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Introduction

The present paper is the second of three short papers developed by the ALISIOS Project (Academic Links and Strategies for the Internationalisation of the Higher Education Sector), intended to enhance mutual understanding of European and Brazilian higher education environments and the conditions for internationalisation and mobility. All three papers in the series focus, to a different extent, on the articulation of internationalisation strategies in the areas of education, research, innovation and technology development. They reference the EU-Brazil Strategic Partnership Policies and Action Plans as a back drop, to better frame the policy context.

ALISIOS is an Erasmus Mundus Action 3 project carried out by eight EU and Brazilian partners: University of Coimbra (coordinator), Campus France, the European University Association (EUA), Foundation of Portuguese Universities (FUP), University of Bologna, Association of Brazilian Higher Education Offices for International Relations (FAUBAI), Coimbra Group of Brazilian Universities (GCUB) and Institute Brazil-Europe of the University of Sao Paulo (IBE-USP). These organisations and institutions are deeply involved in internationalisation of higher education and research and have a wide range of expertise in mobility programmes, institutional development strategies and higher education (HE) policy development.

The overall objective of the project is to create better synergies between the EU policy dialogue with Brazil and academic cooperation projects and activities currently underway with European and Brazilian support. More specifically, ALISIOS tries to explore the opportunities created by the Science without Borders (SwB) programme, to identify good practice and lessons learnt for other funding programmes, to enhance their impact and, in particular, to trigger inter-institutional partnerships. By doing so, the project contributes to the development of EU-Brazil partnerships for academic cooperation, research and innovation.
Objectives of the Paper

The aim of this paper is to provide an overview of internationalisation strategy development trends at the institutional, national and – where relevant - regional level in Europe and Brazil. The paper will start with a scan of internationalisation trends in Europe (at regional, national and institutional level) and then present how they are reflected in the Brazilian context, mainly in terms of national strategic priorities and funding programmes. It will then look in particular at the impact of the Science without Borders programme – a major focus of ALISIOS - on European institutions regarding their internationalisation perspectives, citing the results of a recent survey conducted by the ALISIOS project. It will finish by presenting questions for a continued discussion among practitioners and at policy level between Brazil and Europe.

Internationalisation strategy trends in Europe

In Europe, HE internationalisation is seen as inevitable, namely due to globalisation, interconnectivity, burgeoning student mobility flows and the growth of ICT in educational delivery. But it is also viewed as a process that requires strategic channelling and harnessing, hence the recent proliferation of ‘internationalisation strategy development’, the topic of this paper. What is noteworthy in Europe, however, is that the internationalisation spoken of today stretches beyond pure academic mobility and is encompassing higher education system development more generally. As such, it has become a transversal issue: physical academic mobility of varying types is not only seen as benefiting students and academic staff, but potentially (and also essentially) a number of stakeholders in the academic and business community – students, staff, faculties, institutions, employers, economies, etc. Mobility is not synonymous with internationalisation anymore; it is rather an acknowledged vehicle for an internationalisation that should benefit the local and global community in a much broader and more complex way.

As a result of this, most European universities have developed comprehensive internationalisation strategies and are in the process of implementing them. This entails drawing up indicators for internationalising teaching and research and considering different modes for international engagement, whether it be through strategic partnerships, joint programmes, MOOCs\(^1\) or international staff recruitment. Internationalisation has also grown in importance in the eyes of institutional leadership, as demonstrated by successive institutional surveys that the EUA has conducted (see TRENDS 2010 and TRENDS 2015 (forthcoming)\(^2\)), and is impacting practically all areas of higher education and research development.

In addition, many European governments are setting targets for student mobility, student/staff recruitment and international research, linked to a number of ambitions, whether they be attracting talent, higher education and research excellence or training domestic students to tackle global challenges.

Institutional and national efforts are further underpinned and in some cases inspired by European integration processes: the ‘Europeanisation’ and broader internationalisation of the

---

\(^1\) Massive Open Online Courses

HE sector is intrinsic to the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), driven by the 47 countries of the Bologna Process. While the European Union is party to this process, it also engages its 28 member states in a parallel process of higher education modernisation, defined by policy objectives and programme funding, and drives the European Research Area (ERA). Both areas of EU investment are highlighted in EU2020, the EU growth strategy for this decade, aimed at enhancing international competitiveness and consolidating the common European labour market. Free movement of people and labour in particular are contingent upon the recognition of qualifications across borders as well as the linguistic and intercultural prowess of the young generation, hence the attention given to European education mobility programmes and European higher education collaboration in general.

The sections below further elaborate how the three levels of European HE internationalisation – European, national, and institutional – interrelate.

**Impact of European/EU policy and European funding programmes for internationalisation**

It is difficult to discuss internationalisation trends in the European context without referring to the impact of both the Bologna Process and the European Union agenda, which are distinct yet interrelated. The Bologna Process is a formal yet voluntary intergovernmental process which now includes 47 countries, as mentioned previously, and shapes the EHEA. Since its launch in 1999, its main objectives have been the modernisation and harmonisation of European higher education, namely through comparable degree structures, student-centred learning, a European credit transfer and accumulation system (ECTS) and other related tools for cross-border recognition of studies, a common quality assurance framework (embodied in the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance), and various other action lines through which governments and stakeholder organisations in the HE sector compare and relate their policies. Notably, the Bologna Process also prioritises the internationalisation of the European higher education sector, in addition to and in light of fact that many facets of internationalisation (such as mobility and recognition of degrees abroad) are inherent to Bologna as such. This is articulated in ‘The EHEA in a Global Setting’, a distinct Bologna Process strategy that, since 2007, has framed the discussions regarding the global impacts of the Bologna Process and the need to more broadly internationalise the HE sector. This strategy has inspired subsequent targets for student mobility in the EHEA, and the examination/comparison of national policies and programmes for internationalisation more generally.

