



Foundation for the Development
of the Education System

Find your way to education with us



frse.org.pl



Co-funded by
the European Union



Ministry of Science and Higher Education
Republic of Poland



Ministry of National Education
Republic of Poland

REPORT

➤ Conference “Dialogue on the Future of Education and International Cooperation – Practitioners’ Viewpoints on the 2028–2034 Perspective: Nationwide Meeting of Erasmus+ and European Solidarity Corps Beneficiaries”

➤ Poznań, 4 June 2025



Foundation for the Development
of the Education System

On 4 June 2025, a nationwide conference was held in Poznań to discuss the future shape of the Erasmus+ programme and the European Solidarity Corps within the 2028–2034 perspective. The event was organised by the Polish National Agency for both initiatives – the Foundation for the Development of the Education System (FRSE). For years, both programmes have played a symbolic role in international educational cooperation, enabling professional and personal development as well as the exchange of best practices. The future of these programmes holds great opportunities, but also challenges. The aim of the conference was to set the direction for the further development of Erasmus+ and the European Solidarity Corps, and to ensure they are better aligned with the needs of a changing world, so that they become even more innovative and accessible to all.

The Erasmus+ programme and the European Solidarity Corps encompass more than education – they offer an opportunity to develop the skills of the future, discover new possibilities, and build intercultural bridges. Every participant contributes to the programme and, at the same time, becomes an ambassador of the changes that are shaping a Europe founded on knowledge, cooperation, and engagement.

The conference brought together a large group of Beneficiaries: practitioners and experts involved in the Erasmus+ programme and the European Solidarity Corps, including representatives of universities, schools, public institutions and local authorities, as well as non-governmental organisations, informal groups, and community-based educational initiatives.

The voices of Beneficiaries representing all fields of education, interactive workshops with stakeholders, and joint reflection on the recommendations of the community were central to the event. For the first time, a consultation meeting of such nature was held in Poland, with the aim of providing the National Agency staff with input that can be presented to the relevant authorities at both national and European levels.



Mirosław Marczewski,
Director General



Alina Prochasek,
Board Member



Tomasz Krześniak,
Deputy Director General



Sławomir Drelich,
Board Member

➤ Opening of the conference. Premises and expectations

The meeting was opened by prof. dr hab. Wojciech Sumelka, Vice-Rector for Research at Poznań University of Technology, who highlighted the apt choice of Poznań as the conference venue – a city with an exceptionally high number of students in relation to its population. He noted that Poznań University of Technology currently educates 14,000 students and nearly 500 doctoral candidates, and employs over 2,500 staff members. All of these groups actively engage in international exchange and cooperation, benefiting greatly from such involvement. The Vice-Rector emphasised that such activities are key to the university's dynamic development and contribute to Poznań University of Technology's strong position in rankings, particularly in terms of the number of candidates per place.

Next, Mirosław Marczewski, Director General of FRSE, took the floor and emphasised that although it is only 2025, preparations are already underway for the future – for the next phase of the Erasmus+ programme and the European Solidarity Corps, as well as the new EU perspective for 2028–2034. He pointed out that the conference organisers are determined to ensure that the Polish voice is clearly heard by the European Commission – not only as the position of policymakers or National Agency representatives, but above all as the voice of practitioners: the Beneficiaries of Erasmus+ and the European Solidarity Corps. In his opinion, it is these practitioners who, through their day-to-day work on projects, best understand the strengths and weaknesses of the programmes, and therefore know what is essential and what could be improved.

Mirosław Marczewski then reminded that Poland joined the programmes that now make up the integrated Erasmus+ programme – such as Leonardo da Vinci, Socrates, and Youth for Europe – as early as 1 March 1998. He emphasised that although Poland has been participating in the programme for 27 years, there are still areas that require improvement and further development. “The aim of today's conference is to develop solutions that will ensure that Erasmus+ is not an exclusive programme, but becomes even more accessible to everyone, including those with fewer opportunities who want to engage in international cooperation” – said Marczewski. He also raised the issue of programme funding, stressing the need to increase the resources allocated to their implementation, while pointing out the importance of considering the political context and the emergence of new areas financed from the EU budget, such as security.

