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• 61% of National University Associations report a national policy for internationalization in their countries.

• **Highest priority** activities:
  – Student exchanges & attracting international students
  – Research collaborations
  – Outgoing mobility for faculty/staff

Institutions report:

#1 external driver for increased internationalization:
Government policy (national/regional/state/province)

#1 external obstacle:
Limited public and/or private funding
Policy Motivations

Economic development
- Revenue from international students
- Internationally competent workforce
- Global competitiveness

Public diplomacy
- Building good will & positive national image
- “Soft power”

The greater good
- Addressing global challenges
- Mutual understanding & peace
Policy Emphases

Student mobility

Institutional partnerships
- “Institutional mobility”

Research collaboration

Broad, multi-faceted agendas
Policy Emphases

Student mobility

National policies for inbound mobility
- Japan: “300,000 Foreign Students Plan”

National policies for outbound mobility
- Forthcoming British Council/DAAD comparative study (11 countries)

Bi-lateral policies for reciprocal mobility
- USA/China and USA/Latin America: “100,000 Strong” initiatives
Policy Emphases

Institutional partnerships – “institutional mobility”

**National policies to attract institutions – “education hubs”**

- Student hubs, Talent hubs, Knowledge hubs (Knight, 2013)
- Qatar, Singapore, UAE, Malaysia, Botswana, Hong Kong

**National policies framing/restricting institutional mobility**

- China: Chinese partner institution required
- India: 2010 Foreign Education Institutions Bill
Policy Emphases

Research collaboration

National policies to encourage sustained bilateral or multilateral collaboration

- Norway: Norwegian Partnership Programme (PPNA) for Collaboration in Higher Education with North America

National policies to attract global talent for domestic capacity building

- Russia: Megagrant Project
Policy Emphases

Broad, multi-faceted approaches

Source: www.freeworldmap.net
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Vision and Strategy
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Europe 2020 Strategy

- 2010: EU members adopted the “Europe 2020 Strategy” to ensure the EU would be fit to face the challenges of the future.
- Education, science and research play a special role within this strategy.
- EU member states and the European Commission have to implement appropriate measures.
Europe 2020 Strategy

• By 2020...

- at least 40% of 30- to 34-year-olds should have a higher education degree
- at least 20% of higher education graduates should have spent time abroad
- EU countries should spend 3% of GDP on research and innovation to make Europe more internationally competitive as a research region
Europe 2020 Strategy

Powerful programs for the next 7 years:

- **ERASMUS+** - ca. $ 20 Billion (+ 40%)

- **Horizon 2020** – ca. $ 105 Billion

Horizon 2020 is the financial instrument implementing the Innovation Union, a Europe 2020 flagship initiative aimed at securing Europe's global competitiveness, eventually leading to the European Research Area (ERA).
Towards a single integrated system

2007-2013
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1 Learning Mobility
2 Cooperation
3 Policy support

Specific activities:
Jean Monnet
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ERASMUS +
ERASMUS +

MORE mobility
63% total budget

- 2 million higher education students (within Europe)
- 800,000 staff covering all sectors of education and Youth (within Europe)
- 135,000 student & staff exchanges with partner countries outside Europe
- 200,000 Master student loans
- 34,000 scholarships for Joint Master degree
ERASMUS +

28% total budget
MORE cooperation for more INNOVATION

- **20,000** Strategic Partnerships
- **350** Knowledge Alliances & Sector skills alliances
- **1000** capacity building projects with third countries (focus on EU neighbouring countries)
„Horizon 2020“ – What’s new?

– A single programme bringing together three separate programmes/initiatives*
– Coupling research to innovation – from research to retail, all forms of innovation
– Focus on societal challenges facing EU society, e.g. health, clean energy and transport
– Simplified access, for all companies, universities, institutes in all EU countries and beyond.

* The 7th Research Framework Programme (FP7), innovation aspects of Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP), EU contribution to the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT)
# Horizon 2020 –
the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020)

## Part I: Excellent Science
- 1. European Research Council
- 2. Future and Emerging Technologies
- 3. Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions
- 4. Research Infrastructures

## Part II: Industrial Leadership
- 1. Leadership in Enabling & Industrial Technologies
  - 1.1 Information and communication technologies
  - 1.2 Nanotechnologies
  - 1.3 Advanced materials
  - 1.4 Biotechnology
  - 1.5 Advanced manufacturing and processing
  - 1.6 Space
- 2. Access to Risk Finance
- 3. Innovation in SMEs