On the side of the European Union, which currently supports higher education development through its aforementioned ‘Modernisation Agenda’ and the strategy framework of EU2020, the impacts on HE internationalisation are also discernible. Note that the EU is party to the Bologna Process, participates in its governance, and provides numerous funding opportunities that advance its priorities. The EU also has its own ‘Open Method of Coordination’, through which the 28 member states are benchmarked in the education sector, amongst others. One could argue that the EU higher education related funding programmes demonstrate the effectiveness of European ‘soft policy’ in the European HE landscape. While internationalisation, whether it be in terms of student mobility, international recruitment, institutional partnerships or otherwise, happens on many levels, independent of the EU, the programmes and structures that the EU has financed have been a catalyst for many higher education institutions in ‘institutionalising’

---

3 Note that the first ALISIOS short paper has provided an overview of the Bologna Process and its working methods: http://alisios-project.eu/files/pdf/ALISIOS-Short-Paper1_web.pdf


5 http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/education_training_youth/lifelong_learning/ef0030_en.htm
internationalisation. For example, the Erasmus programme, launched in 1989, sparked a need for institutions to develop international mobility offices, which in many cases today have become centralised offices for internationalisation dealing with a range of matters. It should be noted that to be eligible for the Erasmus programme, institutions must have an Erasmus Charter, which commits them to a number of structural and procedural levers for internationalisation: mobility quality tools, support services for international students and even the notion that mobility should be embedded in a dedicated internationalisation strategy.\(^6\) As another example, though joint and collaborative study programmes were developing in Europe prior to the popular programme Erasmus Mundus \(^7\) (and were also acknowledged in the Bologna Process as an important contribution to building the EHEA), Erasmus Mundus provided a funding incentive and also a framework to discuss and build such programmes. Finally, EU co-funded projects under the former Lifelong Learning Programme - now the Erasmus+ programme - incentivise European and international institutions to develop joint initiatives, whether it be 'quality tools' for mobility, tools to map mobility \(^8\) or agreeing to guidelines and standards and best practices in a number of areas.

Given this context, is there anything distinct about European internationalisation as such? This can be argued on various fronts, however one observation is that European internationalisation is more often than not premised on partnership. This is largely demonstrated by the way in which EU funding programmes are designed, as well as by the recent EU Strategy 'European Higher Education in the World' (2013)\(^9\) and the aforementioned 'EHEA in a Global Setting Strategy' of the Bologna Process, which both favour global partnerships, policy dialogue and even development cooperation in the HE sector as part of the European internationalisation process.

Notably, what has been initially conceived as 'European' programmes and tools for cooperation, such as ECTS, Erasmus and joint degrees, have increasingly 'gone global'. This is a reflection of the need to foster more globally-oriented partnerships for the overall enhancement and competitiveness of European higher education, and to underpin economic, foreign policy and social development objectives.

Also contributing to the European dimension of internationalisation, organisations like EUA, ENQA (European Association of Quality Assurance agencies), ESU (European Students’ Union) and EURASHE (European association of institutions of higher education) should be mentioned, as well as European university networks, like the Coimbra Group, UNICA – Network of universities in European capitals, Santander Group of Universities (SGROUP), Compostela Group, etc. They have increasingly developed international partnerships with non-EHEA organisations in other regions and have supported their membership to internationalise through partnership and policy dialogue. This deserves a mention, as they often contribute to both the governmental and institutional cooperation agendas in the HE sector. Projects have focused on a range of Bologna-related topics, such as quality assurance capacity development, supporting the development of qualifications frameworks, regional mobility and recognition, joint degrees and doctoral education. In general, the premise has been to share the European experience and European HE harmonisation tools but also to learn about developments in other systems and how they relate to Europe. Projects have also provided opportunities for policy dialogue, institutional networking and partnership development.

---


\(^{7}\) Developing Joint Masters Programmes for Europe: Results of the EUA Joint Masters Project, March 2002-January 2004

\(^{8}\) See LLP project ‘Erasmus Quality Tools’ (EMQT): [http://www.emqt.org/](http://www.emqt.org/)

\(^{9}\) Mapping Mobility of University Staff and Students (MAUNIMO)- Project carried out by EUA between 2010 and 2012 that developed a Mobility Mapping Tool for institutions: [http://maunimo.eu/](http://maunimo.eu/)

\(^{10}\) [http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/international-cooperation/world-education_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/international-cooperation/world-education_en.htm)
Trends in developing, implementing and monitoring strategies at the institutional level

As mentioned, at the institutional level, internationalisation strategy development is on the rise in Europe. A 2013 EUA survey on this topic\(^\text{11}\) demonstrated that 50% of the respondent institutions had an internationalisation strategy in place while an additional 30% were developing one. These strategies have purportedly had a strong impact on developing partnerships, sending students abroad, attracting students, sending staff abroad, attracting staff, offering more courses in English and developing joint programmes. In terms of priorities, while generally attracting students from abroad remains at the top (especially graduate students), European institutions also increasingly want to internationalise teaching and learning, provide students opportunities to go abroad and develop strategic partnerships.

