

« FICHE CONTRADICTOIRE »

Evaluation of the EU development co-operation support to higher education in partner countries (2007-2014)

Main recommendations

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
Policy and strategy focus		
<p>Formulate the overall strategic approach to the support of HE in the EU’s development co-operation relations, (R1). <i>Very high importance, Short-term horizon.</i> <i>Recommendation addressed to: DG DEVCO, DG-NEAR, DG-EAC.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Adapt more the HE strategy to development co-operation ie by introducing a section that deals exclusively with development co-operation 2) Updated the strategy so that it reflects both the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the overall EU development objectives, particularly socio-economic development and poverty reduction. 3) Refine the EU’s logic of intervention, at country and provincial levels. Further integrate in the EU’s strategy & activities government accountability, State-society relations, social cohesion, and job creation. Clearly describe logical chains between the overall EU development goals downwards through intermediate and specific impacts to the level of expected outcomes and outputs. 4) Outline an integrated approach, taking account of programme-based support, bilateral co-operation, and political and policy dialogue. 5) Adopt a holistic perspective by elaborating on 	<p>We understand and agree with the rationale behind this recommendation. However, how to formulate (at what level) and to operationalise such a strategy requires further reflexion.</p> <p><i>(comments by DEVCO, NEAR, RTD and EEAS)</i></p> <p>1. We would not oppose to have either (1) an overall strategy on support to education in partner countries that also focuses on HE or (2) to include a specific development section under a more general EU HE strategy.</p> <p>No concrete steps have been taken into this direction so far, it could be looked into by the management of the involved services.</p> <p>More specifically, we suggest including to this recommendation a specific chapter or separate section on “higher education in protracted crises situations”.</p> <p>In addition, the role of HE as a soft power to create allies between world-wide and EU students/academics should not be forgotten in</p>	

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
<p>the inter-relationship between teaching- learning, and research¹ areas.</p> <p>6) Elaborate benchmarks, as was done in case of HE support within the EU².</p>	<p>this context.</p> <p>To recapitulate the current situation: The May 2017 Communication on a renewed agenda for HE is proposing a new impetus for higher education in the EU and is not focusing on developing regions. The most recent policy reference for European higher education at international level is the July 2013 Communication 'EU Higher Education in the World'. Whilst the Communication is mainly focusing on recommendations on how the EU can position its higher education systems internationally, it also underlines the fact that there is ample evidence that higher education is key to delivering the knowledge requirements for economic development and that EU HEIs have a key role to play in supporting modernisation efforts of emerging and developing parts of the world, as well as to contribute to finding solutions to global challenges or narrowing development gaps between peoples and nations. It goes on to highlight the support that Member States and the EU provide for cooperation, capacity building and mobility.</p> <p>Whilst the EU has not published an overall strategy to EU support to education in third</p>	

¹ In line with the recommendation 7 “*formulate a strategic approach with a focus on establishing institutional frameworks for R&P*”

²see “Strategic framework – Education & Training 2020” - European Commission (2009): Strategic framework – Education & Training 2020.
<http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/fragilityconflictviolence/overview>

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
	<p>countries, the importance of education at all levels and linked to human development, sustainable growth, education, skills and employment and active citizenship has been systematically referred to in all recent strategic orientations. In particular the EU Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy, the Communication on the Next Steps for a Sustainable Future (the EU's response to the 2030 and its Sustainable Development Goals) and the more recent Communication on a renewed impetus of the Africa-EU Partnership and European Consensus for Development.</p> <p>2. With the adoption of the 2030 Agenda and its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the EU is already committed to implement the SDGs in its external policies in line with the EU Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy.</p> <p>The new European Consensus for Development, adopted on May 2017 should be considered as the EU's answer to the SDGs agenda. It emphasises the need to support inclusive lifelong learning and equitable quality education for all (SDG 4). It stipulates the importance of promoting education at all levels, including tertiary level, as well as the principle of leaving no-one behind.</p> <p>3. It is important to recall to the evaluators that country ownership is an essential principle for</p>	

