

## ARTICLES

### NATIONAL POLICY FOR ACADEMIC MOBILITY IN RUSSIA AND THE BRICS COUNTRIES: 20 YEARS OF THE BOLOGNA PROCESS IMPLEMENTATION

DMITRY TEPLYAKOV,

Tyumen State University (Tyumen, Russia)

OLGA TEPLYAKOVA,

Tyumen State University (Tyumen, Russia)

DOI: 10.21684/2412-2343-2017-5-1-5-26

*The article analyses the Russian Federal Education Programmes from the aspect of their impact on student and academic staff mobility. The subject of the analysis is the programmes adopted for the period 2000 to 2020 and their implementation reports. A cluster of academic mobility forms compiled by the authors is based on two groups: academic staff and students. The forms of academic staff mobility have been identified as: (1) a migration flow: outward and incoming; and (2) purpose: teaching and research. The forms of student mobility have been identified as: (1) migration flow: outward and incoming; and (2) purpose: credit mobility and degree mobility. The cluster is based on the National Reports on the Implementation of the Bologna Process by different countries from 2012 to 2015 and the Russian Federal Education Programmes. The analysis finds that academic mobility in Russia has been an indicator of the development of education programmes for almost 20 years. During this period, the government's approach to academic mobility has undergone a change from a simple reference as an expected result to the establishing of quantitative indicators. The four quantitative indicators of academic mobility have been in place since 2000. As a result of the analysis, the authors conclude that among the forms of student mobility the most developed is the incoming degree mobility of international students. The student outward credit mobility is the least developed of the four indicators. In the current situation, it is necessary to reform and liberalise the recognition of study abroad periods for Russian students. Without*

*reform, it will be difficult to achieve the target set by the government to have 6 percent of students studying abroad for at least one semester by 2020. The data for 2016 show that only a few higher education institutions have approached the target. The authors also identify problems relating to academic staff mobility.*

*Keywords: academic mobility; credit and degree mobility; internationalisation of education; outward and incoming mobility; Russian Federal Education Programmes.*

**Recommended citation:** Dmitry Teplyakov & Olga Teplyakova, *National Policy for Academic Mobility in Russia and the BRICS Countries: 20 Years of the Bologna Process Implementation*, 5(1) BRICS Law Journal 5–26 (2018).

## Table of Contents

### 1. International Discussion on the Forms of Academic Mobility

#### 1.1. Discussion about Mobility:

##### *Study Abroad and/or Within One's Home Country?*

#### 1.2. Discussion on the Period of Mobility

#### 1.3. Discussion on the Forms of Mobility

### 2. Mobility Indicators in Russian Federal Education Programmes (FEPs)

#### 2.1. Russian Federal Education Programme (2000–2005)

#### 2.2. Russian Federal Education Programme (2006–2010)

#### 2.3. Russian Federal Education Programme (2011–2015)

#### 2.4. Russian Federal Education Programme (2013–2020)

### 3. Academic Mobility in the BRICS Countries

### Conclusion

The formation of the academic mobility system began in Russia from the date of the signing of the Lisbon Recognition Convention in 1999 and the Bologna Declaration in 2003. Russia took responsibility for establishing academic mobility mechanisms and joined the European academic mobility scheme.

Russian national educational policy is reflected in the Federal Education Programmes (FEPs). For the period 2000–2020 five FEPs were adopted, one each in 2000, 2006, 2011, 2013 and 2016. Academic mobility is the target of the FEPs 2000–2020. Quantitative and qualitative indicators of academic mobility have improved under the FEPs. The main trend in the programme indicators of mobility is expanding the forms and actors of academic mobility. In Russia, state policy and regulation have a great influence on educational institutions, which have low initiative and autonomy. This feature is reflected in academic mobility as well. Until 2005, there

were no quantitative indicators of academic mobility, and until 2011 there were no indicators of outward mobility in FEPs and the national education policy. Academic mobility has been absent in the indicators of the effectiveness of universities. As a result, Russian universities cannot show a great record of developing academic mobility, as it was not stimulated by the state. Obviously then, it is necessary to apply organisational, methodological and managerial measures to develop the practice of academic mobility in Russia.

In this article, we develop a cluster of academic mobility forms based on world practice, analyse the indicators of academic mobility established by Russian policy documents and identify their implementation in Russia and their compliance with international requirements.

To form a cluster of academic mobility forms, we used the National Reports regarding the Bologna Process implementation in 2012–2015 in 44 countries.<sup>1</sup> The content of academic mobility in international treaties and conventions was analysed. Scientific views on academic mobility of Russian and foreign authors were also examined. To analyse the Russian practice of academic mobility, FEPs 2000–2020, as well as reports on their implementation, including electronic public reports on academic mobility, were examined.

These sources and documents were investigated using the following methods: (a) theoretical analysis and analysis of best practices, which resulted in the identification of existing forms of academic mobility in the world; (b) modelling, which resulted in the formation of a cluster of academic mobility forms; and (c) a historical and legal method, that is, analysis of changes in legislation, in the dynamics, the results of which have traced the trends and changes in the indicators of the forms of academic mobility. In addition, statistical data from the websites of Russian governmental authorities were used.

## **1. International Discussion on the Forms of Academic Mobility**

Recommendation No. R (95) 8 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on academic mobility gives a definition of academic mobility.

The term “academic mobility” implies a period of study, teaching and/ or research in a country other than a student’s or academic staff member’s country of residence (henceforth referred to as the “home country”). This period is of limited duration, and it is envisaged that the student or staff member return to his or her home country upon completion of the designated

---

<sup>1</sup> National Reports regarding the Bologna Process implementation in 2012–2015 (Feb. 28, 2018), available at <http://www.ehea.info/article-details.aspx?ArticleId=86>.

period. The term “academic mobility” is not intended to cover migration from one country to another.<sup>2</sup>

The points of view of researchers on the notion of academic mobility diverge on at least three questions:

- Does academic mobility relate to only studying abroad, or can it be implemented in the home country as well?
- Does academic mobility relate to part-time education at another institution, or does it also include full training at another institution?
- Does academic mobility relate to physical movement across a border, or can it be done through online learning?

