

*With the support of the Erasmus Mundus programme of the European Commission*



## **Access to Success: Fostering trust and exchange between Europe and Africa**

### **Workshop 3: Europe and Africa: Intra and Inter regional academic mobility**

**3-4 May, 2010**

**La Palm Hotel, Accra, Ghana**

#### **Summary Report and Conclusions**

**Organising parties:** European University Association (EUA), Association of African Universities (AAU) in consultation with the other consortium partners: European Access Network (EAN), European Students' Union (ESU), the Flemish Inter-University Council for Development Cooperation (VLIR-UOS), the Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions (UHR). The seminar was also organised with the support of the National Union of Ghana Students (NUGS).

**Background:** The Access to Success Project aims at enhancing higher education exchange and cooperation between Africa and Europe. It addresses several issues of mutual interest in order to enhance understanding and trust, but also to contribute to policy development and the launch of concrete cooperation initiatives.

A first workshop (Addis Ababa, 17-20 November 2009 – for the outcomes refer to <http://www.accesstosuccess-africa.eu/web/events/workshops/access-and-retention.html>) compared institutional good practices in access and retention, based on a survey which has been conducted in 2009 in several countries of Africa and Europe.

The second workshop (Oslo, 24-25 February, 2010) explored programmes that structure institutional cooperation and capacity building between Europe and Africa. It intended to set a frame for the 3<sup>rd</sup> workshop on inter and intra regional academic mobility held in Accra, Ghana (3-4 May, 2010). A final dissemination conference on 28 September 2010 will present the project outcomes in a white paper to policy makers, cooperation agencies and the university community.

The **third workshop** addressed academic mobility, which is extremely topical for universities around the world. It is both the foundation of many institutions' internationalisation strategies and a political means to open higher education systems globally, promote flows of talent and attract a high qualified labour force. For Europe, it has been a central component of the Bologna process, and student and staff mobility has been closely linked to the broader economic and social integration. Africa, which has also expressed ambitions to grow regional higher education cooperation, is increasingly discussing means to generate mobility within the continent, which is extremely weak compared to the outflow of students to Europe and the USA.

This workshop took a two-dimensional approach to the topic of mobility: intra-regional mobility (within Africa and within Europe) as a potential avenue for regional higher education integration, and inter-regional mobility between Europe and Africa – the realities of brain drain and the drive for increased brain circulation.

#### **I. The Why and How of Intra-Regional mobility: Rationales, incentives and realities**

Providing an overview of the European mobility experience, **Monique Fouilhoux, Regional Coordinator Europe, Education International**, gave an introduction to the European Union's Erasmus programme, a mobility scheme that was launched in the 1980's and that enabled the mobility of approximately 2 million European students. This programme has become a brand for mobility within Europe, and was one of several

precursors of the Bologna Process, which developed a European Higher Education Area over the past decade, defined by converged degree systems and a common credit system (ECTS). Enhancing mobility is a declared goal of both the European Union and the higher education ministers under the Bologna Process, and the importance of mobility for personal growth, quality of HE and research, employability, and the establishment of academic networks has been emphasised. However, while there are some indicators that mobility has been enhanced in Europe, overall, mobility achievements can still further improve. Shortcomings in the understanding and implementation of both the Bologna tools (European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System, Diploma Supplement, etc) and the Lisbon Recognition Convention were suggested reasons, as well as the immigration policy of most European countries – only 6 countries have amended their immigration laws in response to Bologna. The lack of financial support for mobility is also still a concern. Issues such as balanced mobility and brain drain within Europe have been identified but not yet solved. Data on mobility in Europe are still fragmented and hardly allow proper assessment beyond Erasmus mobility. One suggestion from the speaker was that improving mobility should be an institutional rather than an individual responsibility.

**Juma Shabani, Director of UNESCO Bamako Cluster Office**, delivered a snapshot of the present situation for intraregional mobility in Africa. Overall, the HE sector across the continent is characterised by limited access, poor quality, insufficient relevance, but also lack of visibility and promotion of existing African study opportunities. Political unrest was identified as the most powerful though of course highly undesired mobility driver. There is a discourse regarding regional and sub-regional higher education integration but this has not translated into concrete, institutional action. For example, COMEDAF (Conference of Ministers for Higher Education of the African Union) approved a Harmonisation Strategy for Higher Education in 2007, and the Arusha Convention brings forward the recognition issue at pan-African level. It is not yet entirely clear whether efforts made at subregional level such as with the License, Maitrise, Doctorat (LMD) in Francophone Africa, the SADC protocol on education, the West African Economic and Monetary Union, and the East African Community would contribute to Pan-African HE integration, or rather strengthen and distinguish the subregional and nation state systems. The speaker pointed out that true integration must start with sub-regional HE networks and move up, as opposed to being top-town only.

At present, African intraregional institutional partnerships and staff mobility are facilitated by the Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie (AUF) and the Association for Development of Education in Africa (ADEA) through scholarships. A number of new initiatives have been launched to enhance both staff and student mobility, such as the NEPAD (New Partnership for Africa's Development) Network of centres of excellence in Science & Technology, the Pan African University (African Union), the ACP intra-regional programme (European Commission and ACP countries), and the Mwalimu Nyerere Scholarship Scheme (European Commission and African Union Commission). However, the coordination of funding schemes and the transparency and accessibility of mobility opportunities have been highlighted as concerns regarding these programmes. Several African participants admitted they were not aware that such programmes existed and/or questioned their design and promotion. A European participant indicated that the road towards intra-regional mobility and eventually the European Higher Education Area has been a long one, with pre-cursors to even the Erasmus programme in the form of the European joint-study programmes. Discussions on mobility in Africa are new, as are many programmes, and there may be a long period of patience, trial and error and trust building.

