



**European Commission**



**EVALUATION OF  
EU MOBILITY GRANT-AWARDING PROGRAMMES**

April 2002

**VOLUME 1 - FINAL REPORT**

**Prepared by**  
Dr. Pedro de Sousa  
Drs. Jolie Franke  
Dr. Arnold Spitta

**Consortium composed by**  
PARTICIP GmbH  
CIDEAL  
ECDPM  
IDC  
SEPIA

**For the**

**Lead Company:**  
PARTICIP GmbH  
Consultants for development &  
environment  
Hildastr. 66  
D - 79102 Freiburg  
Germany  
[www.particip.de](http://www.particip.de)

This report has been prepared by PARTICIP GmbH for the Commission of the European Communities. The authors accept sole responsibility for this report. The report does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Commission.

## List of acronyms and abbreviations

- ACP countries** – Africa, Caribbean and Pacific countries
- AIT** – Asian Institute of Technology
- ALA countries** – Asian and Latin American countries
- ALFA** – America Latina Formación Académica
- AL – INVEST** – EC funded investment promotion programme in Latin America
- ALURE** – Latin America Optimal Use of Energy Resources
- CAPES** – Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Ensino Superior
- CERAM** – Graduate School of Management and Technology
- CES** – Centre for European Studies
- CNPq** – Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico
- CONACyT** – Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología
- CUESP programme** - Chulalongkorn University European Studies programme
- DAAD** – German Academic Exchange Service
- ECTS** – European Credit Transfer System
- EDF** – European Development Fund
- ERASMUS** – European Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students
- EU** – European Union
- EC** – European Commission
- ESCP – EAP** – Graduate School of Management
- FAPESP** – Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo
- FVS** – Faculty of Veterinary Sciences
- MUA** – Ministry of University Affairs
- NCEA** – National Council for Evaluation and Accreditation
- NUFFIC** – Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education
- OECD** – Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
- ONEC** - National Education Commission
- PTS programme** - Postgraduate Technological Studies programme
- SADC** – Southern African Development Community
- SEAMEO** – Southeast Asian Ministers Organisation
- TAO** – Technical Assistance Office
- ToR** – Terms of Reference

# Executive summary

## A. Objectives and scope of the evaluation (p. 1)

This Final Report presents the main results of the evaluation<sup>1</sup> of selected EC mobility grant-awarding programmes.

The objective of this evaluation is to measure and compare the impact of EC support for mobility programmes between higher education institutions in the EU and their counterparts in Latin America, Asia and Africa. These exchanges are implemented within the framework of two different approaches: programmes awarding “free-movers” mobility grants (individual mobility) and programmes awarding mobility grants within intra-network exchanges (organised mobility within an interuniversity network exchange). The programmes selected for evaluation were: the ALFA Programme – European Union-Latin America (with special emphasis on Mexico, Costa Rica, Chile and Peru); the Postgraduate Technological Studies (PTS) Programme (Thailand); the Chulalongkorn University European Studies Programme (CUESP) (Thailand); the EU-China Higher Education Cooperation Programme (China); and the EDF – FVS (European Development Fund Faculty of Veterinary Science) Programme (Zimbabwe).

This evaluation assesses the programmes’ components of incoming mobility (mobility from third countries to Europe). It seeks to answer thirteen evaluative questions grouped thematically pertaining to issues of **human resources** (transfer of new knowledge / expertise; enhancement of professional perspectives; brain drain; gender), the **promotion of Europe as a centre of academic excellence** (attracting higher education institutions in third countries to their European counterparts; reinforcement of EU’s cultural and economic presence in third countries), **regional integration** (types of cooperation fostered; contribution of ‘free mover’ or intra-network to integration). Other evaluation issues assessed are: **programme administration, sustainability of grants programmes, and the institutionalisation of mobility** in the home universities.

## B. Methodology (p. 4)

The evaluation was conducted by a team of three experts: Dr. Pedro de Sousa (team leader), Drs. Jolie Franke and Dr. Arnold Spitta. A PARTICIP assistance team supported them administratively and methodologically. A steering committee met three times to discuss the progress of the evaluation.

The evaluation was divided in three phases:

- 1 A desk phase, aiming at producing an overview of the EU policy with regard to inter-university exchange, to gain an overview of the opportunities and problems affecting the EC performance in this field (and, thereby, distinguishing the two types of mobility exchanges: free movers from intra-network mobility), and to analyse the administrative, management and funding procedures adopted by the EC. The Evaluation team cooperated closely with the Steering group and several EC officials in charge of the selected programmes.
- 2 A field phase, evaluating the specific mobility grant awarding programmes in Thailand (PTS programme at AIT and European Studies Programme at CUESP), Mexico, Costa Rica and Chile (ALFA). The methodology of the field phase comprised stakeholder interviews and participatory workshops. In addition, the evaluators conducted a survey in the visited countries, as well as in China, Peru and Zimbabwe. The evaluators briefed and debriefed the EC Delegations. In each of the countries, a local consultant assisted the experts. The questionnaires (survey) were sent to teachers (programme participants and coordinators) and students/researchers. The results from the survey were

---

<sup>1</sup>The evaluation was commissioned to PARTICIP GmbH by the European Commission.

compared with the findings of the field visits. The total number of validated returned questionnaires was 198. The overall response rate was 25,2 % (excluding China).

- 3 A concluding phase to further analyse the results of the two previous phases and draft the final report.

### **C. Context (p. 7)**

In the field of higher education, the EC has set up a number of initiatives and programmes with third countries drawing on experience gained from Erasmus and similar programmes. Some Member States have also a well-established tradition of, mainly bilateral, cooperation with third countries on education.

The objectives of the EC in its pursuit of cooperation with third countries are defined as: to ensure that EC education activities incorporate the international dimension in a more systematic way; to give greater visibility to the education cooperation activities in order to promote Europe as a centre of academic excellence, and to attract students seeking an international education; to promote the EC as a worldwide centre of excellence for study and training as well as for scientific and technological research; to contribute to the development of high-quality human resources in third countries and within the EU, through reciprocal human resource development. Contributing to the alleviation of poverty and enhancing participation of women in the programmes are also highlighted as priority objectives.

Concretely, the objectives mentioned above are expected to contribute to strengthening European studies capacities in third countries so as to provide a full service to interested academics and to demonstrate the EC's activity in this field within universities. By targeting suitable professionals and postgraduate students in third countries, the EC should be able to help recently graduated and high level professionals to benefit from excellence in European academia. It should also allow future decision-makers in third countries to develop closer ties with Europe and gain a better understanding of its cultural diversity. In pursuing these objectives the EC promotes and encourages cooperation with third country institutions that wish to or have achieved a level of development comparable to that of EU institutions.

When considering the internal coherence and logic of the EC approach, it is important to note that the EC programmes with third countries are conceived with different cooperation modalities – development and economic – each with its own objectives and strategies. Development cooperation with the ACP countries aims at strengthening the local capacities for higher education without direct benefits for the European Union. It is also expected to contribute to the alleviation or reduction of poverty, which is the overarching objective of EC development policy. The economic cooperation with Asian and Latin American (ALA) countries is meant to serve the mutual interests of the EU and ALA countries, with as much emphasis given to promoting the economic and corporate interests of the EU and its Member States as to supporting development in the ALA countries (Council Regulation No. 443/92, 25 February 1992). Even with this common framework for economic cooperation with Asian and Latin-American (ALA) countries, the enormous differences between levels of development of countries within the same region hamper the effectiveness of a single instrument for cooperation. This context complicates the task of comparing the performance of the intranetwork and 'free mover' approaches.

The analysis of the context within which cooperation takes place currently is expected to provide the European Commission with elements required to redefine the framework for interuniversity cooperation programmes between the EU and third countries to render it more coherent, efficient and visible in its approach.

### **D. Main findings (p. 41) and Conclusions (p. 45)**

- **'Free mover' or intra-network mobility (p. 41, 46)**

In some cases there is no clear distinction between 'free movers' and 'intra-network mobility'. The ALFA programme, which is frequently referred to as the 'model' for intranetwork mobility programmes, is indeed an intranetwork mobility programme. CUESP

was regarded as an intra-network cooperation project between Chulalongkorn University in Thailand and a consortium of three European universities. However, it emerged that its mobility component was not restricted to this intra-university network. The mobility within PTS had, in fact, a more inter-institutional character as in most cases the individual arrangements made by candidates were followed up by supervisors which provided individual mobility with a strong institutional embedding. The EU-China programme is a 'free mover' mobility scheme inside an intra-network programme and the EDF/FVS is a 'free mover' programme within a bilateral interuniversity cooperation agreement.

- **Development of human resources** (p. 42, 46)

The impact of grant programmes for mobility from third countries to Europe remains necessarily modest in view of the magnitude of the target group and the modest volume of the budgets involved.

The most positive results at the individual and institutional level are achieved where there is a strong institutional embedding. The mobility of academic staff has accumulative effects through the transfer of knowledge to various generations of students. Student beneficiaries dispersed across the country or region may contribute to a multiplier effect, but more detailed investigation is required to gauge the extent and impact of this.

Intra-network cooperation has most mutual benefits if cooperation takes place between more or less equal partners. The strengthening of local institutional capacities benefits most directly from the intra-network mobility of academic staff.

Potential grant holders from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds have fewer opportunities to participate in mobility programmes than their better-off peers.

In the programmes under evaluation, brain drain was not a problem. This positive conclusion may, however, not be generalised towards other regions of the world (especially Africa), where academic brain drain remains a serious problem.

Women form minorities in all mobility programmes. However, these figures mirror the gender ratio between the student and staff population in higher education. Despite the fact that the gender issue is explicitly mentioned in the objectives and guidelines of the programmes, the local selection procedures did not foresee special measures to foster women's participation (except for the PTS programme).

- **Europe as a centre of academic excellence** (p. 43, 47)

Although not an explicit objective when the programmes under evaluation were created in the early nineties, positioning Europe as a centre of academic excellence seems coherent with the "mutual benefit" objective of the economic cooperation framework. Nevertheless, it may be considered against the objectives for development cooperation in other regions that would benefit more from strengthened local capacities for higher education.

The promotion of Europe as a centre of academic excellence is hampered by the limited knowledge of non-English or non-Spanish languages (in the case of the ALFA programme) and by the high cost of living of some European countries/cities. Mobility programmes have a modest but positive effect on the promotion of Europe as a centre of academic excellence through the availability of mobility grants.

- **Regional integration** (p. 43, 47)

Regional *cooperation* links up with the actual interests of national stakeholders and higher education institutions in third countries. Therefore, this cooperation enhances the efficiency and sustainability of intra-network cooperation programmes aimed at institution building. Furthermore, the promotion of regional networking fits well with the concept of "added value" that EC funded programmes need to bring in order to differentiate them from a mere duplication or overlapping with the individual Member States' initiatives. Regional cooperation was not a characteristic of the free mover programmes under evaluation as these all concerned mobility towards Europe.

No efforts have been made by the EC to additionally foster regional *integration* in higher education through agreements with national or regional grant awarding organisations (e.g. Mercosur) or regional development banks (e. g. the Interamerican Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank).

- **Programme administration** (p. 44, 48)

The heavy administrative procedures of the ALFA programme, especially the long delays in signing the contracts and transferring the EC funds to the network coordinators, hinder the objective of attaining a more balanced and active (co-ordinating) participation of Latin American universities. They also make the participation of “poorer” state universities more difficult. It cannot be excluded that the poor administrative performance of the ALFA programme has been detrimental to the European Commission’s image. In the projects and programmes analysed in this evaluation, direct programme management by the European Commission (even when assisted by a Technical Assistance Offices – TAO) has been less efficient and effective than when programme management was undertaken by external bodies such as consortia of universities.

In all the programmes under evaluation, the mobility component (and more specifically, the one way mobility from third countries to Europe) is only one of a wider range of cooperation instruments that had to be “isolated” for the purpose of this evaluation. While the costs of the various programmes have been compared, it was impossible to relate the effectiveness of the isolated components of the programmes with their actual costs. Therefore, it has not been possible to analyse the cost-effectiveness of the programmes. However, a comparison with mobility programmes run by EU Member States show that at least in the case of the ALFA programme the performance was not very satisfactory.

- **Programmes’ sustainability** (p. 44, 48)

Regional cooperation enhances the sustainability of intra-network cooperation programmes, because it meets particularly the interests of the counterparts in third countries and it is less expensive than cooperation with EU higher education institutions. The most sustainable results at the institutional level are achieved with mobility of staff organised within the institution.

The sustainability of mobility programmes will, to a large extent, remain dependent on external funding. This seems even more so in the case of free-movers, given that with intra-network exchanges mutual benefits are more likely to persist. The continued existence of EC funding for international exchanges is necessary for the current level of involvement of universities and individuals to be maintained or increased.

- **Institutionalisation of internationalisation** (p. 44, 48)

Both free-mover and intra-network mobility programmes fit well within the internationalisation policy of governments and higher education institutions in third countries. EC mobility programmes (free mover and intra-network) contributed positively to the institutionalisation of internationalisation of higher education institutions, though not to the same extent in the different cases.

Institutionalisation of mobility programmes depends to a large extent on the availability of continued external funding.

The vast majority of the better universities both in Latin America and in Asia already have well established International Offices. To date little efforts have been made between Asian, Latin American universities and their European counterparts to further develop interuniversity cooperation through joint study modules or joint degree programmes.

## **E. Recommendations** (p. 51)

1. *EC cooperation programmes with third countries should differentiate between development cooperation between unequal partners, aiming at structural development in the partner countries and economic cooperation between more or less equal partners,*

*promoting mutual benefits for both EU and third countries.* The choice between a mobility programme for free movers, an intranetwork mobility programme or a “mixed” programme should depend on the specific objectives of the cooperation. If mutual benefits are the aim of mobility programmes, cooperation should take place between more or less equal partners.

2. *Mobility programmes aiming at strengthening institutional capacities should be organised within networks for multilateral interuniversity cooperation between third countries and the EU, preferably with a regional component and directed predominantly towards academic staff.* Regional cooperation is an efficient way to achieve local capacity building and also often an important institutional objective for academic institutions in third countries. The regional components of intra-network programmes (such as ALFA) should foresee special incentives to foster the participation of higher education institutions of less developed countries. For instance:

- A university network could receive additional funding if it includes an institution of a less developed country as a partner;
- A higher education institution of one of the least developed countries should be allowed to participate in the programme with a lower rate of co-funding.

All mobility programmes, both free-mover and intra-network, should take into account the institutional embedding of the scholarship holder in order to achieve most positive and sustainable results at the institutional and individual level.

3. *A longer duration (three to five years) of the intra-university network mobility projects should be considered in order to allow the exchange of more than one student cohort.* Two or three years of student exchange would consolidate exchanges between the participating faculties/departments (which makes it easier to develop common curricular modules, academic recognition of study periods abroad, credit transfer and accumulation, joint diplomas, etc.). This would imply awarding selected projects a contract (financial agreement) of a longer duration (for instance three years, as is the case of the Erasmus Institutional Contract).
4. *The EC should consider either to implement more flexible and substantially improved procedures for the administration of mobility programmes or envisage delegating the administration of such programmes to external bodies such as consortia or networks of universities.*
5. *To increase the effectiveness of promoting Europe as a centre of academic excellence by means of academic mobility initiatives, the size of mobility grant awarding programmes should be increased considerably.* Initiatives should include free-mover mobility programmes, as this type of exchange will be most beneficial for the promotion of Europe as centre of academic excellence. Mobility programmes should be accompanied by complementary activities such as joint courses, joint diplomas and an academic credit accumulation and transfer system between European universities and their partners in third countries. In addition more efforts (including increased funding for language training) are necessary if one wishes to promote mobility towards non-English and non-Spanish speaking countries.
6. *Special measures should be taken in order to increase the participation of women academics in mobility programmes (e.g. affirmative action, fixed quota, etc.).*
7. *To promote equity and prevent exclusion of less-advantaged students and to prevent unequal participation of some Member States, programmes should guarantee that the level of the mobility grant is sufficient to pay for all costs resulting from a study period abroad (travel, accommodation, cost of living in host country, language preparation if necessary) and do not require these costs to be funded by the students' own means.* Consequently, the level of the grants should reflect the cost of living of the host countries and should be fixed so that costs considerations do not prevent financially disadvantaged students from participating in the mobility programme. Moreover,

additional measures (i.e. exempting mobile students from paying tuition fees to the host universities) and policies will be necessary to overcome socio-economic and cultural barriers (i.e., social security, administration of visas and staying permits, etc.).

8. *Cooperation and co-funding agreements should be negotiated with key Latin American stakeholders like CAPES (Brazil), CONACyT (Mexico) and Fundación Ayacucho (Venezuela) and similar organisations in other regions of the world.* This could contribute to enhancing the sense of ownership of the programme in the target countries<sup>2</sup>, to positioning Europe as centre of academic excellence, and to fostering the degree of regional integration. The same approach should be considered for Asian countries. Thailand might lend itself well to play a role as a strategic country for regional development and integration.

---

<sup>2</sup> Agreements with strong third country grant awarding institutions would probably result in changes of the programmes' administrative procedures, as the counterparts would be actively involved in the projects' selection process, which actually, and in spite of the fact that scientists of both Europe and third countries are invited to participate, is entirely conducted by the EC.



## Table of Contents

1.	The mobility programmes evaluated	1
1.1.	THE ISSUES AT STAKE WITH INTER-UNIVERSITY MOBILITY PROGRAMMES	1
1.2.	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAMMES EVALUATED	1
1.2.1.	ALFA	1
1.2.2.	CUESP programme - Chulalongkorn University European Studies Programme	2
1.2.3.	PTS programme - Post-graduate Technological Studies Programme	2
1.2.4.	The EU-China Higher Education Cooperation Programme	3
1.2.5.	The EDF/FVS Programme	3
2.	Evaluation methodology	4
2.1.	THE DESK PHASE METHODOLOGY	4
2.2.	THE FIELD PHASE METHODOLOGY	4
2.3.	THE METHODOLOGY ADOPTED FOR PHASE 3 (FINAL REPORT)	5
2.4.	DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED	5
3.	Policy of the European Commission	7
3.1.	OBJECTIVES	7
3.2.	EXPECTED OUTCOMES	7
3.3.	INTERNAL COHERENCE AND LOGIC OF THE EC APPROACH	7
3.4.	EXTERNAL COHERENCE	8
3.4.1.	The external coherence of the ALFA Programme	8
3.4.2.	The external coherence of the CUESP and PTS programmes	9
4.	Evaluation	11
4.1.	EVALUATION ISSUES	11
4.1.1.	Responses to main evaluative questions (point 2 in the ToR)	11
4.1.1.1.	Development of human resources (point 2.1. in the ToR)	11
4.1.1.2.	Promotion of Europe as a centre of academic excellence (point 2.2 in the Terms of Reference)	21
4.1.1.3.	Mobility grants and regional integration (point 2.3. in the Terms of Reference)	27
4.1.1.4.	Other evaluative questions (point 2.4 in the Terms of Reference)	28
4.1.1.5.	Socio-economic issues emerging from the survey:	39
4.1.1.6.	Poverty alleviation or reduction issues	40
4.2.	MAIN FINDINGS	41
4.2.1.	Different cooperation frameworks call for different cooperation instruments (cfr. 3.3 internal coherence)	41
4.2.2.	'Free Movers' and 'intra-network' often not clearly distinguished (cfr. 1.2 brief description of the programmes evaluated)	41
4.2.3.	Human resources development - knowledge-transfer and professional advantages for mostly male participants (cfr. question 1 and 2)	42
4.2.4.	Promotion of Europe as centre of academic excellence – language barriers prevent more than modest success (cfr. question 5, 6 and 7)	43
4.2.5.	Regional integration - from missed opportunity to sustainable success (cfr. question 8 and 9)	43

4.2.6.	<i>Programmes' administration - weak performance hampers programme performance (cfr.question 10)</i>	44
4.2.7.	<i>Sustainability - dependent on alternative funding sources (cfr.question 11)</i>	44
4.2.8.	<i>Institutionalisation of internationalisation - positive, but modest programme contribution (cfr.question 12 and 13)</i>	44
4.2.9.	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	45
4.3.	CONCLUSIONS	45
4.3.1.	<i>Human resources development – different programme types appropriate for different situations</i>	46
4.3.2.	<i>Promotion of Europe as a centre of academic excellence – best served by free movers and international funding agreements</i>	47
4.3.3.	<i>Regional integration – “added value” of intra-network cooperation</i>	47
4.3.4.	<i>Programmes' administration – Complex decision making potentially hinders flexible programme management</i>	48
4.3.5.	<i>Sustainability – increased in intra-network programmes, but dependence on external funding likely to remain</i>	48
4.3.6.	<i>Institutionalisation of internationalisation – unexploited potential remains.</i>	48
4.3.7.	<i>Equity - insufficiently addressed by most programmes</i>	49
4.4.	RECOMMENDATIONS	51
5.	Terms of Reference for the Evaluation	53

Note: This is Volume 1 of three volumes on the evaluation of grant mobility programmes. The other volumes are:

- Volume 2: Field Phase Report
- Volume 3: Collection of Annexes of Final Report and Field Phase Report

# 1. The mobility programmes evaluated

## 1.1. The issues at stake with inter-university mobility programmes

Inter-university mobility is an ongoing process of improving knowledge and skills and an exceptional means for personal development and building relationships among individuals and institutions, where people learn to show mutual understanding and to use advances in knowledge to foster human development rather than to create further divisions between people and regions. Mobility between higher education institutions leads to the promotion of opportunities to move between institutions and courses within and between different education systems.

Participants in organized mobility programmes may be divided into two groups: mobility within inter-institutional cooperation programmes (intra-network mobility) and individual mobility with an unlimited choice of partner universities. This last type of mobility is called free-mover mobility in the framework of this evaluation, but must not be confused with individual spontaneous mobility that is organised and funded by the participant him/herself.

According to a recent OECD report (*Education at a Glance*, 2001 Edition), the largest share of mobile students are “unorganised” free movers. However, there has also been an increase in the numbers of students involved in organised mobility schemes. The Erasmus programme is a proof of this. One further aspect to be considered if one wants to analyse both approaches is that little is known about free movers, namely what happens to them after their study period abroad, what effect did this experience have on their academic and professional careers. The OECD report also indicates that broad patterns of both mobility approaches somehow show some important differences and imbalances, and more particularly that little is known about the real value of the academic experiences acquired abroad by free movers.

## 1.2. Brief description of the programmes evaluated

### 1.2.1. ALFA

ALFA is a decentralised cooperation programme for interuniversity exchanges of students, researchers and teachers. Adopted in 1994 under Council Regulation 443/92, it forms part of a set of different multi-annual horizontal programmes designed to fund joint projects between Europe and Latin America within the framework of economic cooperation such as AL-INVEST, ALURE and URB-AL.