Under these conditions, where it is not clear how to determine the features of academic mobility, it seems difficult to define the term. It is necessary to develop a sound research position on the above issues. We consider that it is necessary to build on official international documents in the sphere of the Bologna Process and mobility, while taking into account the opinion of researchers, both Russian and foreign.

### **1.1. Discussion about Mobility: Study Abroad and/or Within One’s Home Country?**

Some scholars consider that student mobility implies a period of study abroad, since academic mobility is an essential characteristic of the Bologna Process and involves obtaining a cross-border education, in contrast to the so-called geographical (or internal) mobility, which means the possibility for the student to continue studying at a university located in another region of his or her home country.<sup>3</sup> However, there is another viewpoint suggesting that

academic mobility is a transfer of students... to another educational institution located both in Russia and abroad.<sup>4</sup>

According to the National Reports regarding the Bologna Process implementation in 2012–2015,<sup>5</sup> we can conclude that the purpose of the Bologna Process is international mobility.

---

<sup>2</sup> Recommendation No. R (95) 8 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on Academic Mobility, adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 2 March 1995 at the 531<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Ministers’ Deputies (Feb. 28, 2018), available at <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/highereducation/resources/mobility.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> Козырин А.Н. Финансирование академической мобильности в зарубежных странах // Реформы и право. 2011. № 1. С. 46–52 [Alexander N. Kozyrin, *Financing of Academic Mobility in Foreign Countries*, 1 Reforms and Law 46 (2011)].

<sup>4</sup> Варламова А.В. Академическая мобильность обучающихся российских вузов (на примере ФГБОУ ВПО «РГУТИС») // Вестник ассоциации вузов туризма и сервиса. 2014. № 1. С. 76 [Anna V. Varlamova, *Academic Mobility of Russian HE Students*, 1 Bulletin of the Association of Tourism and Service Universities 74, 76 (2014)].

<sup>5</sup> National Reports 2012–2015, *supra* note 1.

However, this does not mean that internal mobility is completely excluded from the concept of mobility.

Nina Maadad and Malcolm Tight say that mobility programmes allow a transfer of students or teachers to another institution within or outside their home country for study or teaching for a limited period of time.<sup>6</sup> The electronic dictionary “Definitions” states that,

Academic mobility refers to students and teachers in higher education moving to another institution inside or outside their own country to study or teach for a limited time.<sup>7</sup>

On the basis of the foregoing, we believe that the concept of mobility implies a period of study at another educational institution, whose location may be in one’s home country or abroad.

### **1.2. Discussion on the Period of Mobility**

Some Russian scholars consider that only part-time study abroad should be attributed to academic mobility. Full-time study abroad should be attributed not to mobility but to educational migration. This approach is reflected in the glossary of terms of the Bologna Process prepared by the TEMPUS (Trans-European mobility scheme for university studies) National Office in the Russian Federation:

Student mobility implies a possibility of partial training in European universities of partners with subsequent recognition of both the time of study in a foreign institution of higher education and the credit units received there.<sup>8</sup>

Another point of view is that mobility relates not only to part of the period of training, but also to the whole period of training.<sup>9</sup> According to the National Reports regarding the Bologna Process implementation in 2012–2015, student mobility includes credit mobility and degree mobility.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Nina Maadad & Malcolm Tight, *Academic Mobility in Academic Mobility (International Perspectives on Higher Education Research, Volume 11)* iii (N. Maadad & M. Tight (eds.), Bingley: Emerald, 2014).

<sup>7</sup> Academic mobility (n.d.), Definitions.net (Feb. 28, 2018), available at [https://www.definitions.net/definition/academic mobility](https://www.definitions.net/definition/academic%20mobility).

<sup>8</sup> TEMPUS National Office in the Russian Federation (Feb. 28, 2018), available at <http://www.tempus-russia.ru>.

<sup>9</sup> *Токмовцева М.В. Правовые проблемы академической мобильности высших учебных заведений // Культура: управление, экономика, право. 2014. № 2. С. 17–21* [Margarita V. Tokmvtseva, *Legal Problems of Academic Mobility of Higher Educational Institutions*, 2 Culture: Management, Economics, Law 17 (2014)].

<sup>10</sup> National Reports 2012–2015, *supra* note 1.

### **1.3. Discussion on the Forms of Mobility**

Some Russian scholars specify a particular feature of academic mobility – its reality, the actual movement across a border. For example, according to Aleksander Kozyrin,

Academic mobility is always physical mobility.<sup>11</sup>

Others believe that a form of virtual mobility is also possible. For example, Viktor Galichin asserts that

in accordance with new approaches, mobility is provided as a key component of the processes of joint learning, creativity, labor and social life and is carried out both in physical and virtual forms.<sup>12</sup>

According to the National Reports regarding the Bologna Process implementation in 2012–2015, countries presented information on the proposed Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) (para. 7.10, Part “Internationalization and Mobility”). Based on that information, we believe that internet education is recognised as a form of mobility. However, in the professional community there is a discussion whether virtual mobility is an addition to physical mobility or an alternative to it. Sylvia G.M. van de Bunt-Kokhuis says that real mobility can be either replaced by or supplemented with virtual mobility.<sup>13</sup> Jose Silvio tells us the following:

The development of the traditionally called “information and communication technologies” and large telematic networks like the Internet, created new possibilities and new phenomena. It is now possible to move from one place to another in a new space called *virtual space* or *cyberspace*, without moving geographically, and to do things of many kinds, anytime, anywhere: the human dream of defeating space and time is now almost possible, thanks to a new type of mobility called *virtual mobility* enabled by computer-mediated communication.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Kozyrin 2011.

<sup>12</sup> Галичин В.А. Современные тенденции в развитии академической мобильности: опыт Европы // Гуманитарные науки. 2013. № 2(10). С. 112–117 [Viktor A. Galichin, *Modern Trends in the Development of Academic Mobility: The European Experience*, 2(10) Humanitarian Sciences 112 (2013)].