The speaker concluded on a positive note, emphasizing that HE receives much better recognition by governments and donors than in the past, and that support for ICT infrastructure has increased opportunities. He questioned whether mobility in Africa should concentrate on the post-graduate level and S&T, given that there are more pressing needs for Africa.

The **discussion** focused on the following issues:

- The Arusha convention has been revised, and some of the participants contributed to this. However, it is unlikely that it will make an impact, as some countries do not want to accept degrees by all other countries. Similarly, the hope that governments would support mobility, build instruments and remove visa problems has been mentioned. A general debate on mobility and its virtues would have to be launched in Africa, to get beyond political jargon to realistic implementation.
- The NEPAD has been welcomed as a promising initiative. However, institutions and their constituencies are not aware of the opportunities. It would require information and promotion, and one concrete suggestion was to use the regional and national university associations.
- Bologna and the European case have been mentioned as a learning opportunity

## **II. Experiences, policies and challenges for institutional mobility: institutional case studies**

**Lex Bouter, Rector of VU Amsterdam**, presented the case of his university, which commits itself to both academic excellence and societal relevance. Cooperation with Africa has been developed and a main consideration has been to build partnerships and programmes which are driven by a common research interest. This is also one of the reasons why the university is not interested in North-South undergraduate mobility, which is regarded as expensive and difficult to organize, but rather focuses on PhD and MA mobility. As a concrete example, the Desmond Tutu programme, which organises Joint PhD and Sandwich masters, has been referred to. The goal of the institutions is to mainstream development cooperation and merge it into the international strategy of the university. Too often, development cooperation and internationalisation remain fragmented.

**Wilson Wasike, Manager, Training Department, African Economic Research Consortium (AERC)** presented the programme of his institution, which facilitates individual and institutional research capacity building on African economic issues in and across several South, East and West African countries and moves students between a network of institutions. Through a long-term strategy, a strong organisational structure and rigorous selection procedures, the AERC has channelled several donor funding streams to facilitate partnerships, curriculum development and flexible grant schemes, complemented with QA and management enhancement measures. A clear challenge is still that the programme is not yet widely known enough among students.

The discussion raised the following issues:

- The long lead-time for academic relevance has been mentioned, as it would require the programmes of today to provide the education that is needed for tomorrow.
- The need to spread information on such initiatives as the AERC has been stressed, and one question has been whether the Access to Success Project or the AAU and EUA could gather such information on their websites or in a database.
- The importance of development cooperation has been mentioned, which seems often forgotten when the internationalisation portfolios of universities are described.
- Granting open access to educational resources was mentioned as a concrete and efficient means to enhance education, but also research. The VU explained its efforts to enable open access to scientific articles. EUA referred to its Open Access Working Group and the recommendations it came up with <http://www.eua.be/research/open-access/>

### III. Structuring and valorising mobility: break out groups discussion

#### III.1 Recognition and mobility

**Olusola Oyewole, African Union Commission (AUC)** reported on the state of play regarding the Arusha Recognition convention. Its main purpose is to facilitate the mobility of students and professionals throughout the African continent. Launched in Arusha, Tanzania 1981, the Convention has never been implemented due to lack of resources and the fact that only 20 states had signed it. In 2006 COMEDAF, AUC and UNESCO, supported by AAU launched a revision process, in order to improve it, but also to update it on issues that have not been on the horizon 3 decades ago, such as Open and Distance Learning and ICT. In addition, the purpose of the Convention has become much more explicit, in that it seeks to enhance interregional and international cooperation on recognition, QA and accreditation at national and regional levels. The process of recognition should include QA and accreditation of institutions and programmes. Countries will be encouraged to develop regional protocols for QA and harmonisation with agreed minimum standards. An aim in this regards is to enhance the introduction of academic 3 cycle systems of Bachelor, Masters, Doctorates (BMD/LMD) that has already been taken up in some African countries.

The already mentioned programmes of the Pan African University, the Nyerere Scholarship Scheme, a new AU programme for teacher mobility, a rating system of African universities and a compendium on research excellence in Africa done jointly with AAU, would complement and underpin the recognition convention. Generally, the AU would enhance stakeholder consultation and their active participation in the development of these initiatives and the African Union Info Day to be organized in autumn would be a clear step in this direction. AU has expectations for a more intensive cooperation with the AAU in this regards. Visa support arrangement would have to be agreed by the signature countries. The costs for the Arusha implementation would be shared among countries, subregional bodies, AUC, and UNESCO. The revision of the Arusha convention has been concluded in Nov.2009, and currently AUC and UNESCO are in the process to redrafting it in cooperation with the legal unit of UNESCO, to be completed by June 2010.

**Andrejs Rauhvargers, Bologna Recognition Working Group/ Latvian Rectors' Conference** outlined the development and results of the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC). He referred to the high expectations that the LRC raised a decade ago, as it was expected to be the remedy to all recognition problems and contribute significantly to the enhancement of mobility. Over the years, Europe had to realise that the LRC could only succeed when it is implemented in terms of procedures and underpinned by a network of national contact points and dedicated agencies (ENIC/NARIC - <http://www.enic-naric.net/>) and dealt with accordingly by institutions. QA procedures, which came into existence in a parallel process, independent from recognition, have contributed to improving the situation, and there is some expectation that learning outcomes and national qualifications frameworks would further enhance it. However, it ultimately requires solid and efficient structures, continued effort, mutual trust and good will to make it happen.