The special guest of the event, representing the European Commission, was Michael Teutsch, Acting Director at the Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture. He referred to the exceptional timing of the conference in Poznań – during Polish Presidency of the Council of the European Union. As he noted, this presidency has featured numerous initiatives dedicated to education and social inclusion, and the discussions on the future of the Erasmus+ programme and the European Solidarity Corps are well aligned with this broader context of debate. Michael

Deutsch pointed to, among other things, the Informal Meeting of Directors of the Erasmus+ and European Solidarity Corps National Agencies, which took place in May 2025 in Sopot. During that meeting, key issues concerning the future of the programmes beyond 2027 were addressed. The Commission representative drew particular attention to the support for Ukrainian citizens provided through projects, highlighting the importance of these efforts in the context of Ukraine's path towards EU integration. He also stressed the need to educate and build a civil society that is resilient to threats, prepared to respond to change, and ready to defend democratic values.



➤ Panel Discussion: “Experiences and Practices in Erasmus+ and European Solidarity Corps Activities and the European Commission’s Future Financial Perspective”

The aim of the plenary session was to provide space for discussion on what could be improved in the next Erasmus+ programme and European Solidarity Corps perspective. The starting point for reflection was an assessment of the current state of these initiatives and an attempt to answer the question of what benefits internationalisation generates for Beneficiaries.

The discussion was moderated by dr Sławomir Drelich, a member of the FRSE Board. The debate featured representatives from various education fields, who shared their experiences and insights on the functioning of the programmes and their impact on the development of both – the institutions and the individual participants.

Anna Borysiak, Director of the Department for Strategy and Education Development at the Bydgoszcz Regional Education Authority (the only regional education authority in Poland that is a Beneficiary of the Erasmus+ programme), highlighted that short-term mobility in particular brings numerous benefits to staff in her organisation (school inspectors). Participation in the programme supports the development of language skills and helps overcome language barriers, enhances IT competences, and fosters greater openness to other cultures. She noted that for teachers, the benefits of taking part in the programme include discovering new, inspiring teaching methods that can be applied in everyday classroom practice, as well as the opportunity to learn about different education systems.

Prof. Mariusz Głąbowski, Vice-Rector for International Relations at Poznań University of Technology, highlighted the benefits that participation in the Erasmus+ programme brings to higher education institutions. He stressed that Erasmus+ is the foundation for the internationalisation of universities and is embedded in all their activities, not only in terms of staff and student mobility. The programme enables, among other things, the development of joint study offers involving lecturers from foreign universities and the implementation of international projects in student teams, which in turn fosters the development of soft skills that are particularly valuable at a technical university. Professor Głąbowski also emphasised the importance of Erasmus+ support for the European Universities Initiative (Poznań University of Technology acts as the leader in the EUNICE alliance). He also noted the growing interest in short-term mobilities among both staff and students. In his view, the high number of such mobilities has contributed to the integration of digital systems used by partner universities.

Aldona Okraszewska, Programme Director and Member of the Board of the Małopolska Chamber of Local Government Foundation in Kraków, highlighted the benefits of international exchanges from the perspective of the field of Adult Education. The Foundation, which holds an Erasmus+ Accreditation as part of a consortium, implements intensive mobility activities for adult educators and organises group trips for people over the age of 60 – most recently in cooperation with a partner from Spain. Okraszewska emphasised the great value of such exchanges both for educators, who acquire new skills, and for participants, who have the opportunity to experience cultural diversity. As she pointed out, such experiences are particularly important in the context of activating older adults and fostering openness and intercultural competences.

Kamila Lenczewska, Chair of the “Horizons” Centre for Intercultural Initiatives in Poznań, focused on European programme projects from the perspective of non-governmental organisations and volunteering. She emphasised that thanks to these programmes, Poles have become active participants in international activities and are able to represent the country abroad, sharing their knowledge and experience in an international setting.

Jakub Kalinowski, President of the V4Sport Foundation in Wrocław, highlighted the importance of international cooperation as a kind of “window to the world” in the context of activities carried out in the field of Sport. He pointed out that such cooperation allows for the discovery of new perspectives on sport – not only as a domain focused on performance, but also as a tool for supporting mental health and promoting education through physical activity. Kalinowski also mentioned that the V4Sport Foundation implements numerous projects aimed at integrating Ukrainian youth. He placed particular emphasis on the fact that, thanks to international cooperation, the Foundation has become one of the most innovative organisations in the sector, developing scalable solutions.