<sup>13</sup> Sylvia G.M. van de Bunt-Kokhuis, *Academic Pilgrims: Determinants of International Faculty Mobility* (Tilburg: Tilburg University Press, 1996).

<sup>14</sup> Jose Silvio, *Global Learning and Virtual Mobility in Global Peace Through the Global University System* (T. Varis et al. (eds.), Hämeenlinna: University of Tampere, 2003) (Feb. 28, 2018), also available at [http://www.friends-partners.org/utsumi/Global\\_University/Global%20University%20System/UNESCO\\_Chair\\_Book/Manuscripts/Part\\_IV\\_Global\\_Collaboration/Silvio,%20Jose/Silvio\\_web/SilvioD9.htm](http://www.friends-partners.org/utsumi/Global_University/Global%20University%20System/UNESCO_Chair_Book/Manuscripts/Part_IV_Global_Collaboration/Silvio,%20Jose/Silvio_web/SilvioD9.htm).

Ilse Op de Beeck and Wim Van Petegem add their voices:

Since the second half of the 1990s the notion of virtual mobility has gained currency in the context of the internationalisation of higher education institutions.<sup>15</sup>

We believe that the definition of mobility cannot consist only in physical mobility, since researchers agree that there is also virtual mobility.

Thus, we are convinced that the idea of academic mobility should not be narrowed down on any of the following grounds: a period of mobility, forms of mobility, a direction of migration. We suggest a definition of academic mobility based on a wider approach.

The variety of academic mobility forms leads us to the conclusion that academic mobility is any studying, teaching or research period spent at a different institution whether that institution is abroad or in one's home country.

With the foregoing analysis as background, we propose a cluster of academic mobility forms. Our proposition rests on international documents, national regulations of Russia, as well as on Russian and foreign research. The cluster of academic mobility forms is based on two subject groups: academic staff and students. The forms of academic staff and student mobility are identified as follows: (1) migration direction – outward and incoming; and (2) purpose (determined as) – staff, teaching and research, and students, credit mobility and degree mobility. The forms of academic mobility are identified as follows: real (presupposes physical moving) and virtual (presupposes studying at a foreign institution or research collaboration via electronic form). The channels of academic mobility are identified as follows: (a) support programmes mobility (international, national, university), (b) mobility under the curriculum of an educational programme and (c) free mobility.

It should be noted that there are mobility forms which are monitored in the framework of the Bologna Process. These forms include: (1) staff incoming and outward mobility (purpose is not specified); and (2) student incoming and outward credit and degree mobility. These forms of mobility were used as a basis of cluster analysis of the Federal Education Programmes. Our conclusion is that these forms are enshrined in the Russian education programmes. So, what are the forms of academic mobility supported by the Federal Education Programmes?

---

<sup>15</sup> Ilse Op de Beeck & Wim Van Petegem, *Virtual Mobility: An Alternative or Complement to Physical Mobility?* (Media and Learning Unit KU Leuven, Belgium 2012) (Mar. 2, 2018), available at [http://i2agora.odl.unimiskolc.hu/i2agora\\_home/data/P3\\_D6\\_ERACON\\_Virtual%20mobility\\_paper.pdf](http://i2agora.odl.unimiskolc.hu/i2agora_home/data/P3_D6_ERACON_Virtual%20mobility_paper.pdf).

## 2. Mobility Indicators in Russian Federal Education Programmes (FEPs)

### 2.1. Russian Federal Education Programme (2000–2005)

The FEP 2000–2005 established targets for student degree mobility, both incoming and outward.<sup>16</sup> This programme did not include targets for student credit mobility and academic staff mobility. Mobility indicators in the FEP 2000–2005 are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1: Mobility Indicators  
in the Russian Federal Education Programme  
for 2000–2005**

Subject	Direction	Purpose	Existence in Programme
Student	Incoming	Credit	–
		Degree	+
	Outward	Credit	–
		Degree	+
Academic staff	Incoming	Teaching and research	–
	Outward	Teaching and research	–

To improve results on student degree mobility the following activities were planned: (1) ensuring the development of mechanisms and forms of recruitment and training of international students in the educational institutions of Russia, with the aim of increasing student incoming degree mobility; and (2) developing and implementing the order, forms and mechanisms of state support for gaining education by citizens who have shown outstanding abilities, including sending these citizens to study abroad, with the overall aim of raising student outward degree mobility, even though the efforts were directed to supporting talented youth and not all youth.

We would like to emphasise that the increase in mobility was stated as a goal, but the quantitative indicators were lacking. This indicates that the programme planning method in Russia in 2000 was at an early stage of formation. The major channels of mobility were planned to be national and bilateral programmes. Mobility was not available for everyone. The programme does not mention student credit mobility and academic staff mobility.

<sup>16</sup> Федеральный закон от 10 апреля 2000 г. № 51-ФЗ “Об утверждении Федеральной программы развития образования,” Собрание законодательства РФ, 2000, № 16, ст. 1639 [Federal law No. 51-FZ of 10 April 2000. On Approval of the Federal Development Program of Education, Legislation Bulletin of the Russian Federation, 2000, No. 16, Art. 1639].



We can find the performance of these indicators in the report of the Russian Federal Education Agency approved by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation on 1 March 2005.<sup>17</sup>

The percentage of international students (including from the CIS) in the total number of students in public universities amounted to 1.5% in 2000, 2.1% in 2001, 1.5% in 2002, 1.5% in 2003, 1.8% in 2004 and 1.9% in 2005. Thus, the share of international students in Russia increased by 0.4% over the period 2000–2005.

The number of Russian students studying abroad is not included in the report, although the programme stated the goal of supporting citizens who have shown outstanding abilities, including by sending them to study abroad. However, the report does present the number of national and international academic competitions which were attended by Russian students. There were 24 competitions in 2000, 25 in 2001, 24 in 2002, 25 in 2003, 24 in 2004 and 30 in 2005.

