them being in charge of a template document to review: the Erasmus+ inter-institutional Agreement (working group led by the Universitat de València), the Learning Agreement (working group led by the Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II) and the recognition of the mobility (working group led by the Universität des Saarlandes). From their work and their sharing with all the project partners, we reached the following conclusions:

- There is no need to drastically modify the Erasmus+ inter-institutional agreement template for doctoral mobility. However, if such an agreement were to be established to allow an Erasmus+ doctoral mobility to take place, then it should contain some light intellectual property rights clauses, as doctoral mobility most often takes place within a research programme. However, the mere necessity of an inter-institutional agreement at doctoral level was also questioned within the DocMob consortium. During the interviews led after the DocMob survey, a need for more flexibility in the organization of the Erasmus+ doctoral mobility was clearly identified and confirmed, and most respondents thought that in the case of doctoral mobility, the requirement for an Erasmus+ inter-institutional agreement in itself was another obstacle that could be overcome by simply making this agreement not mandatory (as it is already the case for traineeship mobility -SMP- and training staff mobility -STT-). Moreover, doctoral mobility is often an individual initiative rather than an organized and recurrent mobility, which makes the obligation of an inter-institutional agreement even more ill-adapted.
- When dealing with doctoral mobility, the Erasmus+ Learning Agreement should be considered as a flexible document, including, when appropriate, the description of both research/teaching activities and training components chosen in the host institution, but not making either of them compulsory. It should therefore include the courses and the seminars attended, as well as the courses taught by the doctoral student. It is important for the mobility recognition to take into account all aspects of doctoral educational and research components, and any activity that is generally considered as important to be recognized at the third cycle level. In this sense, the learning agreement for doctoral mobility should not be comparable to an academic or a traineeship mobility learning agreement, but it ought to be a new specific document adapted to the doctoral specific needs. Therefore, it really is a new “LA for doctoral mobility” rather than a mere adaptation of the existing learning agreement template to doctoral mobility. This means that doctoral mobility should be viewed as a particular mobility in itself, and not just as a different kind of student or staff mobility (for both short and long stays).
- The learning agreement should also be considered as an estimation, as doctoral educa-

tion is not as precise as it is for the first two cycles of studies, and therefore the choice of activities to be led during the mobility should be left quite open. Before the mobility, the LA should be regarded as a tool to prepare the mobility, in terms of general information provided before departure, and not as a definitive binding contract.

- The LA and the ToR for doctoral mobility should remain included in the same document to be signed before and after the mobility. During the mobility, the LA has to be considered as the reminder of all activities conducted by the doctoral student.
- The use of the ECTS should be made optional. The possibility of a conversion table between working hours (for all activities) and the ECTS would be useful to better implement the doctoral mobility and its recognition. Such a conversion table should be included in the ECTS guide to help HEIs that do not use the ECTS credits to make good use of the Erasmus+ mobility for their doctoral students.
- At the end of the ToR, some transferable skills and competences should be included, as Erasmus+ gives the opportunity to third cycle students to develop such individual skills and competences in new ways that are very specific to their level of studies. Detailing the skills acquired during the mobility could also help the HEIs to overcome the challenges of recognizing doctoral mobility. They could be identified based on the transferable skills and competences matrix proposed by the Eurodoc Report: “Identifying Transferable Skills and Competences to Enhance Early-Career Researchers Employability and Competitiveness”.

For the design of the tools, the DocMob consortium used the above conclusions to propose a unique Learning Agreement / Transcript of Records to be filled before, during and after the mobility. This document is the merge of all the existing types of LA in use in the 2014-2020 Erasmus+ mobility (learning agreement, teaching agreement, training agreement), with the addition of a research description. As stated above, the document should remain provisional as it is often challenging to have a complete overview of all the possible activities that could be done in the host institution before the mobility actually takes place. The document should list all the expected activities in terms of research, learning, training and teaching. In the beginning of the mobility activity, both the home and the host institution must approve the LA. In a third phase, at the end of the mobility, the host supervisor should prepare an assessment that would include the transferable skills acquired by the doctoral student.

The draft of the LA/ToR for doctoral students, as designed by the DocMob partners is available on the DocMob project webpage. Of course, it does not replace in any way the official LA/ToR that the European Commission requires the HEIs to use, but any interested HEI may want to use it freely along with the official templates to test it.

