

## **Summary of the results of the Open Public Consultation (OPC) on the midterm evaluation of the Erasmus+ programme**

This is a summary of the [synopsis report](#) presenting the results of the **[Open Public Consultation \(OPC\) on the midterm evaluation of the Erasmus+ programme](#)** which was conducted by the European Commission from 28 February to 31 May 2017. The objective of the consultation was to gather the opinions of various stakeholders, and the general public, to help assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and added value of the programme. The consultation also covers the Erasmus+ predecessor's programmes (e.g. Lifelong Learning, Youth in Action, Erasmus Mundus, etc.) and contains forward looking questions regarding a possible successor programme to Erasmus+ after 2020.<sup>1</sup>

In total **1800 responses** to the OPC were analysed, including all complete responses (n=1,219) and partial responses when a considerable portion of the survey had been answered (n=581). Alongside the results of the survey, this synopsis report also presents reviews of the **34 position papers** submitted by the OPC respondents on-line.

In total 53% replied as individuals in their personal **capacities**, while 47% replied on behalf of an organisation/institution. 59% of the former indicated that they were a practitioner, while 29% said that they were a learner. Most respondents indicated that they are primarily active in the education area (57% in the higher education sector), while the youth (13%) and sport areas (3%) were less represented, although somehow in proportion to their share in the budget.

The majority of the OPC survey respondents (59%) thought that the current Erasmus+ **objectives are extremely relevant to the current challenges and needs** within education, training, youth and sport, although some objectives were perceived to be notably more relevant than others (from developing the skills and competences of individual learners (73%); or promoting the European dimension of education and youth activities (70%); to supporting policy reforms at national level (44%) or tackling cross-border threats to the integrity of sport, promoting good governance in sport and dual careers of athletes as well as promoting sport for all (33% of respondents). Most papers highlighted that Erasmus+ is one of the EU's most successful programmes and that it remains highly relevant.

Almost all survey respondents agreed that **Erasmus+ is well aligned with EU policies and priorities**. 71% of respondents thought that as a whole, the programme is **achieving its objectives to a 'very large' or 'large' extent**. The most successful objective of the programme, according to respondents, has been developing the skills and competences of individual learners. Compared to the predecessor programmes, the programme has increased systemic impact (88%), is providing more opportunities for cooperation partnerships in a given sector and has strengthened cooperation across the sectors through the integration of education, training, sports and youth sectors into one single programme (80%). Position papers show that Erasmus+ is considered less effective in using the full potential of its alumni network and promoting the programme effectively to reach all its target groups.

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/resources/consultations/erasmus-plus-mid-term-evaluation-2017\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/resources/consultations/erasmus-plus-mid-term-evaluation-2017_en)

Overall an overwhelming majority of respondents believe that the Erasmus+ Programme does have **added value** compared to other levels of intervention. 96% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the Erasmus+ Programme is funding **activities which would not have been funded otherwise**. Further, 91% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that lessons learnt from the Erasmus+ actions (which they were most aware of) are being disseminated (applied elsewhere).

Overall, the Erasmus+ programme is seen as **largely coherent**. 80% of respondents believed that Erasmus+ **does not overlap with other funding** opportunities, compared to 3% of respondents who believed it ‘fully overlaps’. However, most of the others specified that even if there is a partial overlap, Erasmus+ is still very much required either due to: a lack of funding even with the overlap, different objectives of the funding even when targeted at the same beneficiaries or differences in geographical areas covered. Papers highlighted the satisfactory integration provided by the new structure of Erasmus+, while stressing the need to promote further synergies in specific areas.

The respondents on average believe that **Erasmus+ is efficient**. 91% of respondents who expressed an opinion agreed that **transnational learning mobility of individuals is cost effective**. 80% agreed or strongly agreed that the current distribution of Erasmus+ programme management between centralised (European Agency EACEA) and decentralised (National Agencies) is effective and 71% that the budget distribution is appropriate between the three Key Actions of the programme (i.e. learning mobility of individuals, cooperation between organisations and support for policy reform). A significant number of respondents who did not agree suggested allocating more funding to cooperation for innovation and exchange of good practices.

92% of respondents who had indicated that they had detailed knowledge of the Erasmus+ agreed or strongly agreed that **the digitalisation of Erasmus+ is a progress**. In contrast only 60% agreed or strongly agreed that the management of the Erasmus+ programme has been effectively simplified for them. According to most opinion papers despite the EC’s attempts to reduce the administrative burden, the end-users and participation organisations are still facing unnecessarily complex administrative procedures, which **discourage less experienced, smaller organisations**.

The following table shows the opinion of respondents from the **sectoral perspectives**. Erasmus+ is believed to be coherent from the perspective of all sectors. Even though respondents believe that the programme is relevant and coherent, some differences can be found in several sectors. However, the evaluation criterion which received most negative feedback is efficiency as only respondents from the Jean Monnet sector believe the volume of funding is appropriate compared to the programme expectations. Respondents from all the other sectors see the programme overall (or their strand specifically) as underfunded.

	School Educ.	VET	Higher Educ.	HE Intern.	Adult Educ.	Youth	Sport*	Jean Monnet
Relevance (% of respondents who agree that E+ objectives are extremely <b>relevant</b> )								
Coherence (% of respondents who believe that the programme is <b>coherent</b> )								
Effectiveness (% of respondents who agree that E+ is <b>effective</b> in achieving its objectives)								
Efficiency (% of respondents who agree that the programme receives <b>sufficient funds</b> )								

Source: ICF/OPC, \*in the sport sector the number of responses is low, the results are not robust. Legend: 0-40%= red, 40%-60%= orange, 60%-100%= green

As regards the **future programme**, the respondents overall share opinion that the programme is important and should be kept into the next programming period. 79% indicated that in their view there are no other priorities that the Erasmus+ programme should be addressing. The most frequently suggested types of future actions included short-term mobility (outside higher education) or activities fostering inclusion. A large majority of the respondents (73%) are of the opinion that education, training, youth and sport **need to receive more EU funding** than currently during the next planning period. Some of the activities targeted at socially disadvantaged people would not receive adequate funding and the budget available per world region would not always be consistent with the demand for cooperation with partner countries. More than 75% of respondents believe that **most of the measures should be kept in the future programme**, and less than 5% believe they should be dropped. Strongest support was noted for all Key Action 1 (mobility) and most of Key Action 2 (cooperation) as well as support to policy reform as part of Key Action 3.

The results of the consultation have been taken into account by the Commission in the [mid-term evaluation report](#) on the Erasmus+ programme, including the evaluation of the long-term impact of its predecessor programmes, submitted pursuant to Article 21 of Regulation (EU) No 1288/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council<sup>2</sup> and accompanied by a [staff working document](#) (SWD) presenting all evidence<sup>3</sup>. The evaluation builds also on national reports submitted by the programme countries, an evaluation report by an external independent contractor, other reviewed studies, experience in managing the programme, and **over a million responses from all interested parties surveyed**<sup>4</sup>. The Commission report makes proposals to adjust the implementation of the current programme to help reach its full potential by 2020, and considers suggestions for improvements with a view to a successor programme. The results of the full evaluation are published at : [http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/resources/documents/evaluations\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/resources/documents/evaluations_en)

<sup>2</sup> OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 50

<sup>3</sup> [COM\(2018\)50](#) and [SWD\(2018\)40](#) of 31 January 2018

<sup>4</sup> For other types of collection of stakeholder views, see annex 2 of [SWD\(2018\)40](#).