Thus, the FEP 2000–2005 started the development of student mobility, but this was only the beginning.

## **2.2. Russian Federal Education Programme (2006–2010)**

The FEP 2006–2010 established targets for all of the main types of student and academic staff mobility.<sup>18</sup> There were quantitative indicators that should be achieved, especially for student incoming degree mobility. The mobility indicators in the FEP 2006–2010 are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Mobility Indicators  
in the Russian Federal Education Programme  
for 2006–2010**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Direction</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Existence in Programme</b>
Student	Incoming	Credit	+
		Degree	↑ from 0.6% to 1.6% ↑ from 1% to 12% of them on a fee-paid basis
	Outward	Credit	+
		Degree	+

<sup>17</sup> Решение Рособразования от 1 марта 2005 г. № 2 "О работе Федерального агентства по образованию в 2004 году и основных задачах на 2005 год" [Decision of the Federal Agency for Education of the Russian Federation No. 2 of 1 March 2005. On the Work of the Federal Agency for Education of the Russian Federation in 2004 and the Main Tasks for 2005] (Feb. 28, 2018), available at <http://www.zakonprost.ru/content/base/84623/pdf>.

<sup>18</sup> Постановление Правительства РФ от 23 декабря 2005 г. № 803 "О Федеральной целевой программе развития образования на 2006–2010 годы," Собрание законодательства РФ, 2006, № 2, ст. 186 [Act of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 803 of 23 December 2005. On Federal Education Programme for 2006–2010, Legislation Bulletin of the Russian Federation, 2006, No. 2, Art. 186].

Academic staff	Incoming	Teaching and research	+
	Outward	Teaching and research	+

The priority of development is

the growth of academic mobility of students, academic and administrative staff (increase in the number of issued loans and grants for financial support of academic mobility of students and teachers, increasing the number of citizens of the Russian Federation at the age of 30 participating in international exchanges); the growth of export of educational services (increased number of nationals enrolled in institutions of professional education of the Russian Federation).<sup>19</sup>

There are quantitative target indicators in a separate section of the programme: (1) an increase in the share of international students from 0.9% to 1.6%; and (2) an increase in the share of international students studying on a fee-paid basis from 1% to 12%. Thus, the programme priorities (goals, targets) apply to all forms of mobility, and the quantitative indicators relate only to student incoming degree mobility.

The advantages of this programme are: (1) the development of not only student degree mobility, but also student credit mobility (academic exchange) and recognition of study-abroad periods; and (2) the development of academic staff mobility. These indicators were introduced in the FEPs for the first time.

The implementation report of the FEP 2006–2010 states that

all of the 27 indicators have been done at the end of 2010.<sup>20</sup>

The information on the programme presented on the website of the Federal Programmes of Russia also indicates the planned and actually achieved value of indicator 10, according to which,

The specific weight of the number of international students studying in Russian higher education institutions on a fee-paid basis was 12%.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Act of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 803, *supra* note 18.

<sup>20</sup> Краткий отчет о реализации Федеральной целевой программы 2006–2010 (данные 2017 г. по состоянию на 1 октября 2017 г.) [Brief Implementation Report on the Federal Education Programme for 2006–2010 (data for 1 October 2017)] (Feb. 28, 2018), available at <http://fcp.economy.gov.ru/cgi-bin/cis/fcp.cgi/Fcp/ViewFinDoc?fcp=188&fin=92&year=2010>.

<sup>21</sup> Федеральные целевые программы: Программа развития образования на 2006–2010 годы [Federal Targeted Programmes: Education Development Programme for 2006–2010] (Feb. 28, 2018), available at <http://fcp.economy.gov.ru/cgi-bin/cis/fcp.cgi/Fcp/ViewFcp/View/2006/188/>.

The total number of international students can also be evaluated by using unofficial sources, such as the website of UniPage, a company providing academic mobility and study abroad services. For example, in 2012 the total number of students in Russia was about 3,070,000, and 174,000 of them were international students. That is 5.65% of the total number of students.<sup>22</sup> Thus, the quantitative indicator, which was to increase the percentage of international students to 1.6%, was achieved, and, even more, exceeded 3.5 times over.

### **2.3. Russian Federal Education Programme (2011–2015)**

The FEP 2011–2015 developed all the types of academic mobility.<sup>23</sup> Quantitative indicators were set for student outward credit mobility and academic staff outward mobility. Mobility indicators in the FEP 2011–2015 are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3: Mobility Indicators  
in the Russian Federal Education Programme  
for 2011–2015**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Direction</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Existence in Programme</b>
Student	Incoming	Credit	+
		Degree	+
	Outward	Credit	↑ mobility opportunities from 3% to 30% of students
		Degree	+
Academic staff	Incoming	Teaching and research	+
	Outward	Teaching and research	↑ collaboration opportunities from 5% to 52%

Quantitative indicators are: (1) the increase, in the share of students enrolled in programmes that provide the opportunity to study abroad, from 3% to 30% of students during 2010 to 2015 and (2) the increase, in the number of academic staff

<sup>22</sup> Статистика международных студентов в мире [International Students: Statistics] (Feb. 28, 2018), available at [https://www.unipage.net/ru/student\\_statistics#Статистика\\_международных\\_студентов\\_в\\_мире](https://www.unipage.net/ru/student_statistics#Статистика_международных_студентов_в_мире).

<sup>23</sup> Постановление Правительства Российской Федерации от 7 февраля 2011 г. № 61 “О Федеральной целевой программе развития образования на 2011–2015 годы,” Собрание законодательства РФ, 2011, № 10, ст. 1377 [Act of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 61 of 7 February 2011. On Federal Education Programme for 2011–2015, Legislation Bulletin of the Russian Federation, 2011, No. 10, Art. 1377].

who participate in research collaboration and have the opportunity to conduct research on the basis of international educational and research institutions, in the total number of academic staff, from 5% to 52% during 2010 to 2015. The innovation of the programme is its focus on Russian students and their opportunities to study abroad and on international research cooperation of academic staff. The responsibility for organising the mobility of students and staff was assigned to Russian universities. They were only required to create a framework. Universities were not even required to send any students or staff abroad for teaching and research. A national mobility scheme was not launched.