The main objectives of ALFA are: to improve the scientific and technological potential in the Latin American developing countries and to promote international exchanges linked to mobility, as well as to increase the interaction of qualified academics, technology and technical know-how with more developed regions.

The ALFA programme (ALFA I) was adopted for 5 years (1994-1999), but several projects started with some delay and will only finish in 2003. ALFA II started in 2000 and will finish in 2005<sup>1</sup>.

The overall budget of ALFA I amounted to some € 49,4 million, of which the EC contributed € 38,4 million and the counterpart networks some € 11 million. For ALFA II an EC budget of € 42 million has been allocated.

The programme is divided in two sub-programmes: sub-programme A aims to develop administrative and academic skills: structural improvement of higher education (A1) and cooperation between institutions of higher education and companies (A2); sub-programme B is dedicated to cooperation for scientific and technological training: B1 finances activities preparatory to mobility for postgraduates and students; B2 fosters planning and design of common research projects; B3 finances (postgraduate) mobility for advanced training

---

<sup>1</sup> Until September 2001, when the present evaluation began, no ALFA II mobility projects had yet started. As a consequence, they were out of the scope of this evaluation.

(Doctorates, Master's Degrees and professional specialisation), B4 undergraduate student's mobility. Only the mobility component (sub-programme B3 and B4) is the object of this evaluation. Within ALFA, mobility grants are awarded in the framework of an interuniversity cooperation network.

During the first phase, 846 projects were approved, of which more than 50 were interrupted or cancelled for various reasons. Roughly 70 % of the ALFA funds were allocated to mobility projects. 895 higher education institutions (373 from Latin America, 522 from Europe and 155 associated institutions like foundations, enterprises etc.) participated in 596 ALFA networks, each of which with an average number of 11 institutions. 17.615 grant/months have been awarded to students (between 844 and 1.947 who participated in 77 Master, 90 Doctorate courses or research work periods or 31 specialisation courses. In addition, the ALFA reports mention more than 300 joint publications (scientific publications, guides, manuals etc.).<sup>2</sup>

### **1.2.2. CUESP programme - Chulalongkorn University European Studies Programme**

The Chulalongkorn University European Studies Programme (CUESP) was implemented in two phases from 1992 until 1999 in order to achieve a better understanding of the EU in Thailand, as well as to develop human resources to sustain the economic development of Thailand and its economic cooperation with the EU. The programme was implemented by a consortium of European universities (Tübingen, Robert Schuman in Strasbourg and Bocconi in Milan) in cooperation with the Faculties of Economics, Law, Political Science and Arts (History Department) of Chulalongkorn University in Bangkok.

The second phase was extended until 12 October 1999 and had a total budget allocation from the EU of € 2,900,000. Of this budget € 562,759 were spent on the incoming mobility of faculty staff and junior researchers to the European Union. During the second phase, 74 Thai academics (comprising both faculty and students), have experienced an academic stay in Europe. The beneficiaries came mostly from Chulalongkorn University; 15 faculty members came from seven other Thai universities. Host institutions (more than 45) were located in nine countries of the EU.

### **1.2.3. PTS programme - Post-graduate Technological Studies Programme**

The Asian Institute of Technology (AIT), an international training institution based in Thailand, implements the Post-graduate Technological Studies Programme (PTS). The programme aims to train young professionals capable of working in a different cultural context, raising their awareness of opportunities in economic cooperation between Asia and Europe. Moreover it aims to create permanent links between Asian and European professionals, favouring the transfer of expertise and knowledge and balancing the preponderance of Asian human and economic relations with USA and Japan. The programme was approved in 1997 for four years. It was extended for one year until the end of 2002 to facilitate the completion of European fellowships at AIT. The mobility component of 90 students who went for one term (3 to 4 months) to Europe was completed in 2001. The total cost of the programme is € 3,025,438. The maximum EC contribution is € 2,678,650 (including € 150,000 for the European co-ordinator). The AIT contribution is € 346,788, budgeted under administration costs. € 540,000 were allocated to the incoming mobility

<sup>2</sup> According to a TAO list issued in December 2000, 697 Latin American and 147 European students received a grant. Unfortunately, these figures could not be confirmed. During the desk phase (September 2001), at the TAO, just before its closure, the evaluators received one undated list indicating 987 Latin American and 220 European grant holders. The previously mentioned EC document «La coopération entre l'Union Européenne et l'Amérique latine en matière d'enseignement supérieur / Document informel (non paper) proposé par les services de la Commission» indicates in point 8 under the heading of «Situation actuelle» the most important results achieved by ALFA: «(...) Concrètement: 1947 étudiants ont participé à 77 'Masters', 31 à des cours de spécialisation et 90 à des programmes de doctorat, dont les programmes d'études ont été enrichis par des composants 'plurinationales'». It was impossible to clarify which is the correct number of ALFA grant holders (844, 1.207 or 1.947).

component of 90 Asian AIT students spending one term at a European institute. Of this budget € 433,481 has been spent until 31 August 2001, leaving a credit balance of € 106.519.

#### **1.2.4. The EU-China Higher Education Cooperation Programme**

This programme was adopted on 7 May 1996 with a total duration of 4 years. Its management and administration was awarded to the Lund University in representation of the Utrecht Network (consortium of 24 European Universities). The total budget was € 9,630,000.

The programme's overall and specific objectives were to improve the understanding of EU in China, strengthen European Studies in China, develop teaching of European languages and culture in China, providing training in European experiences in governance and human sciences and strengthening Chinese networks of European Studies Institutions.

The programme covered the following actions: infrastructures, funding of publications and technical assistance; grants for Chinese scholars and students to Europe; joint research; short and long term familiarisation visits of Chinese academics to Europe; visits by EU professors; workshops in China involving European businesses and dissemination activities.

Its target public/organizations were academics and students at Chinese and European higher education institutions. Mobility was foreseen in an institutional context, but in fact it concerned individual (free mover) mobility, based on existing individual contacts between European and Chinese academics.

#### **1.2.5. The EDF/FVS Programme**

This programme had as legal basis Agreement No 5335/ZIM (European Development Fund VII). The programme was implemented and managed by the Faculty of Veterinary Science (FVS) of the University of Zimbabwe. Technical assistance was provided in the framework of an agreement between FVS and the University of Utrecht, selected via a restricted tender procedure. Its overall budget was € 9,100,000.

The programme's overall and specific objectives consisted in strengthening manpower at the FVS and at public and private veterinary services. It covered the following actions: training of technicians, staff development fellowships, student exchanges, grants for temporary training at EU universities, long-term and short-term technical assistance from Utrecht University to the University of Zimbabwe, grants for students from SADC countries, teaching materials, equipment and vehicles; construction of buildings, improving animal health to increase livestock productivity and farming incomes. It is a free movers programme within a bilateral interuniversity cooperation agreement.

## 2. Evaluation methodology

The evaluation was subdivided in three different phases:

- A desk phase aimed at producing an overview of the current situation in the field of academic mobility grant-awarding programmes and preparing the field phase of the evaluation;
- A field phase to evaluate specific mobility grant awarding programmes in selected countries. The analysis at field level was complemented by a survey;
- A concluding phase to draw together and further analyse the results of the two previous phases.

Several individuals and structures were involved in the management and implementation of this evaluation. A steering committee met twice to discuss the evaluation's progress and its intermediary products. A team of three experts, Dr. Pedro de Sousa, Evaluation team leader and two evaluation experts, Drs. Jolie Franke and Dr. Arnold Spitta, conducted the evaluation. A PARTICIP assistance team supported them administratively and methodologically. The experts worked as a team and contributed all to the drafting of the reports.

### 2.1. The desk phase methodology

The desk phase methodology was designed to achieve the three objectives mentioned in the ToR: to present an overview of the EU policy with regard to inter-university exchange, to gain an overview of the opportunities and problems affecting the EC performance in this field, and to analyse the administrative, management and funding procedures adopted by the EC for the two types of mobility exchanges.

In order to be able to get high quality information within a short period of time, the Evaluation Team worked in close cooperation with the members of the Steering Group and several EC officials in charge of the selected programmes. This approach provided a fairly equal opportunity for the expression of views and the expression of points of view and of lessons learned by various stakeholders. In consultation with the Evaluation Steering Committee (see above), programmes were selected (ALFA, PTS and CUESP) to be included in the field evaluation. It was decided to conduct field visits to Mexico, Costa Rica, Chile and Thailand and a survey among stakeholders of the same programmes and countries, but complemented with China, Peru and Zimbabwe.

The work performed during this phase also endeavoured to start the analysis of the issues and questions listed in the ToR on the basis of the classic evaluation criteria: Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Sustainability and, eventually, the Impact of both approaches of mobility grants awarding: free movers and intra-network exchanges. The evaluation team also proceeded to a translation of the evaluation issues and questions into judgement criteria and indicators. Besides a presentation of the intermediary findings, they provided recommendations for the field phase, and proposed a methodology for the field visits.

### 2.2. The field phase methodology

The methodology for the Field Phase was defined during the Desk Phase and agreed upon by the Steering Group. It comprised two major components: field visits and a survey.

Two members of the Evaluation Team undertook **site visits** to universities that participated in the mobility programmes under review, organisations funding higher education institutions through grants and international exchange programmes and other public or private higher education authorities of the selected countries. There they interviewed teachers, students and co-ordinators directly involved in mobility exchanges, as well as university officials and experts of other national or international institutions engaged in higher education and academic mobility. During the second half of the site visits, the evaluators conducted participatory workshops, giving key stakeholders in each country the opportunity for

repeated feedback and input into the evaluation process. The evaluators briefed and debriefed the EC Delegation in each visited country. Field visits were conducted in Thailand (PTS programme at AIT and European Studies Programme at CUESP), Mexico, Costa Rica and Chile (ALFA). In each country, a local consultant assisted the experts.

The second component of the field phase was a **survey**, that was implemented between 17/10/2001 and 30/11/2001 by means of a questionnaire distributed either by e-mail or by fax to each of the three categories of key actors involved in mobility exchanges: 1) teachers who organised and coordinated student exchanges, 2) teachers who actually participated in the programme as grant holders, and 3) students/researchers. Harmonised questionnaires were sent to the three visited countries in Latin America (Mexico, Costa Rica, Chile) and Peru; and further to Thailand, China and Zimbabwe. This complementary process of collecting qualitative and quantitative data from a sample of representative stakeholders (actual beneficiaries) was carried out so that the aggregated results obtained from that sample could be compared with the findings of the field visits and projected and included in the present Final Report. The total number of validated returned questionnaires, processed between October 17<sup>th</sup> and November 26<sup>th</sup>, was **198**. The overall response rate was **25,2 %** (China not included because we did not obtain from the Chinese Programme Management Office the exact number of distributed questionnaires) – **25,6% for mobile teachers, 11,7% for coordinators and 38,3 % for students**. Considering that the CUESP programme stopped almost two years ago and that it took considerable effort to trace the former grant holders, we believe that the survey's response rate is satisfactory and that the results provide added value to the data collected during the field visits. Moreover, we obtained interesting information from the countries not selected for field visits, in particular China and Zimbabwe.

### **2.3. The methodology adopted for phase 3 (Final Report)**

The evaluators took stock of the results, findings and conclusions of the previous two phases, while keeping in mind the specifications of the Terms of Reference.

In Chapter 4 (Evaluation) of the present report the Evaluation Team has endeavoured to answer all the evaluative questions concerning the programmes under review, and both approaches of mobility grant-awarding system: free-movers or network exchanges. Therefore, in this chapter, besides listing the evaluation issues and questions raised in the ToR, we explain how they were assessed, and we describe the corresponding assessment criteria and indicator(s). Whenever possible the results from the field visits have been compared with those from the survey.

### **2.4. Difficulties encountered**

The evaluation dealt only with mobility from third countries into Europe, which in all cases studied constituted only one component of broader programmes. Other components, for example visiting European lecturers or European students going to third countries, remained outside the scope of the present evaluation. This limitation added complexity to the evaluation. In some cases it was difficult to make a distinction between the effects of the various components and the effects of the programme as a whole. Given this limitation, even when using specific quantitative indicators to measure the effects of the (mobility component of the) programmes, a precise answer about the effectiveness of the programme as such would be almost impossible. In general, when the report discusses the various evaluation criteria of the programmes, one should bear in mind that when we make reference to “the programme”, we are actually referring only to one of its components (mobility from third countries to Europe).

An unforeseen difficulty was the closing down of the ALFA Technical Assistance Office (TAO) at the end of September 2001, a few days after the evaluators started their work. Due to this, it was not possible to obtain all the documents and information, which would have been desirable for this evaluation, and to clarify some important figures referring to the mobility, flows within the ALFA I programme.

In the implementation of the survey, the lack of specific information on the Alfa projects funded – i.e. the names and contacts of partner institutions in Latin American countries (as well as the names of the local teachers in charge of the exchanges and of those who actually participated in them) – posed a problem. To implement the survey we had to contact the European coordinators to obtain that missing but vital information and in many cases the contact details we obtained from the European project coordinators were incorrect. This resulted in additional work and delay in the despatch of the questionnaires. The same goes for the information on the beneficiaries of the grants. Only at the end of the field phase, during the visit to Chile a list of scholarship holders was received from the EC delegation in Santiago.

The selection of programmes included in this evaluation was undertaken in close consultation with the EC steering committee during the desk phase. Various selection criteria were taken into account. In the first place, due to the quantity of cooperation programmes in some countries and regions, the evaluation concentrated, especially during the field visits, on the more developed regions of Asia and Latin America and, in the latter continent, on the more developed countries. This approach left the low and middle-income level countries somewhat underexposed. However, this reflects the regional spreading of EC funded mobility programmes.

While assessing the performance of the various programmes, we took into account the specific objectives of each programme. While the majority of mobility programmes appear to be organised under the economic cooperation framework, the Terms of Reference for the evaluation explicitly imply all third countries, including ACP countries.



## 3. Policy of the European Commission

### 3.1. Objectives

In the field of higher education, the European Community has established a number of initiatives and programmes with third countries drawing on experience gained from Erasmus and similar programmes. Some Member States also have a well-established tradition of mainly bilateral cooperation with third countries in higher education.

In the pursuit of its cooperation with third countries in this field, some immediate EC objectives have been identified:

- To ensure that EC education activities include the international dimension in a more systematic way;
- To give greater visibility to its action in this field in order to promote Europe as a centre of academic excellence, and to attract students seeking an international education (at the moment of the programmes' conception, this was **not an objective**).
- To promote the EC as a world-wide centre of excellence for study and training as well as for scientific and technological research;
- To contribute to the development of high-quality human resources in third countries and within the EU, through reciprocal human resource development;
- To contribute to the alleviation of poverty; and
- To enhance participation of women in the programmes.

On this last issue, the first Council Resolution on integrating gender issues into development cooperation emphasised the importance of “‘mainstreaming’ gender analysis into the conception and design of development policies and interventions, and of the capacity building on gender issues and gender-sensitive approach”<sup>4</sup>.

Many third countries see potential benefits in systematic cooperation with European higher education institutions, especially within multilateral networks involving institutions from more than one Member State. Such cooperation can enhance the value of bilateral education arrangements with individual Member States. This is why in almost all agreements between the EC and third countries, education is mentioned as a potential field for cooperation.

### 3.2. Expected outcomes

In pursuing these objectives the EC will promote and encourage cooperation with third country institutions that wish to or have achieved a level of development comparable to that of EU institutions.

In the area of development cooperation, the inclusion of higher education is expected, if appropriately designed, to contribute to the alleviation or eradication of poverty, which is the overarching objective of EC development policy. The objectives mentioned above are also expected to contribute to strengthening European studies capacities in third countries so as to provide a full service to interested academics and to demonstrate the EC's activity in this field within universities. By targeting suitable professionals and postgraduate students in third countries, the EC should be able to help recently graduated and high level professionals to benefit from excellence in European academia. It should also allow future decision-makers in third countries to develop closer ties with Europe and get a better understanding of its cultural diversity.

### 3.3. Internal coherence and logic of the EC approach

The analysis of both approaches - the 'free movers' mobility approach as opposed to intra-network mobility - is a difficult one owing to the fact that the programmes within the scope of

---

<sup>4</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No. 2836/98 (OJ L 354, 30/12/1998, p. 005 – 009).

this evaluation are conceived within different cooperation frameworks: on one hand with the development cooperation with the ACP countries, aimed at strengthening the local capacities for higher education without direct benefits for the European Union, and on the other with the economic cooperation with Asian and Latin American (ALA) countries, which is meant to serve the mutual interests of the EU and ALA countries, with as much emphasis given to promoting the economic and corporate interests of the EU and its Member States as to supporting development in the ALA countries (Council Regulation No. 443/92, 25 February 1992). But also within the framework for economic cooperation with Asian and Latin-American (ALA) countries, the enormous differences between levels of development of countries within the same region hamper the effectiveness of a single instrument for cooperation.

It should be clear that while assessing the performance of the various programmes, we took into account the specific objectives of each programme. This made it difficult to compare the effectiveness of the two distinct approaches. The majority of EC funded mobility programmes appear to be organised under the economic cooperation framework. However, while the Final Report on the *Evaluation of Economic Cooperation* between the European Community and partner countries in Asia and Latin America (August 2001) indicates the lack of a distinction between development cooperation (with less developed countries) and economic cooperation (with relatively more developed countries), the Terms of Reference for the present evaluation refers only to “all third countries, including ACP countries”.

The present evaluation confirms the appropriateness and the need to make this distinction. In the case of the ALFA programme, for example, it is evident that cooperation took place between more developed Latin-American countries, while less developed countries in the region did not participate to the same extent in the programme.

In the case of PTS, the component of 90 AIT students travelling to Europe for their Master’s thesis research had positive effects on the individual and institutional level. However, the European component (mobility from Europe to Asia), which was not part of this evaluation, seems much less effective, which leads us to question the pertinence of the “mutual benefit” objective of the framework of this cooperation programme. The legal basis of the CUESP programme was found pertinent, as the establishment of European Studies in Thailand certainly was in the interest of both Thailand and the European Union.

### **3.4. External coherence**

#### **3.4.1. The external coherence of the ALFA Programme**

The characteristics and main current tendencies in Latin America higher education systems are rapid growth, staff development, competitiveness and internationalisation. Despite enormous differences with regard to their economic and scientific development and actual performance – differences reflected in their higher education systems – most Latin American countries have some common characteristics. This refers especially to some major tendencies in the development of higher education institutions and to the priorities set by both the respective governments and by the higher education institutions themselves. Rapid growth of the higher education sector, quality improvement and internationalisation are important characteristics of this transformation process<sup>5</sup>.

There also is a growing market orientation in the higher education systems of Latin America, generally combined with a rapidly growing private sector, and a trend to foster competitiveness at the national, but also at the regional and international level. As most of the higher education systems of the EU member states are also undergoing an important

---

<sup>5</sup> This rapid expansion, both at the undergraduate and – especially – at the postgraduate level is not only due to the population’s growth and to the fact that Latin American societies have a high percentage of young people, but is also related to the rapidly expanding percentage of student enrolment of the total population between the age of 18 and 24. This expansion of the whole system creates an increasing demand for well-trained academic and research staff.

transformation process (see, among others, the rapid changes which started with the Bologna Declaration and continued with the follow-up meetings), there is a wide margin for the exchange of experiences that can support these changes in the Latin American education system.

Despite national and international efforts, in most of the Latin American countries (with the exception, to a certain extent, of Brazil and Costa Rica), the number of university teachers with a postgraduate degree working at undergraduate level is comparatively low.

One of the most important objectives of the education policy of the most important Latin American countries is to enhance the international competitiveness of the higher education system. As a consequence, the “internationalisation” of the higher education institutions is also an issue of high priority. Internationalisation means among others a growing number of research networks with universities throughout the world, accompanied also by an increasing number of exchange programmes for undergraduate and graduate students.

Efforts to meet the challenges of (among others) staff development and internationalisation are made not only by the higher education institutions themselves, but – on a different scale – also by several governments<sup>6</sup>. Besides the countries’ own efforts, cooperation agencies of several counterpart countries (member states of the European Union play an important role among them) offer large grant programmes on a bilateral and, in a few cases, multilateral basis. Although these programmes have to be borne in mind when discussing the impact of the ALFA programme in the Latin American countries, the regional and university network design of the latter makes it distinct from other bilateral programmes. The ALFA programme’s objective of fostering regional cooperation and networking meets quite well the increased efforts in regional integration undertaken by many of the Latin American countries. As almost all the beneficiaries and national stakeholders interviewed during the field phase emphasised and confirmed by the survey results, the programme’s design of enhancing regional cooperation provided an “added value” for the participating universities.

ALFA was created within the framework of the EC’s economic cooperation of mutual interest. Therefore, it has to be analysed not only if the programme met the interests of Latin American universities, but also the needs of European higher education institutions and European society at large. To answer this question, a quantitative indicator is the high number of applications submitted by European universities. Additional indicators are the high number of co-operation agreements in research and academic exchange between Latin American and European Research Councils and Scholarship Organisations<sup>7</sup> and the number of agreements between Higher Education Institutions of Latin America and Europe<sup>8</sup>. However, the interest of European institutions was directly linked to the development level of the Latin American countries involved: little cooperation took place with low and middle-income countries in the region.

Summarising, it can be asserted that the external coherence of the ALFA programme is very satisfactory, as it meets the needs and the demands of the partner higher education institutions and government policies in Latin America.

### **3.4.2. The external coherence of the CUESP and PTS programmes**

The EC policy on Higher Education Cooperation fits very well within the internationalisation policy of governments and higher education institutions in Thailand. For example the Thai

---

<sup>6</sup> In Brazil and Mexico large-scale grant programmes are offered for in-country studies as well as for advanced academic training abroad. Argentina, Venezuela and Uruguay created national grant-awarding (or study loans) programmes for postgraduate studies abroad. Over the last years, Chile doubled its relatively small, highly selective grant programmes. In Costa Rica the government recently created a programme to enhance the country’s research and development capacity.

<sup>7</sup> For example, the Brazilian CAPES, CNPq and FAPESP have numerous agreements with European stakeholders, but also CONACyT of Mexico etc.

<sup>8</sup> The Rector’s Conference of Germany lists 297 bilateral university agreements between German and Latin American universities – and this is just one European country, and certainly not the most important in terms of prioritising cooperation with Latin America.

Ministry of University Affairs (MUA) participates in various mobility schemes as part of its policy to encourage the internationalisation of higher education, e.g. in the Asia Pacific Region; in the Greater Mekong Sub-region and in the framework of the Southeast Asian Ministers Organisation (SEAMEO). Both Chulalongkorn University and the Asian Institute of Technology explicitly express internationalisation as an important strategy for quality enhancement.