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
	<p>aid effectiveness. The EU shall accompany the education reform decided by the national governments.</p> <p>In light of the graduated country process and the future MFF perspectives the EU's logic of intervention will be reviewed. An analysis of and recommendations around appropriate financing instruments might be helpful.</p> <p>There could be scope for better understanding the broader linkages between HE and other forms and levels of education across the entire spectrum – from pre-primary to adult learning. While making these links was not the remit of the evaluation team, such an analysis would nonetheless help to better situate HE into the broader context of life-long learning and human development, i.e. a holistic perspective, as per SDG4.</p> <p>In line with this, any possible strategy should be as comprehensive and open as possible. A too detailed, one-size fits all approach might be counterproductive.</p> <p>4. Higher Education is a part of our cooperation with third countries. It should be discussed at the same level as Trade, ODA, EPA's, etc. In any Political Dialogue HE should be on the agenda.</p> <p>The articulation/linkage between bilateral and</p>	

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
	<p><u>regional</u> programmes should also be taken into account for an integrated approach.</p> <p>The integrated approach has to be assimilated by the different players (both at HQ and country-level). Due to graduation, many EUDs no longer have cooperation staff. In EUDs that don't have HE as a focal sector, Erasmus+ is often a visibility issue dealt with by press officers. The integrated political and cooperation approach has to be maintained.</p> <p>This integrated approach could be built on the example of the African Union-European Union Research and Innovation Partnership on Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture (in the context of our regional policy dialogue with the African Union), which is implemented through Horizon 2020 (DG RTD and DG AGRI), the African Union Research Grants (DG DEVCO) and contributions from EU and AU member states. DG RTD aims to develop the same approach with DG DEVCO through the second Partnership, just launched, on Climate Change and Sustainable Energy.</p> <p>5. A more holistic and cross-sector approach needs to be pursued in partnership with all stakeholders and on all levels. DG RTD has played a role in the past with the concept of the Knowledge Triangle: Innovation, Research and Education.</p>	

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
	<p>Fostering the triangulation (education, innovation, and research) is indeed important. Any future overall strategy in the education sector shall include the promotion of scientific knowledge and research in areas of particular importance to developing countries.</p> <p>In the Erasmus+ context, reflections are ongoing on how to increase the inter-relationship between the different areas post-2020.</p> <p>6. Benchmarks are more political objectives than purely statistical. At the end we need to justify our actions towards the EU tax payer and it is impossible to see how this can be done without benchmarks.</p> <p>Any benchmarks or indicators shall take into consideration equal opportunity and access to higher education (see indicator n°13 in Gender Action Plan II).</p> <p>In line with the 2030 Agenda, the EU and its MS will support the use of SDG indicators (including indicators that focus on HE specifically) to measure development results at country level. The 2016 GEM report by UNESCO largely sets the benchmark for (higher) education.</p>	

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
<p>Deepen the alignment with partner countries' policies and priorities in HE through the creation of jointly-funded academic mobility programmes (R2).</p> <p><i>Medium importance, Long-term horizon.</i></p> <p><i>Recommendation addressed to: DG-EAC DG DEVCO, DG-NEAR, EEAS, EUDs and EU Member States.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ DG-DEVCO should elaborate an action plan in co-operation with relevant EU stakeholders, representatives of HE Agencies of the MS, HE Donor harmonisation group and involve other existing co-ordination mechanisms, to obtain and discuss general information about MS' experience with joint bilateral programmes with partner countries. A list of possible target countries could be elaborated. ➤ This exercise would draw on existing joint programmes between Partner Countries and EU MS. ➤ As a second step, DG-EAC directly (or through EUDs) should contact the respective national government agencies in charge of international academic exchange programmes to explore their potential interest in signing an agreement on HE co-operation with the EU. ➤ The next step would be to negotiate the general conditions (objectives, requirements, funding scheme, and operational steps) of the intended joint programme. 	<p>Partial agreement.</p> <p>There is a bit of a disconnection between this recommendation and Conclusion 2 that stresses that the EU strategy of supporting HE mainly through projects under regional and global programmes was effective (principle of subsidiarity).</p> <p>The character of this recommendation asks to be primarily implemented at national level (bilateral cooperation), through a country-led process, assisted by EUDs and the EU member states/other donors present in the country.</p> <p><i>(Comments by DEVCO, NEAR, EAC and EEAS)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Coordination mechanisms could be improved in order to have a better view of the activities in HE of MS in partner countries. <p>Overall, finances are scarce in the HE sector so the three C's are an absolute must between the EC and the MS.</p> <p>Any identification of target countries would have to be the result of country-level consultations as the ownership principle should be respected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ At a first stage, the existing joint programmes would have to be mapped but 	