The fourth edition of the IAU Internationalisation survey (2013)\(^\text{12}\), based on responses from 1400 institutions globally (and 600 from Europe), also confirms the growing trend in developing institutional internationalisation strategies (56% reported they have one) and, interestingly, outgoing mobility opportunities for students and international research collaboration were noted as the highest priority internationalisation activity. The study indicates a respective drop in the number of institutions that say they have a distinct strategy from previous years, which can likely be attributed to the fact that the concept of what a strategy is (a distinct plan with indicators and resources) has matured and that, in some cases, the international strategy is integrated into the general institutional strategic plan. This survey also confirms that internationalisation has grown in importance for university leadership, which EUA has also observed in its memberships activities.

While this article cannot map the diverse practices in European HE internationalisation, it aims to provide an indication of the current themes that are dominating European institutional strategy discussions, beyond traditional short-term student exchange (or ‘credit mobility’):

- **Comprehensive Internationalisation**: This is a popular term, not just in Europe but also globally (originally coined in the US), to precisely describe the more streamlined, systematic and strategic approaches to internationalisation that have emerged at the institutional level. It can mean coordinating the internal management of international-related activities, offices and objectives, streamlining various support units (for mobility and otherwise) and identifying synergies between the operations of different faculties and departments\(^\text{13}\). The different concepts below can all, in essence, be seen as part of comprehensive internationalisation.

- **Internationalisation at home**: A topic that receives a considerable amount of lip service, it is often associated with the ‘democratisation’ of internationalisation, as study abroad tends to benefit smaller student numbers and often the privileged (note that the Erasmus programme in Europe still only reaches 3% of the total European higher education student population). Internationalisation at home refers to a wide range of ways in which domestic students and staff without the possibility to physically move abroad get international exposure, whether it be through structured extracurricular activities with international students, ‘virtual mobility’, internationalising teaching methodologies, recruiting international staff, etc.

---


\(^\text{12}\) http://iau-aiu.net/content/iau-global-surveys

\(^\text{13}\) The term has been used by Hudzik, J. K., & McCarthy, J. (2012). Leading comprehensive internationalization: strategy and tactics for action. NAFSA.
Internationalisation through collaborative study programmes: As joint and collaborative international degree programmes have developed in Europe (in the context of the Bologna Process and via EU funding programmes), many institutions view them as a vehicle for internationalisation teaching and learning and consolidating international partnerships. Academics develop integrated curricula, incorporate mobility into the study plan and courses are even subject to ‘internationalised’ approaches to programme accreditation, where relevant. Recognition of study time abroad is implicit because studying in another institution is integral to the programme itself. European HEIs increasingly cite the need to grow the number of joint programmes they have in their international strategies.14

Internationalisation of graduate studies and doctoral studies: Relatedly, European universities are increasingly investing in internationalising graduate education. Collaborative doctoral programmes, for example, are deemed beneficial in rendering the content of such programmes internationally relevant, preparing graduates for international careers, generating research capacity and competing for academic talent. European universities need viable partners in all parts of the world, and collaborative masters and doctoral programmes are vehicles for connecting teaching and learning.15 Internationalising graduate education through collaborative programmes has thus become a key feature of international strategies.16

Strategic partnerships: Also to some extent a ‘catch-all’ phrase, strategic partnerships are characterised by the fact the European universities are increasingly interested in building ‘comprehensive’ academic and industry related international partnerships that are transdisciplinary and highly active. They may entail student and staff exchange, joint research, joint programmes, collaborative projects, etc. What is essential is that the partnerships cross-cut different faculties, advance the central mission and strategic plan of the institution, entail a range of potential collaborative activities and have a longer-term perspective.

Digitalisation and ICT are growing on the internationalisation agenda. A recent EUA study (201417) which maps e-learning in Europe demonstrates that at most institutions, e-learning and MOOCs are not yet linked to internationalisation. Yet most institutions developing MOOCs believe them to be a way to enhance visibility and generate international collaboration. There is thus tremendous potential in this field; international strategies are starting to embrace the possibilities offered through digitalisation, ICT and e-learning and it is anticipated that strides will be made in this in the coming years.

“Professionalisation” of internationalisation staff: This is premised on the idea that staff – both academic and administrative – are of key importance for the success of the internationalisation process. For example, universities are starting to set targets for staff mobility and to differentiate their approaches to motivating academic and administrative staff to go abroad, as these two types of mobility may have distinct purposes. A recent project called ‘i-motion’ created a platform to centralise information about staff training events and help to organise job shadowing of university academic staff, particularly those engaged in managing internationalisation in Europe.18

---

14 In a 2013 membership consultation conducted by EUA on Internationalisation, 60% of the 180 institutional respondents reported that their international strategies had prioritised and helped them to develop joint degrees.
15 Affirmed by the EUA-led project CODOC: Cooperation on Doctoral Education between Europe, Africa, Latin America and Asia (2010-12)- Erasmus Mundus co-funded: http://www.eua.be/codoc.aspx
16 Affirmed by the FRINDOC project (2012-14) and research conducted by the EUA Council for Doctoral Education: http://www.eua.be/eua-projects/current-projects/FRINDOC.aspx
18 http://staffmobility.eu/
Erasmus+ programme, in its various actions, has opened up the possibility to embed staff exchanges in all projects.