Various stakeholders we met in the framework of this evaluation stressed Thailand's potential to play an intermediary role in the region<sup>9</sup>. Thailand could be a change agent in forwarding its own experiences towards its less developed neighbouring countries (e.g. Vietnam, Cambodia). Donors could take advantage of this role in order to avoid susceptibilities originating from the old bilateral colonial connections. At the same time this would strengthen regional links and cooperation. However, EC cooperation programmes did not go along with this interest, as various European Studies Programmes in the region were implemented without taking sufficiently into account experiences and built-up expertise of the Chulalongkorn University European Studies Programme (CUESP).

The internationalisation strategy of AIT consists of three tiers: 1) local bridging programmes which consist in a linkage with local undergraduate academic institutions in the most disadvantaged countries of the region, such as Cambodia, Laos or Myanmar; 2) cooperative regional research which consists in a linkage with advanced academic institutions and research organizations in the region in the specification, submission and conduct of joint research projects relevant to the needs of the region and 3) worldwide partnerships which consist in a linkage with some of the most advanced academic institutions in Asia and the Pacific, Europe and America, eager to strengthen through AIT their position in Asia.

Around 30 formal agreements have been signed with various European institutions providing for exchange programs of students and faculty, dual degree programs, joint research agreements, etc. The degree of activity generated by those agreements varies greatly, the funding of the activities being the major issue faced. AIT's main donors in cash and kind (grants and seconded staff) are Thailand, Japan, Sweden and Denmark. AIT falls under responsibility of the Thai Prime Minister's Office of the National Education Commission (ONEC).

In view of the above, the EC policy on higher education cooperation fits very well within the internationalisation policy of the Thai government and the involved higher education institutions in Thailand. However, EC cooperation programmes did not go along with the expressed interest to make use of Thai capacity in the framework of EC cooperation with less developed neighbouring countries.

---

<sup>9</sup> To give an example, in the framework of its internationalisation policy, the Chulalongkorn University offers grants to students of neighbouring countries for graduate degree study.

## 4. Evaluation

### 4.1. Evaluation issues

The evaluation issues and questions assessed are those listed in chapter 2 of the Terms of Reference. The Evaluation Team has endeavoured to answer those questions on the basis of the classical evaluation criteria Efficiency, Effectiveness, Relevance, Sustainability, using the judgement criteria and indicators defined during the Desk Phase. These were applied during the evaluation of the programmes (site visits and survey), as well as additional qualitative indicators allowing the assessment of the selected programmes and of both approaches (free movers and organised mobility within networks) in terms of objectives, outputs and impact.

#### 4.1.1. Responses to main evaluative questions (point 2 in the ToR)

For each question answered, the first table in each section indicates the judgement criteria and indicators actually used when answering the question. The second table in each section summarizes the assessment of the programmes' performance according to the identified judgement criteria. Finally, Annex 1 presents a table with the indicators' degree of relevance and usefulness for answering each question, also including those indicators that although initially identified were eventually not used in the assessment.

##### 4.1.1.1. Development of human resources (point 2.1. in the ToR)

**Question 1:** To which extent did mobility grants (free movers and intranetwork) contribute to the transfer of new knowledge and expertise to third countries, and to increase the scientific and technological potential in those countries?

The assessment of this issue is based on the following judgement criteria and indicators.

Judgement criteria	Indicator(s)
1. Students, researchers and teachers have been trained at European institutions in accordance with the quantitative and qualitative targets.	1. Number of beneficiaries (students, researchers and teachers) who went abroad according to the type of study followed abroad.
2. Cooperation agreements exist between universities/research centres to facilitate transfer of knowledge.	2. Number and type of agreements that consider transfer of knowledge.
3. The exchange contributed to fulfil regional, institutional or personal achievements.	3. Grant holders' assessment of their experience of studying/teaching period in Europe from an academic point of view. Degree of contribution at personal, institutional, national, regional levels.
4. Studies/research in Europe contributed to increased knowledge and expertise of students, researchers and teachers.	4. Contribution to knowledge increase and type and quality of those contributions.
5. Students, researchers and teachers coming to Europe are capable of using their newly acquired knowledge and expertise for the benefit of their country (academic institutions and society at large).	5. Contribution of beneficiaries of mobility grants to improvement of the capacity of local universities to fulfil their mission and to respond to the country's present and future needs.

## ○ ALFA

It is not clear whether the number of grants awarded to undergraduate and students within ALFA I was 844, 1207 or 1947<sup>10</sup>. According to an informal EC document dated 31 October 2000, some 70 % were Latin Americans who spent a study period in Europe (and a small number who spent a study period in another Latin American country. The latter case is out of the scope of this evaluation).

One important indicator would have been a statistical survey on the quantitative results of the study period in Europe of the beneficiaries, i.e. to determine how many Master- and PhD-degrees were achieved within the framework of the ALFA-programme. However, due to the delays in the programme's implementation, student mobility is still ongoing (in fact, until the beginning of 2003) and at this moment, many students have not yet returned from Europe. Therefore, measurable academic or scientific results will only be available in one or two years. The different reports that so far have been issued by the TAO – financial report, final report etc. – had no information about the percentage of Master and Doctorate students who concluded successfully their study after returning from Europe.

In addition, the programme's design – which does not allow for full postgraduate courses in Europe, but only study periods without achieving an academic degree – makes it even more difficult to formulate an appropriate answer. But there are the qualitative interviews of the direct beneficiaries, i.e. the grant holders, and the local or general co-ordinators of the ALFA network in the three countries visited during the field phase, which can provide at least a partial solution to this problem. A great majority of the beneficiaries and local stakeholders stated that there has been transfer of knowledge, and also an increase of the scientific and technological potential in their country. These statements, however, must be kept in perspective given the modest number of grants awarded within ALFA. Indeed, when the scale of the grant-awarding programmes offered by other international donors (the EU Member States, the USA or Canada) or by the Latin American governments themselves is considered, it emerges that ALFA plays only a minor role.

If we look at the participation performance of Latin American universities, there is a clear gap between the more developed countries (or emerging economies), which were very actively engaged in ALFA, and the less developed ones, which had only a poor participation – and thus only little opportunity to be positively impacted by the programme. This situation reflects the fact that ALFA was implemented within a framework of mutual interest. It is therefore by no means surprising to see that the European universities sought mainly the strongest academic partners in Latin America.

Language problems of Latin American students could not be solved satisfactorily. Although the ALFA programme provides additional funding for improving student's language skills, the majority of the Spanish speaking Latin American students chose Spain as a host country, obviously for language reasons. This led to an unequal participation of European countries in the programme, with Spain being the most favoured host country in Europe, with an overall participation rate of about 30%.

**The survey** shows that for ALFA teachers the contributions to institutional or personal development of these type of exchanges (intranetwork) are: Academic and/or scientific improvements (78% very important and 22% relatively important), the exchange of information and increased academic potential (very important for 89% of the respondents), the education or further education of students and researchers (78% consider this aspect as

---

<sup>10</sup> According to a TAO list issued in December 2000, 697 Latin American and 147 European students received a grant. Unfortunately, these figures could not be confirmed. During the desk phase (September 2001), at the TAO, just before its closure, the evaluators received one undated list indicating 987 Latin American and 220 European grant holders. The EC document «La coopération entre l'Union Européenne et l'Amérique latine en matière d'enseignement supérieur / Document informel (non paper) proposé par les services de la Commission» dated 31 Octobre 2000, indicates in point 8 under the heading of «Situation actuelle» the most important results achieved by ALFA : «(...) Concrètement: 1947 étudiants ont participé à 77 `Masters`, 31 à des cours de spécialisation et 90 à des programmes de doctorat, dont les programmes d'études ont été enrichis par des composants `plurinacionales`». It was impossible to clarify which is the correct number of ALFA grant holders (844, 1.207 or 1.947).

very important). Two other aspects considered very important by 44% of all respondents are the institutional support that they can provide to mobile teachers and students as well as the institutional benefits gained from the transfer of knowledge between the participating networked universities (78% of all respondents).

#### ○ **CUESP**

As regards incoming mobility to the EU, 74 Thai academics (63 faculty members and 11 post-graduate students) had experienced an academic stay in Europe during the second phase of CUESP. The beneficiaries came predominantly from Chulalongkorn University; 15 faculty members came from seven other Thai universities. Host institutions (more than 45) were located in nine countries of the EU. Most academic visits consisted of short research visits (lasting between two weeks and two months) by senior faculty of the four involved faculties, visiting various institutions and countries in a short time-span. Outputs were to some extent limited to the individual level: publications and enrichment of undergraduate and post-graduate courses. In some cases textbooks on European topics were developed and published in Thai.

Beneficiaries mentioned their stay in Europe as too short and too individually focused on the specific research topic to experience much of social or cultural life in Europe. The narrow thematic focus of the visits also limited the beneficial impact on the faculty level in their home universities, as the topics often were not considered of great interest for the colleague of the beneficiaries. In addition, for most beneficiaries this was not the first, nor their last opportunity to visit Europe. No special arrangements were made for the visiting fellows. Arrangement of accommodation depended very much on the individual host institution. In general, no major problems were encountered.

All interviewed grant holders considered their visit to Europe as very beneficial on the personal and professional level, as it provided them with the possibility of doing research in a specialised environment and with access to specialised resources.

European studies are considered very relevant to Thai society in view of the importance of EU as the country's second trade partner. The CUESP programme contributed to an increase in knowledge on European issues inside and outside the university. An important aspect is the positive influence outside the university, as Thai scholars more often than is the case in Europe, have a formal or informal role to advise governmental or non-governmental organisations or participate in boards or have links with specialised research centres. Various beneficiaries mentioned having benefited from the fellowships for their functioning in these roles.

The CUESP programme achieved to institutionalise and organise the various topics of interest in European Studies within Chulalongkorn University, which in the past appeared dispersed throughout the university. Most important institutional achievements are the establishment of the National Centre for European Studies, the MA in European Studies and the European Documentation Centre. However the contribution of the incoming mobility component on these achievements was limited.

#### ○ **PTS**

The social and cultural immersion was reported to be a very important element for the beneficiaries. At the same time, the stay was frequently reported being too short to take full advantage of the academic and cultural exposure. The PTS grant provided for language courses. In spite of that, some language problems in non-English speaking countries were also reported by some PTS grantholders. The high cost of living in some European countries in relation to the amount of the grant prevented the students to a large extent from much participation in cultural exchange activities.

The mobility of 90 Asian students coming to the European Union to research for their Master thesis may be considered very successful. All Asian PTS grant holders graduated from AIT. The beneficiaries and their supervisors indicated that the stay in the EU provided the individual student with an important experience namely, having been exposed to a different

culture and a different working environment. PTS beneficiaries were considered as having become more mature, independent and proactive than their peers. After their return from Europe, they tended to be able to work more independently on their thesis and to require less attention than their fellow students who did not go to Europe. The PTS fellowship often provided the beneficiary with an experience of advanced technology that is not available in the region or with a thesis supervisor in a topic that cannot be found at home.

At the same time, the reception and monitoring of students in the host countries was not always very well arranged. Although most beneficiaries mention their interaction with their European supervisors as very positive and fruitful, some indicated that some host universities were not very well prepared or did not know what was expected from them.

On the institutional level positive effects were reported. Often inter-institutional links with institutions in Europe were established or strengthened. As a result of the increased inter-institutional links AIT faculty was invited to visit European institutions and some European supervisors visited AIT. Although the PTS programme was very individually oriented in its design, the supervision and follow-up provided by the respective AIT school was an important factor for success on the individual level and led to sustainable institutional effects.

There is also an indirect effect reported on fellow students who did not participate in the programme but who became interested through the enthusiasm of their PTS colleagues and found possibilities for collaboration with institutions abroad on their own initiative. It was remarked that the PTS programme influenced positively AIT's image and competitiveness, giving a boost to the image of the school.

Some PTS grant holders have continued their studies with a PhD trajectory in AIT, Europe, Japan or elsewhere. However, no exact information is available on the whereabouts of the PTS graduates.

**The survey** also shows that for CUESP and PTS teachers the most significant contributions of this type of exchanges are the academic and scientific improvements (for 80% of the respondents they are very important and for 20% they are relatively important). Other highlighted aspects by the respondents were the education or further education of students and researchers, and the initiation or further cooperation between universities (same percentages as the previous aspect).

It also emerges from the survey that 30% of Chinese teachers considered the mobility grants (free movers) as a very important contribution for academic or scientific improvements, and 11% as relatively important. However, for 33% of the Chinese teachers, the most important aspects are the institutional benefits and transfer of knowledge gained from this type of exchanges. Moreover, 30% indicate that this activity is very important in the initiation of cooperation between higher education institutions. 19% of the respondents report that these exchanges are of no importance towards industrial or other economic use or for technological improvements in their home country.

The survey revealed that all EDF/FVS responding teachers (who considered their exchanges as having taken place within an organised network exchange) reported that the main contribution of this type of exchanges are the resulting academic or scientific improvements, the exchange of information which contributes to increase the academic potential of their home university, and the initiation of further cooperation between higher education institutions. All respondents have also indicated that these exchanges are very important for their home institution in that they benefit from the transfer of knowledge gained. 83% considered the exchanges also as very important in that they allow the provision of institutional support to students/teachers/researchers during their period abroad.



**Question 1: Summarized assessment of programme based on judgement criteria**

Judgement criteria	Assessment of Programme Performance according to Judgement Criteria		
	ALFA	CUESP	PTS
1. Students, researchers and teachers have been trained at European institutions in accordance with the quantitative and qualitative targets.	In general, the mobility took place in accordance with the programme's targets, but due to the frequent delays (mobility is still ongoing), a qualitative assessment is difficult. The field phase interviews showed that several students achieved their qualitative target (i.e. finishing their PhD-research work successfully).	74 Thai academics (comprising staff and students) experienced an academic stay in Europe in accordance with the academic objectives. The qualitative objectives were attained.	90 Asian AIT students went to Europe for one term (3-4 months). The visit was considered successful. The qualitative objectives were attained.
2. Cooperation agreements exist between universities/research centres to facilitate transfer of knowledge.	Cooperation agreements exist and several of them continue despite the end of ALFA funding.	More than 42 host institutions in nine EU countries.	Despite the individual character of the programme, often inter-institutional links were established and strengthened.
3. The exchange contributed to fulfil regional, institutional or personal achievements.	Interviews and survey confirm this positive (but until now predominantly subjective) assessment.	Scholarship holders considered their visit to Europe as very beneficial on the personal and professional level. The contribution of the mobility component on the institutional level was limited.	Beneficiaries and their supervisors are very positive on the effects on the personal, institutional and regional level.
4. Studies/research in Europe contributed to increased knowledge and expertise of students, researchers and teachers.	Interviews and survey confirm the assessment, although it is mostly a personal impression	Undergraduate and post-graduate courses on European Studies were enhanced and new courses were introduced. Didactic material was developed in Thai.	PTS beneficiaries became more independent and proactive, and had experienced a unique level of advanced technology.
5. Students, researchers and teachers coming to Europe are capable of using their newly acquired knowledge and expertise for the benefit of their country (academic institutions and society at large).	It is too early to give an assessment on this very general judgement criterion, as most of the beneficiaries only returned within the last two or three years.	The CUESP contributed to an increase in knowledge on European issues inside and outside the university.	AIT alumni work in relevant sectors in Asia. No specific information is available on PTS alumni.

Summarising, we can state that there has been a transfer of new knowledge to third countries, and an increase of scientific and technological potential in those countries, although it has to be stated that in view of the overall academic exchange figures of the regions involved, this contribution was only a modest one.

**Question 2:** To which extent did mobility grants enhance the employment and professional perspectives of the grant holders in their home country?

Judgement criteria	Indicator(s)
1. The EU mobility programmes increase grant holders' job career perspectives and their chances on the labour market in their home countries	1. Grant holders' assessment as to whether their mobility experience improved their professional chances after having studied in Europe (percentage of grant holders, by programme).

It is difficult to fully address this issue. Indeed, several of the returned beneficiaries had not yet finished their studies. It was thus difficult to ascertain whether the mobility grant had enhanced their employment and professional perspectives in their home country or not. Therefore, the main indicators are the answers given in the survey and the assessment of the beneficiaries, co-ordinators and other local stakeholders during the qualitative interviews of the field phases.

#### ○ **ALFA**

The beneficiaries pointed out that despite the fact that it is too early for concrete results, the international experience obtained through the ALFA mobility grants would be an asset in the C.V. of the grant holders. On the one hand, companies need more and more staff members with international experience and a good command of foreign language(s), on the other hand, faculty staff members who do not seek a job, because they have tenure, profit academically from the networking between their university and European counterparts. Therefore, several interviewed PhD-students with stable employment as faculty staff members explained that their professional career would improve indirectly after obtaining the PhD, in terms of position and recognition at their university, independently of the fact whether they remained in their original post or not.

In some cases, concrete evidence of enhanced professional perspectives was provided: Some PhD courses (this is the case at the University of Costa Rica) have a mandatory study period abroad; the ALFA network allowed PhD-students to meet this requirement. Some stakeholders also gave concrete examples of better job chances of students once they had successfully finished their study. A significant number of beneficiaries (mostly graduate students) were in search of further possibilities to continue their studies in Europe (for example to undertake postdoctoral research). Undergraduate students considered the intercultural experience as an asset for their future professional career, although at the moment it was too early to measure it more precisely.

#### ○ **CUESP**

During the visits, most grant beneficiaries did not mention direct benefits to their professional careers as these were already firmly embedded in their respective faculties. The survey respondents, however, did not share this opinion (see below). However, the 11 junior fellows who engaged in one to two years of post-graduate studies in Europe were very positive on their career possibilities, as their study abroad provides them with good (English) communication skills and knowledge of Western culture. Most of them found work outside the university.

#### ○ **PTS**

The beneficiaries and their supervisors were very positive on the effects of the grant for their professional careers, especially their more proactive and independent attitude, their experience with advanced technology or with specialised topics. The European experience increases their attractiveness for potential employers, especially with European companies

or sub-contractors for European companies. In particular, the programme enhanced the training possibilities of students coming from poor backgrounds.

**The survey** shows that 57% of responding teachers (all countries all programmes) consider mobility very important and very relevant to enhance employment and professional perspectives of former grant holders. Only 3% consider that these exchanges do not enhance professional perspectives. The majority of CUESP teachers who responded (63%) consider mobility exchanges very important to enhancing employment and professional careers of former grant holders, and the remaining percentage has considered them as important and relevant to some extent.

67% of EU-China respondents considered that their professional and employment perspectives were to some extent enhanced by these exchanges. Only 11% did not see their perspectives as being enhanced by the fact of having participated in a mobility programme.

The opinions of FVS grant holders were divided: 40% indicated that the exchanges had been very relevant and important to enhance their employment and professional perspectives, while 35% saw no relevance or importance at all for their future careers. This is indeed a high percentage, but respondents did not justify their answers. The survey also shows that for CUESP and PTS teachers the most significant contributions of this type of exchanges are the academic and scientific improvements (for 80% of the respondents they are very important and for 20% they are relatively important). Other highlighted aspects by the respondents were the education or further education of students and researchers, and the initiation or further cooperation between universities (same percentages as the previous aspect).

#### Question 2: Summarized assessment of programme performance

Judgement criteria	Assessment of Programme Performance according to Judgement Criteria		
	ALFA	CUESP	PTS
1. The EU mobility programmes increase grant holders' job career perspectives and their chances on the labour market in their home countries	An important number of beneficiaries (students without job) mentioned an potential increase of job career perspectives, staff members confirmed indirect benefits (a higher position or better standing at home university.	Most scholarship beneficiaries did not mention direct benefits on their professional careers as these were already firmly based in their respective faculties.	The beneficiaries and their supervisors were very positive on the effects for their professional careers.

It can be concluded that undergraduate and graduate students as well as teachers who were beneficiaries of EC mobility grants gave a positive answer on the question about enhanced career perspectives or, in the case of staff members with tenure, of better academic positions after returning from Europe and achieving the envisaged academic degree.

**Question 3:** Did the awarding of mobility grants take into account a possible risk of « brain drain » and have some procedures and tools been set up in order to prevent that risk?

Judgement criteria	Indicator(s)
1. Universities have policies in place to encourage and support participation in mobility programmes that include measures to minimise/avoid brain drain.	1. Existence of policy provisions to counteract brain-drain.
2. EU mobility programmes (their policies,) are aware of possible "brain drain" phenomenon and its causes.	2. Selection procedures in the participating universities focusing on the brain drain issue.
3. Grant holders return home at the end of their academic exchange period.	3. Percentage of grantees having returned to their home university after the period abroad and analysis of possible causes/motivation of those not doing so.

#### ○ ALFA

Regulations of the ALFA programme stated that the beneficiaries had to sign a return commitment; most (but not all) of the undergraduate and postgraduate students interviewed confirmed having signed it. But the interviewed mobility co-ordinators made clear that they did not consider brain drain as an important issue while selecting the students for the study period in Europe. On the one hand because many of the postgraduate students already occupied a stable position at their home institution, and on the other hand because of the (in many cases) short duration of the study period in Europe and the fact that the grants did not lead to a new (higher) academic degree and, hence, did not stimulate them to stay abroad. So in general the beneficiaries returned to continue their studies. Some mentioned the personal and academic experience in Europe being so positive, that they would seek a new opportunity of postgraduate studies or postdoc research once they had finished their studies successfully.

#### ○ CUESP

All CUESP beneficiaries returned. No reintegration difficulties were mentioned after their return. No special measures were taken, however, as the short duration of the visits and the stable position of the fellows within their home institutions made brain drain not very likely.

Some junior research fellows searched and found possibilities to extend their study period in Europe, especially the PhD candidates, as it is not possible to obtain a European PhD title within one or two years. However, these students are expected to return after they will have finished their studies.

#### ○ PTS

All PTS grant holders returned to AIT. No specific measures were taken. The short duration of the stay in Europe and the fact that all PTS fellows had to come back to AIT to graduate may be expected to have contributed to the 100% return rate of PTS grant holders.

**In the survey** the following question was asked: Is EU-funded mobility susceptible to lead to « brain drain »? Only 7% of all Chinese respondents answered « to some extent ». All other respondents indicated « not at all ». However, when teachers were asked about the criteria they used in the selection of participants, 17% of respondent ALFA teachers who organised student mobility indicated having adopted procedures and tools to assess and/or avoid possible brain drain because they considered this to be important. Several beneficiaries had to sign a return commitment (in compliance with the ALFA guidelines); other co-ordinators included the return criterion in the selection process, although in most cases only implicitly.

80% of CUESP and PTS teachers and all Chinese and FVS teachers considered that this issue was not important.