Dr Ewelina Iwanek, President of the Management Board and Director General of the OIC Poland Foundation in Lublin – a leading organisation in numerous fields (excluding Higher Education), particularly through cooperation partnerships – emphasised that the Erasmus+ programme has played a key role in the organisation’s development. It has enabled the creation of innovative solutions and original products that continue to be used in the foundation’s training offer for many years after the completion of projects. She referred, among other things, to the “European Academies” project, funded under the centralised actions of the Erasmus+ programme, in which the OIC Foundation is the only participant from Poland. As she added, it is thanks to the programme that the Foundation has grown dynamically, developing innovative tools to support entrepreneurs, adult learners, teachers, and students.

The second part of the panel discussion was devoted to the challenges and areas in need of improvement within the Erasmus+ programme and the European Solidarity Corps, as well as proposals for changes and potential directions for their development.

Professor Mariusz Głabowski drew attention to problems faced by the higher education institutions during the implementation of mobilities within the Erasmus+ programme. He pointed to administrative and bureaucratic difficulties that delay student departures for international exchanges. He also addressed issues related to the concept of European Degree and the European Degree Label for programmes launched by European Universities. In addition, he pointed to technical challenges, such as a complex mobility reporting process, limitations related to the POL-on system, lack of compatibility between systems within the Erasmus Without Paper initiative, and above all, difficulties in classifying courses according to ISCED codes and determining which can be recognised as equivalent in the systems of partner universities. Clarifying these issues would be crucial for the development of academic mobility, said Głabowski.

Kamila Lenczewska, speaking from the perspective of non-governmental organisations, raised the issue of not only cultural, but also generational differences among participants in European programmes. She suggested abolishing the division between youth and senior workers and emphasised the need to blur intergenerational boundaries among participants. During the discussion, strong calls were made for closer cross-sectoral cooperation and the reinstatement of adult volunteering, including opportunities for seniors.

Jakub Kalinowski raised the issue of project legacy. He pointed out that while valuable and innovative solutions are developed during project implementation, they are rarely used on a broader scale, especially at the national level. In his view, there is a lack of effective mechanisms and ideas for their continued implementation and scaling. Kalinowski noted that there is no bridge enabling the transfer of project outcomes into systemic solutions. Many participants in the discussion shared this view.

The plenary session was concluded by Jan Pałasz, President of the Board of the Polish Council of Youth Organisations (PROM) – an umbrella organisation bringing together youth NGOs whose mission is to foster genuine youth participation in social life. He presented modern tools that support the active involvement of young people in project and decision-making processes, such as a toolkit developed this year by several National Agencies as part of Training and Cooperation Activities (TCA), which guides users step by step through the entire project cycle, from design to implementation and evaluation. He also recommended the Youth Wiki website – the European encyclopedia of youth policy – as an inspiring and practical resource aimed at young people in Poland and across Europe. Finally, Pałasz encouraged participants to establish cooperation with youth councils, describing them as valuable partners in both local and international initiatives.

Workshop Sessions

The next part of the conference took the form of six parallel workshop sessions aimed at gathering recommendations from Beneficiaries across all fields regarding the new Erasmus+ programme and European Solidarity Corps perspective, with a view to forwarding them to the National Authority and the European Commission.

Mobility of pupils, young people, students, adult learners, teachers, educators and staff

Discussions focused on topics related to the mobility of project participants, which not only contributes to expanding knowledge, broadening horizons, and enhancing competences, but also supports the quality of education through the sharing of experiences, and builds social and intercultural understanding. Workshop participants emphasised that international cooperation plays an important role in addressing global challenges, strengthens European values, and fosters a sense of community and responsibility, which is especially important in times of crisis. The discussion also highlighted the role of mobility in creating space for innovation, in line with the open nature of the education of the future, as well as the need to develop support structures that, in addition to enabling geographical mobility, would encourage open thinking and institutional flexibility.

Workshop participants sought to answer the following questions: What should mobility look like in the next financial perspective? Is it worth keeping the Accreditation system, and if so, in what form? Which types of mobility (long-term, short-term, job shadowing) are worth further developing? Which groups face barriers in accessing the programme, and how can these be addressed? What actions should be taken to improve the accessibility of mobility opportunities?

Key recommendations included simplifying the rules of the Erasmus+ programme and limiting year-to-year changes within a given perspective. Participants advocated for a single Programme Guide covering the entire framework period, which was considered particularly important for the field of Higher Education.

