	Titel		
	Surv	ev of Schools	
Erstellt von	Untertitel		
Luigi Fabbris	Scho	ols' Questionnaire	ROI MOB
Status:	Dokumententyp	Sachgebiet / Stichwort / Bezugnahme	
Datei:	Draft	WP5	

Questionnaire for Schools and Training centres

This questionnaire is aimed at describing the experience and attitudes of schools and training centres towards Erasmus+ mobility. It will take less than 15 minutes to fill in the questionnaire. Your answers will be kept in strict confidentiality and will be analysed only for statistical purposes, in compliance with privacy regulations.

Please, click NEXT to start the questionnaire.

A. School/centre and respondent characteristics

- 1. Belgium
- 2. Germany
- 3. Italy
- 4. Portugal
- 5. Spain
- 6. Other country (Please, specify:.....)

A2. Type of school/centre

- 1. Lower secondary school
- 2. Vocational school
- 3. Training centre
- 4. Higher secondary school
- 5. Other (Please, specify.....)

A3. Major/Discipline of the School/Centre (please, describe::.....)

A4. Number of enrolled students at school (last available year)

- 1. Less than 100
- 2. 101-200
- 3. 201-300
- 4. 301-500
- 5. 501-1,000
- 6. More than 1,000

	Titel		
	Sui	rvev of Schools	
Erstellt von	Untertitel		
Luigi Fabbris	Sch	nools' Questionnaire	ROI MOB
Status:	Dokumententyp	Sachgebiet / Stichwort / Bezugnahme	
Datei:	Draft	WP5	

A5.* Did the School/Centre send and/or host students/apprentices in the framework of **Erasmus+** mobility?

- 1. Just sent apprentices/students
- 2. Just hosted apprentices/students
- 3. Both sent and hosted apprentices/students
- 4. Not at all

A6.* Did the School/Centre send and/or host students/apprentices under other **(non-Erasmus+)** mobility schemes?

- 1. Just sent apprentices/students
- 2. Just hosted apprentices/students
- 3. Both sent and hosted apprentices/students
- 4. Not at all

A7. Gender of the person responding to the questionnaire on behalf of the School/Centre

- 1. Male
- 2. Female

A8. Respondent's age (years)

- 1. Below 30
- 2. 30-45
- 3. 46-60
- 4. More than 60

A9. Respondent's role

- 1. Principal, vice-principal
- 2. Head of department
- 3. Mobility responsible
- 4. Teacher, trainer
- 5. Other (Please, specify:)

B. Sending process (if A5=1 or 3 or A6=1 or 3)

B1. How long has the School/Centre been involved in international mobility programmes, sending participants abroad?

- 1. Less than 2 years
- 2. 2-3 years
- 3. 4-5 years
- 4. 6-10 years
- 5. More than 10 years

	Titel		
	Sur	vev of Schools	
Erstellt von	Untertitel		
Luigi Fabbris	Sch	ools' Questionnaire	ROI MOB
Status:	Dokumententyp	Sachgebiet / Stichwort / Bezugnahme	7
Datei:	Draft	WP5	

B2. How many participants have been sent abroad in the last 12 months? _____

B3. Are you sending participants to whatever country or do you have any preferred countries?

- 1. Whatever country
- 2. Some countries more than others

B4. (if B3=2) Which are the preferred countries? (Please, click the preferred countries; maximum three)

[list] + Other country, please specify:

- B5. Does the selection process of participants follow a fixed-quota policy or is their number defined every year according to variable parameters?
 - 1. Fixed quota
 - 2. Variable every year

B6. Does the School/Centre organize outgoing mobility on its own (as an autonomous promoter), or does it get support from other organizations? (YES/NO)

- a) Autonomous promoter
- b) Partner of a consortium / network
- c) Informal network of schools/ centres and similar organisations
- d) Intermediary organizations
- e) Other supporting bodies (Please, specify:.....)

B7. Which are the most relevant criteria in the participant selection process? (max 3 choices) YES/NO

- a) We do not apply any selection criteria
- b) First-come-first-served
- c) Curriculum/performance
- d) Language skills
- e) Personal and social skills
- f) Previous work experience
- g) Previous mobility experience
- h) Participant's motivation to go on mobility
- i) Staff's certainty of usefulness of mobility for the participant
- j) Other (please, specify.....)