A short report on the implementation of the Federal Education Programme for 2011–2015 notes:

By the end of 2015, out of 29 target indicators, the target values were achieved for all of them, for a number of indicators there is stable dynamics of exceeding the planned values.

According to the report, the share of students enrolled in programmes that included an opportunity of credit mobility at foreign universities in 2014 was 18.7%; the target was set at 20%, which was therefore clearly not achieved. The share of teachers who worked at universities participating in inter-university collaboration in 2014 was 42.1%; the target was set at 42%, which therefore was slightly exceeded. Data for 2015 with respect to meeting the targets in the report are not available.<sup>24</sup>

#### **2.4. Russian Federal Education Programme (2013–2020)**

The FEP 2013–2020 establishes targets for all the main types of student and academic staff mobility.<sup>25</sup> There are quantitative indicators that should be achieved, especially for student outward credit mobility. Mobility indicators in the FEP 2013–2020 years are presented in Table 4.

---

<sup>24</sup> Краткий отчет о реализации Федеральной целевой программы 2011–2015 (данные 2017 г. по состоянию на 1 октября 2017 г.) [Brief Implementation Report on the Federal Education Programme for 2011–2015 (data for 1 Oct. 2017)] (Feb. 28, 2018), available at <http://fcp.economy.gov.ru/cgi-bin/cis/fcp.cgi/Fcp/ViewFinDoc?fcp=305&fin=92&year=2015>.

<sup>25</sup> Постановление Правительства РФ от 15 апреля 2014 г. № 295 “Об утверждении государственной программы Российской Федерации “Развитие образования” на 2013–2020 годы,” Собрание законодательства РФ, 2014, № 17, ст. 2058 [Act of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 295 of 15 April 2014. On Federal Education Programme “Education Development” for 2013–2020, Legislation Bulletin of the Russian Federation, 2014, No. 17, Art. 2058].

**Table 4: Mobility Indicators  
in the Russian Federal Education Programme  
for 2013–2020**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Direction</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Existence in Programme</b>
Student	Incoming	Credit	+
		Degree	+
	Outward	Credit	↑ 0.1% to 6% (except CIS and Baltic countries)
		Degree	+
Academic staff	Incoming	Teaching, research	+
	Outward	Teaching, research	+

The expected final result of the implementation of the programme and an indicator of its social and economic effectiveness is

an increase of academic student and staff mobility, which allows to provide new levels of interaction between various educational and economic systems.

For student mobility, the set quantitative indicator is:

[A]n increase in the share of the number of persons who have completed at least one semester of studying abroad during the academic year (except in the CIS and the Baltic countries) in the total number of students enrolled in higher education programmes from 0.1% to 6% from 2013 to 2020.

The advantage of this programme is that it assesses the development of real mobility, and not only the availability of opportunities for mobility, as in the previous programme. By 2020, the planned indicator of student outward mobility (except in the CIS and Baltic countries) should be 6%. For 2015, this indicator was set at 1.5% and for 2016 at 2%.

The Ministry of Education and Science prepared a report in 2015 on the implementation and evaluation of the effectiveness of the FEP 2013–2020 that reflects the indicators of academic mobility in a descriptive manner.

17 leading universities, participants of the 5-100 Project, are implementing 183 educational programmes developed in collaboration with 170 foreign

educational institutions and awarding degrees from each of the partner institutions and 191 educational programmes, part of which is learned using the resources of others organizations. 64 educational institutions under the Ministry of Education and Science of Russia... [which] are not participating in the 5-100 Project, implement 218 joint educational programmes with international partners. 1,010 educational programmes using the resources of other organizations are implemented by 122 higher education institutions and are aimed primarily at developing internal Russian academic mobility.<sup>26</sup>

The report also refers to the monitoring of the effectiveness of institutions of higher education, which shows the indicators of academic mobility for each institution separately. However, it is noteworthy that in monitoring the effectiveness of institutions of higher education, this indicator is formulated differently than in the state programme, without reservation (except for CIS countries).

Thus, overall monitoring of outward academic mobility is being carried out, including for CIS countries. The question may then be asked: Have universities fulfilled the indicator of outward academic mobility for a period of not less than one semester in respect of 2% of the number of students in 2016?

Consider this indicator on the example of data presented in relation to 21 universities that are part of the 5-100 Programme. Information is presented in Table 5 below on the basis of statistical data posted on the portal "Information and analytical materials on the results of monitoring the effectiveness of educational institutions of higher education" (<http://monitoring.edu.ru>).

**Table 5: Outward Credit Mobility of Students in the Universities Entering into the 5-100 Programme**

<b>Higher Education Institution</b>	<b>Outward Credit Mobility (%)</b>
1. Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University	0.44
2. Higher School of Economics: National Research University	1.10
3. Far Eastern Federal University (FEFU)	0.52
4. Kazan Federal University (KFU)	0.58
5. Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology (MIPT)	0.53

<sup>26</sup> Отчет о ходе реализации и оценке эффективности государственной программы Российской Федерации "Развитие образования" на 2013–2020 годы в 2015 году [Implementation Report on Russian Federal Programme "Education Development" for 2013–2020 in 2015] (Feb. 28, 2018), available at <http://xn--80abucjiibhv9a.xn--p1ai/%D0%B4%D0%BE%D0%BA%D1%83%D0%BC%D0%B5%D0%BD%D1%82%D1%8B/8257>.