- **Internationalisation metrics**: This topic has been tackled by a number a projects, funding initiatives and consultancy services striving to professionalise the way in which internationalisation is measured: projects of note are ‘IMPI – Indicators for mapping and profiling internationalisation’ \(^{19}\), the *Guide to Assessing the Quality of Internationalisation* \(^{20}\), produced by the European Consortium of Accreditation Agencies (ECA), and various institutional assessments and audits for internationalisation, such as that of the German Rectors’ Conference (HRK).

### Trends in national strategy development for higher education internationalisation

National policies and strategies for the internationalisation of the HE sector in Europe are also prevalent. The intention is often to provide a framework for university internationalisation, set objectives and benchmarks and channel investments. In some countries this is more targeted towards excellence and a limited number of institutions, whereas in other countries the strategies may be more comprehensive, attempting to engage all types of institutions in the internationalisation process.

It should be mentioned that the Bologna Process has given some impulse for this: the 2009 Leuven Communiqué committed countries to achieving 20% mobility by 2020 in the EHEA \(^{21}\). This launched a discussion on national benchmarks for mobility and internationalisation more generally. The recent ‘Bologna Implementation Report’ (forthcoming) - timed to be released in conjunction with the 2015 Bologna Ministerial Conference in Yerevan - cites a number of trends in national strategy development from countries of different shapes and sizes with different resource perspectives. For example:

- **The Danish Government** has launched in June 2013 a two-part action plan for increased internationalisation of the higher education institutions in Denmark. The first part \(^{22}\) of the action plan, ‘Enhanced insight through global outlook’, focuses primarily on the effort to strengthen the international competences of Danish students as well as the international learning environments at Danish higher education institutions. The goal is more students studying abroad, stronger international learning environments and better foreign language skills. To realise the vision, the first part of the action plan comprises 31 concrete initiatives, including a top-talent scholarship programme to which it will allocate DKK 25 million (2.68 million Euros) during 2015-2017.

- **The Netherlands** has recently launched its “Vision” \(^{23}\) on the International Dimension of higher education and VET. It is based on the analysis and recommendations of the universities of applied sciences and the Dutch research universities, and confirms the crucial need for the acquisition of knowledge, skills and professional competencies in the context of internationalisation. This vision commits to a scholarship programme of 5 million Euros to attract top talent every year, and will also aim to send 10,000 Dutch students abroad every year. These scholarships will be co-financed by the Dutch

\(^{19}\) [http://www.impi-project.eu]  
\(^{21}\) 20% of all students graduating in the EHEA should have been mobile by 2020  
Institutions. The vision also aims to improve the retention of top talent in the work force, improve information on study opportunities within the Netherlands and for Dutch students to study abroad and facilitate transnational education by easing regulations for delivering programmes abroad. Finally, it targets the internationalisation of the VET sector as an important factor in upscaling certain professions that require an international outlook (tourism, for example) and sets a benchmark for VET student mobility.

- **Ireland**: Cognisant of the fact that Ireland, as a small, open European economy, relies fundamentally on international engagement, the Irish Government's International Education Strategy 2010–15 outlines a range of targets and ten ‘strategic actions’ to build on these achievements, with the primary objective of ensuring that ‘Ireland will become internationally recognised and ranked as a world leader in the delivery of high-quality international education’. Among the strategic actions are 1) The Education Ireland brand will be redeveloped and national promotion and marketing will be strengthened, 2) Quality will be at the heart of Ireland’s international education offering, 3) Ireland’s visa, immigration and labour market access policies will be strong and competitive, 4) Outward mobility by Irish staff members and students will be encouraged 5) North–South and EU co-operation will enhance Ireland’s international education performance.

- **Flanders**: The Flemish Community of Belgium has recently launched a specific ‘mobility Strategy’ for the higher education sector. It sets the ambitious goal of sending one in every three students abroad for a mobility period (though allows institutions to set their own content specific targets). It also contains objectives and funding measures to support underprivileged students to study abroad.

- **Lithuania** is increasingly investing in branding itself as a destination for study. Of note, funds from the European Social Funds (ESF) have been committed to a project “Development of Internationalisation of Higher Education” (September 2010 – June 2015, 6.6 million Euros). This supports the development of a national portal (www.studyinlithuania.lt), Lithuanian university participation in educational fairs abroad, promotion events for international students, the development of promotional material for studying in Lithuania and additional scholarships for outgoing Erasmus students.