B8. Which is the approximate per cent rate of acceptance of requests for mobility? *(reference: last year)*

- 1. Less than 25%
- 2. Between 26 and 50%
- 3. Between 51 and 75%
- 4. Between 76 and 99%
- 5. 100%

	Titel		
	Su	rvev of Schools	
Erstellt von	Untertitel		
Luigi Fabbris	Sc	hools' Questionnaire	ROI MOB
Status:	Dokumententyp	Sachgebiet / Stichwort / Bezugnahme	7
Datei:	Draft	WP5	

B9. Which is the rate of participants taking part (e.g. the students/trainees who asked to participate) in Erasmus+ or Erasmus-like mobility programmes compared to your total number of students/trainees?

- 1. Less than 2%
- 2. Between 2 and 5%
- 3. Between 6 and 10%
- 4. Between 11 and 15%
- 5. More than 15%

B10. Do you think that the number of participants in Erasmus+ mobility programmes, at the national level, is adequate?

- 1. Too low, should grow
- 2. Adequate
- 3. Too high, should decrease

B11. And in your organization?

- 1. Too low, should grow
- 2. Adequate
- 3. Too high, should decrease

B12. Imagine your School/Centre needs 100 budget-points to finance its sending activities. From which sources are these 100 points procured? (if no funding is needed, put 'own budget'=100)

· •	,	
a) Own budget:		
b) Private funds		
c) EU funds		
d) Other public fu	ınds	
e) Other sources		
	Total	100
B13. Which is the ave	_	unt of grants per participant assigned to participants
Euro		
B14. All in all, in mon	etary terms	s, can you estimate the total yearly cost of the

Erasmus+ experience for your School/Centre (besides possible grants you received by the Erasmus+ and ignoring non-monetary aspects such as dedicated time, worries, etc.)?

..... Euro

	Titel		
	Surv	ev of Schools	
Erstellt von	Untertitel		1
Luigi Fabbris	Scho	Schools' Questionnaire	
Status:	Dokumententyp	Sachgebiet / Stichwort / Bezugnahme	
Datei:	Draft	WP5	

C. Hosting process (if A5=2 or 3 or A6=2 or 3)

- C1. How long has the School/Centre hosted participants in international mobility?
 - 1. Less than 2 years
 - 2. 2-3 years
 - 3. 4-5 years
 - 4. 6-10 years
 - 5. More than 10 years
- C2. How many participants did your School/Centre host in the last 12 months? ____
- C3. Are you hosting participants from whatever country or do they mostly come from some specific countries?
 - 1. Whatever country
 - 2. Specific countries
- C4. (if C3=2) Which countries are they from? (*Please, click maximum three countries*)
- [list] + Other country, please specify:
- C5. In its hosting activities, does your School/Centre operate as an autonomous partner, working directly with sending organizations, or does it have the support of other organizations? (YES/NO)
 - a) Autonomous partner
 - b) Partner of a consortium/network
 - c) Informal network of schools/centres and similar organisations
 - d) Intermediary organizations
 - e) Other supporting bodies (Please, specify:.....)
- C6. Does your School/Centre apply a predefined plan with standard criteria for participant selection?
 - 1. Yes, we have a plan we follow
 - 2. No, we make a case by case analysis
 - 3. No, we do not make any selection
- C7. (If C6 = 1 or 2) Which are the most relevant criteria in your participant selection plan? (max 3 choices)
 - a) Duration of the internship
 - b) Time of the year
 - c) Language skills
 - d) Professional and technical skills
 - e) Age
 - f) Gender
 - g) Nationality
 - h) Other (please, specify:_____)

	Titel		
	Surv	ev of Schools	
Erstellt von	Untertitel		
Luigi Fabbris	School	ols' Questionnaire	ROI MOB
Status:	Dokumententyp	Sachgebiet / Stichwort / Bezugnahme	
Datei:	Draft	WP5	

- C8. What is the approximate per cent rate of acceptance of hospitality applications? (reference: last year)
 - 1. Less than 25%
 - 2. Between 26 and 50%
 - 3. Between 51 and 75%
 - 4. Between 76 and 99%
 - 5. 100%
- C9. Imagine your School/Centre needs 100 budget-points to finance its hosting activities. From which sources are these 100 points procured (reference: last year; if no external funding is required, put 'own budget'=100)?

a)	Own budget:			
o)	Private funds			
c)	EU funds			
(b	Other public fund	ds		
e)	Other sources			
-				
		Total	100)

C10. All in all, in monetary terms, can you estimate the **approximate total yearly cost** incurred by your school/centre for hosting one participant (besides possible grants you received by the Erasmus+ Programme and ignoring non-monetary aspects such as dedicated time, worries, etc.)?