6. National University of Science and Technology (MISIS)	0.67
7. National Research Nuclear University (MEPhI)	0.37
8. Lobachevsky State University of Nizhni Novgorod	0.36
9. Novosibirsk State University	0.00
10. I.M. Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (MSMU)	0.09
11. RUDN University	1.85
12. Samara National Research University	0.00
13. Saint Petersburg Electro-technical University (LETI)	0.34
14. ITMO University	0.77
15. Peter the Great Saint-Petersburg Polytechnic University	1.51
16. Siberian Federal University	0.00
17. National Research Tomsk State University	0.32
18. National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University	1.90
19. Tyumen State University (TSU)	0.40
20. Ural Federal University (UrFU)	0.90
21. South Ural State University: National Research University	0.45

Based on the data of monitoring the effectiveness of universities in 2016,<sup>27</sup> it is clear that each individual institution of higher education did not achieve the target of 2% of student mobility. Just four universities had more than one percent: Higher School of Economics, RUDN University, Peter the Great Saint-Petersburg Polytechnic University and National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University. The average indicator of student mobility in all the examined higher education institutions was 0.62% of the total number of students. On average in Russia, the implementation of this indicator is much lower in higher education institutions that are not members of the 5-100 Programme. So, for example, in the Vladimir Region, 16 universities were monitored. Just one university out of 16, Vladimir State University, achieved 0.27% of students studied abroad for at least one semester. The remaining monitored institutions had a value of 0.00%. Therefore, we can state quite definitely that student outward credit mobility in Russia is very poorly developed, which leads to the impossibility

<sup>27</sup> Информационно-аналитические материалы по результатам проведения мониторинга эффективности деятельности образовательных организаций высшего образования в 2016 г. [Results of Monitoring the Effectiveness of HEIs [Higher Education Institutions] in 2016] (Feb. 28, 2018), available at <http://indicators.miccedu.ru/monitoring/2016/index.php?m=vpo>.

of fulfilling the indicators planned by the Ministry of Education and Science in the FEP 2013–2020.

The Federal Education Programme for 2016–2020 does not establish indicators of academic mobility at all.<sup>28</sup> This programme focuses on other goals and, in fact, acts as a part of its namesake for 2013–2020.

### 3. Academic Mobility in the BRICS Countries

The above review of Russian education programmes shows that beginning in 2000 and continuing to 2020 student mobility is the target indicator of the programmes. The development of student mobility is a worldwide trend. Viv Caruana believes that transnational higher education is the most visible manifestation of globalisation, trade liberalisation and commodification of higher education in a borderless market fuelled by huge increases in worldwide demand.<sup>29</sup> The UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS) conducts statistical research aimed at studying the mobility of students in the world. UIS answers questions about where students go to study, where they come from and how the demand for higher education changes, especially in the developing world. The growth of student mobility in Russia is in line with global trends, including tendencies in the BRICS countries.

Student mobility indicators in the BRICS countries for 2015 are presented in Table 6, according to UIS data.<sup>30</sup>

**Table 6: Student Mobility in the BRICS Countries in 2015**

	China	India	Russia	Brazil	South Africa
<b>Students abroad:</b>					
Total number of mobile students abroad	801,187	255,030	56,328	40,891	7,461
(% of total mobile students)	...	...	...	...	...
Outbound mobility ratio	1.9	0.8	0.9	0.5	0.7
Gross outbound enrolment ratio	0.8	0.2	0.7	0.3	0.1

<sup>28</sup> Постановление Правительства Российской Федерации от 23 мая 2015 г. № 497 “О Федеральной целевой программе развития образования на 2016–2020 годы,” *Собрание законодательства РФ*, 2018, № 1(2), ст. 375 [Act of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 497 of 23 May 2015. On Federal Education Programme for 2016–2020, *Legislation Bulletin of the Russian Federation*, 2018, No. 1(2), Art. 375].

<sup>29</sup> Viv Caruana, *Researching the Transnational Higher Education Policy Landscape: Exploring Network Power and Dissensus in a Globalizing System*, 14(1) *London Review of Education* 56 (2016).

<sup>30</sup> Global Flow of Tertiary-Level Students, UNESCO Institute of Statistics (2015) (Feb. 28, 2018), available at <http://uis.unesco.org/en/uis-student-flow>.



<b>Students hosted:</b>					
Total number of mobile students hosted	123,127	41,993	226,431	19,855	42,594
(% of total mobile students)	...	...	...	...	...
Inbound mobility rate	0.3	0.1	3.4	0.2	4.2

**China.** As we can see, China is the world leader in outward mobility – no other country has such a high level of outward mobility. China is commonly perceived as a major “sending” nation of international students, but China’s future development prospects distinctively attract students to choose China as their study abroad destination.<sup>31</sup> Recent studies show that the number of students that want to choose China for their education abroad is increasing. M.A. Jiani finds that the strong economic growth of China is a major factor that encourages international students to seek higher education opportunities in China. The interest of overseas Chinese nationals and people of Chinese descent in returning home and discovering their cultural identity may be considered a legitimate rationale for prospective students.

The Chinese government has promulgated guidelines for students and scholars studying abroad, which are

to support students and scholars studying abroad, to encourage them to return to China after their completion of their studies and to guarantee them the freedom of coming and going.

In addition, the Chinese central government has developed many policies to attract foreign students to study in China. China’s “Higher Education as a Case Study” plays a key role in the trade in higher education services. It has been a leading consumer of education abroad, becoming, in fact, the biggest such consumer in the world. In 2008, there were 2,965,840 overseas students in the whole world, of which 441,186 were from China, accounting for 14.9 percent of the total (India ranked second with more than 170,000 “outbound students,” accounting for 5.7 percent of the total).<sup>32</sup>

The Chinese government is taking significant steps to develop incoming and outward academic mobility. China has signed protocols with more than 34 countries in mutual recognition of academic degrees and qualifications; the Chinese government has set up a series of scholarship programmes to sponsor international students, teachers and scholars to undertake study and research at Chinese higher education institutions.<sup>33</sup> China is a participant in many network programmes such as the University

<sup>31</sup> M.A. Jiani, *Why and How International Students Choose Mainland China as a Higher Education Study Abroad Destination*, 74(4) *Higher Education* 563 (2016).

<sup>32</sup> The International Mobility of Students in Asia and the Pacific, UNESCO (2013) (Feb. 28, 2018), available at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002262/226219e.pdf>.