The recommendations also included: involving as many organisations from the country as possible in the Erasmus+ programme, including participants with fewer opportunities (by eliminating barriers for these groups), ensuring high-quality mobility, and making full use of the potential of Accreditation. Participants also highlighted the shortcomings of the European Commission's IT tools for managing the Erasmus+ programme, as well as the complexity of funding rules in mobility projects, particularly in relation to Erasmus Accreditation (compared to Key Action 2). The need for proper project management in line with the programme rules was emphasised, along with the importance of taking the programme's horizontal priorities into account to the fullest extent possible. According to workshop participants, mobility projects should also respond to current and future challenges and ensure the greatest possible impact on participants, the organisation, and the recipients of the educational offer.

Participants highlighted the need for the European Commission to allocate greater funding to individual fields of the Erasmus+ programme under Key Action 1, as well as to introduce subsidies for hosting organisations (a proposal put forward in the fields of Adult Education and School Education). The recommendations also included reinstating mobility types such as study visits and senior volunteering, and maintaining long-term pupil mobility (rather than replacing it exclusively with short-term mobility). The issue of mutual recognition of learning outcomes was also raised, particularly in the context of long-term pupil mobility. Participants suggested using the Online Language Support (OLS) test as an effective tool for assessing the development of language competences. A proposal was also made to reintroduce the use of a unified Erasmus+



logo by Beneficiaries in promotional materials and documents. The importance of maintaining the programme's recognisability was especially emphasised by representatives of the field of Higher Education.

Within the field of Higher Education, a number of specific proposals for changes were submitted to simplify the rules for implementing and reporting mobility. These included: separating activities for Programme Countries and Partner Countries (avoiding the mixing of actions and their funding), ensuring that the responsibility for setting financial rules (e.g. for green travel or mobility of persons with disabilities) is not assigned to universities, removing the requirement for virtual mobility days in Erasmus+ traineeships, and either eliminating the five-day flexibility rule or allowing for the prolongation of funding after the end of the mobility. Numerous suggestions also concerned lump sums, including rounding up and increasing travel lump sums (while abolishing funding for travel days), and increasing the lump sum for green travel (while reducing it for the standard travel). A separate recommendation was made to provide greater support in finding accommodation for mobility participants.

Participants in the discussion emphasised the need to better promote the various forms of mobility (school trips, internships, traineeships, volunteering, etc.) aimed at people at different stages of education (such as youth exchanges, DiscoverEU, the European Solidarity Corps, and NGO-led initiatives like the "Erasmus in Schools" programme run by the Erasmus Student Network). They also highlighted the need to improve access to mobility for company staff in the field of Vocational Education and Training.

Addressing these recommendations could significantly facilitate mobility implementation for project coordinators and improve cooperation between the National Agency and governing bodies.



➤ Supporting Cooperation Partnerships

The discussions focused on supporting partnerships between educational institutions, the public and private sectors, and non-governmental organisations. The development of innovative educational initiatives that respond to real social and economic needs was highlighted as the key objective of implementing cooperation partnerships.

Workshop participants focused on three main issues: access to the programme and funding; priorities, evaluation criteria, and sectoral differences; and results, their value, and use. Areas requiring improvement, simplification and clarification were identified for each of these issues.

In terms of access to the programme and funding, participants pointed to difficulties in finding partners for Key Action 2, the insufficient budget available under Key Action 2 (particularly in Small-Scale Partnerships), and the continued unequal requirements regarding remuneration rates for project work, as reported by experts from different countries (despite the use of lump-sum funding). Concerns were also raised about the lack of appreciation for the work of project coordinators in beneficiary organisations (mainly in formal education), the lack of recognition of non-formal education within the education system, and the limited access for entities without legal personality (in the field of Youth). In the field of School Education, participants highlighted problems with the flow of financial resources and the refusal of governing authorities (Local Government Units) to allow subordinate public schools to take on the role of the project leader.

In the discussion on priorities, evaluation criteria, and sectoral differences, participants highlighted the omission of AI and physical activity from the horizontal priorities, as well as the absence of national priorities, which had been part of previous editions of the Erasmus+ programme. Concerns were also raised about the excessive number of unclear sectoral priorities and the unclear rules for assessing budget planning in the application evaluation criteria. Following the change in the funding model to lump sums, many applicants find it difficult to create action budgets or work packages, and the evaluation criteria for this aspect are not clearly defined.