A second important tool for the preparation of doctoral mobility is the institution’s factsheet, which describes the organization of doctoral studies and doctoral mobility activities in both the host and the home institutions. As with the mobility of bachelor and master students, this

document will provide the home institution with important data for the preparation of its doctoral mobility: contacts (often not the same as for bachelor and master levels), procedures, admission criteria, recognition of the mobility activities, etc. The DocMob project website shows an example of an Erasmus+ Datasheet at doctoral level, whose core data are introduced according to the DocMob project partners' experience.

X. OUR RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON THE DOCMOB PROJECT CONCLUSION

1. TRAJECTORIES – IMBALANCE AND ASYMMETRIES AMONG MS (MEMBER STATES) IN THE ABILITY TO ATTRACT PHD CANDIDATES

Among early attempts at theorising and explaining student and staff mobility there is a set of studies showing that some countries (and HEIs) attract more than others because of features such as prestige, reputation and funding capabilities¹². Ackers adds that the discourse of scientific mobility need to be embedded in its temporal and spatial context to be fully understood. Later studies build on these ideas by pointing out that, in Europe, ‘the position within geographies of power (economic and otherwise) and knowledge matter and by recommending to pay attention to the institutional infrastructures that stimulate mobility³.

All the above is perfectly in line with the main findings of the DocMob project, which has highlighted the existence of clear national divergences among Member States and the fragmentation of doctoral structures across Europe. Hence, the need to address these issues as a matter of primary concern. In fact, a broader and commonly shared understanding of doctoral mobility practices could facilitate their implementation across Europe and higher education institutions.

Overcoming cross-country differences – i.e., undertaking more significant steps towards harmonisation of doctoral mobility practices among Member States – means, above all, trying to commonly define what doctoral mobility is and achieve convergence on the employment status and functions of doctoral candidates at European level. Greater harmonisation is desirable also on a practical level: data collection and analysis. In fact, at present, the different statuses of doctoral candidates – staff member vs. student – affect, for example, the way national statistical agencies collect secondary data.

2. TEACHERS’ MOBILITY

Doctoral supervisors’ connections and networks, as well as teaching mobility schemes (a teacher coming from another university) are powerful means that operate as a mobility in-

1 Avveduto, S. (2001) ‘International mobility of PhDs’, in Innovative people, Mobility of Skilled Personnel in National Innovation Systems, ed. OECD, Paris: OECD, pp. 229-242.

2 Ackers, L. (2005) ‘Promoting scientific mobility and balanced growth in the European research Area’, Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research 18(3): 301-317.

3 Bauder, H. (2015) ‘The International Mobility of Academics: A Labour Market Perspective’, International Migration 53(1): 83-96.

centive influencing or shaping the mobility choices by doctoral candidates¹².

Teachers' mobility and doctoral mobility

Lecturers' mobility, known as "staff mobility for teaching" in the Erasmus+ Programme, is a preliminary tool that encourages student mobility, and it already gets funding for travel expenses. In the specific case of doctoral mobility though, it needs more opportunities of funding because again, a lecture cannot be addressed to doctoral students in the same way as it is to bachelor or even master students. The DocMob project partners believe that at doctoral level, lecturer's mobility therefore needs a new and specific financial support for organizing short courses and Doctoral Schools, but also for promoting the results of doctoral Erasmus+ mobility itself.

Short courses

In this scheme, short courses would be an average of 10 hours courses, which a lecturer could give in any Erasmus+ partner HEI. They could be listed on an Erasmus+ funded website (such as PhDHub) as available doctoral courses in Erasmus+ partner countries, along with a short description of their content, the number of teaching hours, the style of teaching and the final assessment rationale. The institutions interested in widening their teaching offer should regularly monitor this list. The expected results of these short courses would be that the doctoral students following them would be motivated and advised in their application for an Erasmus+ doctoral exchange by guest lecturers from partner institutions.

Doctoral Schools

These would be intensive and thematic short Schools (lasting one week). It would be helpful to finance or improve an existing online platform (PhDHub?) that would host offers and demands for both teachers and students. The Doctoral Schools' Online platform would provide the HEIs with a place where they could share joint teaching experiences and spread them among scientific partners.