<sup>33</sup> *Id.*

SCO, the BRICS Network University and CAMPUS Asia – Collective Action for the Mobility Programme of University Students in Asia.

China has established a solid base for academic exchanges with the BRICS countries within the framework of special agreements, as well as in the framework of the state education policy of the Chinese government.

**India.** Rosa Becker and Renze Kolster have noted,

With more than 170,300 students studying abroad, India is the world's second largest supplier of international students (after China). However, the percentage of Indians studying abroad is still small, and amounted to no more than 1% of the total Indian student population in 2008.<sup>34</sup>

According to data from the UNESCO Institute of Statistics, the overall trend remained the same in India in 2015. The total number of Indian mobile students abroad was 255,030 and the total number of mobile students hosted in India was 41,993. Dr Pushkar has written that given the low number of foreign students in India, while their numbers are growing worldwide, the question is whether the Indian government should become more interested in attracting international students. The question is whether the government and India's universities can take concrete measures to make India more appealing to foreign students.<sup>35</sup>

The 2014 QS BRICS ranking devoted a specific section to internationalisation, and on this measure India did not fare well: only one Indian institution made it into the BRICS top 100 for the proportion of international faculty, and just two institutions made it into the top 100 for the proportion of international students. In a related development, the Indian Council of Cultural Relations found that of the 3,465 scholarship slots offered to foreign students for study in India 1,361 (39%) went unused in 2013/14.<sup>36</sup>

One of the current policies to encourage student outward mobility is the Educational Exchange Programme. The programme, established on the basis of agreements between India and several other countries, aims to increase the focus on cooperation and sharing best practices in the field of education for mutual benefit. The programme includes scholarships that allow Indian students to study abroad in the participating countries at the postgraduate, PhD or postdoctoral levels. These scholarships are mainly funded by the participating countries.

---

<sup>34</sup> Rosa Becker & Renze Kolster, *International Student Recruitment: Policies and Developments in Selected Countries* (The Hague: Nuffic, 2012).

<sup>35</sup> Pushkar, *Why India Needs to Seriously Push Its "Study in India" Initiative*, *The Wire*, 31 June 2016 (Feb. 28, 2018), available at <https://thewire.in/55157/study-in-india-mhrd-international-students/>.

<sup>36</sup> India is a Key Source of International Students – Can It Become a Destination?, *ICEF Monitor*, 18 February 2015 (Feb. 28, 2018), available at <http://monitor.icef.com/2015/02/india-key-source-international-students-can-become-destination/>.

The Indian government aims to attract more international students by changing the admissions process, improving the education infrastructure and increasing the emphasis on academic support.

Scholarships funded by the Indian government for foreign students include scientific fellowships (JRF) for foreign citizens, which allows international students to undertake postgraduate studies at Indian universities in the fields of the sciences, humanities and the social sciences. Scholarships are awarded to students and faculty from the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.<sup>37</sup>

The Indian government also provides funding for the Research Fellowships (JRFs) for Foreign Nationals, which similarly enables international students to undertake postgraduate studies/research at Indian universities in the areas of the sciences, humanities and the social sciences. Again, fellowships are awarded to students and teachers from developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America.<sup>38</sup>

**Brazil.** The level of incoming and outward academic mobility in Brazil is much lower than that in China and India. The total number of Brazilian mobile students abroad is 40,891 and the total number of mobile students hosted in Brazil is 19,855.

From 2002 through 2016, Brazil's federal government promoted policies that increased enrolments in higher education. The impact was substantial: from 2002 to 2012, college enrolments in Brazil doubled.<sup>39</sup> In 2011, the government created the programme "Science without Borders," which is aimed at promoting the consolidation, expansion and internationalisation of science and technology, innovation and competitiveness of Brazil through international exchange and mobility. This initiative was the result of the joint efforts of the Ministries of Science, Technology and Innovation and the Ministry of Education. The project provides for the use of up to 10,000 scholarships over four years to facilitate exchange so that undergraduate students and graduate students can go abroad to maintain contacts with competitive education systems in relation to technology and innovation. In addition, the programme aims to attract researchers from abroad who want to settle in Brazil or to establish partnerships with Brazilian researchers in the priority areas identified in the programme, and to create opportunities for business researchers to receive specialised training abroad.

However in December 2016, the government passed a constitutional amendment and froze social spending in Brazil for twenty years. This decision was entirely incompatible with the country's human rights obligations, according to the United Nations Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights Philip

---

<sup>37</sup> Becker & Kolster 2012.

<sup>38</sup> *Id.*

<sup>39</sup> José Celso Freire Jr., *Beyond Science Without Borders: Brazil Retools Its Internationalization Strategy*, World Education News & Reviews (WENR), 18 September 2017 (Mar. 2, 2018), available at <https://wenr.wes.org/2017/09/beyond-science-without-borders-brazil-retools-its-internationalization-scheme>.

Alston.<sup>40</sup> In the international education community, the official cessation of Brazil's Science Without Borders programme is one of the most important casualties of austerity measures. What may be less obvious is the impact on a broad swath of young Brazilians. These funding cuts threaten access to quality education for a substantial majority of Brazilian youth who otherwise cannot afford higher education.<sup>41</sup>

Political and legal changes in Brazil are putting into question the development of academic mobility.

**South Africa.** The student outward mobility of South Africa is quite low. The total number of mobile students abroad from South Africa is 7,461. However, South Africa is the leading host country in Africa and ranks 11<sup>th</sup> amongst host countries worldwide. South Africa is making an important contribution to the continent's human resource development and helping to retain skilled graduates in Africa.<sup>42</sup> The total number of mobile students hosted in South Africa is 42,594. South Africa, which has one of the most extensive tertiary education systems in the region, has fewer than 6,000 students studying abroad, representing about 0.1% of its tertiary-age population.