**Question 3: Summarized assessment of programme performance**

Judgement criteria	Assessment of Programme Performance according to Judgement Criteria		
	ALFA	CUESP	PTS
1. Universities have policies in place to encourage and support participation in mobility programmes that include measures to minimise/avoid brain drain.	In many cases, despite the ALFA regulations, no special measures were taken when selecting the beneficiaries.	No special measures were taken, however, the short duration of the visits and the stable position of the fellows within their home institutions made brain drain not likely.	No specific measures were taken, as the short duration of the stay and the fact that all fellows had to return to AIT to graduate did not make brain drain very likely.
2. EU mobility programmes (their policies,) are aware of possible “brain drain” phenomenon and its causes.	ALFA regulations state a written return commitment of beneficiaries.	No special measures were needed.	No special measures were deemed necessary.
3. Grant holders return home at the end of their academic exchange period.	The great majority returned, only a small percentage remained in Europe, some due to personal reasons (e.g. marriage), others to continue research.	All beneficiaries returned.	All beneficiaries returned

Despite the fact that the EC programme policies and guidelines take into account the “brain drain” problem, the participating universities did not take special measures against this phenomenon, obviously because this seems not to have been necessary.<sup>11</sup>

**Question 4:** Did the awarding of mobility grants contemplate gender issues, and how did (and how many) female grant holders benefited from them?

Judgement criteria	Indicator(s)
1. Programme policies and design contemplate gender issues.	1. Existence of selection procedures which contemplate specific measures to promote female participation
2. EU mobility programmes reflect a more balanced participation between male and female grant holders	2. Percentage of female grant holders that actually participated in the programmes (by home country, level of studies).

○ **ALFA**

Only a small number of the interviewed beneficiaries and stakeholders stated that the gender issue had played a role during the selection process of the future grant holders. Despite the fact that the ALFA Guidelines mention gender issues as an important selection criterion, in none of the countries visited was it taken into consideration as a main issue<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> The positive findings of this evaluation may however not be generalised towards other regions of the world. A recent report, written in preparation for the World Summit on Sustainable Development, to be held in Johannesburg in September 2002, notes that Africa has lost one-third of its skilled professionals in recent decades. Although the report urges African nations to do more to support higher education financially and to protect the rights of professors, some say that the main problem is that universities in Western countries raid the best talent from Africa (University of Natal, 2001)

<sup>12</sup> Even the stakeholders at the University of Costa Rica, which takes very seriously the female participation at all levels (the evaluator received a detailed survey on this issue), told that no specific cautions were taken. Nevertheless it has to be mentioned that the PhD-course in education, from where half of the ALFA beneficiaries of the country were selected, had a very high ratio of female students.

Participation of female students (roughly 40% of the Latin American participants)<sup>13</sup> was quite satisfactory, especially with regard to the priority fields of cooperation (among others, engineering sciences), where the ratio of female students is traditionally lower than in other disciplines. However, the percentages vary between the different countries. In Chile, only 24 % of the beneficiaries were women. Despite this poor performance, no special measures were taken. The Chilean co-ordinators explained that they only accepted academic criteria when selecting the students. A probable explanation for these dissimilarities is the kind of studies in which the students are enrolled: in Costa Rica, a PhD-course in Education showed a high percentage of female students, whereas in Chile the disciplines which participated in the exchange programme relied more on natural sciences and engineering.

Some 50 % of the beneficiaries from Europe were female (but the mobility component from Europe to Latin America corresponds only to 25 - 30 % of the whole mobility taking place within ALFA).

**The survey** indicates that 26% of ALFA responding teachers considered gender issues as important criteria in their choice of participating students, while 28% responded that this was only a somewhat important issue. The remaining 46% indicated that this issue was not important or had not been used as a criterion for their choice of participating students. 50% of teachers indicate that this programme had very much contributed to increasing the chances of equal participation of men and women in this mobility programme, while the remaining 50% indicated that those chances had been increased to some extent.

#### ○ **CUESP**

48% of grant holders were female. According to the survey results gender was an important selection criterion. However, the CUESP coordinators indicated that no special measures had been taken to promote female participation as in Thailand almost no gender discrimination seems to exist at the academic level, in the disciplines concerned. The rate of participants' gender in the Master Course in European Studies is 75% female and 25% male; for visiting European lecturers it was 14% and 86% respectively, and for European senior researchers 29% and 71% respectively.

**The survey** shows that 40% of CUESP responding teachers considered gender issues as a very important criterion for choosing participants. The same percentage indicates that it was an important issue, while the remaining 20% responded that it was not important and therefore had not been taken into account.

#### ○ **PTS**

22% of grant holders were female. Although gender equality was mentioned to be a priority criterion for the selection of applicants, this is less than the average AIT gender ratio (37%). However, in comparison with the application figures, 47% of female applicants were admitted, while this was only 26% for male applicants. No explanation could be found for the low application rate for female students. 38% of the European students coming to AIT were women.

EU-China and EDF/FVS participating teachers did not answer this survey question. However, the number of male respondents (70%) is significantly higher than the number of female respondents. On the other hand, 17% of the EDF/FVS teachers indicate that this programme had very much contributed to increase the chances of balanced participation of women and men, while 67% considered that it had done so to some extent, and 16% responded not at all.

---

<sup>13</sup> Some 280 out of a total of 700 Latin American grant holders were female (according to the TAO grant holder list of December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2000).

**Question 4: Summarized assessment of programme performance**

Judgement criteria	Assessment of Programme Performance according to Judgement Criteria		
	ALFA	CUESP	PTS
1. Programme policies and design contemplate gender issues.	EC guidelines contemplate gender issues, but only little efforts were made to guarantee equal female participation when selecting the beneficiaries.	Although the survey indicates otherwise, CUESP coordinators indicated that no specific measures had been taken.	Gender equality was a selection criterion and in comparison with application figures, almost twice as much female students were admitted than male students.
2. EU mobility programmes reflect a more balanced participation between male and female grant holders	Despite the fact that gender equity is an objective of the programme, female students were a minority (about 40 % of the participants) and therefore not very satisfactory.	48% of scholarship holders were female.	22% of PTS grant holders were female. This is less than the average AIT sex ratio. No explanation could be found for the low application rate for female students.

Women form a minority in all mobility programmes. This can be explained by the gender ratio among staff and student population at the home universities<sup>14</sup>. Despite the fact that the programme guidelines contemplated the issue, in general the participating universities did not take special measures (i. e. quota or incentives).

*4.1.1.2. Promotion of Europe as a centre of academic excellence (point 2.2 in the Terms of Reference)*

**Question 5:** Did free mover mobility grants and intranetwork mobility grants contribute (and if so to what extent) to position Europe as a centre of academic excellence capable of attracting students from third countries wishing to obtain solid international qualifications?

Judgement criteria	Indicator(s)
1. The EU mobility programmes have made an important contribution towards restoring the balance between EU and, notably, the USA as far as student mobility is concerned.	1. Degree to which the image/perception of quality of European higher education institutions (i.e. their teaching and research) has improved as a result of interuniversity cooperation within the EU funded mobility programmes.

○ **ALFA**

The main information has been obtained during the field visits: the opinions of the direct and indirect beneficiaries (grant holders and coordinators) - opinions based on their European experience -, and other stakeholders gave clear (though subjective) answers. An important judgement criterion was the high number of ex-beneficiaries and co-ordinators willing to continue, and also to reinforce cooperation with European academic partners. A significant number of ALFA grant holders were interested in a second study or research period in Europe with another funding source. Especially in Chile, but (to a minor extent) also in Costa Rica and Mexico, the stakeholders interviewed pointed out that there was a longstanding tradition in the country of considering European universities as centres of academic excellence. Stakeholders of national institutions for the promotion of teaching and research like the Brazilian CAPES, the Mexican CONACyT (Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y

<sup>14</sup> In this regard, it has to be said that also in the EU member states the rate of female professors is also far away from being satisfactory.

Tecnología) pointed out their interest (and policy priority) to diversify academic exchange flows, and in particular to increase exchanges with Europe<sup>15</sup>.

Although the promotion of the European universities as centres of excellence was only an implicit objective when the programme was created in the early 90s, ALFA has contributed to reinforcing this perception of Europe. It contributed to strengthening the academic and cultural links between Latin America and Europe, although the programme's information and communication strategy should have been more effective. Compared with the overall size of amount of grants awarded by programmes in Latin American countries, ALFA is quite a modest option. Therefore, its effectiveness does not rely primarily on the money spent or in the number of grants awarded, but in its network structure and regional component. Both elements distinguish it from a large number of bilateral grant awarding programmes, most of them offered by EU Member States, but also by the United States and Canada.

But it has to be admitted that some important stakeholders (like the Brazilian CAPES) were reluctant about ALFA I – doubting its quality standards - due to the high number of network projects concentrated in Spain. The limited knowledge of other languages of most participants gave Spain a 30 % participation, which may be considered too high in proportion to the scientific and cultural potential of the 14 other Member States<sup>16</sup>.

**The survey** showed, on the subject of Europe as a centre of academic excellence, that a vast majority of teachers and students considered that the prestige and quality of their specific European partner university was more important than the prestige and quality of the overall higher education system of the host country. However, in the perception of the evaluators, this predominant argument in the questionnaires is only « half of the truth » - a heavy argument to chose the European partner university was the language question – if the applicant did not have a satisfactory command of English or another European language, he or she applied for Spain, the easiest way to solve the language problem – but a problematic one in terms of one important objective of the programme, i. e. to promote Europe as a centre of academic excellence. The quality of studies/research that they were about to undertake at the host institution was the determining criterion in their choice of host institution.

#### ○ **CUESP**

Nine European countries were visited by CUESP grantholders. Although some EU countries were more frequently visited than others, no significant influence can be attributed to language factors.

The European Studies Programme contributed to an enhanced interest in European Studies from students and staff at Chulalongkorn University. The importance that universities and their professors attach to European Studies is obvious. In view of future developments, first-hand European knowledge will remain of great importance for teachers and students involved in European Studies in Thailand. The impact of the programme on the image of Europe and European integration, in general outside the specific scope of European Studies, may be expected to be modest but positive.

---

<sup>15</sup> The Mexican CONACyT offers every year about 1.200 grants to graduate students for postgraduate studies in Europe, North and South America. CAPES sponsors 1500 grant holders (mainly PhD graduate students) outside the country.

<sup>16</sup> This imbalance (some call it a distortion) in the ratio of the participating European universities was one of the major reasons why the powerful Brazilian scholarship organization CAPES got a, in a certain way, negative impression of ALFA I and was not interested in funding the Brazilian partner universities participating in ALFA projects.



○ **PTS**

Fourteen European countries were visited by PTS grantholders. Although some language problems were reported, this did not significantly influence the choice of host country.

The PTS was reported to have a modest but positive contribution to the image of European higher education institutions. The PTS programme gave a positive impetus to mobility towards European institutions, but whose effectiveness in the light of the magnitude of the Asian region and the importance of other host countries, must be considered very limited. In this regard the obstacle of engaging in exchange programmes in non-English languages must be mentioned, as well as the high cost of living in some European countries. In general, figures of academic mobility reflect to some extent specific obstacles like language problems, but to a large extent depend on the availability of grant opportunities.

**Question 5: Summarized assessment of programme**

Judgement criteria	Assessment of Programme Performance according to Judgement Criteria		
	ALFA	CUESP	PTS
1. The EU mobility programmes have made an important contribution towards restoring the balance between EU and, notably, the USA as far as student mobility is concerned.	In general, the ALFA programme contributed to strengthening the EU as a centre of academic excellence, though in a modest size. The problem of the language distortion (being Spain disproportionately favoured) played against the objective of turning the EU into a Centre of Excellence	CUESP had a positive but modest effect on the image of European education for the people involved.	PTS had a positive but modest contribution to the image of European Higher Education institutions.

In general the impact of the evaluated programmes on the image of Europe as a centre of academic excellence was found to be modest but positive.

**Question 6:** To what extent have EC funded mobility grants increased the interest of higher education institutions in third countries for EU universities?

Judgement criteria	Indicator(s)
1. The experience of study or teaching abroad in the framework of a mobility programme has contributed to a better knowledge about the EU, its Member States, their higher education systems and universities.	1. Grant holders' assessment of their period abroad in Europe, from an academic and a socio-cultural point of view.
2. The mobility programmes are increasingly put in the framework of repositioning the EU as a "centre of academic excellence".	2. Degree to which the image/perception of quality of European higher education institutions (i.e. their teaching and research) is improving as a result of interuniversity cooperation within the EC funded mobility programmes

○ **ALFA**

In the opinion of co-ordinators and beneficiaries, the mobility grants contributed to prioritise cooperation and joint research projects with Europe, due to the financial possibilities offered by ALFA. The high number of applications to the ALFA programme demonstrates the positive attitude of universities in Europe and Latin America. An indicator of the genuine

interest generated in universities of both continents is the surprisingly high number of ongoing cooperation projects after ALFA's financial aid was terminated (to some extent, student mobility is also ongoing). Many stakeholders indicated that they were looking for more European opportunities just to diversify their exchange programmes.

#### ○ **CUESP**

As the topic of studies was "European Studies", the academic visits definitely improved the knowledge on the EU as a whole. However, various beneficiaries mentioned their stay being too short to very much experience cultural or academic life in Europe. CUESP had a positive effect on the image of European education for the people involved, but this effect must be considered very modest in terms of the university as a whole and even more so at national level. Academic mobility to European countries depends on the (non-) existence of barriers like language and visa problems, but even more on the availability of grants.

#### ○ **PTS**

The visit to Europe was considered very important for the personal and professional development of PTS beneficiaries. However, one term (3 to 4 months) was mentioned to be too short to take full advantage of the academic and cultural exposure.

The grantees already had a positive perception of European education before their exchange, as can be inferred from the high number of applicants for the programme. Asian students struggled to be admitted at AIT. Application figures for the PTS programme were more than three times as high as could be admitted (308 applicants for 90 grants). Students considered their participation in the PTS programme as an opportunity of a lifetime. For the first batches the most important selection criterion was the students' GPA. Therefore, the most outstanding students were sent to Europe. For later batches a cumulative analysis was made in order to achieve an equal distribution amongst the four schools and amongst the countries of origin.

One indication that the PTS programme helped to raise interest in European education institutions is an "indirect motivational effect". Fellow students, who did not participate in PTS, became interested in education exchanges thanks to the enthusiasm of PTS grant holders. Later, on their own initiative, they found possibilities for collaboration with institutions abroad.

According to **the survey**, the availability of EU funded cooperation programmes and mobility grants was the predominant factor inducing institutions to cooperate with their European counterparts and for students to choose a European host university. Other very important aspects that attracted the respondents were, at an institutional level, (i) institutional capacity building; (ii) further internationalisation of the institution by means of new exchanges and cooperation with other European universities; (iii) further developing cooperation contacts and activities.

100% of CUESP and EDF/FVS responding teachers considered the possibility of establishing and further developing contacts with European universities as a very important element contributing to the transfer of new knowledge and expertise as well as to the scientific and technological potential of the home university. 100% of the CUESP responding teachers reported that the availability of these programmes and grants is, to some extent, susceptible to inducing other forms of interuniversity cooperation. 100% of responding FVS teachers reported that to some extent they contribute to more research in other areas of study.

On an individual level, the availability of these programmes and mobility grants gave participants the possibility of (i) taking courses or research not possible in their home country/institution; (ii) participating in practical projects and laboratory work; (iii) taking courses involving teaching methods not available in the home country; (iv) more research in the participants' field of study, and (v) self-development.

**Question 6: Summarized assessment of programme performance**

Judgement criteria	Assessment of Programme Performance according to Judgement Criteria		
	ALFA	CUESP	PTS
1. The experience of study or teaching abroad in the framework of a mobility programme has contributed to a better knowledge about the EU, its Member States, their higher education systems and universities.	According to the interviews and the survey, ALFA contributed to a better knowledge about the EU and its Member States etc. A proof of it is the high number of ongoing cooperation projects after ALFA funding was terminated.	CUESP had a positive but modest effect on the image of European education. However, various beneficiaries mentioned their stay being too short to very much experience cultural or academic life.	The already positive perception of European education of the PTS applicants was strengthened by their visit to Europe.
2. The mobility programmes are increasingly put in the framework of repositioning the EU as a “centre of academic excellence”.	ALFA repositioned the EU as “centre of academic excellence”, but it has to be born in mind that the programme is of a comparatively modest size.	Academic mobility to European countries depends on the (non-) existence of barriers like language and visa problems, but even more on the availability of scholarships	Fellow students who did not participate in the PTS programme became interested in educational exchanges with European institutions as well.

In general the mobility grants enhanced the already positive image of European education.

**Question 7:** To what extent did mobility grants reinforce the EU’s cultural and economic presence in third countries?

Judgement criteria	Indicator(s)
1. Students, researchers and teachers have been well trained on European issues during exchange period	1a. Number of students, researchers and teachers trained abroad on European issues.
	1b. European studies are part of the regular degree curriculum of the home universities (in the third countries).
2. Programmes contemplate mobility and exchanges other than just student ones in order to foster economic and trade relations	2. Degree to which “non-students” participate in mobility and exchange programmes
3. European companies offer training placements to incoming students	3. Number of grant holders that received a training placement in European companies

○ **ALFA**

The (direct and indirect) beneficiaries emphasised the reinforcement of the European Union’s cultural presence in Latin America through the mobility grants, but denied an influence with regard to its economic presence. However, the interviewed stakeholders made clear that this reinforcement is inevitably modest, as ALFA is «middle sized» when compared to other international donor programmes. As *European Studies* as such were normally not the subject of the studies to be attended in Europe, the cultural presence did not grow directly, but only as a by-product of the grant holders’ exposure to European culture and way of life.

○ **CUESP**

All CUESP mobility took place within the framework of European Studies. Undergraduate courses on European topics have been enhanced and new courses have been introduced. A one-year interdisciplinary Master’s course in European Studies is running and financially sustainable. The CUESP programme implied more components than just incoming mobility to the EU. During visits of the European Consortium universities and from visiting professors

from other European universities various aspects of European Studies were discussed and lectured. CUESP beneficiaries mentioned the importance of their visits to Europe for enhancing their undergraduate and post-graduate courses. People involved in the programme are aware of the importance of the EU for Southeast Asian trade. However, the CUESP was not directly oriented towards economic cooperation and trade relations. Thai university academic staff is often involved in policy advising. Hence the enhanced knowledge by their academic visit to Europe will have its impact, though necessarily modest, among decision makers in Thailand.

At the same time, the periods were too short really to build up an institutional or individual link with (scholars of) the host university<sup>17</sup> and too short and focused on the individual research topic for the beneficiaries to experience many differences in academic culture or teaching and research methods.

#### ○ PTS

The effect of PTS on the EU's cultural and economic presence in the Asian region must be considered very limited. Some grant holders did their research in European companies such as Siemens and Nokia. These and other beneficiaries may be interesting to be contracted by European firms operating in Asia. However, alumni figures indicate that only 9% of AIT alumni are working in the private sector. Moreover, 90 PTS grant holders cannot make a difference on a total Asian population of over 3.3 billion.

Additionally, the high cost of living and language difficulties in non-English speaking countries and the short duration of the stay were also often mentioned as a problem for personal and cultural exchange in the host countries. Although some stated that with careful planning they could manage, all agreed that the grant (€ 800 a month) did not allow for much cultural exchange. Almost all beneficiaries and their supervisors mentioned one term (3 to 4 months) to be too short to take full advantage of the academic and cultural exposure.

#### Question 7: Summarized assessment of programme

Judgement criteria	Assessment of Programme Performance according to Judgement Criteria		
	ALFA	CUESP	PTS
1. Students, researchers and teachers have been well trained on European issues during exchange period	ALFA reinforced the EU's cultural, but not its economic presence.  There is no evidence that European Studies were created in the framework of the programme.	All CUESP mobility was oriented towards European topics.	PTS students were not trained in European issues.
2. Programmes contemplate mobility and exchanges other than just student ones in order to foster economic and trade relations	Other than student and staff member exchanges occurred only in a very small scale.	CUESP mobility was mostly staff mobility, however, not directed towards economic cooperation and trade relations.	Some grant holders did their research in European companies.
3. European companies offer training placements to incoming students	There were European companies offering training placements, but on a modest scale.	No European companies involved in training.	After termination of PTS some European companies offer training possibilities for AIT students.

The evaluation shows diverging appreciations from the three programmes: the CUESP was most effective in enhancing the cultural and economic presence of the EU in Thailand, as it was directed towards European Studies. ALFA beneficiaries were positive on the cultural influence but negative on economic influence. Finally the influence of PTS must be considered very limited in view of the magnitude of the Asian region and the modest size of

<sup>17</sup> Only a few beneficiaries mentioned that they were still in contact with their former host institutions.

the programme. This however, applies to some extent to the ALFA and CUESP programmes as well.

4.1.1.3. *Mobility grants and regional integration (point 2.3. in the Terms of Reference)*

**Question 8 and 9:** To what extent did the EC mobility programmes contribute to fostering South-South cooperation? Did free movers grants contribute to regional cooperation?

Judgement criteria	Indicator(s)
1. The mobility programmes include a component related to regional interuniversity cooperation and contribute to foster regional cooperation.	1a. Frequency of individual and-institutional regional cooperation (type of activities: student exchanges, teacher exchanges, joint research, joint development of curricula, development and introduction of credit transfer system).
	1b. Number and quality of networks of institutions in the region (outside EU funded mobility programmes), resulting from previous participation in a EU funded interuniversity mobility exchange.

○ **ALFA**

Due to the closure of the Technical Assistance Office, the exact number of regional grants (intra Latin America) could not be obtained. But in the three countries visited several regional grant holders were interviewed. Almost all beneficiaries and stakeholders emphasized that the ALFA programme contributed to fostering regional cooperation within Latin America. However, the mobility grants were only one of the tools offered by ALFA to strengthen this intra-regional cooperation. The current ongoing regional cooperation may be seen as an objective and visible indicator, which can be illustrated through the results achieved (common publications and congress and seminar papers, common manuals and guidelines for administrative and management purposes, etc).

Therefore, one of most important assets of the ALFA programme is its contribution to regional cooperation and integration. The links between Latin American universities, which were created within the ALFA programme, are in many cases still functioning despite the end of EC funding. The network and regional design was considered by almost all the interviewed stakeholders as very positive, innovative and as an excellent opportunity for Latin American universities. All types of academic cooperation (common research projects, seminars, workshops, guest lectures etc.) were mentioned. The comprehensive programme structure – proposals for institutional projects to foster the university's administrative performance, meetings to prepare a common research project were eligible as well as mobility projects – allowed the network participants to make optimal use of the (always relatively scarce) resources assigned. This asset is strongly related to the networks. It therefore leads us to believe that a free mover grants awarding programme would not have achieved the same results.