Spurring this development is not only the will of the academic community to internationalise teaching and learning, but the admittedly economically centric fact that international students and staff have economic impact. A number of national studies (UK, Netherlands, Germany, Denmark, France) have been released on the past three years, citing the economic impact of international students and subsequently making the argument for a) supporting university internationalisation and b) attempting to retain students and staff to contribute to the labour market. In many cases, visa restrictions and legislation have been lightened to support the hiring of international graduates. While ‘free-movers’ are also one source of international students, there has been a concerted rise in government supported/scholarship students. European countries have developed a variety of bi-lateral funding programmes dedicated to enhancing partnership between institutions. This has ranged from building large international research alliances to encouraging joint campuses and centres between domestic and emerging country HEIs. Below diverse examples are listed to illustrate this (though not comprehensively), notably of government funded partnership programmes, scholarship programmes, and joint programme incentives:

---

• As of September 2014, the United Kingdom launched the second application cycle of the Global Innovation Initiative (GII), a higher education grant competition created to strengthen higher education research partnerships between the United States, the United Kingdom and four other countries: Brazil, China, India, and Indonesia. This initiative provides grant opportunities for post-secondary educational partnerships on topics of global significance in the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM).

• France is also active in increasing HE partnerships on a bilateral basis. From this perspective, the main countries where concrete programmes have been launched are Algeria, Gabon, Malaysia, Iraq, Peru, Mexico, Argentina, Colombia and ‘Partnerships for excellence’ are further funded with the USA (“Tocqueville-Fulbright” chairs for example) and countries in Asia (like in South-Korea, Singapore, with support to university and scientific projects; or Taiwan and Japan, with pluri-disciplinary meetings for early-stage researchers). Generally speaking, partnerships involve an increasing focus on student mobility at master and doctoral levels mainly in scientific and technological fields.

• In Germany, there have been a number of initiatives to enhance partnership with non-EHEA institutions, specifically through joint-study programmes. ASEMUNDUS/Euro-Asia.net was a joint European project, coordinated by the DAAD, on promoting European-Asian joint study programmes and mobility partnerships (using the Erasmus Mundus programme as best practice). The DAAD has also financed Integrated International Double Degree Programmes between German institutions and institutions around the globe, providing additional scholarships for German students to participate in such programmes and undertake a credit-mobility abroad.

• Spain launched an excellence programme - ‘International Campus of Excellence’ (2009-2011) - where specific funding was allocated to establish strategic partnerships with foreign universities and centres of excellence worldwide, in countries like USA, China and in Latin America.

Internationalisation strategy trends in Brazil

Higher education policy trends

The growth in the global interest of higher education internationalisation has also strongly affected Brazilian politics. The boom in technological, economic and cultural globalisation has forced higher education actors to make various reforms and to enhance Brazil's international presence in education and research. Since the mid-90s, there have been a number of ground-breaking educational milestones, such as the new Law on Directory in Brazilian Education (Law # 9394/1996), establishing guidelines and entry criteria for all levels of education, and the Brazilian National Plan for Education (2014-2024), which sets goals for Brazilian education over a ten year period, including benchmarks for higher education.

The Brazilian National Plan on Education (2014-2024), launched in June 2014, presents important progress for Brazilian Higher Education policies, with commitments such as: increasing the number of undergraduate and graduate enrolments; growing the percentage of professors with Masters and Doctor Degrees in higher education institutions and increasing the portion of GDP assigned to education to 10% by 2020. Other objectives include tapering the private higher education enrolments (which have grown exponentially) and diminishing regional inequalities. The impact of this should be an expansion of public university vacancies, bringing the Brazilian federal education network deeper into non-urban areas, strengthening technological education and establishing the Federal Institutes of Education, Science and Technology (IFETs), improving student loan policies through new forms of funding, online education stimulation via Brazil's Open University (UAB) and fostering policies and programs to inclusion and affirmative actions (Speller, Robl & Meneghel, 2012).

It is also relevant to highlight the present importance given to evaluation processes (at institutional, course and student levels) to ensure quality in education, led by the Brazilian National System for the Evaluation of the Higher Education (SINAES).

An overview of internationalisation in Brazilian Higher Education

In Brazil's political scenery, especially in the last ten years, there have been numerous initiatives to bolster higher education internationalisation. It is important to emphasise that the internationalisation process in Brazil is linked to addressing the basic challenges in the higher education system: enhancing quality, expanding public education, democratic management, respect towards diversity and financial sustainability (UNESCO, CNE, MEC, 2012). Amongst Brazilian governmental agencies committed to such action are: the Foundation for the Coordination of Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES), linked to Brazilian Ministry of Education, the Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) and the Financing Agency for Studies and Projects (FINEP), both linked to the Brazilian Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTI).

In 2001, for example, CAPES funded a number of binational university partnerships, with the main goal of increasing the number of incoming undergraduate students, post-graduate students and professors. The partnerships promoted mutual recognition of studies in a number
of academic fields and joint curricular structures between institutions for specific courses. Some of the countries involved in this scheme were Germany, Argentina, Chile, China, Cuba, Spain, United States, France, the Netherlands, Italy, Portugal, East Timor, Uruguay, among others (Morosini, 2011).

In addition, one can observe a progressive growth in CAPES’ annual investment in scholarships and post-graduate study incentives in Brazil. In an eight-year period, the funding grew from USD 200,000 to USD 1,100,000. CAPES scholarship programmes enable academic mobility at all levels of higher education, including individual students and staff and research groups.