Student mobility is attracting increased attention in Africa, given the challenges with which the continent is confronted regarding the development of human capital and the achievement of sustainable development. Higher education is now widely recognised as an important driver of socio-economic growth and human development, for without a strong higher education system it is difficult (or maybe impossible) for any developing country, in Africa or elsewhere, to achieve sustainable development.<sup>43</sup>

Damtew Teferra and Jane Knight have written that in South Africa there is no policy on the internationalisation of higher education; internationalisation is a decentralised process in which every South African university pursues its own activities with a greater or lesser degree of institutional policy direction.<sup>44</sup> All the same, South Africa, being the most economically developed country in the region, is also the centre of attraction for students from neighbouring countries. What is more, South Africa is a participant in the BRICS Network University programme.

---

<sup>40</sup> Brazil 20-Year Public Expenditure Cap Will Breach Human Rights, The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) (2016) (Feb. 28, 2018), available at <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=21006>.

<sup>41</sup> Freire, *Beyond Science*, *supra* note 39.

<sup>42</sup> Chiao-Ling Chien & Felly Chiteng Kot, *New Patterns in Student Mobility in the Southern Africa Development Community* (Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2012).

<sup>43</sup> *Accelerating Catch-Up: Tertiary Education for Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa* (Washington: The World Bank, 2009).

<sup>44</sup> *Higher Education in Africa: The International Dimension* (D. Teferra & J. Knight (eds.), Accra: African Books Collective, 2008).

## Conclusion

The review presented on Russian Federal Education Programmes shows that, beginning in 2000 and continuing to 2020, student mobility is the target indicator of the programmes. On the basis of the revealed indicators, we can trace the following trends in the development of academic mobility in Russia: (a) the increase in a number of forms of academic mobility, supported by the Federal Education Programmes; (b) the prevalence of indicators of the development of all the forms of student mobility in comparison with academic staff mobility; (c) the availability of indicators for the development of academic staff mobility is an achievement in the development of academic mobility; (d) the relative randomness of quantitative indicators of the development of academic mobility. None of the indicators were repeated in five national education programmes, although, in our opinion, each of the indicators would not be an asset and could be included in subsequent programmes with an increase in the quantitative value; and (e) it is obvious that the Ministry of Education and Science cannot cover the whole variety of relations in higher education in the field of targeted programmes and that it has to establish separate indicators. Consequently, the universities should take an active role in this issue and develop their own programmes, including in terms of academic mobility.

Legal and political analyses in other BRICS countries has showed that national governments encourage student mobility. These states have adopted programmes aimed at developing student mobility. The BRICS countries are the leaders in student mobility either on the global level (China and India) or in their regions. In the BRICS countries, the government is a key player in the formation of education policies including mobility, for the policy of universities depends on public policy. Taking into account the importance of mobility for the evolution of education and human capital, the BRICS countries actively include the development of mobility in the national education programmes. Being the economic leaders of their regions, the BRICS countries are leaders in terms of the level of education, and as a result, also the level of mobility. The process of academic mobility is a worldwide process in which almost all states are included, and on this basis we believe that it is necessary to develop academic exchanges between the BRICS countries, such as network universities, recognition of degrees and periods of education, and scientific collaboration.

Modern tendencies of the internationalisation of education lead us to the conclusion that academic mobility will continue to grow.

## Acknowledgements

The research was carried out with the support of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, Grant 15-03-00626, Access of Individuals and Legal Entities to Implementing Russia's Foreign Policy towards the Nordic States.

We express our gratitude to Pavel Kuznetsov, Director of the Centre for International Education, Tyumen State University, Russia. We are thankful for kindly provided information on mobility at Tyumen State University and the opportunity to communicate with international students participating in the programme of academic exchanges at Tyumen State University.

### References

Becker R. & Kolster R. *International Student Recruitment: Policies and Developments in Selected Countries* (The Hague: Nuffic, 2012).

Caruana V. *Researching the Transnational Higher Education Policy Landscape: Exploring Network Power and Dissensus in a Globalizing System*, 14(1) *London Review of Education* 56 (2016).

Chien C.-L. & Kot F.C. *New Patterns in Student Mobility in the Southern Africa Development Community* (Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2012).

De Beeck I.O. & Van Petegem W. *Virtual Mobility: An Alternative or Complement to Physical Mobility?* (Media and Learning Unit KU Leuven, Belgium 2012) (Mar. 2, 2018), available at [http://i2agora.odl.uni-miskolc.hu/i2agora\\_home/data/P3\\_D6\\_ERACON\\_Virtual%20mobility\\_paper.pdf](http://i2agora.odl.uni-miskolc.hu/i2agora_home/data/P3_D6_ERACON_Virtual%20mobility_paper.pdf).

Freire J.C. Jr. *Beyond Science Without Borders: Brazil Retools Its Internationalization Strategy*, *World Education News & Reviews* (WENR), 18 September 2017 (Mar. 2, 2018), available at <https://wenr.wes.org/2017/09/beyond-science-without-borders-brazil-retools-its-internationalization-scheme>.

*Higher Education in Africa: The International Dimension* (D. Teferra & J. Knight (eds.)), Accra: African Books Collective, 2008).

Jiani M.A. *Why and How International Students Choose Mainland China as a Higher Education Study Abroad Destination*, 74(4) *Higher Education* 563 (2016).

Maadad N. & Tight M. *Academic Mobility in Academic Mobility (International Perspectives on Higher Education Research, Volume 11)* iii (N. Maadad & M. Tight (eds.)), Bingley: Emerald, 2014).

Van de Bunt-Kokhuis S.G.M. *Academic Pilgrims: Determinants of International Faculty Mobility* (Tilburg: Tilburg University Press, 1996).

### Information about the authors

**Dmitry Teplyakov (Tyumen, Russia)** – Deputy Head, Department of Constitutional and Municipal Law, Tyumen State University (38 Lenina St., Tyumen, 625000, Russia; e-mail: [tepld@yandex.ru](mailto:tepld@yandex.ru)).

**Olga Teplyakova (Tyumen, Russia)** – Associate Professor, Department of Constitutional and Municipal Law, Tyumen State University (38 Lenina St., Tyumen, 625000, Russia; e-mail: [teplyakova.oa@yandex.ru](mailto:teplyakova.oa@yandex.ru)).