During the discussions on programme results, participants emphasised the absence of a system for evaluating project results in terms of their effectiveness and quality of use, as well as the lack of a clear definition of innovation. Attention was drawn to the low cost-effectiveness of large-scale partnerships and the lack of a requirement to plan in detail how results will be used already at the application stage, especially for larger-scale projects. The generally insufficient use of results, despite their high cost, was also identified as a significant issue.

Workshop participants formulated the following recommendations for the further development of Cooperation Partnerships in the next financial perspective:

In the area of access to the programme and funding, it was recommended that preparatory visits under Key Action 2 be reinstated (similar to Key Action 1) and that mutual mobility activities carried out in partnership projects for staff and learners be included in statistical reporting. Participants also called for the reinstatement of school partnership projects and the creation of a clear pathway for collaboration between schools and other educational institutions in the fields of School Education and VET. The need to establish and support specialised units for project implementation within Local Government Units and other organisations was highlighted. Some stakeholders also recommended changing the method of transferring funds to public schools under the jurisdiction of Local Government Units.

Other important recommendations concerning Key Action 2 included calls to eliminate unfair practices (such as so-called project factories), as well as to further limit the maximum number of applications submitted by a single institution per year or per call across different fields. It was also proposed that the right to submit applications be reserved for institutions with documented activity in the relevant area (e.g. in the field of Sport or Adult Education). In addition, the discussion highlighted the importance of investing in human capital, particularly in the context of strengthening institutions' resilience to changes in leadership. Participants pointed that the role of educators and project coordinators needs to be appreciated, and that the continuity of institutional knowledge in the implementation of projects should be ensured.

Proposed changes related to priorities, evaluation criteria, and sectoral differences included considering the inclusion of the specific role of AI in the horizontal priorities (currently, they only



cover digital transformation) and highlighting physical activity as a factor supporting the programme's objectives. Participants pointed to the need to formulate two or three clear sector-specific priorities, to add one or two national priorities to partnership projects that reflect national policies, strategies, and needs (preferably those with the highest scores), and to develop a single short and user-friendly guide for applicants on how to construct a budget (instead of the three sources currently in place). Participants also suggested considering whether the weighting of evaluation criteria should vary depending on the field (currently, each criterion carries the same maximum score regardless of the field). Applicants would benefit from specific feedback from experts on the budget, clarifying what has been planned incorrectly and what should be improved in the future, as this aspect is currently not sufficiently addressed in the evaluation criteria. In the field of Higher Education, a change in the university evaluation system was proposed to promote the involvement of academic staff in various forms of educational cooperation projects, such as blended intensive programmes or initiatives under Key Action 2.

During the discussion on project results, participants called for the modernisation of the Erasmus+ Project Results Platform to improve the dissemination of project outcomes (especially in the case of Small-Scale Partnerships). They also proposed introducing new forms of funding (Key Actions) to support implementation projects and scaling-up activities. It was suggested that project applications should include a plan for the implementation of the results achieved (this mainly applies to large projects), with an appropriately planned budget and timeline. Participants noted that the Final Report currently focuses solely on a description of activities and recommended that it should include a separate section on the use of results and the assessment of learning outcomes. It was emphasised that activities related to the implementation and dissemination of results – understood not merely as presenting the materials produced, but above all as means of reaching potential users and teaching them how to use the results – should have a clearly defined place in projects and dedicated funding. It was noted that calls organised by the National Agency and the European Commission (e.g. EITA) should focus on promoting project results, not just the initiatives or ideas carried out within projects. Participants also stressed that National Agency should actively support the dissemination of project results, both in Poland and abroad.

➤ Priorities of the Erasmus+ Programme and the European Solidarity Corps: Experiences and Suggestions for the Future

The workshop session began with a discussion on the current priorities of the Erasmus+ programme and the European Solidarity Corps, namely inclusion and diversity, digital transformation, environment and fight against climate change, and participation in democratic life. Data were presented on the popularity of these priorities among Polish Beneficiaries under Key Action 2 of the Erasmus+ programme, against data from across the EU. Participants emphasised the need to continue these priorities in the new programme perspective, highlighting the importance of continuity in actions.

During the discussion, participants analysed whether the current priorities are clear, necessary, and sufficiently precise. They considered which of them are the easiest and which the most difficult to implement in practice, and whether they are described in a way that supports project planning in the relevant programme documents (including the Erasmus+ Programme Guide and the European Solidarity Corps Programme Guide).