○ **CUESP**

As far as cooperation is concerned between researchers in the field of European Studies in Thailand and the ASEAN region, which is one of the specific objectives, it must be said that it was a lost opportunity that the Centre for European Studies at Chulalongkorn University was not involved in the establishment of European Studies Centres or Programmes in the region, beyond perhaps having acted as an example or 'inspiration'. It would have been very efficient way to capitalise on established know-how in Thailand and at the time it would have been an excellent opportunity for specialists in European Studies to work together and establish strong links. Although contacts exist on their own account, this could have been

better exploited by the EC. The programme design did not allow the exploitation of lessons learned with European integration for the benefit of ASEAN integration. According to many stakeholders, CUESP was too much uni-directionally oriented towards Europe.

○ **PTS**

The component of the PTS programme that is under evaluation, consisting of the 90 Asian students going to Europe during one term, did not include regional cooperation. On the other hand, the other component, consisting of 90 European students coming to AIT for 5 terms does foresee one term at another institution in Asia. However, some problems were reported of finding suitable host institutions for the European students. In addition, the European Commission excluded some countries, which were of interest to the students involved (China, India, Sri Lanka)<sup>18</sup>.

**Question 8-9: Summarized assessment of programme performance**

Judgement criteria	Assessment of Programme Performance according to Judgement Criteria		
	ALFA	CUESP	PTS
1. The mobility programmes include a component related to regional interuniversity cooperation and contribute to foster regional cooperation.	The ALFA university networks definitely fostered regional co-operation, and therefore South-South links.	The design of the mobility component did not contemplate regional mobility.	The design of the mobility component did not contemplate regional mobility.

In spite of the lack of official (EC) data on the number and quality of cooperation agreements/activities between regional universities, the interviews carried out during the site visits confirm that the regional component of the ALFA programme may be considered one of its most positive aspects. The incoming mobility component of the CUESP and PTS programmes did not imply any regional cooperation, which, in the case of the CUESP was unfortunate. There is no reason why free-mover mobility programmes should not contain a regional mobility component.

4.1.1.4. *Other evaluative questions (point 2.4 in the Terms of Reference)*

**Question 10:** To what extent does the Community administration system of awarding of mobility grants (i.e. tools, human resources, procedures) favour or hinder the pursuit of the expected results?

Judgement criteria	Indicator(s)
1. The administration of the programmes facilitated achieving the envisaged programme results or hindered them.	1a. Centralised or decentralised programme management and administrative procedures facilitating or hindering the objectives (length of the selection period, degree of punctuality in grant payment)
	1b. Time passed during selection procedure (between initial application and approval).
	1c. Time passed between approval and travel of grant recipient.
2. The programmes' Guidelines are clear and meet the specific needs of participant countries and individuals.	2. Stakeholders' expectations and assessment of the degree to which their needs have been addressed (i.e. level of satisfaction).

<sup>18</sup> The reason for this had to do with the existence of other EC funded programmes in these countries.

### ○ ALFA

Almost unanimously, the direct beneficiaries and the Latin American programme co-ordinators<sup>19</sup> interviewed during the field visits complained about the heavy administrative procedures and the long delays in responding and in the transfer of funds. Delays of half a year or a complete year occurred in many cases. In one case in Chile funds were delayed for nearly three years. In another case, money was sent from the EC to the partner institution without any specific name or subject identification<sup>20</sup>. The survey shows that 50% of all ALFA mobile teachers think that the administrative structure used to manage the programme was to a medium degree appropriate, while the remaining 50% of ALFA mobile teachers report a low degree of appropriateness.

The students' assessment of their mobility experience was more positive, although 22 % of the Mexican and 33 % of the Costa Rican students gave negative reports. At the same time, students' complaints about the low amount of the grant amount were quite common.<sup>21</sup> A second complaint was related to delays in paying out the grant, which ranged from a few weeks up to six months. This created a complicated situation for many students<sup>22</sup>.

Generally, the administrative problems gave way to a feeling of frustration among many direct stakeholders. Other consequences of the above mentioned problems were: postgraduate courses could not start as planned; the students chosen for the study period in Europe had in the meantime finished their studies and were no longer eligible as grant holders. In other cases the students who had been selected after the approval of the submitted project could not travel due to long delays between receiving confirmation of the approval of their project, the signing of the contract and the transfer of funds from Brussels to the network co-ordinator. As a consequence of these delays the participating universities were forced to initiate a new process of student selection (frustrating those who had previously been selected). In other cases, students did not arrive at the beginning of the semester, but in the midst of the term. However, calls for proposals and selection of ALFA network projects normally took place following the established time schedule.

The criticism related to the administrative problems before the projects could start – delays for which in most cases the responsibility lays in Brussels – were so general (in fact, less than 10 % of the local co-ordinators, general co-ordinators, participating academics and other university stakeholders met during the field phase considered the ALFA administration as “satisfactory”), that the question arises, whether the way the programme was managed did not seriously affect its performance. Some co-ordinators doubted if based on their experiences they would re-submit an ALFA proposal as network coordinators. This kind of frustration could potentially have prevented the intended increase of the number of Latin American network co-ordinators, which is one of the objectives of the programme.

---

<sup>19</sup> As ALFA is designed as a decentralised programme of horizontal academic cooperation, for each of the university networks within the programme's framework, an academic co-ordinator belonging to one of the participating universities was responsible for the whole co-ordination between the network universities on the one hand, and for all the administrative, financial and reporting issues with regard to the TAO in Brussels on the other. In more than 80 % of the ALFA projects the network co-ordinator was a European university.

<sup>20</sup> In the case of the ALFA project 601360, when, after more than two years of delays, the desperate Chilean network coordinator finally found out that the money had been transferred from the EC Financial Services to a wrong bank account and he therefore recommended in an e-mail the necessity of clearly indicating the name of the beneficiary and the subject and ALFA project number on the transfer, he only received the answer from an EC official, that this was out of his competence, because the transfer was the responsibility of another EC-office.

<sup>21</sup> EC funding covered about 75 % of the “eligible” costs (as defined by the EC). In some cases, during the interviews it emerged that the participating universities did not pay the remaining 25 %. They simply sent their students abroad without giving their financial contribution to the mobility project. This problem raises again the question about the national grant organisations like CAPES, CONACYT or Fundación Ayacucho, and their possibilities to co-finance the ALFA projects (which would suppose agreements between these institutions and the EC).

<sup>22</sup> The coordinators from the participating universities informed the grant holders that the cause of their inconveniences was Brussels' delay in sending the funds.

It should be noted that although the European Commission was assisted by a Technical Assistance Office in the task of managing the ALFA programme, all major decisions concerning the programme, such as the final selection of projects to be funded, remained within the EC.

In conclusion, the programme's administration was probably its weakest point. It cannot be excluded that the administration of the programme has been detrimental to the European Commission's image.

#### ○ **CUESP and PTS**

The European Commission was not directly involved in the implementation of neither CUESP nor the PTS programmes. The PTS programme, implemented by the Asian Institute of Technology, organised an efficient and effective administration process. CUESP, implemented by a consortium of three European universities (Tübingen, Robert Schuman in Strasbourg and Bocconi in Milan), handled all finances and developed a solid administrative structure as well<sup>23</sup>.

The Faculty fellowships under CUESP were reported to be adequate, whereas the junior fellowships were considered somewhat tight. The individual faculty member did the organisation of the research visits. The consortium offered help in identifying interested host institutions. The fellowships were distributed on an equal share basis among the four faculties and there was no major competition, as the demand was low due to the difficulties for senior teachers to leave their duties unattended.

**The survey** shows that 83% of all EDF/FVS mobile teachers consider that the administrative structure used to manage the programme was to a medium degree appropriate, while the remaining 17% of EDF/FVS mobile teachers considered that the management structure of their programme was to a high degree appropriate. As to the Coordinators, the CUESP responding coordinators have a more positive view on this issue, as 40% indicated a high degree of appropriateness and 60% a medium degree of appropriateness. However, it should be noted that during the site visits, the feeling was expressed that CUESP did not in all aspects reflect the priorities of the stakeholders at Chulalongkorn. For example, omitting to take up ASEAN integration issues, links with industry and exchange with European scholars specialised in Asian Studies somehow does not reflect a significant degree of ownership. One beneficiary remarked: "Ownership starts with the budget". A more evenly distributed budget could have increased the feeling of ownership within Chulalongkorn, and this would probably have had a positive effect on sustainability of the programme's results.

From an administrative point of view, the responding students' assessment of their mobility experience was more positive. 10% of former PTS student grant holders reported a negative experience. Only 8% of the EU-China students and 14% of EDF/FVS students considered their experience as very negative from an administrative point of view.

---

<sup>23</sup> The allocation of the budget was the subject of discussions between CUESP and the European consortium. Eventually the consortium took a decision: Only 10% were spent directly by the CUESP administration on administrative and publication costs.



**Question 10: Summarized assessment of programme performance**

Judgement criteria	Assessment of Programme Performance according to Judgement Criteria		
	ALFA	CUESP	PTS
1. The administration of the programmes facilitated achieving the envisaged programme results or hindered them.	The administration very often hindered the envisaged results and was detrimental to the programme's image.	The consortium of European universities developed a solid administrative structure.	AIT organised an efficient and effective administration process.
2. The programmes' Guidelines are clear and meet the specific needs of participant countries and individuals.	In general, the guidelines met the needs of the participant countries and individuals, although they did not foster the participation of the least developed countries of Latin America.	Although the survey indicates otherwise, during the site visit the feeling was expressed that CUESP did not in all aspects reflect the priorities of the stakeholders at Chulalongkorn University.	Programmes' guidelines were clear and expectations of the beneficiaries were met.

The ALFA programme's administration was probably its weakest point. It cannot be excluded that the administration of the programme has been detrimental to the European Commission's image. Both PTS and CUESP, which were administered by the implementing institutes, organised efficient and effective administration structures.

**Approximation of cost-benefit analysis of ALFA, CUESP and PTS**

Judgement criteria	Indicator(s)
1. The relation between the costs of the mobility components of the programmes and the value of their effects	1. Costs of mobility, of coordination, of administration and value of the benefits

It is extremely difficult to come to general conclusions comparing the five programmes, as figures represent diverging cost items (cf. table in Annex 3). For example, the administration costs for the PTS programme (Asian component) representing 15% of the costs of incoming mobility, cannot be compared as such with the administration costs of the CUESP programme which have been calculated as 12% of incoming and outgoing mobility. This programme has a separate budget line for coordination costs whereas in PTS these are considered administration costs. If one adds up the CUESP coordination costs with the administration costs, one would get an administration/coordination fee of 42% of the overall expenditure. Although apparently extremely expensive<sup>24</sup>, this cannot be compared as such with the 15% of PTS, as CUESP's fee includes incoming and outgoing mobility, and coordination activities have been reported to be very beneficial for the institution building effects of CUESP, such as the establishment of the Centre for European Studies, the European Documentation Centre and the Master Course in European Studies. A comparison between CUESP and FVS coordination fees is impossible as well, given that in FVS expert visits are included, in CUESP these are separately budgeted. On the other hand, for FVS, the administration of grants was managed directly by the EC, which, according to the project implementers, did not facilitate at all the administrative tasks of the Utrecht University<sup>25</sup>.

<sup>24</sup> Comparing these figures with administration/coordination costs of other Institution Building programmes such as the Dutch MHO, where this percentage varies between 10 and 25%.

<sup>25</sup> The separation between the fellowships component (administered by the EC) and the link programme (administered by Utrecht University) caused a discrepancy in time between both programmes (because of a delay in the start-up of the fellowship phase, the link programme is concluded while the fellowship component still continues).

For the initial phase of ALFA (1994 to 1999) the EC allocated a budget of € 38,4 million (including a supplement of € 6,4 million), to which some € 11 million own funding has to be added. From this overall budget of some € 49,4 million, € 6 million were earmarked for the support activities (mainly to finance the Technical Assistance Office, follow-up, publications, the Scientific Committee and contingencies). Therefore, the ratio between the overall programme budget and the administrative budget is 12,15 %, which is quite satisfactory. If we deduct the funds provided by the partner networks, thus funds not administered by the EC (therefore not creating any additional work), the ratio raises to 15,6 % administrative costs – still acceptable – and, when compared to other donor agencies, can be considered as a competitive percentage<sup>26</sup>. But the administrative ratio gets worse if we take into account that in addition to the TAO the work of EC officials has also to be calculated (in the decision making process, in the allocation of funds etc.), and that the network coordinators also had a significant administrative burden. This is difficult to measure, but should be considered when discussing the programme's efficiency.

A conclusion based on this comparison could be that the administration/coordination of free-mover programmes is less expensive than the one of institution building programmes (intranetwork cooperation programmes). However, the value of this conclusion is limited as it is not possible to translate the effectiveness of both programmes in financial terms in order to come to a cost-effectiveness ratio. Although institutional effects of the coordination activities by the CUESP European consortium have been reported as very positive and quite sustainable, these cannot be quantified (N.B.: this component was not part of the evaluation). This applies to the effect of the PTS programme, which has been evaluated positively on an individual and institutional level but which cannot be quantified either.

At this moment, due to the fact that mobility under ALFA I will continue until 2003, it is not possible to assess qualitative achievements, i.e. achieved results. During the field phase visits, beneficiaries evaluated their study experience in Europe very positively. In the meantime, some had successfully concluded their studies.

The percentage of administrative costs of the ALFA programme is not the only way to address the cost-efficiency issue. A preliminary (though merely quantitative) approach is the following calculation: The programme budget (including counterpart network funds, excluding the administrative budget) of ALFA I was of € 43,4 million, of which approximately 70 % were spent on mobility projects (including secondary programme costs declared "eligible" items by the EC), i.e. € 30,38 million<sup>27</sup>. Following an informal EC document of October 2000, 17.615 months/grants have been awarded. Therefore, dividing the programme's budget spent in mobility projects (including secondary items) by the number of months/grants awarded, the result is € 1.724 expenditure for each month/grant or € 20.696 a year. This is comparable with other donor programmes: e.g. DAAD PhD grants: € 1.600/month; Nuffic MSc grants: 1470/month). This would make a difference of less than 10 % higher average costs of a 12 months-ALFA grant, which could be seen as acceptable. But the ratio worsens if we consider the real monthly amount given to the beneficiaries: in the ALFA I programme, the net value of the grant was € 600 a month, while PhD grant holders of DAAD get a grant of net € 920 a month<sup>28</sup>. (Nuffic monthly allowance: € 735,12, excluding travel, accommodation, study materials, etc). The ratio between the amount of the net monthly value of the grant and the net expenditure seems not to be very satisfactory, but a more detailed analysis (which is out of the scope of this evaluation) would be helpful to determine whether the difference is due to other network activities which influence positively the objectives of the programme, or to an imbalanced cost structure within the networks.

<sup>26</sup> For instance, the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) has a ratio of some 11 % administrative costs (distributed on a variety of more than 100 exchange programmes, which may have very different ratios of administrative costs).

<sup>27</sup> Following the ALFA Directory, page 22, only 58 % were spent on mobility projects, i. e. € 25.172 million which divided by 17.615 months/grants gives an average of € 1.542,5 net /month, or € 18.510,6 a year.

<sup>28</sup> As the evaluators were told, in ALFA II the amount of the grant is supposed to raise to € 1.000 a month, which seems to be reasonable with regard to the living costs in almost all EU countries.

Regarding the costs of mobility (including tuition, allowances, travel costs, language courses, insurances and book allowances) very rough averages have been calculated. Factors influencing the volume of these costs are the length of the stay (obviously, for short trips travel costs are more significant in terms of monthly costs than a two-year Master course), and the aim of the visit. The only relevant conclusion is that the Asian component of the PTS programme was not as expensive as has frequently been suggested by the EC Steering Committee.

In short, it is extremely difficult to come to general conclusions, as in all programmes, figures represent diverging cost items. In addition, the one-way mobility from third countries to Europe is only one of a wider range of cooperation instruments, which had to be “isolated” for the purpose of this evaluation. While the costs of the various programmes have been compared, it was impossible to translate the effectiveness of the isolated components of the programmes into financial terms. Therefore, it has not been possible to analyse the cost-effectiveness of the programmes. However, a comparison with mobility programmes run by EU Member States shows that at least in the case of the ALFA programme the performance was not very satisfactory.

**Question 11:** To what extent are both types of mobility grants sustainable in the long term without continuous financial support from the EC?

Judgement criteria	Indicator(s)
1. Sustainability of mobility grants without EC support	1a. Degree to which intra-network mobility continues without EC support.
	1b. Degree to which free mover mobility continues without EC support.
	1c. University use their own or other financial means to fund mobility
2. Existence of funding for mobility exchange from other national or international donors.	2a. Number and financial scope of co-operation agreements local universities have concluded with other international or national donors or scholarship organisations
	2b. Number and financial scope of co-operation agreements between EC and other national / international donors or scholarship organisations.
3. Existence of cooperation agreements between universities and companies.	3. Number and financial scope of co-operation agreements local universities have concluded with companies

#### ○ ALFA

One of the strongest achievements of ALFA in terms of sustainability is the networking of universities, within Latin America and also between the European Union and Latin America. Many cooperation activities are still ongoing without ALFA funding. In some cases, the Latin American network partners were invited (without ALFA funding) as guest lecturers to Europe or to other Latin American countries, in other cases, the network members managed to continue sending some PhD students to Europe, financed by other means, such as short term grants from EU member States etc. Both results demonstrate ALFA's positive spin-off effects. Also the regional component of the programme continued functioning in many cases without EC funding. Networking and regional cooperation therefore are two core elements of the ALFA programme with a chance to be sustained without EC funding – although on a lower level of intensity.

In addition, the major Latin American universities started developing a policy of internationalisation and student mobility. There are middle sized private universities in

Mexico, which annually exchange more than one hundred students<sup>29</sup>. Some of these universities will also continue exchanging students within the ALFA network, although ALFA funding is finished. One should keep in mind, however, that particularly rather expensive private universities can afford the expenses and cope with the organisational problems that a study period abroad entails. The mobility-option will then be limited to a small group of upper class students<sup>30</sup>.

There is no evidence that the EC did not assess the possibility of negotiating agreements on joint mobility programmes with national or international grant awarding agencies, which could allow continuing the programmes despite the decreasing of the EC funding.

#### ○ **CUESP**

Travel possibilities for faculty members have diminished, but still exist in some way or another through membership of associations, invitations for conference attendance and other fellowship programmes (Thai, Japanese, European, etc.). As one of the beneficiaries put it: “The ones who once got an opportunity to travel always keep getting invited each year”. The MA in European Studies has replaced to an extent the post-graduate training component for post-graduate students who went for one or two years to Europe for a Master’s study. The visiting professors that come from Europe paid by the MA often also give some lectures to a broader audience in the faculties or outside the university.

Responses of Chulalongkorn University to the opportunities the CUESP as well as other international cooperation programmes and partnerships provided have been limited by various factors. First of all the Asian financial crisis in 1997 eclipsed any development plan of the university. Furthermore, after changes in the University’s administration both vice-presidents for International Relations and for Research resigned and were not replaced. Lack of funding limits the possibilities to follow-up international contacts and is one of the reasons for many of Chula’s numerous international inter-institutional agreements being not more than paper agreements. However, this applies to many higher education institutions, even in Europe.

Although the MUA explicitly indicated its intention to maintain its support to CES at the same level, it seems prudent to search for a diversification of sources of income. Until now there is no other direct donor support to the Centre for European Studies, except for specific contributions to some conferences. During CUESP’s implementation there were certain limitations for searching additional funding. For example, it was not possible to open up cooperation towards European scholars interested in Asian topics, as the programme was exclusively limited towards European issues. Cooperation with the business sector was outside CUESP’s scope as well. With the closure of the programme there are more possibilities for developing links with these sectors, which seem very relevant for the sustainability of the Centre. Although the Centre acknowledges the importance and the possibilities that these sectors could provide, not many activities have yet been developed in this field. The MUA strongly supports this orientation towards the industry sector.

#### ○ **PTS**

AIT will only be able to continue providing grants for research visits to Europe if alternative external or internal (increased tuition) funding sources are found. Some examples for external funding exist: In some cases cooperation contributed to a broad-based inter-institutional cooperation programme, as in the case between the AIT School of Management and the European School of Management (ESCP-EAP) with branches in Paris, Oxford, Berlin and Madrid. With funding from the French government 62 Asian students and 30 European students are participating in a 2-year dual degree MBA programme, spending

---

<sup>29</sup> In the specific case of the Universidad Iberoamericana, 5 students travelled within the framework of ALFA I.

<sup>30</sup> The Chilean model of bank loans for postgraduate studies mentioned in the Field Phase report is quite recent but also selective in the priority disciplines (namely those with a high return in terms of the private income of the credit holder). Therefore, this does not seem to be an adequate alternative because it only covers a small range of academic disciplines.

three terms at AIT, two terms in a European Business School and one term for research/thesis either in Europe or Asia, leading to a degree from both institutions. In 2000, Asiaweek in the Asia Pacific region ranked this MBA programme no. 4. In other cases institutional contacts with the grant holders' supervisors led to the invitation of European scholars as assistant professors at AIT. Some inter-institutional links started in the framework of PTS received a follow-up funded by a European industry (Siemens and Nokia).

Generally sustainability will be more complicated at the institutional level than at the individual level. The above-mentioned positive spin-off effects of the programme, the increased or enhanced inter-institutional links, need to be followed-up to be sustainable. This might be possible with modern communication media such as e-mail and the Internet. However, personal contacts will remain indispensable. It can be expected that some institutional effects will fade unless new funding be found, as in the case with the joint MBA of AIT/ESCP-EAP and some partnerships funded by European industry. Other academic contacts will be maintained, if these are to the benefit for both partners.

**The survey** gives a clear picture of the opinion of responding mobile teachers on this issue. To the question as to whether their government had considered providing complementary national financial resources to fund student mobility, 50% of ALFA respondents answered « to some extent », while the other half answered « not at all ». 17% of EDF/FVS respondents indicated « to some extent », while 83% said « not at all ». The questionnaire also asked them whether there had been support from political actors and from the private sector to foster student mobility. In both cases the answers were 100% « not at all ». 100% of ALFA mobile teachers indicate that there is, to some extent, a sense of ownership of the programme among participants. This opinion is shared by 67% of EDF/FVS mobile teachers.

When asked if they thought that the benefits brought by the programme in which they participated were sustainable should it come to an end, 100% of ALFA and 33% of FVS mobile teachers replied that they were sustainable to some extent, while 67% of FVS teachers said « not at all ». As for the coordinators, 40% of CUESP respondents indicated that their government had considered providing complementary funding to mobility, as well as that there was envisaged support from political actors to fostering mobility. CUESP coordinators (60%) indicate that their institution and beneficiaries of the mobility grants feel a strong sense of ownership of the programme in which they participated.