An important step in the European process has been the introduction of the notion of 'substantial difference', which reversed the burden of proof from the recognition seeker to the recognizing agency.

A particularity of the European Union is that for a number of regulated professions (medical doctor, dentist, nurse, midwife, veterinary surgeon, pharmacist, architect) recognition is done automatically, as it falls under a European Union directive, whereas for all other academic disciplines are under the general system and subject to a recognition decisions at national level.

The **discussion** focused in particular on clarifying what recognition actually means. The worry of many participants from Africa is clearly that once Arusha is signed and ratified, every diploma would have to be recognized, whereas the European practice

demonstrates that this is not the case. The European case suggests that recognition procedures, if not applied diligently and with the clear will to recognise, run danger to impede recognition rather than to enhance it. It also confirms that while national agencies for recognition have an important and responsible task to fulfil, the final decision on the individual case is of course with the employer or the university. This also responds to the concern about how a university can issue a degree on behalf of 53 African countries: the degree awarding power remains with the institutions.

Another key point was the role of governments, in particular the AU, and stakeholder in the process. AAU defined its potential role in the process of Arusha mainly at the level of consultation and information dissemination. For the European process, EUA clarified that it is supporting the development of the European Higher Education Area, and is participating in the policy discussions and decisions, in partnership with governments and other stakeholder representative bodies. But while it is invited to the annual conferences of the ENIC/NARIC and contributes to the policy discussions on recognition in Bologna Process and with the European Commission, it has no immediate role in recognition. Generally, participants invited the AU to develop a transparent and clear stakeholder consultation process, and to circulate information on initiatives and programmes widely. Joint degrees and integrated mobility modules in curricula were suggested as an institutional method to enhance recognition. EUA confirmed that joint provision of courses and degrees are high on the agenda of the European universities, but given the high transaction costs, this might not be a model for mass mobility. With the introduction of the Bologna degree cycles, the trend seems to go towards vertical mobility (mobility between degrees) rather than horizontally (within degrees). However, with regards to the general promise of the recognition convention the option of mobility e.g. within an undergraduate degree should be possible and with regards to growing interconnectivity and general mobility options, it should not be given up too hastily.

Some participants were generally sceptical towards the feasibility of Arusha, regarding the feasibility, in particular with regards to the governance and management of the process, but also regarding its scope and purpose. Does Africa really need at this stage an Arusha Convention, given that there is so little need for cross border recognition? Would this not for and foremost benefit private for-profit institutions? The argument was brought up that study periods are not even recognised within the same university. While some participants saw the need to harmonise curricula throughout the African continent, others expressed their reservation, partly because they thought that standardization would not be feasible, or not desirable. European participants explained that beyond the convergence of degree cycles, and some initiatives for the development of core curricula in certain disciplines, the general trend in Europe is rather to make curricula and degrees transparent through the development of learning outcomes.

A similar discussion developed around QA: European experience suggests not to overburden the recognition process with QA, but rather to develop it in well distinguished separate processes. The current vision of the AU foresees that each African country has to set up a national body for QA and accreditation, complemented by regional protocols and an African Quality Assurance Network.

The point was made that in Europe the vision is to develop QA with clearly defined roles for agencies and institutions, which are outlined in the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) for QA. The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA – [www.enqa.eu](http://www.enqa.eu)) was established to bring together QA agencies. Agencies should operate independently from governments. Also a European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education ([www.eqar.eu](http://www.eqar.eu)) was established by stakeholder organisations (mandated by the European governments) in 2008, with the purpose to list agencies that substantially comply with the ESG.

### **III. 2 Virtual mobility: A new dimension for partnership?**

David Ndegwah of Tangaza College, Kenya and Otto Kroesen of the TU Delft, the Netherlands held a joint presentation on the challenges of organising a virtual seminar on

intercultural dialogue for African (Kenya, Ethiopia) and Dutch students through online collaboration.

A number of obstacles had to be overcome in making this virtual seminar possible. Technical challenges were poor connectivity to the worldwide web in Kenya and Ethiopia, lack of knowledge on blackboard learning environments and difficulties with the timing of the seminar, due to the time difference. There were also social challenges to tackle, as technology does not take place in a social vacuum. The different access to technology, easily led to frustrations, as uploading of pictures for the Dutch students was a simple act, whereas downloading them for viewing in Africa took a lot of effort. The collaboration tried to overcome these challenges by better coordinating the input from the coordinators, in terms of lectures, info materials and field survey and by using an asynchronous mode of discussion. The speakers concluded that virtual communication does not replace, but can enhance physical communication. However adequate ICT infrastructure is essential for this type of cooperation. The learning goal of the virtual seminar was intercultural understanding: analytical vs. practical approach. Given the cultural misunderstandings from both sides and the challenges with the technology, an important part of the learning experience was met.

A question was raised why virtual mobility was even discussed, when bandwidth is still such a problem. The view from the working group was that a first vision is very important and that small things already can be done (using Skype in NL to call cell phones in Kenya, using e-mail is a possibility). One should be creative and work around problems. However, participants agreed that the topic is not so much about mobility, but more about curriculum development. There is a need for agreement on what a course should lead to and then you can offer the same course in different universities. With an online seminar, you can enhance collaboration, bring people together and reach a larger audience. There are certain intercultural aspects involved as well, but it still doesn't replace mobility.