- 1. 0
- 2. 1 250
- 3. 251-500
- 4. 501-1,000
- 5. 1,001-2,000
- 6. More than 2,000

D. Level of School/Centre engagement

D1. (If A5=1 or 3 or A6=1 or 3) Is your School/Centre available to send abroad more people in the future than those sent in the past 12 months?

- 1. Our School/Centre is available to send abroad more participants
- 2. The number sent in the last year fulfils our School/Centre policy
- 3. The number sent in the last year is beyond sustainability

D2. (If A5=2 or 3 or A6=2 or 3) Is your School/Centre available to host more mobility participants in the future than those hosted in the past 12 months?

- 1. Our School/Centre is available to host more participants
- 2. The number hosted in the last year fulfils our School/Centre policy
- 3. The number hosted in the last year is beyond sustainability

	Titel		
	Surve	ev of Schools	
Erstellt von	Untertitel		
Luigi Fabbris	School	ols' Questionnaire	ROI MOB
Status:	Dokumententyp	Sachgebiet / Stichwort / Bezugnahme	
Datei:	Draft	WP5	

D3. (If A5=2 or 3 or A6=2 or 3) Does your School/Centre involve own staff in tasks specifically devoted to hosting foreign participants?

- 1. Yes, mainly for tutorship and/or training
- 2. Yes, mainly for social activities
- 3. Yes, for all related activities
- 4. No staff is specifically devoted to mobility programmes

D4. (If A5=2 or 3 or A6=2 or 3) Are the hosted participants usually involved in ongoing learning activities or are they part of special pathways?

- 1. Usually integrated into on-going activities
- 2. Part of special pathways
- 3. Other (Please, specify:)

D5. (If A5=2 or 3 or A6=2 or 3) Which is the most relevant investment required by engaging in hosting activities? (*Pick up one, the most relevant to your School/Centre*)

- 1. Organizational costs
- 2. Direct staff costs (e.g. salaries, allowances, etc.)
- 3. Indirect staff costs (for tutorship, training, social activities, etc.)
- 4. Loss in teaching times
- 5. Costs and time of dedicated structures
- 6. Cost of providing externally dedicated services
- 7. Other (Please, specify:.....)

D6. (If A5=1 or 3 or A6=1 or 3) With reference to participants sent abroad, does this activity require to engage School/Centre staff in tasks specifically devoted to own students in mobility (*Please*, *ignore obvious administrative duties*)?

- 1. Yes, mainly for tutorship and/or training
- 2. Yes, mainly for language training
- 3. Yes, for all related activities
- 4. No staff is specifically devoted to outgoing Erasmus+ tasks

D7. (If A5=1 or 3 or A6=1 or 3) Which is the most relevant investment required by sending activities? (*Pick up one, the most relevant to the School/centre*)

- 1. Organizational costs
- 2. Direct staff costs (e.g. salaries, allowances, etc.)
- 3. Indirect staff costs (for tutorship, training, other dedicated activities)
- 4. Loss in teaching times
- 5. Costs and time of dedicated structures
- 6. Cost of providing externally dedicated services
- 7. Other (Please, specify:.....)

	Titel		
	Sur	vev of Schools	
Erstellt von	Untertitel		
Luigi Fabbris	Sch	ools' Questionnaire	ROI MOB
Status:	Dokumententyp	Sachgebiet / Stichwort / Bezugnahme	7
Datei:	Draft	WP5	

D8. Which are the main **obstacles** to youth international mobility? Please, select the aspects that, according to your opinion, could discourage schools/centres from sending or hosting participants? (*maximum three options for outgoing and three for incoming mobilities*)

(Programmer: random order but Other)

Sending	Aspects	Hosting
а	Language barriers	а
b	Insufficient number of self-offering candidates	b
С	Inadequate professional standards of candidates	С
d	Opposition of families to mobility	d
е	Inadequate personal or interpersonal competencies of candidates	е
f	Inadequacy of possible tutors	f
g	Insufficient number of hosting companies	g
h	Too short length of stay	h
i	Heavy costs (direct or indirect) of the whole process	i
j	Hosting organizations have no financial benefit	j
k	Lack of grants with respect to demand	k
I	Unbalanced distribution of the candidates' gender	
m	Inadequate accommodation for candidates	m
n	Administrative burden of the process	n
0	Lack of recognition of periods spent abroad	0
р	Insufficient appreciation of mobility outcomes by the labour market	р
q	Mistrust about mobility caused by previous experience	q
r	Other	r

D8b (se D8_sending=r) Please, specify the aspect that according to your experience could discourage outgoing mobility

D8c (se D8_hosting=r) Please, specify the aspect that according to your experience could discourage incoming mobility

E. Evaluation of possible returns (se A5=1,3 or A6=1,3)

E1.* Let us now evaluate the returns your School/Centre could get from sending its participants abroad. Please, consider the possible benefits described in the following and select **three** that, in your opinion, mostly apply to your School/Centre experience.