Doctoral teaching abroad Enhancement

Eventually, a part of the Erasmus+ doctoral grant should be allocated to finance the presentation of the research work that doctoral students have carried out during their experience abroad. The presentation should include both the research items and research groups in which the doctoral student and its home institution are personally involved. Its main scope would be the promotion of doctoral Erasmus+ exchanges' reciprocity, which could also be achieved by supporting relations between a doctoral student of a hosting institution and a doctoral student from a sending institution.

1 Millard, D. (2005) 'The Impact of Clustering on Scientific Mobility: A Case Study of the UK', *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research* 18(3): 343-359.

2 Ackers, L., Gill, B. and Guth J. (2008) 'Doctoral Mobility in the Social Sciences. Report to the NORFACE ERA-NET', Helsinki: NORFACE ERA-NET. https://www.norface.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Doctoral_Mobility.pdf. (Accessed March 12, 2021).

3. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Built on the experience and feedbacks shared with project partners and other participating European HEIs, the DocMob consortium would like to make the following recommendations:

- There should be a specific mobility strand for doctoral students in the 2021-2027 Erasmus+ Programme. Doctoral students have a particular status compared to bachelor and master students: they are in a specific stage of their life and are conducting not one but multiple activities at the same time (teaching, research, courses, traineeships, training...). The 2021-2027 Erasmus+ Programme should also include a clear definition of what a doctoral mobility is, and what it is not (for example, the mere participation in a conference abroad is not a mobility activity).
- There should be an overall simplification of the procedures for doctoral mobility and a better communication on the opportunities of mobility open to doctoral students.
- Two clearly separate funds should be allocated to HEIs to organize their student mobility. One would be for their bachelor/master mobility, and the other for their doctoral mobility. It would replace the current global financial envelope designed for both types of mobility, which too often leaves no other choice to HEIs but to give priority to the bachelor/master mobility over the funding of doctoral mobility.
- Inter-institutional agreements should not be made compulsory for Erasmus+ doctoral mobility, which is often an individual initiative rather than an organized and recurrent mobility. Making the inter-institutional agreements mandatory probably discourages many doctoral candidates and their supervisors to engage in an Erasmus+ mobility project, as witnessed within the DocMob project partners' institutions.
- Specific template documents should be designed for doctoral mobility to take into account all the activities carried out by a doctoral student during his/her mobility. An entirely new Erasmus+ Learning Agreement for doctoral mobility should be shaped, containing all the forms of activities that a doctoral student can undertake without making any of them compulsory. This document should also allow modifications during the course of the mobility in the smoothest possible way. In a previous section of this Handbook, we went into details about the draft proposal of a LA/ToR for doctoral students, which was set up further to our discussions within the working groups of the DocMob's project. It includes a list of transferable skills acquired during the mobility.
- The use of the ECTS should not be made mandatory for Erasmus+ doctoral mobility, but a detailed conversion table could be usefully included in the ECTS guide to help HEIs that don't use the ECTS credits to make good use of the Erasmus+ mobility for their doctoral students.

- The mandatory duration of doctoral mobility has to be as flexible as possible to meet the needs of different countries and candidates (from a few days to more than a year).
- A difference should be made between short-term mobility and long-term mobility when managing doctoral mobility. Because they are usually older, doctoral students are in a different life stage that may involve a spouse, children, and a job position to support their studies. A common barrier to doctoral Erasmus+ mobility is the low monthly grant that discourages doctoral students from participating in an Erasmus+ exchange. Experience in the fieldwork clearly shows that as far as doctoral mobility is concerned national/local programmes offer more advantages in terms of scholarships and flexibility of the mobility. One of the reasons of the success of the ICM for doctoral exchanges is the higher attraction that it offers compared to KA103. The 2021-2027 Erasmus+ Programme should consider raising the scholarships of KA103 for third cycle students to the amounts proposed in the framework of the ICM to complement the existing local/national funding opportunities in the best possible way.
- A new type of Erasmus+ doctoral teaching mobility should be considered so that it can be addressed specifically to doctoral students and act as an incentive for doctoral mobility. This mobility should not concentrate on the necessity to give at least 8 hours of teaching because it does not fit with the organization of doctoral studies. In addition, the need for the doctoral student and his/ her home supervisor to meet regularly during the student's mobility should be recognized and at least partly funded by the Erasmus+ Programme.
- Ultimately, it is necessary to give the Erasmus+ National Agencies and the European Commission a central role in harmonizing practices for managing the mobility of doctoral students between partners and participating countries: the same rules should apply for every HEI and every Erasmus+ doctoral beneficiary.