The break-out group concluded that online collaboration between universities in Africa and Europe can be a useful addition to regular student and staff mobility, as it has the potential to reach a larger audience when integrated in the curricula. Also the use of open educational resources has great potential to internationalise university teaching and to spread knowledge more easily. However, in order to allow Africa to benefit from these technological possibilities, more investments in ICT infrastructure are crucial. Also, a stable electricity grid is a precondition for increasing the use of online collaboration methods.

### **III. 3 Joint degrees and mobility – innovative curricula and other institutional benefits**

Par Svensson of Lund University presented the experiences of his university with joint degrees and specifically with the Erasmus Mundus programme. Strategically, the Board of Lund University decided to focus on long term collaboration and partnerships, 2/3 of which are research intensive. Erasmus Mundus has been a means to achieve this strategy, and it is felt that EM is a vehicle to turn individual academic cooperation to institutional collaboration. The benefits from the programme are manifold: It enhances income and competitiveness, is a tool for marketing, builds trust with other institutions, opens doors to universities involved, brings in international teachers, enhances employability of students and establishes research contacts. However the programme is not without challenges: There are problems with recognition of joint degrees, housing, admissions, examinations, administration support (Lund built up an information platform and a support service for teachers that come in), and an underlying need for support from university leadership. Sustainability is also a concern, as the European Commission will stop funding scholarships for programmes that have been established for several years.

**Nan Warner of the University of Cape Town** presented a different approach to regional degree cooperation as a structure for mobility- the USHEPIA programme. The premise of this programme is that there is a need for partnership between African universities in order to capitalise on the wealth of African culture, experience and resources and as a means to unleash S-S research potential. USHEPIA consists of 8 Southern and Eastern universities that share a goal of human capacity building and research collaboration. Doctoral fellowships are awarded that are unique and flexible and respect an equal male-female ratio. All fellows have stayed on the continent and 96% have stayed with their home universities. The speaker concluded that African Academic research networks can be a key way to address retention of staff in Africa. In the future, the programme would like to look at post doc opportunities, career tracks for graduates to continue research careers when they go home, and connecting with alumni.

After discussion, it was concluded that intra-regional mobility can and should be structured in a way that renders benefits for institutions and students. Joint degrees can be one avenue, Africa research exchange networks can be another modality. Erasmus Mundus (EM) is a European programme designed for European objectives (that African students and universities can benefit from) whereas USHEPIA is an African programme designed for African needs. EM is not a development programme at the core but perhaps one can learn from it as African universities explore collaboration models for regional mobility and institutional partnership. Joint degrees are a natural articulation of internationalisation in Europe and are worth exploring strategically, though one should consider the resource implications in managing them.

#### **IV. Generating regional mobility in Africa: Launching Nyerere and other schemes**

The session presented major initiative of the African Union and the European Union to enhance intra-African and Africa-Europe exchange and cooperation in HE.

**Olusola Oyewole, Senior Education Expert, African Union Commission (AUC)** reported on efforts to launch the Nyerere Programme to enhance intra-African HE mobility. One call has already been launched, but the selection procedures were lengthy, and only 19 scholarships were awarded in 2009, which focused on a few destinations in Africa. This experience has been taken into account when relaunching the programme this year with a focus on graduate level education. Funding for Nyerere will be provided under the EU-ACP mobility scheme, with a five year duration and 40 Mill EUR (of which 30 Mill go to Africa, and 10 Mill to the Caribbean and the Pacific). This will result in a 6 Mill EUR p.a. for Africa. Additional funds have been provided to include North Africa and South Africa. Initially the programme will be implemented by the EC's EACEA agency together with AUC, and in Phase 2, AUC will take over entirely. Two calls will be launched, one for university consortia or networks bringing together partners from 3 African regions to provide a programme in more than one language. The speaker raised questions for the audience on whether the programme's objectives are achievable and if the vision of the programme can be met.

**Deirdre Lennan, European Commission**, presented the flagship programmes of the European Commission that currently support HE exchange and cooperation with Africa. Under the ACP programme, the EDULINK Programme is to foster capacity building and regional integration in the field of higher education through institutional networking and to support quality higher education systems which are relevant to the needs of the labour market, and consistent with ACP socio-economic development priorities. Under the EDULINK II, 20 million EUR are foreseen and the next call is likely to be published in Autumn 2010 with deadline in early Spring 2011. <http://www.acp-edulink.eu/>  
The Erasmus Mundus programme provides under 3 actions grants for the establishment of partnerships with joint curricula provision (Action 1) scholarships for individual

graduate students for African Masters and PhD to Europe, exchange of African and European academics (Action 2) and under Action 3 initiatives for accompanying measures (such as the present Access to Success Project). Action 2 provides 6 EUR million for ACP countries, and 4.8 Mill EUR for South Africa.  
[http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus\\_mundus/programme/about\\_erasmus\\_mundus\\_en.php](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/programme/about_erasmus_mundus_en.php)

The speaker referred also to the ongoing policy processes, the Africa-EU Partnership, launched in 2007. There is a clear move in the EC's development agenda from supporting basic education to a more comprehensive approach. This has also been confirmed in the revision of the Cotonou Partnership Agreement.

The Access to Success Project has been mentioned as a current important initiative, as well as the feasibility study to assess the prospects of launching a 'Tuning' like exercise in Africa. Tuning has been an initiative to enhance convergence in disciplinary curricula to improve learning and teaching, which has been employed in Europe and in some other parts of the world. First results are expected to be presented at a stakeholder conference which will take place back-to-back with the AU-EU Summit end of November 2010.