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
	<p>again, mainly focusing on countries that have HE as a focal sector, due to HR constraints.</p> <p>Possibly delegating additional staff to EUDs to handle HE could be proposed. It should be noted that EUDs already play an active role promoting HE programmes (from EU but also from MS). DG EAC/EACEA makes important efforts to assist the EUDs in these promotional tasks.</p> <p>➤ This would have to be a country-led process (in line with a specific education sector plan) -> joint programming (part of a NIP). It should not contradict the various SSF's and Joint Programming documents at country level (e.g. in case higher education is not foreseen as a priority area of cooperation).</p> <p>EEAS highlights that HE agreements, similar to the S&T agreements, between interested countries and the EU would be a step forward. This should indeed be seen as a good practice but considering the high workload of our EUDs, signing and following up on such an agreement would only be feasible in countries that specifically select higher education as a focal sector (this might be different for FPI countries).</p> <p>The EU already has strategic partnerships in</p>	

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
	<p>education and training (including HE) with a number of strategic countries including emerging/developing regions (India, China and South Africa). The added value of these agreements however is only evident when there is a similar investment of resources on both sides. Agreements in writing (consisting only of formal senior official meetings) which are not accompanied by concrete action (sharing of experience, seminars, joint studies or actions, etc) are generally not beneficial or cost-effective.</p> <p>➤ If this approach would be implemented in the context of the Erasmus+ programme or another regional/global programme (so not in a bilateral cooperation context): There can be more alignment with partner country reforms in higher education and also more efforts made to enhance the efforts of the EC and MS funded academic mobility and cooperation programmes but the response is not necessarily through a joint programme tailored for each partner country, as the cost of such an exercise would be disproportionate in comparison to the actual budget available for the universities, students and staff in the given partner country. The current Erasmus+ budget for 79 ACP countries for instance is around 5 million Euro per year, per action. This amounts to 5 Capacity Building projects</p>	

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
	<p>(equivalent of the former Edulink programme) per year. To go through the process of identifying national priorities for 79 countries when perhaps only 15/20 countries will have a funded project is disproportionate. The same applies for the mobility actions. Erasmus+ is a bottom up global programme and bearing in mind that we might be talking about 3 mobilities in a given country per year, it would be disproportionate to develop specific priorities for each individual country.</p> <p>Our proposal would therefore to further explore how the respective programmes can be complementary and to take a more structured approach with the partner country to discuss the opportunities available both at EU and MS level (so as to increase the take-up and impact).</p> <p>One other area where we could propose to enhance alignment is to help partner countries use Erasmus+ for further supporting reform when this has been identified by them as a priority area of focus for EU or MS bilateral support in the field of higher education.</p>	
Results		
Realign the support to HE with the objective	Agreement but formulation should be revised	

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
<p>of strengthening intra-regional co-operation (R3). <i>High importance, Medium-term horizon.</i> <i>Recommendation addressed to: DG-EAC DG DEVCO, DG-NEAR, EEAS.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Amend the Erasmus+ programme to the extent that all HEIs can both send and receive students under the mobility components. ➤ Replicate the Intra-Africa Academic Mobility Scheme in other regions or introducing similar regional mobility programmes outside the scope of Erasmus+. 	<p>for the first bullet.</p> <p><i>(Comments by DEVCO and EAC)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The ICM action under Erasmus+ already allows for both inbound and outbound mobilities, so it should be clear that we are talking about south-south mobilities. In line with the DACability rules, only outbound mobility of staff and PhD students can be funded from DCI and EDF. <p>Erasmus+ allows HEIs to both send and receive students under the mobility components. There is one limitation which is linked to development funding (only PhD candidates from Europe can study in developing partner countries, not first or second level students) and this is currently imposed by the OECD DAC guidelines. This is an element that is being taken into account in the reflexions on the next phase of Erasmus+ after 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Unlocking the potential of south-south or triangular exchanges under the future E+ programme (or possibly outside the scope of E+) is a priority. This should re-emphasize the importance regional integration in the higher education arena. <p>For example: In Latin America South –</p>	