Graphic 1: Evolution in overseas scholarship granting in all levels

Some examples of specific CAPES programmes and initiatives are:

- Programme on Student Scientific Training for Cape Verde, Mozambique and Angola (CAPES/PIFC) – funding for projects conducted by Brazilian public universities for Cape Verde citizens to provide scientific training for undergraduate studies.
- Higher Studies School – aims at funding post-graduate studies at federal, state, confessional and community universities in order to nourish academic cooperation and international academic exchange.
- Capes Programme on Faculty Scholarships and Doctorates – Mercosul – promotes faculty exchange and training to contribute to the quality of teaching and the sustainable development in Mercosul countries.
- Student Programme – Undergraduate and Graduate Agreement (PEC-G and PEC-PG): offers scholarships to students from 55 African and Latin American countries for undergraduate and graduate studies at Brazilian universities.

CNPq is also an important actor in the field of international cooperation, supporting high quality research projects, researchers’ mobility and training, as well as human resources development. The main objective is to promote scientific and technological development in Brazil. Funding opportunities include: 1) initiating new collaboration through research professor mobility in the context of joint projects; 2) consolidating institutional partnerships; 3) coordinating collaboration within international networks; 4) structuring partnerships with virtual laboratories and associated international laboratories (Brazil, 2010).

CNPq’s priority is also to increase research with South America countries (PROSUL) and Africa (PRO-AFRICA), and to train foreign human resources in Brazil (PEC-PG, Agreement, CNPq/TWAS and CNPq-Mozambique Scholarship Programme). It promotes cooperation with

---

emerging countries and interaction with developing countries via joint programmes of P&amp;D (IBAS, Brazil-India-South Africa). Some of the programmes include:

- South America: South American Programme for the Support of Science and Technology Cooperation – PROSUL;
- Iberoamerica: Programme for Developing Iberoamerican Science and Technology – CYTED;
- Latin America, Caribbean, Africa, Asia: Student Programme – Undergraduate and Graduate Agreement (PEC-G and PEC-PG);
- Africa Cooperation Programme in Science and Technology – PROAFRICA;
- The World Academy of Sciences for the advancement of science in developing countries – TWAS

CNPq has agreements with institutions of Science and Technology/research councils in over 35 countries, including: Germany (DLR, DAAD and DFG), France (Campus France, CNRS, INRIA, IRD and INSERM), Spain (CSIC), Belgium (FNRS), USA (NSF), Argentina (CONICET), Chile (CONICYT), Colombia (COLCIENCIAS), Costa Rica (CONICIT), Cuba (MÉS and CITMA), Mexico (CONACYT), Slovenia (MHEST), Korea (KOSEF) and Finland (AKA).

Regarding the cooperation with the European Union, some examples of projects are:

- EULARINET - European Union – Latin American Research and Innovation Networks, funded by European Commission, focusing on industry and science;
- EULANEST - European – Latin American Network for Science and Technology, cooperation network with 8 funding agencies for Innovation and Development, coordinated by the Ministry of Education and Science, in Spain;
- APORTA – Science and Technology Access in Brazil (Acesso a Ciência e Tecnologia no Brasil), promotes opportunities for European scientists in research programmes in Brazil.

Science without Borders

In addition to the previously cited funding schemes for internationalising Brazilian higher education and research, the Brazilian government is currently channelling considerable investment into the Science without Borders Programme (SwB), which has impacted Brazilian institutions and students dramatically. Regulated by the Decree # 7.642, SwB is a joint effort of the Brazilian Ministry of Education (MEC) and the Brazilian Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTI), implemented by CAPES and CNPq.

SwB aims at promoting the consolidation, expansion and internationalisation of science, technology and innovation in Brazil, as well as Brazilian competitiveness via international exchange and mobility (CAPES, 201430). The programme envisages awarding 101,000 scholarships, with a continuum of nearly 25,000 annual students in the programme until 2016. The purpose is to maintain contact with diverse educational systems abroad, particularly those competitive in technology and innovation, to attract foreign students interested in partnerships with Brazilian researchers and to offer Brazilian researchers the opportunity to be trained abroad (MEC, 2013)31. The fields of study encompassed by SwB are: Engineering and other

technological areas; Sciences; Biology; Biomedicine and Health Sciences; Information Technology and Computing; Airspace Technology; Pharmacy; Sustainable Agriculture Production; Oil, Gas and Mineral Coal; Renewable Energies; Mineral Technologies; Biotechnology; Nanotechnology and New Materials; Biodiversity and Bioprospecting; Marine Science; Creative Industry (production and processes linked to innovation and technological development); New Technology in Construction Engineering; Technical Professional Training.

To the present day, 77,806 scholarships have already been granted according to the table below, primarily to undergraduate students. Note that ‘sandwich undergraduate’ refers to what is called in Europe ‘credit mobility’ or ‘short term mobility’, that is to say, mobility that is embedded in a study programme. This is similar for ‘sandwich doctorates’, whereby a doctoral student spends a portion of his/her PhD abroad, but receives the degree by the Brazilian institution only.

Table 1: Scholarship distribution by level of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th># of scholarships</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich undergraduate</td>
<td>61,534</td>
<td>79.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich Doctorate</td>
<td>7,792</td>
<td>10.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-doctorate</td>
<td>4,291</td>
<td>5.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Doctorate</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>3.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Young Scientist (in Brazil)</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters study abroad</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special visiting researcher (in Brazil)</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77,806</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to develop the programme, cooperation agreements have been established with countries in five continents, which establish how many students each country can receive. Each country then has a different way of managing the programme and identifying university placements.