**Discussions** focused on the Nyerere programme and how it can be implemented in a transparent manner, accessible for all African universities and students. There was some concern regarding the suggestion that the best brains will be attracted to a few destinations, and its implications regarding the inequality of study conditions. The representative of the AU encouraged universities and countries to think how to attract students. Regarding concerns that Africa once again would have to rely on foreign support, it was responded that indeed the EC money should challenge the African countries to consider more investment in HE. Whether there will be links between Nyerere and the Pan African University is still subject to discussion. There was also a discussion whether there should be an age limit for scholarships: there was the opinion that in particular young people should benefit, whereas with regards to LLL and the often complex study paths it was argued that there should be no age limit.

Generally, stakeholders expressed their concern that these processes are launched and implemented in a top down manner, without stakeholder consultation and involvement. It was mentioned that while in 2007 the AAU has been appointed to be AUCs HE implementing agency, the issues of Nyerere and the Pan-African University have not be subject of discussion between the two organisations so far. Other questions concerned the administration of the Nyerere programme and how AUC as a political body can facilitate a fair selection of scholarship applicants, which should be met on academic grounds. AU and EC representatives confirmed that the Nyerere Programme will be transparent and well accessible for students. Participants confirmed that further information on the stakeholders' day in November would be very much welcomed.

## **V. Inter-regional academic mobility and professional brain drain**

**Abdeslam Marfouk, Université Catholique de Louvain/ Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium**, provided an overview on brain drain from Africa to OECD countries. A key point in his argumentation was that while brain drain occurs in most countries of the world, it has the greatest magnitude in Sub-Saharan Africa, which for a population that is 13 times larger than that of France has only half as many medical doctors. In particular in environments where highly skilled labour is scarce, any migration is a very sensitive issue. Highly skilled women deserve particular attention in this regard, as in some countries they tend to migrate twice as often as highly skilled men.

**MeeFoong Lee, EAN** and **Tor Rynning Torp, UHR**, both partners in the Access to Success Project consortium, reported from the two previous project workshops on Access and Retention and on Capacity building partnerships between Europe and Africa, highlighting how these two events linked to brain drain issues. The fact that brain drain from African countries involves the privileged few that made it into university acerbates the impact on social capital. In thinking on how to retain them, one would also have to

consider how universities but also donor programmes can enhance careers and living conditions.

In the **discussion** some participants argued that brain drain is there to stay, particularly as conditions in the African labour markets and in universities are poor and unemployment is high. Clearly there is a mismatch between the labour market requirements and the skills of graduates. Intra-African brain drain was mentioned, which lacks statistics. From a university perspective, internal country brain drain is also concerning as careers outside the university are often far more attractive. While from an African perspective this appears to be a waste of research potential, employment of research trained graduates in various economic areas and sectors is highly encouraged in Europe.

The issue of return of investment through brain drain has been addressed as for some countries remittances are an important income source. However, the overall economic value of remittances is highly contested. More rewarding seems to be Diaspora concepts that have been developed by various countries that try to encourage scholars to keep in touch with their home universities, and contribute through teaching stays etc. A concrete suggestion that has been aired was a database of African diaspora scholars.

## **VI. Fighting brain drain, driving brain circulation: Current modalities: Break out discussion**

Participants split into two groups with two/three presenters per group and parallel discussions on current initiatives and programmes aimed at minimizing brain drain and promoting brain circulation. Key questions were: How do the aims of different national government and agency programmes differ? To what extent are they sensitive to brain drain? What is good practice in either mitigating brain drain or encouraging brain circulation?

In the first session, **Almudena Caballos Villar, Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo (AECID)** and **Heike Edelmann-Okinda, German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)** presented. DAAD has a variety of programmes that contribute to building capacity of African universities, training African students, and mitigating brain drain: 'Competence centres' aimed at obtaining MDGs, excellence centres for disciplinary research in Africa, post graduate courses for African professionals (with high employment rate upon return), African Good Governance Networks, alumni programmes, salary support for returnees to start own businesses upon return, and infrastructure for return researchers.

Spain has traditionally been Latin America focused in terms of university development cooperation but is looking toward Africa and generally towards greater diversification geographically. The AECID is using lessons from past experiences in mobility schemes, scholarships and institutional development support in other regions and would like to coordinate better with other development agents and share practice.

In the second session, **Abdoulaye Salifou from the Bureau of Central Africa of Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie (AUF)** presented the various programmes and scholarships that AUF provides to combat brain drain. The programmes are aimed at building ICT capacity at universities and generally building academic excellence and offer a variety of scholarships for mobility within Africa, PhD joint supervision, post doctorate work and distance learning/online training. **Richard Middleton** of the **Commonwealth Scholarship Commission**, presented the various scholarship opportunities for African Commonwealth residents to study in the UK, and highlighted that 88% of grantees are now based in their home country. He offered several propositions to reduce brain gain the CSC has analysed: Distance learning and split site awards that allow students to stay in their home institution, developing strong institutional partnerships that allow the student/ staff to cultivate a relationship with their home university even if abroad, and involving home countries in the scholarship selection process for scholarships so mutual interest in the student/staff is conveyed.