- a. Improving own participants' language skills
- b. Improving teamwork efficiency (without coaching costs)
- c. Improving participants' ICT, project management, innovation skills
- d. Motivating participants to learning, improving self-consciousness, increasing completion rate
- e. Encouraging intergenerational exchange, culture sharing
- f. Assessing the competencies of promising participants

	Titel		
	Surve		
Erstellt von	Untertitel		
Luigi Fabbris	Schoo	ROI MOB	
Status:	Dokumententyp	Sachgebiet / Stichwort / Bezugnahme	
Datei:	Draft	WP5	

- g. Strengthening participants and families relationships towards the School/Centre (nice place to study)
- h. Assessing potential talents, easing enrolment
- i. Improving staff's management skills (included planning and evaluation)
- j. Improving knowledge and usage of European tools (e.g. Europass, ECVET, etc.)
- k. Innovating methods of teaching or training, matching programme contents with labour market needs
- I. Broadening mind-set and business ideas
- m. Enhancing reputation/brand
- n. Improving international collaboration
- E2.* And which are the **three** aspects that least apply to your School/Centre experience?

(Programmer: same as E1 but those selected in E1)

- E3. * Now, please, consider the following benefits you pinpointed as very relevant from sending participants abroad. Which is the **most relevant** to you? [most relevant]
- E4.* And among the three aspects you selected as lesser relevant, which is the **least relevant** to you? [least relevant]
- E5. All in all, how much do you feel that sending participants abroad is worth the effort?

Minimum=① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩=Maximum

E. Evaluation of possible returns (2) (se A5=2 o 3 o A6=2 o 3)

- E6.* Let us now evaluate the returns the School/Centre could get from hosting participants from other countries. Please, select **three** of the possible benefits listed in the following that, in your opinion, mostly apply to your School/Centre.
- a) Improving own participants' language skills
- b) Improving teamwork efficiency (without coaching costs)
- c) Improving participants' ICT, project management, web use, innovation skills
- d) Motivating participants to learning, improving self-consciousness, increasing completion rate
- e) Encouraging intergenerational exchange, culture sharing
- f) Strengthening participants and families relationships towards the School/Centre (nice place to study)
- g) Attracting potential talents, easing enrolment
- h) Improving staff's management skills (included planning and evaluation)
- i) Improving knowledge and usage of European tools (e.g. Europass, ECVET, etc.)
- j) Innovating methods of teaching/training, matching programme contents with labour market needs
- k) Broadening mind-set and business ideas

	Titel		
	Surve		
Erstellt von	Untertitel		
Luigi Fabbris	Schoo	ROI MOB	
Status:	Dokumententyp	Sachgebiet / Stichwort / Bezugnahme	
Datei:	Draft	WP5	

- I) Enhancing reputation/brand
- m) Improving international collaboration
- n) Improving collaboration with local stakeholders
- E7.* And which are the **three** aspects that least apply to your School/Centre experience?

(Programmer: same as E6 but those selected in E6)

E8.* Now, please, consider the following benefits you pinpointed as very relevant from hosting participants in mobility. Which is the **most relevant** to you?

[most relevant]

E9*. And among the three aspects you selected as lesser relevant, which is the **least relevant** to you?

[least relevant]

E10. All in all, how much do you feel that hosting participants is worth the effort?

Minimum=① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩=Maximum

E. Evaluation of possible returns (to everybody)

E11. Finally, which are the categories of possible recipients that get the highest benefits and the ones that get the lowest ones from Erasmus+ mobility? Please, order the categories from 1 (highest) to 5 (lowest benefits)

Category	Order
Students/apprentices	
Schools and training centres	
Companies (both sending and hosting)	
Labour market	
The European Union as an institution	

F. Closing suggestions

F1. Our	questions	are over.	Would you	ı mind addi	ng some si	uggestions fo	r EU
schools	or training	centres,	about how	to improve	and make	international	mobility
easier?							

F2. Would you like to receive the final report (computer file) collecting findings from this survey? If so, please provide us a valid e-mail address.

Thank you very much for your kind collaboration.