In order to carry out SwB in Brazil, 566 Brazilian institutions were accredited, i.e. deemed eligible to send students abroad under the programme. Of those, 133 are public (23%), and 433 (77%) are private. Amongst the public higher education institutions, 67% are federal, 28% state-owned and just 5% municipal.

The Brazilian Southeast region accounts for the highest numbers in scholarships granted: *Universidade de São Paulo* (4,976), *Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais* (3,693) and *Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro* (2,729) are at the top. In the Brazilian Central-West region, *Universidade de Brasília* has granted 2,509 scholarships. In the Southern Region, *Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina* granted the greatest number: 2,366. The preparedness of students to go abroad (from a language and study perspective) as well as the capacity of the Brazilian institutions to support students to do so are factors impacting these statistics. The programme has triggered a national debate on Brazilian higher education internationalisation.
and, in particular, on the preparedness of Brazilian higher education institutions to promote and manage student mobility. It is anticipated that the allocated number of scholarships will not be awarded by the 2015 deadline, for example, and that more focus in the future will be placed on preparing students for a study abroad experience, promoting opportunities, and demonstrating the added value.

A mention should also be given to the programme Language without Borders (LwB), which was launched as a response to SwB in order to prepare more Brazilian students with language competencies to enable them to study abroad at foreign universities. The Brazilian Ministry of Education (MEC), jointly with the Higher Education Secretariat (Sesu) and CAPES, implement LwB. The programme is responsible for providing online and on campus English and French courses and proficiency tests.

SwB has also had a strong impact of higher education relations with Europe. Switzerland and 17 of the 28 EU member countries are associated with SwB: Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Netherlands, Norway, Ireland, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom. Until the 3rd trimester of 2015, 77,806 scholarships have been granted. Of those, 40,187 are aimed at placing Brazilian students in the EU. The United Kingdom is the second most desired destination after the USA. France, Germany, Spain, Portugal and Italy are also highly chosen by Brazilian students. Graphic 2 shows SwB most preferred countries32.

Graphic 2: Scholarship granted by destination country

---

In terms of prospects for the future, the Brazilian National Advisory Council proposed to implement an assessment of the SwB Programme in order to generate better information and data as a basis for improvement (MEC, 2013).

The Council, which consults numerous stakeholders such as university networks, has also made recommendations for the improvement and continuous development of the Programme. These include three main aspects:

- Programme design aspects: introduction of a quota for master’s degree students; give priority to CNPq researchers when selecting the scholarship grantees; scholarships for Brazilian domestic mobility; insertion of scholars in research groups after the mobility.

- Technical and structural aspects: undergraduate and graduate scholarship balance; decentralisation in selection (for universities with doctoral programmes); guides that aid partner countries and Brazilian institutional coordinators; identification of institutional representatives at hosting institutions; definition on the number of students per university.

- Academic aspects: improve candidate supervision; student language preparation; enhanced distribution of institutional coordinator per student.

It is believed that the Programme will gradually improve; follow-up of the students’ progress via meetings and visits to the hosting institutions are critical as it is the systematic evaluation of the Programme by students.

University networks and their contribution to internationalisation

Another form of international cooperation important for higher education Internationalisation in Brazil is university networking. Such cooperation is supported, for example, by the Brazilian Association for International Education (FAUBAI) and the Coimbra Group of Brazilian Universities (GCUB).

Founded in 1988, FAUBAI brings together more than 180 managers and other responsible parties for international affairs at higher education institutions. It promotes the training of international education managers through seminars, workshops and regional and national meetings. In addition, FAUBAI supports Brazilian HEIs to work together with funding agencies, diplomatic missions, and international organisations.

GCUB is a non-profit Brazilian university network. Founded in 2008, its mission is to promote internationalisation in its member universities through institutional cooperation, knowledge exchange and good practice exchange on higher education. Currently it is composed by 70 of the most prestigious Brazilian federal, state, confessional and community universities, spread over Brazil’s five regions.

GCUB maintains partnerships and projects that include mobility programmes, scholar training, faculty and research projects, international missions of rectors and other authorities related to higher education, and other policy events linked to university internationalisation.

With the EU, in particular, GCUB has the following programmes:
• International Graduation Programme (PLI): created by GCUB and funded by CAPES, it aims at quality improvement to enhance capacities of basic education teachers, through sandwich undergraduate mobility, leading to double major degrees, in seven areas: Chemistry, Physics, Mathematics, Biology, Portuguese Language, Arts, and Physical Education. On an international level, there are 12 Portuguese and 2 French universities. In Brazil, over 50 Brazilian universities take part in the Programme.

• GCUB maintains a partnership with the University of Manchester and CNPq, the Scholarship Programme for Full Doctorate and Sandwich Doctorate at the Faculty of Engineering and Physical Sciences. In this program, CNPq offers scholarships through SwB.

• Full Doctor’s Programme in Physics offers full scholarships to Brazilian students under the guidance of the Nobel Prize Winners in 2010 with studies on graphene.

• GCUB also has a partnership with the Coimbra Group (CG), composed by 40 European universities and the Network of Universities from the Capitals of Europe (UNICA), which congregates 46 universities. GCUB partnerships with these networks include joint projects on research, academic and scientific activities, faculty and student exchange programmes, creation and sharing of post-graduation programmes.