The following conclusions/questions were drawn from the sessions:

- Might these programmes benefit from collaboration/ coordination? Spain considers information sharing critical but joint programming may be difficult when it comes to national government priorities. Coordination and cooperation of both European agencies and of 'recipient' countries/ institutions was addressed in the Access to Success Oslo workshop and many practical suggestions were provided
- Promotion and dissemination of information on different European programmes is critical. Information is fragmented and there is a vast array of potential programmes that students, researchers and institutions can benefit from. This can be addressed by agency cooperation both in Europe and through outposts in Africa (such as lecturers and information centers), alumni and university partners
- Promoting good practice in utilising the diaspora and also alumni of such programmes was highlighted.

## **VII. Inter-regional mobility and brain drain: Student input**

Input was provided from a panel of three student representative which met prior to the workshop to discuss mobility and brain drain. **Ivy de Souza, National Union of Ghana Students, Emma di Orio, European Students Union, and Karen Basiye, Erasmus Mundus Alumni**, presented their respective student organisations and addressed the following questions: Why do students like the Erasmus Mundus alumni go out? In what cases have they returned? Why have they not returned? How can the EM programme be more conscious of brain drain? How can the alumni contribute? What is the role of student unions in Africa in helping to fight brain drain? How can institutions work with them more effectively?

The students looked critically at mobility programmes in both Europe and now in Africa and posed several questions:

- If the programme entails a joint degree, will this be recognised?
- How can fair selection be ensured? Quality? Employability?
- Is the study destination safe?
- What is the added value of the mobility to the degree?
- What are the administrative obstacles in doing it?
- What are the student services at the host institution?

It was generally felt that though Erasmus Mundus has been successful in Europe, Africa students may be more reticent to move within Africa as internal African mobility is not highly regarded nor seen as beneficial. Mobility programmes such as Nyerere would need significant promotion. Alumni can be an important tool in this endeavour.

The discussion highlighted the need to promote existing mobility programmes in Africa and their successes. The needs and questions of students must be considered and universities must have the appropriate resources to accommodate international students. Recognition is clearly a thread in the discussion, which is why long-term partnerships may be the best structures for student mobility as they can engage in a trust building relationship between certain institutions.

In terms of brain drain, the students confessed that while many African students who go to Europe or the US feel connected to their home countries, they naturally want the best job and quality of life prospects. It is important to be honest about the interest of countries in the North to attract high-skilled labour and the needs of countries in the South to retain talent and to search for creative solutions at both institutional and governmental level to connect to the Diaspora.

## VIII. Institutional perspectives on brain drain: challenges and solutions

**Barack Owuor, Maseno University, Kenya**, presented different reasons why university staff decides to be mobile, for example in order to enhance the academic capacity and combat migration and HIV, one of the main factors impacting Kenya's universities today. Staff and student mobility have enormous academic, cultural and political benefits.

Intra-African mobility has existed for quite some time, as before independence the colleges of Dar Es Salam and Nairobi were connected to the University of Makerere. While turned into universities after independence, staff cooperation and student exchange with credit recognition continued. With the establishment of the East African Community, the three countries started to develop different university systems. Though the efforts of the Interuniversity Council of the East African Community (IUCEA) to enhance exchanges continued, supported by the German DAAD, mobility did not reach its expected overall goals. The speaker stressed that enhancing mobility within East Africa could be a means to strengthen critical mass and build capacity within the region. This could then lead to addressing and reducing some of the brain drain issues.

**Stephen Simukanga, University of Zambia (UNZA)** presented the case of his university, which until 1982 was the only university in Zambia. Today, two more public and 6 private universities have been established, which brings up serious competition in terms of staff recruitment. Poor facilities and funding for research and teaching and low remuneration have been identified as motives for brain drain. These and other issues are addressed in the university's strategic plan, that aims at improving learning and teaching conditions for both students and teachers (they hope to attain a 1 to 10 teacher student ratio), provide attractive social benefit packages for staff and their families and offer extra income opportunities (consultancy).

Overall, the speaker concluded that (for the university) the concern is not with brain drain out of the country, but within the country as university staff is moving to private universities and other better paid jobs. While strategies to tackle this have been identified, a critical issue is of course time and resources to implement them. One good practice has been the efforts of the University of Zambia to connect to alumni living abroad and offer them opportunities to teach a few lectures of courses when they return to see family.

**Brian O'Connell, University of the Western Cape**, brought forward the case of South Africa and his own university. Brain drain comes on top of the AIDS/HIV problem, which is a pertinent threat to the 10 fold human capital increase that SA has been able to realise during the past 30 years.

Today, the annual loss through brain drain of medical personnel is estimated 37 Mill USD, with 25% of SA medical graduates immigrating to the US alone, most of them from historically white universities. 16 years after the end of the apartheid, 11% of white population still account for 2/3 of the PhD graduates. And while SA has managed to develop pockets of research excellence, in international comparison, its overall scientific production remains low in percentage to population, and rather fragile, as its success in research is based on a small elite of scholars.

In this overall scenario, the speaker considered the options of University of the Western Cape (UWC), in looking on policy development (countries that benefit from brain drain stop to do so, resp. remunerate providing countries; African countries build jointly an agenda to prevent brain drain) to institutional measures in developing strong partnerships and donor relations and building up competent programmes and sufficient staff support for students to succeed, in particular at graduate level. Factors for success are funding, functioning structures, and especially passion and commitment amongst the university community.

## **IX. The meeting was concluded with the following remarks and recommendations:**

### **Crucial importance of mobility**

Given the increasing demand for universities to produce globally relevant graduates, academic Mobility has been identified as crucial for universities and their constituencies; the benefits of mobility for students, staff and researchers are manifold, and can also support the capacity development and international connectivity of African universities

Mobility should not directly imply brain drain. While mobility may open opportunities for brain drain, the overall assumption was that restricting mobility does not necessarily prevent it. While the following conclusions distinguish between intra- and interregional mobility, many of the observations and arguments are valid for both.