Learning Agreement for PhD-Mobility

Higher Education:
Learning Agreement form

Academic Year 2019/2020

PhD Student	Last name(s)	First name(s)	Date of birth	Nationality ¹	Sex [M/F/D]	Field of education ²		
	Email address		Home address		Telephone number			
Sending Institution	Name	Faculty/ Department	Erasmus code ³ (if applicable)	Address	Country	PhD coordinator: name; position; email; phone	Departmental coordinator ⁴ : name; position; email; phone	
	Saarland University		D SAARBRU01	Campus, D-66123 Saarbrücken	Germany			
Receiving Organisation /Enterprise	Name		Department	Website	Country	Address	Size	
							<input type="checkbox"/> < 250 employees <input type="checkbox"/> > 250 employees	
	PhD Coordinator: name / position/ e-mail/ phone				Erasmus+ Departmental Coordinator: name/ position/ e-mail/ phone (if applicable)			

Before the mobility

<i>Table A – PhD Mobility Programme at the Receiving Organisation/Enterprise</i>	
Planned period of the mobility: from [day/month/year] _____ to [day/month/year] _____	
Programme title:	Number of working hours per week:
Research components (proposed mobility activity):	

Educational components:			
	Unit (please insert unit if known, otherwise the field of interest)	ECTS credits ⁵ (not mandatory)	
Seminars learning activity	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
	4.		
	5.		
Courses	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
	4.		
	5.		
Seminars teaching activity	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
	4.		
	5.		
Knowledge, skills and competences to be acquired (expected Learning Outcomes):			
Monitoring plan:			
Evaluation plan:			
The level of language competence ⁶ in _____ [indicate here the main language of work] that the PhD student already has or agrees to acquire by the start of the mobility period is: A1 <input type="checkbox"/> A2 <input type="checkbox"/> B1 <input type="checkbox"/> B2 <input type="checkbox"/> C1 <input type="checkbox"/> C2 <input type="checkbox"/> Native speaker <input type="checkbox"/>			

Table B - Sending Institution
Accident insurance for the PhD candidate

The Sending Institution will provide an accident insurance to the PhD candidate (if not provided by the Receiving Organisation/Enterprise): Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	The accident insurance covers: - accidents during travels made for work purposes: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> - accidents on the way to work and back from work: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
The Sending Institution will provide a liability insurance to the PhD candidate (if not provided by the Receiving Organisation/Enterprise): Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Integration of the research stay in the Diploma Supplement : Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	

Table C - Receiving Organisation/Enterprise

The Receiving Organisation/Enterprise will provide financial support to the PhD candidate: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, amount (EUR/month):
The Receiving Organisation/Enterprise will provide a contribution in kind to the PhD candidate: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> If yes, please specify:	
The Receiving Organisation/Enterprise will provide an accident insurance to the PhD candidate (if not provided by the Sending Institution): Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	The accident insurance covers: - accidents during travels made for work purposes: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> - accidents on the way to work and back from work: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
The Receiving Organisation/Enterprise will provide a liability insurance to the PhD candidate (if not provided by the Sending Institution): Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
The Receiving Organisation/Enterprise will provide appropriate support and equipment to the PhD candidate.	
Upon completion of the mobility programme, the Organisation/Enterprise undertakes to issue a Certificate within 5 weeks after the end of the programme.	

By signing this document, the PhD student, the Sending Institution and the Receiving Organisation/Enterprise confirm that they approve the Learning Agreement and that they will comply with all the arrangements agreed by all parties. The trainee and Receiving Organisation/Enterprise will communicate to the Sending Institution any problem or changes regarding the PhD mobility period. The Sending Institution and the trainee should also commit to what is set out in the Erasmus+ grant agreement. The institution undertakes to respect all the principles of the Erasmus Charter for Higher Education relating to PhD mobility.