## Part III: Societal Challenges
- 1. Health, demographic change and wellbeing
- 2. Food security, sustainable agriculture, marine and inland water research and bioeconomy
- 3. Secure, clean and efficient energy
- 4. Smart, green and integrated transport
- 5. Climate action, environment, resource efficiency and raw materials
- 6. Europe in a changing world - inclusive, innovative and reflective societies
- 7. Secure societies – Protecting freedom and security of Europe and its citizens

## Part IIIa: Spreading Excellence and Widening Participation

## Part IIIb: Science with & for Society

## Part IV: Non-nuclear direct actions of the Joint Research Centre (JRC)

## Part V: The European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT)
Horizon 2020 Budget

- Excellent Science; 24,4 Mrd
- Industrial Leadership; 17,0 Mrd
- Societal Challenges; 29,7 Mrd
- EIT; 2,7 Mrd
- JRC; 1,9 Mrd
- Science with and for Society; 0,5 Mrd
- Widening Participation; 0,8 Mrd

Gesamt: 77,0 Mrd. €

Horizon 2020: Problems, Challenges

- Horizon 2020 is based on excellence – how can countries (especially in Eastern Europe) succeed without the necessary institutional basis?
- The aim of a single and joint ERA: How does it interfere with the national strategies and national budgets?
Thank you for your attention!
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Who sets US higher education policy?

National level
- President
- Congress
- Supreme court
- Government agencies

State/local level
- Governor
- State governing bodies
- Local boards

Institutional level
- Governing boards
- President & top leaders
- Shared governance units (e.g. faculty senate)
Who influences US higher education policy?

- Taxpayers/public
- Employers
- Students & parents
- Faculty & staff
- Associations
- Alumni & other donors

US higher education policy
## Government Internationalization Policies & Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Initiatives/Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential initiatives</td>
<td>• 100,000 Strong (China, Americas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>• Fulbright-Hays programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Title VI programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department</td>
<td>• Fulbright and other exchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Visa policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>• Higher Education for Development (HED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>• National Security Education Program (NSEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
<td>• SEVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Department</td>
<td>• GATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Department</td>
<td>• Deemed export regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• International student recruiting initiatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Internationalization Spending

### FY 2013

*All figures in thousands*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>NSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding to individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulbright</td>
<td>$ 231,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Academic Exchanges</td>
<td>$ 55,822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Academic Fellowships</td>
<td>$ 38,907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Cultural Exchanges</td>
<td>$ 195,151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding to institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International and Area Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 70,164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 58,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 47,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total by Department</strong></td>
<td>$ 521,720</td>
<td>$ 70,164</td>
<td>$ 58,132</td>
<td>$ 47,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 639,524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Internationalization Spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Education</th>
<th>State Department</th>
<th>Total Federal Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • 41% decrease in budget for international education & foreign language programs from FY 2010 to FY 2012. | • **Decreasing** budget for exchanges:  
  - FY 12 = $598.8m  
  - FY 13 = est. $572.4m  
  - FY 14 = $568.6m  
  - Reliance on **public-private partnerships** for funding (e.g. 100,000 Strong in the Americas) | • Of the **total** federal budget:  
  - 1.4% allocated for “international affairs”  
  - 0.015% allocated for international exchanges |
| • Total funding for these activities accounts for **0.1% of overall budget** | | |

*Source: Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange*
Towards a National Policy

NAFSA & Alliance


- Addressed:
  - Foreign language and area studies
  - Attracting international students
  - Study abroad
  - Exchange programs

- Called for a White House Council on International Education
Towards a National Policy

Department of Education

• International Strategy 2012-16: “Succeeding Globally Through International Education & Engagement”

•Addresses:
  – Student global competencies
  – Best practices from abroad
  – “Education diplomacy”
Filling the Breach

- **ACE’s Center for Internationalization & Global Engagement**
  - Voice for **1800 member** institutions
  - Programs to support **internationalization** nationwide
  - **Monitoring & analysis** of global higher education issues
    - Impact on US institutions
    - How US fits into world scene
  - National and international **advocacy**

- **Other associations** can play a similar role
Institution “Foreign Policies”

• Beyond sovereignty

• Academic, financial, & other motivations

• Strategic plans create commitment and direction

• Direct relationships & negotiations with institutions & government ministries abroad

• Often disconnected from home government initiatives
What is Needed

• A more **holistic** approach

• Importance of inter-agency **cooperation**

• Better **liaison** between national & institutional initiatives
  – Structures to promote communication about priorities
Discussion and questions