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
	<p>South cooperation is already being implemented by a 10 M€ project, modality that is planned to be more developed in the near future in the framework of the growing number of MICs.</p>	
<p>Develop and implement an approach towards strengthening inclusiveness (R4) <i>Very High importance, Medium-term horizon.</i> <i>Recommendation addressed to: DG-EAC DG DEVCO, DG-NEAR, EACEA.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Elaborate a concept of inclusiveness – create a general positively-affirming definition which might be easier to implement and measure than a definition with negative connotations (e.g. including words such as “disadvantaged”, “discriminated”, or “excluded”, or a combination of them); valid for global EU actions in development co-operation and, if needed, for HE in particular. This definition needs to allow enough room for an adapted operational definition. It should comprise aspects that are both relevant for Erasmus+ and measurable within its scope. ➤ Inclusiveness can be a political issue in many partner countries that have different understandings: Political dialogue will need to be employed where appropriate to get agreement at regional level or, where 	<p>Agreement <i>(Comments by DEVCO and EAC)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Equity and inclusion, with a particular focus on gender, should be key features in the promotion and the implementation of any future HE programme. Avoiding an elitist character of HE is of particular concern. For any future programme, there is a need to put in place systematic mechanisms to increase the participation of disadvantaged individuals and hard-to-reach groups (that often do not identify themselves as such). <p>Any definition would have to be sufficiently context specific. It might be challenging for global/regional programmes to find a balance between a more one-size-fits-all approach and targeted action. EUDs could potentially play a role here. To be further explored.</p>	

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
<p>appropriate, at country level, together with regional organisations and partner countries³.</p> <p>➤ Once a definition has been agreed, create a performance mechanism – (see details in the report) to monitor progress.</p>	<p>Generally speaking and according to case studies undertaken in the context of the mid-term review of Erasmus+, the programmes supporting higher education such as Erasmus+ but also other bilateral programmes tend to reach out to those who are easier to reach amongst the disadvantaged and not to those who are disengaged or at risk of marginalisation. In partner countries this is also difficult as there is often no clear definition of the target group. Erasmus+ evaluation survey responses indicate that the self-reported participation of young people from a minority background or with learning difficulties is rather small. Yet, responses highlight that disadvantaged learners show more positive results than the others, in particular in completing formal learning and in boosting their self-confidence in their education capacities.</p> <p>Inclusiveness is an element that we are currently looking into in the context of the mid-term review of Erasmus+ and we will see how this reflexion and examples of good practice from both the EU and partner country cooperation can be brought into the next phase of Erasmus+, our policy dialogue with partner countries and into the</p>	

³ and may be embedded within the context of UNESCO's Education Framework for Action 2030 – SDG 4

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
	monitoring of on-going projects.	
<p>Create labour market oriented “dual” study courses (R5) <i>Medium importance, Long-term horizon.</i> <i>Recommendation addressed to: DG-EAC DG DEVCO, DG-NEAR.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Create a innovated Dual study courses, as entire degree programmes, under a new action of Erasmus+ or through a special funding scheme established by DG-DEVCO in co-ordination with DG-EAC. The development of dual study courses at HEIs in partner countries would be based on close collaboration between universities and enterprises. The curriculum and course content is tailored to the changing demands of industries and businesses.⁴ ➤ Start with a pilot project, the dual programmes should be designed and developed by consortia comprising EU HE institutions, EU-based companies, partner country HEIs, and partner country companies. <i>In some partner countries, amendments to HE laws or other legislation and standards might be necessary to establish the framework for the implementation of dual programmes. Thus the legal situation needs to be taken into account for the application of projects and their implementation. There are three main types of dual programmes that could be considered: (see</i> 	<p>Agreement.</p> <p><i>(Comments by DEVCO, NEAR and EAC)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Agreement on the importance of supporting partner countries in introducing Dual Study/Training Programmes, although we consider the term "dual study" to be somewhat confusing (reference JMD). The focus should be on creating stronger linkages with the private sector, which requires a considerable transformation in how we approach HE systems. Means for a direct match between demand and supply of companies' requirements should be provided, so as to lessen the consequences of misdirected planning that often results in labour mismatch. Programmes should be designed as a mix of practical on-the-job training and tertiary institutions' studies leading to accredited Diplomas/Degrees. The objective is to encourage partnerships between the private sector employers and the tertiary institutions of the partner 	