Participants highlighted the need to rephrase and clarify the priorities that were assessed as too vague and difficult to understand. The priority concerning participation in democratic life, although present in every field, was considered the least specific. It was suggested that this priority should be expanded to include topics such as digital hygiene and critical thinking, and, above all, that it explicitly address countering nationalism. Workshop participants also called for the introduction of a new, fifth priority focused on mental and physical wellbeing, encompassing, among other aspects, mental health, adaptability, and resilience in responding to crisis situations. As for the European Solidarity Corps, they suggested the need to increase European rotation – i.e. the dynamics and balance in the flow of participants between the countries participating in the programme.

Participants pointed to the need to develop national priorities and to make sectoral priorities optional. They also strongly emphasised the importance of promoting greater cross-sectoral cooperation in projects, particularly in the area of non-formal education.

A significant part of the discussion focused on the programme guides for both Erasmus+ and the European Solidarity Corps. Recommendations included improving their accessibility, simplifying the language used, and eliminating inconsistencies between language versions of the documents.

Participants highlighted the value of in-person meetings organised by the Foundation for the Development of the Education System, the InnHUB network, and the Regional Information Points. They stressed that these should not be replaced solely by webinars and online activities. The organisation of more cross-sectoral networking events aimed at programme Beneficiaries was proposed.

➤ Union of Skills, Preparedness Union Strategy, and Skills Development

The discussion focused on key components of the European Union's policies on skills development and explored the potential role of the Erasmus+ Programme and the European Solidarity Corps in supporting these components. Participants reviewed EU initiatives that respond to today's educational challenges. In the 2028-2034 perspective, it will be essential to address the Union of Skills, where skills development becomes the foundation of competitiveness, social cohesion, and readiness for future generations, as well as the Preparedness Union Strategy, which aims at enabling fast and effective responses through the development of competences, resources, and shared mechanisms – readiness for change, crisis management, and social transformation. Workshop participants explored how Erasmus+ and the European Solidarity Corps should support education under the Union of Skills and the Preparedness Union Strategy, and how to make it easier for Beneficiaries to implement the objectives of these initiatives. They also discussed how to build cross-sectoral partnerships to help deliver on the goals of both strategies.

Workshop participants primarily called for the reintroduction of volunteering opportunities for adults over the age of 30, in a format that would support the development of adaptability and crisis response skills. They highlighted the need to incorporate elements such as survival training, civil defence, and first aid. This type of activity would combine skills development with the strengthening of both physical and mental resilience.

The need to integrate psychophysical education with elements of digitalisation and to promote active outdoor learning as an alternative to traditional training in conference settings was strongly emphasised.

Attention was given to the need to support actions that prepare individuals and institutions for crisis situations. Participants highlighted the educational potential of training in how to respond to sudden and extreme events (such as blackouts), which aligns with the broader context of developing micro-credentials and acquiring essential life skills.

They also pointed to the lack of a conscious needs assessment and full-scale evaluation of projects carried out under the Erasmus+ programme. They stressed that it not only hinders effective preparation for implementing activities, but also impairs the assessment of their outcomes and the planning of future personal and professional development. Particular attention was paid to the importance of self-evaluation after completing mobility.

It was also suggested that the implementation of initiatives such as the Union of Skills and the Preparedness Union requires systemic reform and top-down action. Only such an approach can give appropriate weight to areas such as environmental education or preparing society

to respond to global challenges. It was proposed that GreenComp (the European sustainability competence framework) and the Union of Skills be recognised and promoted by institutions (schools, universities, educational organisations) as official and recommended reference points for shaping educational programmes and development activities.

The importance of scalable projects was also highlighted, along with the need to support innovative initiatives through appropriate funding (grants). A recommended approach involved testing solutions through small pilot projects, followed by their systematic implementation on a larger scale. This requires increased financial resources, an effective scaling mechanism, and ongoing monitoring of outcomes.

To conclude the discussion, participants recommended to develop a network of contacts through dedicated meetings aimed at exchanging experiences, sharing good practices, motivating one another, and generating new ideas for future projects.



Cross-sectoral cooperation

The discussion began with an attempt to define the concept of cross-sectoral cooperation. Workshop participants unanimously agreed that the term has not yet been clearly defined and is often interpreted in different ways – does it refer to cooperation between partner institutions within a project, cooperation between the educational fields of the Erasmus+ programme, or both at the same time?