Should the programme and its funding come to an end, 40% of CUESP coordinators and 5% of ALFA coordinators rated as « very much so » the sustainability of the benefits it brought to the participating institutions, while the vast majority (92% ALFA and 60% CUESP) of respondents believe that they are sustainable to some extent. Only 3% of ALFA responding coordinators indicated « not at all ».

**Question 11: Summarized assessment of programme performance**

Judgement criteria	Assessment of Programme Performance according to Judgement Criteria		
	ALFA	CUESP	PTS
1. Sustainability of mobility grants without EC support	Several university networks continue cooperating, some of them include exchange of students without EC funding, but in a minor dimension.	Travel possibilities for staff diminished but exist to some extent.	Mobility depends entirely on external funding.
2. Existence of funding for mobility exchange from other national or international donors.	There are important national and international donor agencies, but there is no evidence they were encouraged to co-operate and co-finance.	Other donors exist, however mobility in European studies will not be funded by other than European donors.	Funding for mobility exists, but to a lesser extent and paid by national governments or by the involved institutions themselves.
3. Existence of cooperation agreements between universities and companies.	Only little evidence of co-operation agreements between universities and companies.	The design of the CUESP programme did not permit cooperation with business sector.	Some inter-institutional links, which started under the PTS programme, received a follow-up funded by a European industry.

Continuity of mobility grants beyond the programme's termination depends to a large extent on the existence of (alternative) external funding. In all involved institutions alternative funding for mobility grants exists to some extent. Reliance on this kind of funding, however, could limit mobility to better off students, or could have as a consequence that mobility will be directed towards other regions (depending on the regional preferences of the alternative donors).

**Question 12 and 13:** To what extent did both approaches of mobility grants contribute to the institutionalisation of mobility in the home universities of the grant holders? If they did, which tools and mechanisms have been adopted (i.e. recognition of periods of study abroad, transfer of academic credits, databases of grant holders, development of joint curricula, training of resource persons, etc.) to achieve it?

Judgement criteria	Indicator(s)
1. Universities in Europe and third countries engage in the elaboration of joint curricula that take into account the specific needs and constraints of the respective institutions and countries.	Collaborative agreements existing between home and host institution(s)/research centres leading to joint or double degrees/diplomas; number of students that effectively benefited from this result (by programme).
2. Increasing successful dialogue between universities in Europe and in third countries with a view to introducing and facilitating academic recognition of diplomas, exams and study periods taken abroad, as well as the transfer and/or accumulation of academic credits.	2. Evolution in the process of academic recognition of diplomas and study periods abroad and contribution to the development of a system for the accumulation and transfer of academic credits, as a result of the EU funded programme.
3. Mobility exchanges become part of the universities institutional (internationalisation) policy.	3. Creation or strengthening of international relations offices within participating universities (by programme).
4. The mobility programmes have contributed to qualitative improvements (curricular, didactic, pedagogical) in cooperation (including joint research) between existing and newly created networks of universities at regional and/or trans-continental level, thus contributing directly to the development of human resources	4. Number, type and quality of new courses being introduced as a result of mobility programmes and consequent increase in the number of graduates, postgraduates, post -doctorates participating in mobility programme.

#### ○ ALFA

Almost all higher education institutions in Latin America participating in ALFA already had an international relations office operating before the programme started. This makes it difficult to ascertain whether ALFA contributed to the establishment of such an office or not.

The programme was an additional opportunity for the universities to develop or reinforce the exchange of students and teachers with Europe. ALFA has indeed increased the number of students from Latin America travelling to Europe. Consequently, some universities reinforced their international relations offices in parallel with their participation in ALFA projects. Therefore, an indirect influence on the need to strengthen international academic cooperation can be attributed to ALFA. For some “younger” higher education institutions ALFA contributed decisively to the creation of a centralised office of international relations (this is the case, for example, of the Instituto Tecnológico de Costa Rica).

With regard to intra-network agreements on joint diplomas or study modules, development of joint curricula etc, it has to be stressed that neither the interviews during the field visits nor the survey revealed attempts in this direction. If agreements were settled, they focussed on the recognition of the credits acquired at the host university during the study period abroad.

#### ○ CUESP

In general, an important overall achievement of the programme was the institutionalisation and organisation of various topics of interest in European Studies, which were formerly dispersed throughout the university. However, no joint education programmes were developed or planned in the framework of the CUESP programme. Although various inter-institutional links exist with European universities, the incoming mobility component did not

influence directly the institutional level, as the topics often were very specific and not considered of great interest for other faculty members. Also, the periods were too short to really build up an institutional or individual link with (scholars) of the host university. No formal recognition of diplomas was part of the mobility component. Three junior post-graduate fellows obtained a Master's title during their stay in Europe. No activities were undertaken in the field of academic credit transfer.

Within CUESP four joint research projects were launched. The contribution of the incoming mobility component to these projects was limited. The research projects concluded with four publications.

CUESP had a positive effect on mobility to Europe as the MA in European Studies has a study visit to Europe as an integral part of the programme. However, beyond the European Studies Centre<sup>31</sup> and the MA<sup>32</sup>, the effect on the institutional memory of Chulalongkorn University must be considered modest. The network of Thai 'Europeanists', formed by the CUESP Faculty Fellows as a kind of Alumni Association, which was mentioned in the final CUESP report as an important contribution to sustainability, does not seem very vibrant. Resource persons in the MUA and the Thai Research Fund mentioned the CES to be somewhat exclusivist and isolated within CU. While being a national centre, more promotion work should be done by the Centre to involve other scholars in European subjects in other universities or centres.

Follow-up to the numerous international links of CU depends to a large extent on the availability of resources. Existing courses have been enhanced and new courses have been introduced, in Chulalongkorn as well as in other Thai universities.

#### ○ **PTS**

No joint degree programmes were offered as part of the PTS programme, as this only implied one term in a European institution. However as a direct spin-off of the PTS programme a dual degree MBA programme was developed in cooperation between AIT and the European School of Management (ESCP-EAP) with a first year in Asia and a second in Europe. With funding by the French government 62 Asian students and 30 European are enrolled in this MBA programme.

The PTS study visits to European institutes were all recognised as part of the AIT master's programme. AIT is increasingly involved in the establishment of sandwich programmes<sup>33</sup> with partner organisations abroad. However it is acknowledged that this approach is far more complicated for the majority of more "technical" oriented studies at AIT, which are stricter, and less flexible than the management courses.

The AIT School of Management (SOM) adopted the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) in order to facilitate academic exchange. Various PTS grant holders were offered a PhD trajectory and some indeed went back to their host institutions after their graduation at AIT. In one dual degree MBA programme, study abroad is part of the normal curriculum. The success of PTS aroused the interest of AIT to continue the formula in regular AIT programmes. However, this would require additional funding. AIT has many international partnerships, in the Asian as well as the European region. However, the extent to which follow-up can be given to these links, depends largely on available funds.

---

<sup>31</sup> The Centre for European Studies receives institutional support from the university in the form of office space, facilities and staff seconded by the various faculties. The Ministry of University Affairs (MUA) has acknowledged the centre within its programme for specialised 'National Centres for Regional Studies' and provides a budget of approx. € 50,000 per year for its functioning.

<sup>32</sup> The Master's Course in European Studies is running for its fifth year and continues to attract more interested students than can be admitted who are willing to pay 300,000 Baht (approx. € 7,000) for the one-year programme. Tuition fees provide for a study visit to Europe, visiting professors from Europe and the salaries of the CU professors.

<sup>33</sup> A sandwich course is a training course with alternate periods of formal instruction and practical experience. In this particular case, they start and end at AIT, and include a research or practical oriented period in another institution in between.



**In the survey**, mobile teachers and coordinators were asked whether the EU programme in which they had participated have contributed to strengthening the institutional capacities of their home university. 10% of FVS mobile teachers answered: « very much so », 67% « to some extent » and 23% said « not at all »; 100% of the responding ALFA mobile teachers reported a contribution « to some extent ». As for the coordinators, 80% of CUESP respondents indicated « very much so and 20% « to some extent ». 92% of ALFA coordinators reported « to some extent » and only the remaining 8% said « not at all ».

#### Questions 12-13: Summarized assessment of programme performance

Judgement criteria	Assessment of Programme Performance according to Judgement Criteria		
	ALFA	CUESP	PTS
1. Universities in Europe and third countries engage in the elaboration of joint curricula that take into account the specific needs and constraints of the respective institutions and countries.	No evidence of agreements leading to joint curricula in the framework of the ALFA mobility programme.	No joint education programmes were developed nor were they planned for.	No joint degree programmes were offered as part of the PTS programme. However, as a direct spin-off of PTS a dual degree MBA programme was developed in cooperation between AIT and the European School of Management.
2. Increasing successful dialogue between universities in Europe and in third countries with a view to introducing and facilitating academic recognition of diplomas, exams and study periods taken abroad, as well as the transfer and/or accumulation of academic credits.	There were only mentioned agreements regarding the recognition of the credits acquired during the study period abroad. No evidence of further university commitments (like double degrees etc.) in the framework of ALFA.	No formal recognition of diplomas was part of the mobility programme.	All PTS study visits were recognised as part of the AIT master's programme. The AIT School of Management adopted the European Credit Transfer System.
3. Mobility exchanges become part of the universities' institutional (internationalisation) policy.	The majority of the better off universities in Latin America started developing internationalisation policies before ALFA, including mobility programmes. ALFA fostered this institutional policy.	CU has many international contacts and partnerships. However, the effect of the incoming mobility component of CUESP on the institutional memory of CU must be considered modest.	AIT has many international partnerships. The success of PTS aroused the interest of AIT to continue the formula. However this depends on available funding.
4. The mobility programmes have contributed to qualitative improvements (curricular, didactic, pedagogical) in cooperation (including joint research) between existing and newly created networks of universities at regional and/or trans-continental level, thus contributing directly to the development of human resources	Several networks worked on qualitative improvements through academic co-operation and joint research projects. However, concrete examples are difficult to find.	In the framework of the CUESP four joint research projects were started. The contribution of the incoming mobility component to these projects was limited.	Existing partnerships were strengthened and new partnerships were initiated.

The implementation of the mobility programmes under evaluation coincided with an increasing interest in international cooperation and with the strengthening of the international cooperation offices, which created a positive environment for institutionalisation of mobility. The impact of the programmes on the institutional memory must however be considered modest.

#### 4.1.1.5. Socio-economic issues emerging from the survey:

The question of the socio-economic background of the participants was **not** explicitly included in the Terms of Reference for the evaluation. However, during the meetings with the Steering Committee this issue appeared to be of great interest. This was evaluated by means of the survey. The judgement indicators were the level of education of the beneficiaries' parents, their occupation and income level.

The analysis of the students' family educational background suggests some bias towards higher educational levels of parents, in particular of their fathers, with one exception in Mexico, where 80% of the respondents' fathers and 100% of their mothers had left school before the age of 15. The survey shows that all countries except Chile, Zimbabwe and PTS participants, students' fathers have obtained a higher education degree. In these cases the percentage of respondents' mothers with a higher education degree is higher than the percentage of fathers with the same academic qualification. The discrepancy between PTS and CUESP respondents concerning the highest education level reached by their mothers (70% for PTS and 17% for CUESP students) is noteworthy.

The majority of students' parents belong to the higher occupational categories, mainly in intellectual and scientific professions. The result for Mexico cannot be considered as significant, given that only 40% of the respondents have answered this question. Significant is however the fact that 100% of Costa Rican and 83% of CUESP respondents' mothers are not engaged in paid activity and are not seeking employment.

In spite of the fact that the majority of students' fathers belong to the higher occupational categories and have a higher education qualification, the majority of respondents assess the income status of their parents as average when compared to the average income situation in their home countries. Exceptions are Chile and Peru (both with 50%), CUESP students with 37,6% and Costa Rica with 36% of respondents estimating the income status of their parents as above average. EDF/FVS students show a significant contrast in their replies, in that 14.2% consider the income status of their parents as considerably higher than average, while 57.4% consider them to be considerably lower than average.

It may be generally stated that participation in (higher) education is related to the students' socio-economic background. This is also reflected in mobility figures. Because of the importance of the higher education sector for social and economic development (as explained in 4.1.1.6), this is a reason to invest in higher education in general and in higher education mobility programmes in particular. Another question is whether potential grant holders from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds have less opportunities to participate in mobility programmes than their more well off peers. This issue obviously is directly linked to the amount of the grants.

#### 4.1.1.6. *Poverty alleviation or reduction issues*

The fight against poverty has two dimensions: a national and an international. The key to generating employment, economic development, alleviating poverty (and narrowing gender differences) is growth - high-quality growth, and the most indispensable ingredient to promote and achieve growth is investment: investment first in a countries' human resources, especially in their education. Without investment in human resources that leads to increased economic capacities of the country and its human resources, poverty alleviation may be a lost battle<sup>34</sup>.

In the past decades, important international donor institutions, among others the World Bank, had developed an economic analysis which contributed to the view that public investment in higher education brings meagre results, compared to investments in primary and secondary schools, and that higher education magnifies income inequality. However, according to recent publications of the Association of Commonwealth Universities, World Bank and UNESCO<sup>35</sup>, newer research results demonstrate that in the globalised knowledge society "Higher education is no longer a luxury, it is essential to national social and economic development"<sup>36</sup>, and emphasize that educated people clearly have many effects on society: they are well positioned to become economic and social entrepreneurs.

<sup>34</sup> Two Council resolutions set out key strategic principles for the Community's current approach towards poverty reduction in partner countries. The 1993 Council Resolution on the fight against poverty spells out a number of broad policy objectives.

<sup>35</sup> Compiled by Nuffic in *The Importance of higher education in social and economic progress of the developing countries*, 26/7/2000.

<sup>36</sup> *Higher Education in Developing Countries – Peril and Promise*, Washington 2000.

Certainly, this overall view on the impact of higher education on societies' development is not an answer to the question whether the EC mobility programmes contribute (directly) to poverty alleviation or not. Following the personal opinions of the beneficiaries who answered the questionnaire, this was not the case. Our survey results suggest that a majority of respondents reported that the mobility programmes in general and the mobility grants (whatever approach is considered) in particular had no direct impact on poverty alleviation.

## 4.2. Main findings

### 4.2.1. Different cooperation frameworks call for different cooperation instruments (cfr. 3.3 internal coherence)

EU mobility grant awarding programmes are conceived in two distinct co-operation frameworks. On the one hand, development co-operation with ACP countries aimed at strengthening local capacities for higher education without direct benefits for the EU, and on the other hand economic co-operation with Asian and Latin American countries, which is set up to serve mutual interests. These differences in scope and objectives implied that **different instruments** have to be developed in the field of mobility grants and higher education in general to address the specificity of each situation; this is even the case within the field of economic co-operation, as it concerns EU cooperation with countries with a highly varying level of economic and social development.

### 4.2.2. 'Free Movers' and 'intra-network' often not clearly distinguished (cfr. 1.2 brief description of the programmes evaluated)

While comparing the mobility components of the various programmes under study, it should be noted that in some cases there is not a clear definition of and thus no clear distinction between 'free movers' and 'intra-network mobility'. For instance, the Asian Institute of Technology implemented the PTS programme. Initially it was considered the only free-mover programme presently being supported by the EC. However, the AIT participates in numerous (formal and informal) networks with European universities. During the implementation of the programme, agreements were discussed and signed between AIT and some European universities for the development of sandwich programmes<sup>37</sup> and the awarding of double degrees.

On the other side of the continuum is the ALFA programme, an intranetwork mobility programme. However, it should be clear, that the ALFA programme has other features that go beyond the intra-network characteristic, i. e. its regional component, as it requires projects to be implemented by networks of at least three European and two (in ALFA II: three) Latin-American institutions.

The EU-China Higher Education Cooperation Programme is supposedly an intra-network cooperation programme. It aims to strengthen European Studies in China. According to the Commission's programme review, "the wide disbursement of grants to individuals working in many Chinese universities has meant that the institutional impact will, in many cases, be minimal". The EU-China programme is a free mover mobility scheme inside an intra-network programme.

Finally, the EDF/FVS programme is the result of bilateral links or partnership between one university in Europe and one university in a third country, in this specific case the Faculty of Veterinary Science of the University of Zimbabwe. It is a free movers programme within a bilateral interuniversity cooperation agreement.

It is thus important to put the two programme approaches – free mover mobility and interuniversity network mobility – more into perspective. In fact, it appeared that there is no such difference between the designs of the two programme's mobility component being implemented in Thailand. Grant holders of both programmes arranged their contacts with host institutions on their own initiative and had the choice of opting for any host institution in

---

<sup>37</sup> Sandwich programmes explained in footnote 33.

any country in Europe. Although CUESP was seen as an intra-network cooperation project between Chulalongkorn University in Thailand and a consortium of three European universities, its mobility component was not restricted to this intra-university network. In fact PTS mobility had a more interinstitutional character, as in most cases the individual arrangements of PTS candidates were followed-up by supervisors who provided the individual mobility with a strong institutional embedding. It should be noted that the most positive results at the individual as well as the institutional level were achieved in cases where this institutional embedding was strongest. In fact, of all the mobility programmes evaluated during the field phase, only the ALFA programme turned out to be a real intranetwork mobility programme.

#### **4.2.3. Human resources development - knowledge-transfer and professional advantages for mostly male participants (cfr. question 1 and 2)**

**Transfer of knowledge and expertise, and increase of scientific and technological potential** (cfr. question 1).

All ALFA beneficiaries underlined the positive experiences and effects at academic and individual level that the study period in Europe has brought. Both graduate and undergraduate students enjoyed the experience of European culture and societies (most of them tried to visit European regions other than their host country). The variety of experiences is very broad. It ranges from short visits of two months to PhD studies lasting more than two years. It seems that for many, perhaps for most grant holders, it was their first experience of Europe. As PhD students were the biggest group, transfer of scientific and acquiring technological knowledge and, hence, an increase of the scientific and technological potential, were the major results of their stay in Europe.

PTS and CUESP had very positive effects on the individual level, but beneficiaries considered their stay in Europe as too short to fully experience social and cultural life. While CUESP beneficiaries mention the importance of access to specialised resources for research, PTS beneficiaries emphasise their contact and experience with a different culture and working environment. The effectiveness beyond the individual level varies according to the programme. Effectiveness at institutional level of the PTS student going to Europe was strengthened by the institutional follow-up given to the individual exchange activity. The fact that the PTS beneficiaries originate from various Asian countries contributes to a multiplier effect of PTS graduates returning to their home countries where they are expected to contribute to their countries' development. In the case of CUESP institutional effects of the individual mobility seem to be more limited due to the specific topic of research of the faculty members. However, beyond the institutional level a positive spin-off to Thai society is recorded through participation of the beneficiaries in formal and informal advisory boards.

**Enhancement of employment and professional perspectives** (cfr. Question 2).

ALFA undergraduate students were optimistic that the international experience would enrich their C.V. and provide them with an advantage in comparison with other young professionals who did not participate in this experience. Those who learned or improved their knowledge of a second (or third) foreign language considered this fact an additional asset. Junior beneficiaries of the CUESP and PTS programme showed similar expectations

**Risk of brain drain** (cfr. Question 3).

In all the visited and surveyed countries the risk of brain drain was not considered a special problem or a concern. The local programme managers established a return condition, to be signed by the grant holder before leaving. In ALFA, FVS, CUESP and PTS no special measures were taken to avoid brain drain and, as a matter of fact, it did not occur. In many cases this can be related to the short duration of the visits (between two and four months –

CUESP and PTS) and to the fact that participants were well established in their faculties (CUESP, ALFA) or had to return to graduate (PTS, ALFA).<sup>38</sup>

#### **Gender issues and participation of female grant holders** (cfr. Question 4).

Female participation in mobility programmes varied between 48% (CUESP), 40% (ALFA), 28% (PTS) and 20% (EDF/FVS) (no figures are available for the EU-China programme). Except for the PTS programme, no special measures were taken to promote female participation. The differences in participation rates must be put in relation to the gender ratio among staff and student population of the home institutions. Although PTS female applicants had almost twice as many chances to be admitted as male applicants, their participation (22%) was below the average AIT ratio (37%). No adequate explanation was found for the low application figures of female students.

#### **4.2.4. Promotion of Europe as centre of academic excellence – language barriers prevent more than modest success** (cfr. question 5, 6 and 7)

In spite of the fact that the objective of promoting Europe as a centre of academic excellence has not been worked out properly, our evaluation showed that while the objective seems coherent with the “mutual benefit” principle of the economic cooperation framework, it may be considered almost incompatible with the objectives for development cooperation, which are preferably directed to strengthening local capacities for higher education in EU partner countries.

When ALFA was created in the early 90s, the promotion of the European universities as centres of excellence was at most an implicit issue. However, the programme contributed to strengthening the academic and cultural links between Latin America and Europe, although the information and communication policy of the programme itself could have been stronger. The limited language knowledge of many participants gave Spain a 30 % participation rate. This may be considered too high in relation to the scientific and cultural potential of the other 14 EU Member States. In Chile and other Latin American countries, Europe is traditionally considered a centre of academic excellence in many disciplines. ALFA reinforced this idea. The cultural presence of Europe was strengthened by the contacts resulting from the exchanges, but its economic presence most probably not.

The importance that Thai Europeanists attach to European Studies is clear. In view of ongoing developments, first-hand European knowledge will remain of great importance to academics involved in European Studies in Thailand. The programme’s impact on the image of European Education and European integration, in general outside the specific scope of European Studies, may be expected to be modest but positive. The same can be said about the PTS programme, as it gave a positive impetus to mobility towards European universities. However, the impact of both (small) programmes in light of the magnitude of the Asian region and the importance of other host countries must be considered very limited. In this regard, the obstacle of non-English languages must be mentioned as well as the high cost of living in some European countries.

#### **4.2.5. Regional integration - from missed opportunity to sustainable success** (cfr. question 8 and 9)

One of the most important impacts of ALFA is its contribution to regional cooperation and integration. The links between Latin American universities created by ALFA are, in many cases, still functioning, despite the end of ALFA funding. The comprehensive programme structure allowed the network participants to make an optimal use of the resources assigned. This asset is strongly related to the network, a free mover grant programme would not have produced the same effects.

---

<sup>38</sup> The positive findings of this evaluation may however not be generalised towards other regions of the world. See footnote 11 for details.

Both CUESP and PTS programmes regarded mobility to and from Europe, and practically no regional mobility was foreseen. In the case of CUESP this is regarded as a lost opportunity, as it would have been very positive if the experiences of CUESP had been capitalised on for replication in other European Studies Programmes in the region.