⁴For a more detailed discussion, see Tobias Nolting & Rainer Beedgen. Rethinking the relation between higher education and employment – The dual study system of the Baden-Wuerttemberg Co-operative State University as a new way of integrating theory and practice
<https://www.pef.uni-lj.si/fileadmin/Datoteke/Mednarodna/conference/wher/after/nolting-proceedings.pdf>

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
<i>details in the main report).</i>	<p>country. Partner Countries should move towards more participatory governance of their skills policies in order to reflect market needs and stakeholders' views. Actions of this type could certainly contribute to the so-called "skills revolution" in Africa, for example. However, and prior to any possible financial support from the EU, the importance of ownership and sustainability should be underlined which can only be obtained if local employers and governments together share the costs burden of "Dual Programmes". One current example is what done by the Republic of Mauritius.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Countries need to boost growth and ensure competitiveness, by achieving higher levels of employment, building up human capital and strengthening social cohesion through their own education and VET systems. ➤ Cooperation between the education and VET sectors and businesses is a key element of creating skills that are useful to enterprises, support their competitiveness and growth. ➤ In the context of the Erasmus+ programme, the importance of the relevance of study programmes to employability is high on the agenda and nearly one third of capacity building in higher education projects 	

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
	involve enterprises. As of this year it is possible for university students from partner countries to carry out practical placements and internships in Europe. We will evaluate how this new activity is taken up and feed the recommendation into our reflexions on the next phase of Erasmus+ post 2020.	
Co-ordination and synergies		
<p>Expand formal mechanisms to facilitate the co-ordination of EU and Member States support to HE (R6) "⁵</p> <p><i>Very High importance, Medium-term horizon.</i> <i>Recommendation addressed to: DG EAC, DG DEVCO, DG-NEAR, EUDs in partner countries, EU MS and their HE agencies.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ DG-DEVCO should take the initiative to establish a regular dialogue mechanism with MS, with the objective of harmonising support to HE, increasing synergies, and facilitating joint programming. ➤ Beyond the current exchanges in the HE Donor Harmonisation Group, EU-MS consultations should focus on joint analytical work on the pros and cons of establishing HE as a priority sector, on producing a joint response that shows how a division of labour could be conceptualised and implemented, and on identifying stakeholders that are to focus on the HE sector (including commitments to indicative 	<p>Agreement.</p> <p><i>(Comments by DEVCO and EAC)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The continuing extension of joint programming (now involving 59 countries with 22 completed joint strategies) will further promote and operationalise close coordination at country level between the EU and MS development cooperation programmes. As Joint Programming is a country-driven process aligned to the country development priorities that encompasses joint analysis and the development of a joint response. Discussions on how best to harmonise support to HE will take place through the EUDs at country level. 	

⁵ This implementation approach is in line with the joint communication "Towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations https://ec.europa.eu/culture/policies/strategic-framework/strategy-international-cultural-relations_en

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
<p>allocations).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ EU Delegations in partner countries should – analogous to other sectors – establish co-ordination meetings with MS that provide support to HE with the dual objective of mutually reinforcing the different programmes and interventions and enhancing the European voice on HE. 	<p>In the context of global/regional initiatives: We believe that there can be more alignment with partner country reforms in higher education. We can explore how the respective programmes can be complementary and to take a more structured approach with the partner country to discuss the opportunities available both at EU and MS level (so as to increase the take-up and impact). One other area where we could propose to enhance alignment is to help partner countries use Erasmus+ for further supporting reform when this has been identified by them as a priority area of focus for EU or MS bilateral support in the field of higher education.</p>	
<p>Strengthen the links between the support to HE and the support to research and innovation (R7) <i>High importance, Long-term horizon.</i> <i>Recommendation addressed to: DG EAC, DG DEVCO, DG-NEAR, DG RTD.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A study should be conducted by HE experts on how the current loosely-connected approaches to HE (i.e. teaching and learning) and research can be better brought together. ➤ The creation of an additional action or activity under Erasmus+ that enables HE institutions networks/consortia to apply for grants for Erasmus Mundus Joint Master's Degrees and 	<p>Agreement (alternatives proposed). <i>(Comments by DEVCO, RTD and EAC)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ We could undertake an analysis on how teaching, learning and research can be more closely connected. We can use some of the Erasmus+ projects working in this specific area as the basis for the analysis and then as examples of good practice for future projects and dissemination. There are also examples from EU groups of universities working in this specific field that could be 	