### **Mobility within the region**

The European case was discussed with regards to its at least partial success in enhancing intraregional mobility, mainly through the incentives and programmes provided by the European Union. However, intra-European mobility is still insufficiently documented and can be suspected to lag behind expectations developed in the Bologna Process, as there are a range of obstacles (visas for non-EU Bologna country citizens, resident permits, pensions, recognition issues) and also internal brain-drain issues (from East to West) to deal with.

In Africa, intra-regional mobility is very limited, and the existing initiatives have low visibility. While enhancing mobility within Africa meets a lot of scepticism, participants agreed that there is growing political and academic awareness for the necessity to enhance it. Possible approaches and mobility initiatives could involve programmes for staff exchanges, sabbaticals, researcher and PhD mobility, and perhaps semester abroad in the case of undergraduates. European but also specific African experiences with mobility could be of use.

### **Systems' change and regional recognition conventions**

It was clearly stated that Africa can and should not copy the Bologna Process, but rather take it as a learning opportunity. The African Union, with the support of regional level stakeholder organisations such as the AAU, was seen as the main institution to encourage the harmonization of HE systems.

A critical element in bringing regional integration forward, and more specifically enhancing mobility, is recognition of degrees and study periods abroad. In the European case, the example of the Lisbon Recognition Convention illustrates that an agreement on paper cannot be a remedy for all recognition and mobility problems. For the Arusha Convention, a discussion should be started on its long-term implementation, promotion, and maintenance. This should also include the development of national structures that would be in charge of the follow-up and promotion of the Convention through institutional incentives and discussions on how it relates to stakeholders. AAU and national Rectors' Conferences can contribute to these discussions and play a role in promoting it and facilitating the information flow to universities. Quality assurance would have to be developed at institutional, national and regional level in parallel processes to aid recognition. But this should be done separately from the Arusha Convention, in order not to overburden it.

### **Brain drain from Africa to Europe**

Brain drain is statistically undeniable (though many aren't aware of the statistics), although the relationship with academic mobility programmes still needs to be demonstrated. Some professions, for example health services are particularly affected, which has dire consequences for the sending country. Governments and institutions in Africa and Europe can take steps to staunch brain drain, and to minimise its causes:

- It seems that there is currently still a lack of awareness for brain drain and its impacts. For the individual academic the opportunity to study and work in a foreign country might be economically and professionally rewarding. Institutions may take a certain pride in the fact that their graduates succeed in international careers. Remittances from migrants may improve the purchasing power of families and contribute to the economy. Domestic shortage of work opportunities may even suggest that academic migration is desirable. Given these assumptions, there is clearly a need for collecting and publicizing data both from Africa and within Africa and analyzing more scientifically its effects
- Governments both in Africa and in Europe have a responsibility in developing concrete measures to mitigate brain drain. The example of Norwegian government which doesn't hire nurses from emerging countries was quoted. Another way would be to consider how to remunerate countries for brain drain. But there was a general agreement that incentives and programmes which consider brain drain in a responsible manner might be more appropriate than regulation, which potentially limits the individual freedom of students and academics.
- Governments and universities can contribute to improving conditions for university personnel, through transparent human resources policies and regulations.
- The development of Diaspora structures, such as a ministry for Diaspora, can be a strategic and tangible way to confront the issues at country and regional level. Institutions should be encouraged to create strategies for engaging the Diaspora and tracking graduates. At regional level, it was suggested to set-up of an academic Diaspora database for Africa.

One development in internationalisation which can be constructed to fight brain drain is embedding mobility in collaborative frameworks: There seems to be a clear trend towards partnerships, joint degrees and mobility windows in Europe, which are perceived as a mean to improve recognition, to ensure quality and contribute to a better mobility balance. These approaches can be shared with African universities who considering new approaches to institutional collaboration and mobility with the African region and subregions. Online collaboration tools were found as a mean to support interregional cooperation, provided that reliable ICT and other infrastructure exist. Granting open access to research publications is one of the concrete measures already practiced by universities to enhance research conditions at partner institutions. While this might not reverse the mobility flows, it can contribute to achieving a better balance.

Governments and donor initiatives are invited to support such initiatives through long term, flexible (also regarding mobility duration), demand driven programmes that respond to the needs of universities

Fora for government-university community discussion have been suggested to align strategies and actions. African colleagues clearly desired more information on EU and AUC programmes for the academic community. A clear challenge to be addressed by universities, donors and governments is ensuring that these programmes and their implementation are mutually beneficial to all institutions involved (in Europe and Africa).

### **Government – stakeholder relations**

For many of the issues addressed, the relationship between governments and stakeholder organisations were identified as a critical issue: Starting from the needs assessment over the development and implementation of policies, strategies and programmes, be it in higher education reform or on concrete projects in the area of institutional development and mobility enhancement: there is a crucial need for partnership and collaboration between governments in order to ensure that measures are embraced by the university community. This has been proven by various national examples and also at regional level, e.g. in the European Bologna Process. Any kind of regional reform process in Africa would have to consider the role of associations in liaising with regional governments and shaping stakeholder consultation. Student input is also crucial, and the feedback of the student organisations and the Erasmus Mundus Alumni brought forward critical questions for future cooperation, programming, and discussions on brain drain.