#### **4.2.6. Programmes' administration - weak performance hampers programme performance (cfr.question 10)**

To administer ALFA, the European Commission created a Technical Assistance Office (TAO<sup>39</sup>), although all major decisions remained within the EC (like final approval of the selected projects, the signing of the project contract between the university network and the EC). This led to structural problems: the TAO was not in the position to answer adequately (and in due time) to the questions posed by applicants or coordinators, because of delays of the EC in responding. Especially the transfer of the EC-funds to the network coordinators through its Financial Services not only frequently showed unexpected delays of several months, but also serious performance deficits.

A prominent Central American stakeholder summarised his critical view of the administrative performance of ALFA in the following way: "If fostering mutual cultural comprehension and the enhancement of academic and scientific ties between Europe and Latin America is one of the main objectives of the ALFA programme, why do the administrative procedures not reflect this effort in bringing together the two cultures?"

The administration of the ALFA programme was probably its weakest point. Therefore, the possibility cannot be excluded that the administrative issue has contributed to damaging the European Commission's image.

The European Commission was not directly involved in the administration of either CUESP or PTS. Stakeholders considered the administrative structure effective and efficient, both at the level of AIT and CU and their European counterparts.

#### **4.2.7. Sustainability - dependent on alternative funding sources (cfr.question 11)**

All programmes show important positive individual and institutional effects, which are expected to sustain after their termination. However, the sustainability, as such, of mobility programmes will to a large extent remain dependent on external funding. This seems even more so in the case of free-movers mobility, given that with intranetwork exchanges mutual benefits are more likely to occur. In some of the EU Member States, universities tend to charge (high) tuition fees to incoming foreign students, particularly if they are not participating in an organised student exchange within a given interuniversity programme. This may constitute a considerable problem to potential future « free moving » students from less favoured regions of the world and, especially, from less favoured socio-economic backgrounds. Unless there is some significant financial support to fund this type of « spontaneous » mobility, it is unlikely that those students will be able to spend a period of studies abroad, particularly in European host countries where already the cost of living is considerably high.

There is no evidence indicating that the European Commission attempted to negotiate additional funding through agreements with stakeholders (national scholarship institutions, regional development banks etc.) in the target regions of the mobility programmes, in order to ensure a higher degree of sustainability.

#### **4.2.8. Institutionalisation of internationalisation - positive, but modest programme contribution (cfr.question 12 and 13)**

Universities in Latin America are undergoing deep institutional changes and modernisation. Internationalisation of the higher education system is an important issue. As universities are increasingly exposed to increasing competition (both from national and foreign competitors),

---

<sup>39</sup> Closed in September 2001.

many of them have started to develop international exchange programmes, to actively build up regional networks and consider internationalisation as a key element for their quality improvement. ALFA contributed to this process, but most likely only in a modest and indirect way, complementing efforts of well-established universities, which were already under way when ALFA started. However, some “younger” (less developed) universities reported that ALFA had given the initial impulse for strengthening their Office for international cooperation.

Both AIT (PTS) and CU (CUESP) are well aware of the importance of international cooperation for their teaching and research. Both institutions have an impressive list of international inter-institutional contacts, although not all equally dynamic. The PTS and the CUESP programmes certainly had a positive influence on this international orientation, although it has to be admitted that in view of overall figures of Chulalongkorn, the impact of CUESP on the institutional level necessarily had to be more modest than the PTS programme.

The survey shows that mobility grants awarded within intranetwork mobility programmes (organised mobility) have contributed greatly to an increased internationalisation of the home universities, on new partnership agreements. The constitution of interuniversity networks was reported as one of the main contributions leading to closer cooperation with other universities in the region or neighbouring countries. However, the survey also shows that the potential of these exchanges is not yet fully « exploited », given that a uniform system of academic credits and accumulation and transfer system has not yet been adopted and put into practice.

#### 4.2.9. Miscellaneous

**Socio-economic background of beneficiaries** (cfr. 4.1.1.5 Socio-economic issues emerging from the survey results): Participation in higher education is clearly related to the parents' socio-economic background, which, hence, influences also the socio-economic profile of the beneficiaries. The question whether students from disadvantaged backgrounds would have fewer opportunities to participate in mobility programmes than their better off peers was too complex to be analysed in the framework of this evaluation. It would require some further research.

### 4.3. Conclusions

In assessing the selected programmes, our first conclusion was that, in general terms, there is not always a clear distinction between the ‘free movers’ programmes and the ‘intra-network mobility’ programmes under review (with the exception of the ALFA programme).

Mobility grant awarding programmes are an effective instrument to foster cooperation between the EU and third countries in the field of higher education. However, it should be noted that these programmes are set up within different cooperation frameworks, some focusing on development cooperation as in the case of ACP countries while others are focused on economic cooperation as in the case of ALA countries. The present evaluation has concluded that there is a need to conceive different instruments and approaches in higher education cooperation programmes based on a sound assessment of the level of socio-economic and academic development of the target countries concerned. Programmes have various specific objectives contributing to broad policy objectives such as poverty alleviation (in the case of development cooperation) and the promotion of mutual economic and corporate interests (in the case of economic cooperation); the specific mobility approach should be chosen in accordance with these objectives. It should however be kept in mind that the impact of the programmes will remain necessarily modest, in view of the magnitude of the target group and the relatively modest volume of the budgets available.

**Table: Summary of the six EC objectives in the cooperation with partner countries in the field of higher education and their achievement**

EC Objective	Degree to which objective was achieved
1. To ensure that EC education programmes include the international dimension in a more systematic way;	Objective was reached. EC funded academic mobility programmes enhance the international dimension of EU higher education as they promote opportunities to move between institutions and courses within and between different national education systems. Because of interest sparked by the Community exchange programmes, many educational and training institutions open up to mobility and exchanges, and integrate them in their internationalisation policy, particularly in smaller sized institutions and in some less developed countries.
2. To give greater visibility to its action in this field in order to promote Europe as a centre of academic excellence, and to attract students seeking an international education (at the moment of the programmes' conception, this was not an objective).	Objective was achieved to some extent, despite the fact that it was not considered to be an objective at the moment of the programmes' conception. Exchanges provided participants with the opportunity to acquire new skills, including foreign language competence. Programmes constitute a factor of motivation for learners, teachers and trainers.
3. To promote the EC as a centre of excellence for study and training as well as for scientific and technological research;	Objective was achieved (however, only as far as third countries are concerned, because the programmes' mobility component within the EU was not the subject of the present evaluation).
4. To contribute to the development of high-quality human resources in third countries and within the EU, through reciprocal human resource development;	Objective has been achieved to some extent.
5. To contribute to the alleviation of poverty; and	This issue was beyond the scope of the present evaluation
6. To enhance participation of women in the programmes.	Performance of the programmes with regard to this issue was poor, reflecting gender ratios among staff and students at the home institutions. Furthermore, the participating universities did not consider particular measures to enhance women's participation in the exchange programmes.

In spite of these four positive conclusions, and although the programmes under evaluation contributed to reaching the EC objectives, their contribution should be considered only a modest one given the dimension of the programmes.

#### **4.3.1. Human resources development – different programme types appropriate for different situations**

This evaluation shows that both free-mover and intra-network mobility programmes can have positive effects for the beneficiaries and for their host institutions. However, the most positive results at the individual and institutional level are achieved where there is a strong institutional embedding. Both types of approaches might however be appropriate for different purposes:

- **Free-mover programmes** are important instruments for PhD-students, given the fact that they have to look for the best research institutes/scientific advisors in their field, whether or not this is part of the university network of their home university. Many PhD-students are at the same time faculty staff members in their home universities. Upon their return from Europe their academic achievements have a positive impact on the research and teaching potential of their home institution.



- **Intra-network mobility** seems the most appropriate approach in case the strengthening of local institutional capacities is envisaged; our findings suggest also that intra-network cooperation will have most mutual benefits if cooperation takes place between more or less equal partners.

Both mobility of staff and students produce spin-off effects. Both have a multiplier effect, but in a different way: in the former case, there is transfer of knowledge to various generations of students; in the latter, beneficiaries will be dispersed over the country or region.

In the programmes under evaluation (located in Latin America and Asia), brain drain was not really a problem. This positive conclusion may, however, not be generalised towards other regions of the world (especially Africa), where academic brain drain remains a serious problem.

With regard to the EC's concern for gender issues, it can be concluded that women form a minority in all mobility programmes as their rate of participation mirrors the gender ratio among student and staff population of the home institutions. In most programmes, no specific measures were undertaken to improve this situation.

On socio-economic and equity issues, potential grant holders from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds seem to have fewer opportunities to participate in mobility programmes than their better off peers. No specific measures were undertaken by both types of programmes (free movers and intranetwork) to improve this situation.

#### **4.3.2. Promotion of Europe as a centre of academic excellence – best served by free movers and international funding agreements**

This evaluation found that academic mobility is influenced to some extent by specific obstacles like language problems (and, hence, leads to a relative preference for some EU countries), but that it depends to a large extent on the availability of grants. In view of the policy objective of promoting Europe as a centre of academic excellence, this brings us to the following conclusions:

- EU mobility programmes are relatively modest in size and budget, and, hence, have only a modest positive effect;
- At postgraduate (and especially at PhD) level, beneficiaries benefit most from a free mover programme which allows them to seek the best European research and study opportunities in their field of specialisation, and not just a study period abroad in a network member university. As such, this kind of mobility would contribute most directly towards promoting Europe as a centre of academic excellence.
- Positioning Europe as a centre of academic excellence is coherent with the “mutual benefit” objective of the economic cooperation framework. Nevertheless, it may be considered against the objectives for development cooperation in other regions, which would benefit more from strengthened local capacities for higher education.
- Agreements with national and regional funding institutions in third countries strengthen Higher Education cooperation and contribute to reposition Europe as a Centre of academic excellence.

#### **4.3.3. Regional integration – “added value” of intra-network cooperation**

Universities in Latin American and Asia face increasing competition and challenges and are aware of the need to “go international”. Regional cooperation constitutes an important strategy in this regard. This evaluation has demonstrated that such an approach links up with actual interests of stakeholders in third countries and enhances the efficiency and sustainability of intra-network cooperation programmes aiming at institution building. Again, agreements with regional stakeholders on co-financing regional academic mobility contribute to reposition Europe as a model of integration.

When assessing only the programme's mobility component, we concluded, on the contrary, that free-mover mobility does not foster regional cooperation. This is understandable as there is no incentive in free mover programmes to create regional co-operation networks. Regional cooperation was not a characteristic of the free mover programmes under evaluation as these all concerned mobility towards Europe<sup>40</sup>.

Last but not least, it should be noted that promotion of regional networking fits well with the concept of "added value" that EC funded programmes need to bring in order to differentiate them from a mere duplication or overlapping with the individual Member States' initiatives.

#### **4.3.4. Programmes' administration – Complex decision making potentially hinders flexible programme management**

The analysis of the ALFA experience suggests that the creation of a specific management structure (in this case a TAO) did not lead to a flexible management of the programme. On the contrary, the complex decision making structures between the TAO and the EC (and the number of EC units involved) have led to heavy and very complex administrative procedures and, hence, to a decrease in effectiveness and efficiency. Moreover, it hampered a more balanced active (co-ordinating) participation of Latin American universities and made participation of "poorer" state universities more difficult. Frequent delays led to frustration among many participants. The poor administrative performance of ALFA was by no means competitive with the flexible procedures of US-American universities cooperation programmes, and also did not contribute to the image of Europe of Centre of academic excellence.

No conclusion could be drawn in this evaluation regarding the cost-effectiveness of both types of programmes due to a lack of reliable data.

#### **4.3.5. Sustainability – increased in intra-network programmes, but dependence on external funding likely to remain**

The evaluation did not allow to fully assess the sustainability of the *benefits and outcomes* created by the programmes, but evidence exists that the effects on both the individual and institutional level will sustain to a major extent; institutional effects are however more sustainable when mobility has been embedded in the interuniversity cooperation programmes.

The issue of sustainability of academic mobility programmes *as such* should be put in the right perspective, as all over the world, such programmes need external funding (cfr. the Socrates (Erasmus) programmes). It has however been found that many networks remained active after external funding had stopped. This was especially the case when regional cooperation was explicitly part of intra-network cooperation programmes.

Agreements with national and regional stakeholders on co-funded mobility programmes could help to consolidate them, even when EC-funding decreases.

This being said, sustainability of mobility programmes will to a large extent remain dependent on external funding. This seems even more so in the case of free-movers, given that with intra-network exchanges mutual benefits are more likely to occur because of a more comprehensive programme structure. Hence, the continued existence of EC funding for international exchanges is necessary for the current level of involvement of universities and individuals to be at least maintained or increased.

#### **4.3.6. Institutionalisation of internationalisation – unexploited potential remains.**

Internationalisation is an important issue dealt with by the academic institutions and to some extent by some governments in the visited countries, particularly Thailand. Both free-mover

---

<sup>40</sup>There is no reason why free mover programmes could not imply regional mobility. However, this remained outside the scope of the evaluation.

and intra-network mobility programmes fit well within their institutional internationalisation policy. The EC mobility programmes (free mover and intra-network) contributed positively to the institutionalisation of internationalisation of higher education institutions, though not to the same extent in the different cases. EC support seems to be most effective in this aspect in the case of “younger” universities and within an inter-university network approach. However, the potential was not fully exploited as to date little efforts were made among Asian, Latin American universities and their European homologues to further develop interuniversity cooperation through joint study modules or joint degree programmes.

#### **4.3.7. Equity - insufficiently addressed by most programmes**

Only few programmes attained limited achievements in terms of increased and improved access of women and weaker socio-economic groups, largely because only in a few cases measures were undertaken to address this issue.

The following table offers a summarized assessment of ALFA, CUESP and PTS, based on the 5 standard evaluation criteria.

**Table: Summarizing Assessment of Programme Performance based on standard evaluation criteria**

Evaluation Criteria	Assessment		
	ALFA	CUESP	PTS
Relevance	<b>Increasing relevance:</b> Latin America's higher education systems are engaged in a process of expansion (especially in postgraduate sector), quality improvement, modernisation and internationalisation (also on regional level). Trend exists to foster competitiveness at regional and international level. Universities are interested in increased cooperation with Europe, and are themselves proactive in the same direction.	<b>Limited Relevance:</b> Better understanding of European business sector especially important for Thai society, as Europe is Thailand's second largest trading partner. Although CUESP had an economics component, this was of a very academic and uni-directional orientation and no direct link was made towards European or Asian business sectors. CUESP also too restricted towards European integration issues. Too little attention to ASEAN integration	<b>Partial Relevance:</b> Asian mobility component of programme addresses the region's development needs, especially by enhancing the training possibilities of students coming from poor backgrounds. All training areas in AIT may be considered relevant for the development of the countries of origin of the students. The relevance of the European component (mobility from for the Europe to Asia) is questionable.
Efficiency	<b>Limited efficiency:</b> delays affected many mobility projects, partly making necessary to repeat administrative processes (e.g. student selection). Heavy administrative burden for most projects resulting in high administrative costs with at the same time low monthly grants.	<b>Limited Efficiency:</b> costs for programme administration in partner countries make out about 12% of overall budget for incoming and outgoing mobility. In addition, programme has a separate budget line for coordination costs, which raises the proportion of resources spent on administration. Administration + coordination costs amount to 42% of overall expenditure <sup>41</sup> .	<b>Appropriate Efficiency:</b> administration costs for Asian component represent 15% of overall budget. Administration of programme adequate.
Effectiveness	<b>Appropriate Effectiveness:</b> purpose of the ALFA Programme achieved. However, effects small due to limited programme size.	<b>High Effectiveness:</b> implementation of programme successful. At end of project all specific objectives / programme purpose had been achieved.	<b>Medium – High Effectiveness:</b> expected to achieve most of its specific objectives, especially because these have been formulated in very general terms. However, it is doubtful whether the specific objective of rectifying the imbalance between the academic exchanges between Asia and USA or Japan and Asia and Europe will be achieved or not (Note: programme not yet concluded).
Sustainability	<b>Limited Sustainability:</b> Generally, mobility programmes require inflow of external resources to be sustained. In some cases, alternative funding sources are available. Networks / regional cooperation can be sustained to large extend after ALFA funding was terminated.	<b>Limited Sustainability:</b> Many activities (e.g. Centre for European Studies, European Exchange visit during Master's Course in European Studies) are continued, but on a smaller scale due to a restricted budget, partly with university resources or student funds.	<b>Limited Sustainability:</b> inter-institutional links would need to be followed-up to be sustainable. It can be expected that some institutional effects will fade unless new funding is found.
Impact	<b>Limited Impact:</b> though generally positive, impact modest due to limited scale of the programme. Strongest impact through programme's network structure and regional component.	<b>Partial Impact:</b> Impact generally hard to assess. Programme made small contribution to improve understanding of the EU in Thailand. Contributed to development of human resources with a specialisation in European Studies	<b>Low Impact:</b> though individual experiences of participants were positive, impact is limited due to small size of programme.

<sup>41</sup> Note: it is not clear if all coordination costs can be considered administration costs. The true ratio of administration costs / overall budget could not be determined.

#### 4.4. Recommendations

1. *EC cooperation programmes with third countries should differentiate between development cooperation between unequal partners, aiming at structural development in the partner countries and economic cooperation between more or less equal partners, promoting mutual benefits for both EU and third countries.* The choice between a mobility programme for free movers, an intranetwork mobility programme or a “mixed” programme should depend on the specific objectives of the cooperation. If mutual benefits are the aim of mobility programmes, cooperation should take place between more or less equal partners.<sup>42</sup>
2. *Mobility programmes aiming at strengthening institutional capacities should be organised within networks for multilateral interuniversity cooperation between third countries and the EU, preferably with a regional component and directed predominantly towards academic staff.* Regional cooperation is an efficient way to achieve local capacity building and also often an important institutional objective for academic institutions in third countries. The regional components of intra-network programmes (such as ALFA) should foresee special incentives to foster the participation of higher education institutions of less developed countries. For instance:
  - A university network could receive additional funding if it includes an institution of a less developed country as a partner;
  - A higher education institution of one of the least developed countries should be allowed to participate in the programme with a lower rate of co-funding.

All mobility programmes, both free-mover and intra-network, should take into account the institutional embedding of the scholarship holder in order to achieve most positive and sustainable results at the institutional and individual level<sup>43</sup>.
3. *A longer duration (three to five years) of the intra-university network mobility projects should be considered in order to allow the exchange of more than one student cohort.* Two or three years of student exchange would consolidate exchanges between the participating faculties/departments (which makes it easier to develop common curricular modules, academic recognition of study periods abroad, credit transfer and accumulation, joint diplomas, etc.). This would imply awarding selected projects a contract (financial agreement) of a longer duration (for instance three years, as is the case of the Erasmus Institutional Contract).<sup>44</sup>
4. *The EC should consider either to implement more flexible and substantially improved procedures for the administration of mobility programmes or envisage delegating the administration of such programmes to external bodies such as consortia or networks of universities.*<sup>45</sup>
5. *To increase the effectiveness of promoting Europe as a centre of academic excellence by means of academic mobility initiatives, the size of mobility grant awarding programmes should be increased considerably.* Initiatives should include free-mover mobility programmes, as this type of exchange will be most beneficial for the promotion of Europe as centre of academic excellence. Mobility programmes should be accompanied by complementary activities such as joint courses, joint diplomas and an academic credit accumulation and transfer system between European universities and their partners in third countries. In addition more efforts (including increased funding for language training)

<sup>42</sup> Recommendation based on main findings in sections 4.2.1; 4.2.2. and conclusions in sections 4.3.1.;4.3.2.

<sup>43</sup> Recommendation based on main findings 4.2.1., 4.2.2., 4.2.3., 4.2.5., 4.2.8. and conclusions in sections 4.3.1., 4.3.2. and 4.3.3.

<sup>44</sup> Recommendation based on main findings in section 4.2.3. and on conclusions in section 4.3.6.

<sup>45</sup> Recommendation based on main findings in section 4.2.6. and on conclusions in section 4.3.4.

are necessary if one wishes to promote mobility towards non-English and non-Spanish speaking countries.<sup>46</sup>

6. *Special measures should be taken in order to increase the participation of women academics in mobility programmes (e.g. affirmative action, fixed quota, etc.).*<sup>47</sup>
7. *To promote equity and prevent exclusion of less-advantaged students and to prevent unequal participation of some Member States, programmes should guarantee that the level of the mobility grant is sufficient to pay for all costs resulting from a study period abroad (travel, accommodation, cost of living in host country, language preparation if necessary) and do not require these costs to be funded by the students' own means.* Consequently, the level of the grants should reflect the cost of living of the host countries and should be fixed so that costs considerations do not prevent financially disadvantaged students from participating in the mobility programme. Moreover, additional measures (i.e. exempting mobile students from paying tuition fees to the host universities) and policies will be necessary to overcome socio-economic and cultural barriers (i.e., social security, administration of visas and staying permits, etc.).<sup>48</sup>
8. *Cooperation and co-funding agreements should be negotiated with key Latin American stakeholders like CAPES (Brazil), CONACyT (Mexico) and Fundación Ayacucho (Venezuela) and similar organisations in other regions of the world.* This could contribute to enhancing the sense of ownership of the programme in the target countries<sup>49</sup>, to positioning Europe as centre of academic excellence, and to fostering the degree of regional integration. The same approach should be considered for Asian countries. Thailand might lend itself well to play a role as a strategic country for regional development and integration<sup>50</sup>.

---

<sup>46</sup> Recommendation based on main findings in section 4.2.4., 4.2.8. and conclusions in sections 4.3.2. and 4.3.6.

<sup>47</sup> Recommendation based on main findings in section 4.2.3. and conclusions in section 4.3.7.

<sup>48</sup> Recommendation based on main findings in section 4.2.7., 4.2.9. and on conclusions in section 4.3.7.

<sup>49</sup> Agreements with strong third country grant awarding institutions would probably result in changes of the programmes' administrative procedures, as the counterparts would be actively involved in the projects' selection process, which actually, and in spite of the fact that scientists of both Europe and third countries are invited to participate, is entirely conducted by the EC.

<sup>50</sup> Recommendation based on main findings in sections 4.2.4., 4.2.5., 4.2.7., 4.2.8. and conclusions in sections 4.3.2., 4.3.3., 4.3.5. and 4.3.6.

# 5. Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

## BOURSES DE MOBILITE

### Cahier des Charges

(version finale)

#### 1. Introduction

##### 1.1 – Description du Sujet à Evaluer

L'éducation constitue un des secteurs prioritaires des programmes de coopération extérieure de la Communauté européenne. Ainsi la totalité des accords de coopération de la CE mettent-ils l'accent sur le secteur éducatif en général, et plus particulièrement sur sa composante éducation de base et formation initiale. Cependant, dans un contexte de mondialisation et de recours croissant aux nouvelles technologies de l'information, la progression économique et sociale durable dans les pays tiers, de même que le renforcement de leurs relations avec l'Union européenne, reposent également sur le dynamisme de leur secteur universitaire. L'enseignement supérieur a, en effet, un rôle crucial à jouer pour la formation de ressources humaines capables de participer à une économie globale de plus en plus fondée sur les connaissances. Des efforts importants ont donc été déployés par la Communauté en appui à la coopération inter-universitaire. Le total des engagements financiers dans le secteur de l'éducation tertiaire (toutes régions confondues) représente environ 376 Millions d'Euros (engagements en cours).