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
<p>for research funding (for example, under Horizon 2020) in one package co-funded by DG-DEVCO and DG-RTD. The proposed joint Master's degree and the research project(s) should be in the same thematic field and related to each other. This would offer an opportunity for research-led teaching, exposing both post-graduate students and academic staff from partner countries to research environments at HEIs in the EU, and – through the mutually-reinforcing effects of implementing both a joint master's degree and joint research – increasing the prospects for the sustainability of the network.</p> <p>➤ the expansion of the Jean Monnet activities⁶ (under the same or a different name) under Erasmus+, with the aim of covering more subject areas and having a stronger research focus than the current activities which are restricted to field of European Union studies.⁷</p>	<p>used.</p> <p>➤ Agreement on the need for better alignment between EU support to Higher Education and to Research & Innovation, as per the findings of the Strategic evaluation of EU support to Research and Innovation for development in partner countries (2007-2013) of May 2016.</p> <p>In alternative to creating a new action under Erasmus+, EU services may explore the possibility of earmarking specific Framework Programme's funds (possibly under the upcoming FP9) to contribute to the Joint Master's Degrees action with specific research related activities.</p> <p>In line with the SDGs, emphasis should be put on enhancing scientific research and technological capabilities specifically related to the industrial sectors and labour demand of partner countries.</p> <p>DG RTD does emphasise that Horizon 2020 is a competitive programme which might make it more difficult to identify a clear action/activity as described but it could be worth exploring further.</p>	

⁶ http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/home/erasmus-plus/funding/jean-monnet-activities-2017_en

⁷ "European Union studies comprise the study of Europe in its entirety with particular emphasis on the European integration process in both its internal and external aspects. They promote active European citizenship and deal with the role of the EU in a globalised world, enhancing awareness of the Union and facilitating future engagement and people-to-people dialogue worldwide". Erasmus+ Programme Guide, version 2 (2017): 20/01/2017, p. 196.

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
	<p>On the other hand, under the umbrella of the AU-EU Research and Innovation Partnerships on food and nutrition security and on climate/sustainable energy, the component of capacity building is firmly established and it is the component which should be developed by DG DEVCO while the elements of collaborative actions are under the responsibility of DG RTD. The objective of the Partnerships is indeed to ensure coherence of actions between the funding of RTD and the one of DEVCO.</p> <p>➤ There is now a substantial volume of teaching and research about the EU, irrespective of Erasmus+ support and the current mid-term review of the Erasmus+ programme highlights that the relevance of Jean Monnet activities could indeed be enhanced as there is a need to strengthen European's understanding of the EU (and not only a population that is already quite knowledgeable in this area) and also build up the EU's global reach outside the EU. Reflexions on the future scope of the Jean Monnet programme are therefore currently underway for the next phase of Erasmus+ post 2020.</p> <p>Good practice in Latin America: In the framework of the "CELAC-EU Academic and</p>	

Recommendations * Final report - September 2017	Joint Response of the services: October 2017	Joint Response of the services on follow-up (one year later) October 2018
	<p>Knowledge summit", El Salvador, October 5th and 6th 2017, DG EAC, DG RTD, with the participation of DEVCO, organized back to back events to make the first "EU-CELAC Academic Knowledge Week" allowing cross fertilization of the Academia and Research through the generation and application of knowledge, closer integration and bi-regional strategic cooperation.</p> <p>In June 2015 it was agreed to establish the EU-CELAC Common Research Area, initiative lead by DG RTD.</p> <p>We support the promotion of the "EU-Latin American Higher Education Area" and the development of a common Latin America higher education area" so Research and Higher Education share the same approach in the region.</p>	