Commitment	Name	Email	Position/Faculty	Date	Signature
PhD Student			<i>PhD student</i>		
PhD-Coordinator or Erasmus+ Departmental Coordinator at the Sending Institution					
PhD-Coordinator or Erasmus+ Departmental Coordinator at the Receiving Organisation					

During the Mobility

<p>Table A2 – Exceptional Changes to the Mobility Programme at the Receiving Organisation/Enterprise (to be approved by e-mail or signature by the PhD Student, the responsible person in the Sending Institution and the responsible person in the Receiving Organisation/Enterprise)</p> <p>Planned period of the mobility: from [day/month/year] _____ till [day/month/year] _____</p>			
Name of the PhD Student:			
Programme title:		Number of working hours per week:	
Detailed programme of the mobility period:			
Educational components:			
	Unit (please insert unit if known, otherwise the field of interest)	ECTS credits ⁷ (not mandatory)	
Seminars learning activity	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
	4.		
	5.		
Courses	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
	4.		
	5.		
Seminars teaching activity	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
	4.		
	5.		

Knowledge, skills and competences to be acquired by the end of the mobility (expected Learning Outcomes):

Monitoring plan:

Evaluation plan:

Date:

Name, signature and stamp of the Supervisor at the Receiving Organisation/Enterprise:

After the Mobility
Table D – Certificate by the Receiving Organisation/Enterprise

Table D – Certificate by the Receiving Organisation/Enterprise			
Name of the PhD student:			
Name of the Receiving Organisation/Enterprise:			
Sector of the Receiving Organisation/Enterprise:			
Address of the Receiving Organisation/Enterprise [street, city, postal code, country, phone, e-mail address], website :			
Start date and end date of traineeship: from [day/month/year] _____ to [day/month/year] _____			
Programme title:			
Detailed programme of the mobility including tasks carried out by:			
Educational components:			
	Unit (please insert unit if known, otherwise the field of interest)	ECTS credits ⁸ (not mandatory)	
Seminars learning activity	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
	4.		
	5.		
Courses	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
	4.		
	5.		
Seminars teaching activity	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
	4.		
	5.		

Knowledge, skills (intellectual and practical) and competences acquired (achieved Learning Outcomes):
Evaluation of the PhD student:
Date:
Name, signature and stamp of the Supervisor at the Receiving Organisation/Enterprise:

¹ **Nationality:** Country to which the person belongs administratively and that issues the ID card and/or passport.

² **Field of education:** The [ISCED-F 2013 search tool](http://ec.europa.eu/education/tools/isced-f_en.html) available at http://ec.europa.eu/education/tools/isced-f_en.html should be used to find the ISCED 2013 detailed field of education and training that is closest to the subject of the degree to be awarded to the trainee by the sending institution.

³ **Erasmus code:** a unique identifier that every higher education institution that has been awarded with the Erasmus Charter for Higher Education (ECHE) receives. It is only applicable to higher education institutions located in Programme Countries.

⁴ **Departmental coordinator at sending institution:** this person is responsible for signing the Learning Agreement, amending it if needed and recognising the credits and associated learning outcomes on behalf of the responsible academic body as set out in the Learning Agreement. List of UdS Departmental Coordinators: <https://www.uni-saarland.de/global/erasmus/info/koordinatoren.html>

⁵ **ECTS credits (or equivalent):** in countries where the "ECTS" system is not in place, in particular for institutions located in Partner Countries not participating in the Bologna process, "ECTS" needs to be replaced in the relevant tables by the name of the equivalent system that is used, and a web link to an explanation to the system should be added.

⁶ **Level of language competence:** a description of the European Language Levels (CEFR) is available at: <https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr>

⁷ **ECTS credits (or equivalent):** in countries where the "ECTS" system is not in place, in particular for institutions located in Partner Countries not participating in the Bologna process, "ECTS" needs to be replaced in the relevant tables by the name of the equivalent system that is used, and a web link to an explanation to the system should be added.

⁸ **ECTS credits (or equivalent):** in countries where the "ECTS" system is not in place, in particular for institutions located in Partner Countries not participating in the Bologna process, "ECTS" needs to be replaced in the relevant tables by the name of the equivalent system that is used, and a web link to an explanation to the system should be added.