### Participation list

First name	Family name	Organisation / institution	Country
Willy	Aastrup	Aarhus University	Denmark
Koffi	Ahadzi-Nonon	Université de Lomé	Togo
Sola	Akinrinade	Osun state university	Nigeria
Samuel Yaw	Akomea	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology	Ghana
James	Anyan	World Bank Consultant, Erasmus Mundus Alumnus	Ghana
Naa	Ardamafio	University of Ghana	Ghana
Hortense	Atta Taky Diallo	Université d'Abobo-Adjamé	Côte d'Ivoire
Karen	Basiye	Erasmus Mundus Alumni	Kenya
Bruno	Bekolo Ebe	Université de Douala	Cameroun
Deborah	Bennett	Association of Commonwealth Universities and Commonwealth Scholarship Commission	UK
Lex	Bouter	Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	The Netherlands
Elizabeth	Colucci	European University Association	Belgium
Samuel Antwi	Darkwah	Mendel University, Brno	Czech Republic
Ivy	De Souza	National Union of Ghana Students	Ghana
Samba	Diop	University of The Gambia	The Gambia
Heike	Edelmann-Okinda	DAAD	Germany / Ghana
Di Iorio	Emma Luisa	European Students' Union	UK
Juliet	Ezekannagh Oluchi	University of Ibadan / Women Education and Development Volunteer	Nigeria
Monique	Fouilhoux	Education International	France
Nadja	Gmelch	Associació Catalana d'Universitats Públiques	Spain
Goolam	Mohamedbhai	African Association of Universities	Ghana
Libor	Grega	Mendel Univesrity	Czech Republic
Gilford T	Hapanyengwi	University of Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe
Päivi	Hellén	Helsinki Metropolia University of Applied Sciences	Finland
Piet	Henderikx	European Association of Distance Teaching Universities	Belgium
Jaroslav	Hlusek	Mendel Univesrity	Czech Republic
Michael	Hörig	European University Association	Belgium
Tomasz	Jelenski	International Centre of Education, Cracow University of Technology	Poland
Andrea	Johnson	Carnegie Corporation of New York	USA
James Otieno	Jowi	African Network for Internationalization of Education	Kenya
Hanna	Juntunen	Helsinki Metropolia University of Applied Sciences	Finland
Kees	Kouwenaar	Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	The Netherlands
Otto	Kroesen	University of Delft	The Netherlands

Deirdre	Lennan	European Commission Education and Culture	EC
Evelyn	Mainoo	National Union of Ghana Students	Ghana
Abdeslam	Marfouk	IRES- Universite Catholique de Louvain and Université Libre de Bruxelles	Belgium
Narciso	Matos	FDC - Foundation for Community Development	Mozambique
Kenneth M	Mavuti	University of Nairobi	Kenya
Alem	Mebrahtu Tesfamariam	Mekelle University	Ethiopia
Mee Foong	Lee	European Access Network	UK
Michael	Gaebel	European University Association	Belgium
Richard	Middleton	Commonwealth Scholarship Commission	UK
David	Ndegwah	Tangaza College	Kenya
James	Nyomakwa-Obimpeh	EMA - African Chapter	UK
Brian	O'Connell	University of the Western Cape	South Africa
Oluwatobi Temitayo	Ogunlesi	University of Agriculture, Abeokuta	Nigeria
Adeokun Oluwafemi	Ojealabi	University of Ibadan	Nigeria
Christopher Friday Ijeoma	Onwuka	University of Agriculture, Abeokuta	Nigeria
Barack	Owuor	Maseno University	Kenya
Olusola	Oyewole	African Union Commission	Ethiopia
Marvi	Pulver	Tallinn University	Estonia
Albert	Quainoo	University for Development Studies, Tamale	Ghana
Andrejs	Rauhvargers	Latvian Rectors' Council / Bologna Follow-up group	Latvia
John	Reilly	University of Kent	UK
Kwame Emmanuel	Ross	Liberia National Students' Union (LINSU)	Liberia
Aloys	Ruzibiza	National University of Rwanda	Rwanda
Abdoulaye	Salifou	Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie, Central Africa Bureau	Cameroun
Taye Tamaraukarite	Semithan	University of Agriculture, Abeokuta	Nigeria
Juma	Shabani	UNESCO Bamako Cluster Office	Mali
Stephen	Simukanga	University of Zambia	Zambia
Pär	Svensson	Lund University	Sweden
Prof	Tagoe	University of Ghana	Ghana
Semighan Taiye	Tamaraukaritei	Student Union, University of Agriculture, Abeokuta	Nigeria
Joseph Valerian	Tesha	University of Daar es Salaam	Tanzania
Alex	Tetty-Enyo	Ministry of Education, Ghana	Ghana
Lillian	Tibatemwa-Ekirikubinza	Makerere University	Uganda
Tor Rynning	Torp	Norwegian Rectors' Conference (UHR)	Norway

Muhammad Tsowa	Usman	Federal University of Technology, Minna	Nigeria
Stasys	Vaitkevicius	Mykolas Romeris University	Lithuania
Rosemary	Victor-Ochonma	University of Port Harcourt	Nigeria
Almudena Caballos	Villar	Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo (AECID)	Spain
Karolien	Vrints	VLIR-UOS	Belgium
Nan	Warner	USHEPiA and EAAV Programmes, International Academic Programmes Office, University of Cape Town	South Africa
Wilson	Wasike	African economic research consortium	Kenya
Pascal	Hoba	African Association of Universities	Ghana