Dans le cadre de la politique communautaire en matière de coopération inter-universitaire, la mobilité des universitaires (étudiants, doctorants, chercheurs, professeurs) a, au cours de ces dernières années, été mise en oeuvre suivant deux approches fort différentes. Les bourses de mobilité sont, en effet, soit (i) attribuées de façon ponctuelle et sans intégration préalable dans des structures de coopération entre institutions (bourses « *free movers* »)<sup>51</sup>, ou bien (ii) les échanges ne sont autorisés que dans le cadre (et entre les membres) de *réseaux*<sup>52</sup> composés d'institutions d'enseignement supérieur de l'UE et des pays tiers.

##### 1.2. Motivation et Objectifs de l'Evaluation

La présente évaluation entre dans le cadre du programme de travail 2001 de l'Unité Evaluation tel qu'approuvé par le Comité de Direction d'EuropeAid Office de Coopération. Elle doit permettre de faire le bilan et de mesurer l'*impact* des interventions de la coopération extérieure dans le domaine des bourses de mobilité. On mettra en évidence les résultats obtenus -- dans le cadre de chacune des approches « *free movers* » et « réseaux » -- du point de vue de : leur *efficacité* (la mesure dans laquelle chaque « modèle » de bourses de mobilité permet d'atteindre l'objectif fixé), de leur *efficience* (c'est à dire la manière dont les ressources financières, législatives, administratives, etc., ont été utilisées par rapport aux effets produits), ainsi que de leur *viabilité* sur le long terme. On s'interrogera également sur la *pertinence* de chacune de ces deux approches, ainsi que sur la *cohérence interne* d'une politique communautaire reposant sur deux approches et stratégies différentes en matière de bourses de mobilité.

---

<sup>51</sup> On désigne par « *free movers* » les bénéficiaires de bourses à *titre individuel*, sans qu'il n'y ait d'implication institutionnelle inter-universitaire (Nb : en revanche, dans le cadre Erasmus, le terme de « *free movers* » renvoie à un individu qui ne bénéficie pas *forcément* d'une bourse)

<sup>52</sup> Par commodité nous employons ici le terme de bourses de mobilité « en réseaux » afin de désigner les bourses délivrées dans le cadre de projets de coopération entre universités (multilatéraux ou bilatéraux) par opposition aux bourses « *free movers* ». On notera qu'il existe entre ces deux modèles *free movers* / en réseaux, des situations intermédiaires.

Par ailleurs, cette évaluation s'inscrit dans un contexte caractérisé par le travail actuellement mené par les services de la Commission en vue de définir un nouveau cadre pour les programmes de coopération inter-universitaire de la CE avec les pays tiers. Cette évaluation devrait donc contribuer à la mise en oeuvre d'une approche de la politique de coopération extérieure en matière de bourses de mobilité qui soit plus cohérente, plus efficiente et plus visible.

Les résultats de cette évaluation seront communiqués aux Commissaires membres du Comité de direction d'EuropeAid Office de Coopération, aux Directeurs Généraux, ainsi qu'aux Directeurs des services et gestionnaires chargés de la préparation et de la mise en oeuvre de la politique de coopération inter-universitaire avec les pays tiers.

### 1.3. Suivi de l'Évaluation : Groupe de Pilotage

Afin d'assurer le suivi de cette évaluation, un groupe de pilotage sera créé. Ce groupe sera composé de personnes issues de différents services de la Commission qui, par leurs connaissances et expériences dans le domaine évalué, constituent un pôle de référence indispensable pour le bon déroulement de l'évaluation. C'est à cette instance *ad hoc* que revient la co-responsabilité, avec l'Unité Evaluation, du suivi de l'évaluation.

La contribution du groupe de pilotage est essentielle au bon déroulement de l'évaluation en ce qu'elle porte tant sur les questions évaluatives, la méthodologie retenue, ainsi que sur les conclusions et les recommandations formulées par l'équipe de consultants. Une réunion entre l'Unité Evaluation de EuropeAid Office de Coopération, groupe de pilotage et membres de l'équipe de consultants sera prévue à chaque étape du déroulement de l'évaluation :

- lors du lancement de l'évaluation : pour une discussion approfondie du Cahier des charges et du calendrier ;
- au terme de la phase de recherche documentaire : pour une discussion de la méthodologie proposée par les consultants pour la phase de terrain ;
- Enfin, à la fin de l'exercice après remise par les consultants de leur rapport final (version provisoire) : il revient au groupe de pilotage d'examiner les conclusions ainsi que les recommandations proposées par les consultants en vue d'améliorer l'action communautaire en matière de bourses de mobilité.

## 2. Principales Questions Évaluatives par Thèmes

L'évaluation doit répondre aux questions évaluatives et fournir des jugements détaillés fondés sur l'analyse de données quantitatives et qualitatives.

### 2.1. Développement des Ressources Humaines

- Dans quelle mesure les bourses de mobilité (*free movers* / en réseaux) ont-elles permis le transfert de connaissances nouvelles et d'expertise vers les pays tiers, ainsi que l'amélioration du potentiel scientifique et technologique dans les pays tiers ?
- Dans quelle mesure les bourses de mobilité ont-elles suscité, pour leurs bénéficiaires, de meilleurs débouchés et perspectives professionnels dans leur propre pays ?
- Comment ont-elles pris en compte le risque de *brain-drain* ? Le cas échéant des procédures ou mécanismes ont-ils été mis en place afin de prévenir/de lutter contre le *brain-drain* ?
- Comment les bourses de mobilité (*free movers* / en réseaux) ont-elles intégré la problématique de genre ? Comment/combien de femmes ont-elles été sélectionnées pour bénéficier des bourses de mobilité ?



## 2.2. Promotion d'un espace européen comme « centre d'excellence » :

- Les bourses de mobilité *free movers* d'une part et bourses « en réseaux » d'autre part, ont-elle contribué, et dans quelle mesure, à repositionner l'Europe comme « centre d'excellence » (notamment en contrebalançant la position dominante des Etats-Unis et/ou Canada, Australie, Japon, etc.) capable d'attirer les étudiants désireux d'acquérir des qualifications de renommée internationale ?
- Dans quelle mesure les bourses de mobilité (*free movers* / en réseaux) ont-elles favorisé l'intérêt des institutions d'enseignement supérieur des pays tiers pour les universités de l'U.E?
- Dans quelle mesure ces bourses ont-elle constitué un vecteur de renforcement de la présence culturelle et économique de l'Union dans les pays tiers ?

## 2.3. Bourses de mobilité et intégration Régionale :

- Dans quelle mesure la portée régionale du programme ALFA – du fait de sa structuration en réseaux auxquels participent des institutions de plusieurs pays Latino-américains – favorise-t-elle la coopération Sud-Sud?
- Les bourses de type *free movers* ont-elles déclenché des mécanismes de coopération régionale?

## 2.4. Autres questions évaluatives :

- Dans quelle mesure le système d'administration communautaire (au sens large : instruments, ressources humaines, procédures, etc.) des bourses de mobilité (*free movers* / en réseaux) favorise-t-il ou, au contraire, entrave-t-il la poursuite des objectifs fixés ?
- Dans quelle mesure les bourses de mobilité selon qu'elles constituent un élément inséré dans un programme de coopération universitaire (en réseaux), ou, au contraire, reposent sur des seuls individus (*free movers*) sont-elles viables sur le long terme (sans un soutien continu de la Commission européenne) ?
- Dans quelle mesure les bourses (*free movers* / en réseaux) permettent-elles d'incorporer la mobilité à la mémoire des institutions dont sont issus les bénéficiaires? Le cas échéant, par quels mécanismes (reconnaissance des périodes d'études, transférabilité des crédits académiques, base de données des personnes ayant bénéficié des bourses de mobilité, cursus commun, formation de personnes-ressources, etc.) ce travail de mémoire est-il rendu possible?

## 3. Terminologie

L'analyse de l'*impact* des interventions de la coopération extérieure dans le domaine des bourses de mobilité sera basée sur les critères classiques de l'évaluation :

### 3.1. Pertinence :

La pertinence des projets/programmes est directement liée à la qualité de leur *conception*. On évaluera donc l'adéquation des projets/programmes avec : d'une part, les objectifs de la politique communautaire en matière d'éducation supérieure, et, d'autre part avec les problèmes qu'ils se proposent de résoudre, en examinant comment la mobilité des universitaires (étudiants, doctorants, chercheurs, professeurs) s'insère dans le cadre plus vaste des problèmes liés à l'éducation tertiaire dans les pays tiers.

### 3.2. Efficacité

Le critère d'efficacité pose la question de savoir si l'objectif des projets/programmes a été, ou sera probablement atteint. On analyse ici la mesure dans laquelle les bénéficiaires (au sens

large) ciblés ont effectivement retiré profit des produits ou des services des projets/programmes.

### 3.3. Efficience

Les projets/programmes de bourses de mobilité doivent être d'un bon rapport coût-avantages. La question centrale que pose le critère d'efficience est de savoir si des résultats similaires auraient pu être obtenus par d'autres moyens de formation, à un coût moins élevé et dans les mêmes délais. Cette mesure doit être quantitative ou qualitative, et doit également prendre en compte l'impact financier et/ou à coût donné, la durée de réalisation.

### 3.4. Viabilité

La viabilité permet de déterminer si les résultats positifs du projet/programme (au niveau de son objectif spécifique) sont susceptibles de perdurer sans l'appui de la Commission. Ce critère porte aussi sur l'impact à plus long terme et particulièrement sur l'effet escompté des projets/programmes sur les institutions d'enseignement supérieur dans les pays tiers. On analysera les possibilités (mécanismes, approches) de pérenniser les échanges inter-universitaires.

## 4. Les Phases de l'Evaluation

L'évaluation comportera trois phases successives :

### 4.1. Phase de Recherche Documentaire et Structuration de l'Etude

A partir des documents disponibles à Bruxelles (sources législatives, documents préparatoires, conventions de financements, documents de suivi, rapports de monitoring, rapports d'évaluations précédentes, etc.) et d'entretiens avec les gestionnaires de projets/programmes à Bruxelles, les consultants mèneront une étude permettant de donner une photographie de la situation actuelle en matière de bourses de mobilité.

Pour les bourses de mobilité de type *free movers*, les consultants procéderont à la collecte et à l'analyse des données et informations relatives aux volets bourses de mobilité contenus dans les différents projets en matière d'éducation supérieure financés par la Commission européenne dans les pays ACP, MED, et ASIE. Ainsi, on constituera au terme de cette analyse documentaire, un échantillon représentatif de projets de bourses *free movers* qui fera, ensuite, l'objet d'une étude plus approfondie.

Les éléments clés de la phase de recherche documentaire consisteront en :

- (i) un résumé de la politique communautaire en matière d'échanges inter-universitaires (dans le cadre d'une approche comparative avec les activités des autres bailleurs de fonds dans ce domaine) ;
- (ii) un diagnostic d'ensemble des principaux atouts et problèmes affectant la performance communautaire dans ce domaine (on distinguera les deux approches communautaires *free movers* / en réseaux);
- (iii) une analyse de la structure administrative, de la gestion, et du financement des projets/programmes bourses de mobilité de type *free movers* et « en réseaux » (ainsi que des flux d'universitaires -- étudiants, doctorants, chercheurs, professeurs), et leur influence sur la mise en oeuvre de la politique communautaire.

Cette partie relative à la recherche documentaire sera complétée par un travail de structuration du *Rapport intermédiaire* dans lequel les consultants présenteront :

- (i) leurs commentaires sur les données collectées durant l'étude documentaire ;
- (ii) l'identification des objectifs et de la logique d'intervention des mesures communautaires en matière de bourses de mobilité ainsi que les impacts attendus ;

- (iii) les critères de jugement et les indicateurs retenus pour mesurer l'impact des mesures ;
- (iv) une présentation de l'approche à suivre pour répondre aux questions évaluatives.

Sur la base du rapport sur la phase documentaire et structuration de l'étude, il sera procédé à un affinement de la méthodologie, ainsi qu'à la sélection des pays accueillant des projets/programmes dont les volets bourses de mobilité feront l'objet d'une analyse dans le cadre de la phase de terrain.

#### **4.2. Phase de Terrain**

Dans un second temps, les consultants se rendront dans au moins quatre pays tiers où des projets/programmes de bourses de mobilité ont été mis en oeuvre (soit sous la forme d'un « sous-programme » comme dans le cas d'ALFA, ou sous la forme d'un « volet » comme c'est le cas pour les bourses de type *free movers*).

Cette phase permettra de rassembler des informations additionnelles afin de clarifier tous les points soulevés par l'analyse documentaire. Cette phase est principalement basée sur des rencontres et entretiens avec: les gestionnaires des projets/programmes sur place, avec les délégations, les bénéficiaires (boursiers, ainsi que les acteurs qui, en employant les ces derniers ont bénéficié d'un renforcement de leurs capacités), ou encore les autres bailleurs de fonds.

Des réunions de *briefing* (lors de l'arrivée des consultants) et de *debriefing* (avant leur départ) seront organisées avec les délégations.

A la fin de cette phase de terrain, les consultants présenteront un rapport (dans lequel seront également repris les études de cas nationaux avec compte-rendu détaillé des entretiens effectués). Ce rapport sera présenté au Groupe de Pilotage. Sur la base des commentaires du Groupe, et après approbation de l'Unité, les consultants procéderont à la rédaction du rapport final.

#### **4.3. Synthèse des Travaux et Actions de Restitution**

Sur la base des informations recueillies durant les deux phases précédentes, les consultants rédigeront une version préliminaire de leur rapport présentant les résultats principaux de leur étude ainsi que les recommandations clés.

Après commentaires du Groupe de Pilotage, les consultants finaliseront leur rapport et le communiqueront à l'Unité.

Le texte principal d'un rapport d'évaluation ne devrait pas excéder 50 pages, auxquelles viennent s'ajouter les annexes et un *résumé synthétique* (de 5 pages maximum) reprenant les résultats et les recommandations. Enfin, un résumé court d'une page devrait être rédigé (séparément) afin de faciliter l'insertion du rapport dans les bases de données de l'Unité Evaluation.

*Nota Bene* : On attire l'attention des consultants sur le fait que le rapport devra être rédigé dans une langue (français ou anglais) de qualité excellente.

Le rapport d'évaluation, son résumé (« EvInfo »), ainsi que la fiche contradictoire à laquelle il donnera lieu seront publiés sur le site internet de l'Unité Evaluation.

#### **5. Profil des Consultants**

Cette évaluation devra être conduite par une équipe composée de : un expert *senior level* (qui agira en qualité de directeur de l'équipe) et de deux experts *middle level*.

Langues de travail requises : pratique courante de l'espagnol et de l'anglais (éventuellement une autre langue à déterminer en fonction des pays sélectionnés pour la phase de terrain).

Cette équipe qui aura une expérience manifeste en matière d'évaluation de projets internationaux devra constituer un ensemble multidisciplinaire présentant des compétences certaines en matière d'éducation universitaire. Les consultants devront également être au fait des politiques et procédures de la Commission européenne. Ils/elles devront également bien maîtriser la situation politique, sociale, culturelle et économique des pays tiers bénéficiaires de projets de la Commission en matière de bourses de mobilité.

*Nota Bene* : La Commission européenne encourage vivement les consultants à recourir à des experts locaux durant la phase de terrain.

## 6. Calendrier

Le Calendrier et l'échéancier des travaux feront l'objet d'une discussion avec le groupe de pilotage.

La durée approximative de l'évaluation est de :

- 52 jours pour le consultant *senior*
- 60 jours pour les consultants *middle level*

Le début de la phase de recherche documentaire est prévu pour septembre 2001 et le rapport final (dans sa version provisoire) devrait être remis à la mi-décembre 2001.

Le budget indicatif pour cette évaluation est de : 160 000 Euros

\* \*  
\*

## Annexes

### 1. Contexte

L'accent mis par la CE sur l'éducation de base et sur la formation initiale --priorité indiscutable pour les pays en développement -- s'accompagne d'un processus d'intégration de l'ensemble du cadre éducatif. L'éducation supérieure est, en effet, un secteur stratégique pour instaurer des processus de développement économique durable qui, à leur tour, contribuent à la réduction des inégalités sociales. Les universités sont les diffuseurs privilégiés du savoir et de la connaissance dans la société où ils forment les futurs décideurs. Elles jouent également un rôle actif dans tous les secteurs d'activité économique, culturelle et sociale dans des pays où, par ailleurs, elles représentent souvent le seul embryon d'une société de la connaissance et de l'innovation, lequel est essentiel pour lancer des processus de rénovation économique, technologique et social.

A la suite de l'expérience positive de la Commission européenne dans le domaine de la coopération intra-européenne en matière d'enseignement supérieur (ERASMUS puis SOCRATES), la Commission a élargi son action en matière de bourses de mobilité à l'ensemble des pays tiers. Ainsi, il existe aujourd'hui soit sous la forme de programmes régionaux et sectoriels ou sous la forme de programmes ponctuels et bilatéraux, une coopération universitaire de la Communauté avec l'ensemble des régions (ACP, ALA, MED, PHARE, TACIS).

Ainsi, en Amérique Latine, le programme ALFA (« Amérique Latine – Formation Académique »)<sup>53</sup> comporte deux sous-programmes B et C de ALFA I (regroupés depuis sous un seul sous-programme B dans le cadre d'ALFA II) qui concernent la mobilité des étudiants de troisième et de deuxième cycles, et représentent 50% (44,9% + 7,1%) du budget de ALFA I. En dehors d'ALFA, de TEMPUS<sup>54</sup>, d'Asia-Link ou EU-ASEAN University Network<sup>55</sup> c'est le caractère ponctuel qui domine l'approche communautaire en matière de bourses de mobilité entre pays tiers et Union européenne. Ainsi, on dénombre actuellement 208 projets/programmes en cours dans le secteur de l'éducation, dont environ 70 (c'est à dire 36%, soit 20% du total engagé) concernent le secteur tertiaire. On compte, pour les pays ACP, 54 projets approuvés (pour un montant total de 52 M d'Euros), ainsi que 19 projets en Asie (147,64 M d'Euros).<sup>56</sup> Parmi ces multiples projets, et à titre d'exemple, on peut mentionner le *Postgraduate Technological Studies Programme* en Asie (1996 – 2002, pour un budget d'environ 3 M. d'Euros) qui accorde des bourses à des étudiants asiatiques désireux de venir étudier durant un trimestre dans une université européenne de leur choix.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Approuvé en 1994 pour une période de 5 ans, ALFA a été reconduit (ALFA II) en février 2000 pour une durée de 6 ans. La base de financement du programme est le règlement CEE 443/92 du Conseil du 25.2.1992. Le budget relatif à la première phase s'élève à 40 M. d'Euros (dont 32 apportés par la CE). En 1997, la contribution communautaire a été augmentée de 6,4 M. d'Euros, soit une contribution totale de 38,4 M. d'Euros. Pour ALFA II, la contribution communautaire s'élève à 42 M. d'Euros. ALFA I a déjà fait l'objet de deux évaluations (1996 et 1998) qui ont surtout couvert les aspects relatifs à l'administration et à la gestion du Programme, ainsi que les résultats des projets mis en oeuvre par les institutions d'enseignement supérieur et leurs répercussions dans l'univers académique latino-américain.

<sup>54</sup> Le programme TEMPUS existe depuis 1990 et fut conçu aux fins de répondre aux besoins en matière d'éducation des pays d'Europe Centrale et orientale. TEMPUS III couvre la période 2000-2006.

<sup>55</sup> Asia-Link et EU-ASEAN University Network sont des programmes de coopération entre universités asiatiques et européennes. Ces deux programmes n'en sont qu'au stade du lancement.

<sup>56</sup> Cet éparpillement du financement communautaire contraste avec « l'approche ALFA », en Amérique Latine où, on l'a vu, un seul programme correspond à un engagement financier de 42 millions d'Euros.

<sup>57</sup> Ce programme comprend également un module pour des étudiants européens désireux d'étudier à l'*Asian Institute for Technology* (Bangkok). Ce programme a fait l'objet d'une évaluation à mi-parcours (décembre 1999).

## 2. Documentation

La listes de documents répertoriés ci-dessous n'est pas exhaustive. Elle se présente comme un point de départ ou de référence pour les experts.

- Règlement du Conseil (CEE) n°443/92 du 25 février 1992 relatif à l'aide financière et technique ainsi que sur la coopération économique avec les pays en voie de développement d'Asie et d'Amérique Latine.
- Communication du 31/10/2000 sur *La promotion et la protection des droits de l'Homme ; la promotion de la société de l'information et la réduction des inégalités sociales*

- **Asie**

### *Bilateral Projects and Initiatives*

- Chulalongkorn University European Studies Programme
- European Studies Programme Philippines
- European Studies Programme Malaysia
- European Studies Macao
- European Studies Programme Pakistan
- European Studies Programme Vietnam
- European Studies Programme China
- European Studies Programme India
- EU-China Higher Education Programme
- EU-China Academic Network
- EICEP – EC-India Cooperation and Exchange Programme 1992-1996.

### *Regional/Horizontal Programmes*

- Postgraduate Technological Studies Programme
- EU-ASEAN University Network
- Asia-Link

### *ASEM-Induced Project*

- ASEM Chair at University of Malaya
- ASEM DUO Fellowships Programme

Rapport d'évaluation (Mid-term): Post-graduate Technological Studies Programme (Economic Co-operation Project n° B-7/3001/ALA/97/02), December 1999.

- **Amérique Latine**

- rapport de l'évaluation thématique de la coopération régionale en Amérique latine, réalisée par le SCR (1997-98)
- Décision de la Commission, du 10 mars 1998 sur le Programme ALFA
- Décision sur la phase II du Programme ALFA, 4 Décembre (E/2549/98 document C(98)3824)
- The Globalisation of Education and Training: recommendations for a coherent response of the European Union", study commissioned by the European Commission, DG EAC, September 2000.
- Programme ALFA - Annuaire des projets approuvés durant la première phase (1994-1999)

- **ACP**
  - Evaluation of EC support to the Education Sector in ACP countries (Draft Synthesis Report, July 2001).
  
- **Méditerranée du Sud, Proche et Moyen-Orient**
  - Programme MED-CAMPUS (1992 –1998)