In conclusion, though large-scale mobility programmes have had a tremendous impact in launching an internationalisation debate in Brazil (on funding, mobility, student preparedness and institutional resources) many challenges lay ahead. For example, the SwB programme demonstrates that Brazilian universities need to flexibilise their curricula in order to be more internationally-oriented and to accommodate mobility periods. Language training must continue. Upscaling the training of PhDs must continue to be a priority. Brazilian policy reform must also facilitate recognition of study periods abroad and foreign qualifications. Finally, the impact of SwB in particular on Brazilian institutional internationalisation strategy development across the country must be better studied and discussed. University networks for internationalisation, such as those mentioned, as well as international projects such as ALISIOS, are critical for addressing these challenges.
The impacts of SwB on European HEIs: results of a survey

Given the sheer magnitude of the programme and the speed at which it was rolled out in 2011/12, it is clear that an immediate impact has been made on Brazilian undergraduates (in particular) studying and training abroad. CAPES, CNPq and the Brazilian higher education institutions are still making attempts to grasp this impact, particularly as the present government has promised a new funding phase. However, the impact has not been limited to Brazil. Different European agencies managing the programme for their countries and higher education institutions have also reported a considerable impact in Europe. For one, SwB is a very large scholarship programme that has, in the case of some institutions, more than quadrupled their intake of Brazilian students. Other institutions and countries in Europe had virtually no academic contact and student exchange with Brazil and are suddenly receiving comparatively large waves of students. Hungary, for example, has now welcomed more than 1800 students in two years, more than other European countries of similar size, and yet has little precedent of past Brazilian cooperation.

In order to better gauge these impacts, a survey was conducted between December 2014 and January 2015 in the context of the ALISIOS project. Its purpose was to propose a single survey to European universities across different countries and to gain a European perspective on the impacts of SwB. Some national agencies have already conducted institutional surveys, however, it was deemed of interest to have a cross-European comparative perspective.

219 institutions and 255 individuals replied from 15 countries with the highest number of responses coming from Germany, France and Ireland. When asked what their position was in the institution, 122 responded that they were a coordinator specifically for SwB, which demonstrates the high human resource investment that the programme has required in terms of managing mobility. In terms of numbers, less than 20% of the respondents claimed to receive 50-100 students from Brazil annually, 5% receive more than 150 and the majority (72%) less than 50 students. This was not correlated, however, with the number of students received in the past. 62% claimed that they became involved in the programme as a result of their internationalisation strategy while 44% said that it was rather a result of their national strategy for internationalisation and bi-lateral agreements with Brazil at national level.

One question that has been recurrent in ALISIOS is the extent to which SwB has triggered stronger inter-university cooperation (as opposed to just mobility flows). According to the survey, 35% have developed further partnerships as a result of the programme whereas 65% have not. 83% would like to develop more partnerships. Relatedly, 46% of the respondents state that learning agreements are in place for SwB mobility (something that would be mandatory in Erasmus and a tool that is deemed helpful for the recognition of studies) while 26% say that no learning agreements are in place. For the others, it is a mixed picture. Only 13% reported that 100% of their Brazilian students received recognition for their studies once they returned home. 65% reported that they had no information on this, which shows that the knowledge around study recognition is still opaque. In the open comments, some suggested that as they were receiving students from institutions with which they did not have partnerships, and thus limited communication, it was difficult to ensure the recognition of studies.
Regarding the management of the programme, half of the institutions seem to encounter similar challenges as with other mobility programmes, whereas 37% of the institutions perceive the management of the SwB programme as more challenging. The problems in the management are foremost attributed to issues with credit recognition, difficulties to find work placements, lack of or difficult communication with the home universities and insufficient language skills of the SwB students.

It is clear that from the European perspective, there has been an impact - both in terms of resources for and in terms of approach to internationalisation. Yet it is also clear that the potential is not yet realized. SwB should be leveraged to generate more inter-institutional partnerships in which the mobility may be embedded. This may enhance the recognition of the studies of the Brazilian students and have a longer-term impact on the institutions involved, opening up different frontiers of cooperation. It may also increase the flows of European students going to Brazil, which at this stage are limited.
Conclusions and follow-up for ALISIOS

Internationalisation is clearly a universal theme that is of strategic concern for both Europe and Brazil. In both regions, albeit at different paces, discussions on internationalisation have been enhanced by large mobility programmes, which provide a means for institutions to improve cooperation, recognition, student support services and other elements of the internationalisation process.

In Europe, while strategies for internationalisation take place at national levels and to some extent also at the level of the EU, which supports internationalisation through the Erasmus+ and the Horizon 2020 programmes, and in the Bologna Process, there is a whole realm to be explored with the wider world. The fact that not all European universities apply learning agreements to their exchanges with Brazilian universities under SwB is telling, particularly regarding the extent to which European cooperation and mobility tools are being used globally. There is great room for improvement. Projects like ALISIOS are thus important for drawing attention to the wider impact of programmes like SwB and Erasmus+, and for promoting the importance of internationalisation strategy development in the higher education sector in Europe and Brazil.
About ALISIOS

ALISIOS stands for Academic Links and Strategies for the Internationalisation of the HE Sector. It is a European Erasmus Mundus Action 3 project promoted by eight EU and Brazilian organisations deeply involved in academic internationalisation, with a wide range of expertise in mobility programmes, institutional strategy and HE policy development.

ALISIOS publications are freely available at www.alisios-project.eu.
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