It was emphasised that cross-sectoral cooperation most often arises in the context of Key Action 2, where partnerships are cross-sectoral by nature. In contrast, mobility under Key Action 1 rarely extends beyond a single field, which results in the creation of “sectoral bubbles” and significantly limits the exchange of knowledge, competences and experience between different areas. The current system does not encourage participation in cross-sectoral projects, as the application rules are not entirely clear.

It was recommended that cross-sectorality in projects should be recognised not only formally, i.e. through the involvement of organisations from different fields, but also at the level of target groups (e.g. school pupils and university students in a youth project). It was noted that Beneficiaries currently carrying out activities aimed at recipients from different fields often do not know which field to assign their project to. Therefore, clear and transparent rules for defining and presenting cross-sectorality need to be developed, along with changes to application forms that would enable applicants to describe and justify the cross-sectoral nature of their projects. This would help evaluating experts understand why the integration of fields in a given project is relevant. It was also suggested that application assessment criteria should award higher scores to projects involving cross-sectoral participant groups, even if they are formally carried out within a single field. Furthermore, the introduction of flexible budget models in actions such as the European Solidarity Corps was proposed to accommodate complex, cross-sectoral projects.

Another proposal was to allow for the continuation of projects in different fields (as a separate action with its own budget or via transfer, e.g. to the European Solidarity Corps) and to enable the scaling and multiplying of already developed project results across fields (rather than starting from scratch). According to the participants, the creation of a dedicated cross-sectoral action would help avoid ambiguity and simplify the application process.

Attendees also highlighted the need for training for experts and National Agency staff to help them better understand the specific nature of cross-sectoral projects, as well as for clear communication at the national level to convey that cross-sectorality is not only allowed, but also encouraged. They also highlighted the need for training on accounting and administration regulations to help to adapt the internal regulations of Local Government Units and universities. A strong call was made for greater integration between formal and non-formal education.

➤ Facilitations and Technical Changes in the Erasmus+ Programme and the European Solidarity Corps

The session included a reminder of how the European Commission's systems operate, including the Application Forms platform, the Beneficiary Module, and accompanying systems, as well as the OnLine FRSE system.

Participants highlighted the need to adapt tools and systems to be more user-friendly and intuitive, in line with accessibility standards. The discussion on technical improvements for the upcoming Erasmus+ Programme and European Solidarity Corps perspective resulted in five key recommendations:

- 1.** Ensuring that all programme websites comply with accessibility standards, making them intuitive and user-friendly for everyone (including persons with disabilities) regardless of age or device used.
- 2.** Creating a knowledge base to support project implementation from application submission to final reporting. This resource should clearly indicate which system to use at each stage of the project and highlight key information to consider. The aim is to simplify project management processes and ensure continuity and stability of results.
- 3.** Sector-level technical improvements to the systems of the European Commission and the Foundation for the Development of the Education System that allow for various enhancements, such as the ability to personalise messages and apply more advanced filters for universities and other entities. Filtering should allow searches based on multiple criteria simultaneously, including language, country, and both Polish and English names. This also applies to the Erasmus+ Project Results Platform, which should make it possible to search for good practices by topic, not just by specific project data.
- 4.** Improving compatibility and streamlining data migration between Polish systems operated by the National Agency and European Commission systems – e.g. by enhancing integration between the OnLine FRSE system and the Beneficiary Module in order to avoid the need to repeatedly enter the same data across different platforms.
- 5.** Improving communication regarding the publication of call results and updates in the systems – so that individuals responsible for specific actions or fields can quickly and efficiently share information about updates and changes in the European Commission's systems.

Conclusions

The conference concluded by highlighting the importance of the Erasmus+ programme and the European Solidarity Corps as key initiatives shaping the future of Europe. Attention was drawn to Poland's 27-year participation in the Erasmus+ programme, which stands as evidence of the country's lasting commitment to the development of international educational and social cooperation.

The presence of representatives from all fields during the event reflected their active involvement and shared commitment to improving these programmes. As Mirosław Marczewski, Director General of the Foundation for the Development of the Education System – the National Agency for the Erasmus+ Programme and the European Solidarity Corps – emphasised: “We are not aiming for a revolution, but for evolution”, pointing out that Polish approach is based on supporting gradual and thoughtful development of EU initiatives.

The recommendations gathered during the conference will be submitted to the National Authority and the European Commission as proposals for further improvement of the programmes in the 2028–2034 perspective.

The main partner of the conference was Poznań University of Technology.



POZNAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
