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The International Mobility of Researchers:
Policy Support at National and Institutional Levels
-Japan Society for the Promotion of Science- (Outline)
FOREWORD

In 2005 and 2006, I was fortunate to have the opportunity to exchange views with university presidents and foreign government officials on three occasions: at the Japan-Sweden President Meeting, Japan-China President Meeting and Japan-France Symposium on Higher Education. I was greatly impressed to learn that in all countries the issue of university internationalization is recognized as a matter of some urgency, and that this recognition is accompanied by active engagement in the cause of internationalization by both universities themselves and government officials.

There have been some noticeable developments in areas of academic research and higher education in Europe, supported by the Lisbon Strategy and the Bologna Process. In February 2007, I had the opportunity to participate in a panel discussion at the conference to launch the European Research Council (ERC). ERC is an independent funding agency that provides competitive research funds to top quality researchers in universities throughout Europe, with the aim of enhancing the international competitiveness of Europe in the area of academic research. Evaluation of ERC applications is based on the the single criterion of academic merit, and funds are awarded on a competitive basis, irrespective of the applicants’ nationalities. Thus, the establishment of the ERC is widely expected to lead to fierce competition among universities in Europe for top quality researchers. University presidents throughout Europe will no longer be able to remain indifferent to candidates who have been successful in obtaining ERC funding, as the funding allocations will effectively be an indication of how the top researchers are distributed around different universities. Furthermore, as the competition for human resources intensifies, people in Europe are turning their attention to top-level human resources in China and other Asian regions more than ever before.

In this age of worldwide competition for “knowledge”, it would appear that the issue of international strategy for universities, institutions which are central to the creation of “knowledge”, is now recognized as an extremely important theme. This recognition has in turn led to much earnest discussion as well as the development of a diverse range of policies in countries overseas.

The need for internationalization of Japanese universities has been discussed for some years now. Developments in the international environment in which Japan must operate, however, are progressing more rapidly in this respect. I am of the belief that Japan’s universities need to initiative more dynamic change if they are to keep abreast of global trends.

The Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities is a project that provides assistance to 20 pilot institutions selected by an evaluation group under Japan’s Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). Each pilot institution is furnished support in its endeavors to develop an “International Strategy Headquarters”,
overarching all its different departments and tailored to its own distinctive institutional characteristics. The Headquarters will formulate international strategy for the institution as a whole and enhance systems and structures to carry out organized international activities. The project also aims to conduct wide-ranging analysis of activities at these 20 pilot institutions and to apply the results of this analysis to development of leading models of international expansion strategy in universities. In other words, it could be said that this program aims to create innovative models for university reform based on the principles and practices of internationalization.

The Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) extracts examples of good practice from the 20 pilot institutions, based on comprehensive analysis of their activities. It combines these with the results of surveys on internationalization in overseas universities to develop models for promoting university internationalization. These models are disseminated both among the 20 pilot institutions and throughout the higher education community in Japan.

We have now reached the end of the second year of this five-year project, and this interim report represents a compilation of activities pursued under the project and models developed to date. In the course of preparing this report, the University International Strategy Council engaged in vigorous discussion and provided valuable advice regarding its content. I would like to express my thanks to Mr. Tsutomu Kimura, President for the National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE) who chaired the Council, and to all other eminent Council members.

In April 2006, JSPS established the “JSPS Project Team for Supporting University Internationalization”, headed by the JSPS President. Through this Team, JSPS continues to support the activities for internationalization in Japanese universities, with initiatives including training on international operations for administrative staff at national universities and other institutes and provision of support for internationalization through JSPS overseas offices. As we work to develop these efforts further, I ask for your continued understanding and cooperation.

Finally, I would be pleased if this report could provide some help for universities in Japan seeking to expand their international activities in a strategic and institutionally organized manner.

April 2007

Motoyuki Ono
President
Japan Society for the Promotion of Science
JSPS Project Team for Supporting University Internationalization
I. Outline of the Project
1. Background – The need for institutionally organized internationalization in universities –

The changing conception of “internationalization”

The need for the internationalization of universities is a long-standing issue: one that was discussed even back at a time when venturing abroad was not a common endeavor for most people in Japan. In this age of intensive competition for knowledge, however, global conditions are changing constantly, and it seems that “internationalization” is now assuming a meaning distinct from its traditional roots. This is particularly evident when examining how to enhance universities’ appeal as a core contributor to the generation of knowledge for the global community.

Yamamoto (2006) describes the historical change in the meaning of university internationalization as follows:

It seems to me that universities and internationalization have been closely intertwined ever since the Meiji Era. The internationalization of universities was virtually a national strategy for Japan, a less developed country in the area of higher education at that time, and, in that sense, internationalization was a considerably organized endeavor. Foreign teachers in the government services and students sent abroad by the government played a major role in the early Meiji Era even if they were typical of a passive approach to internationalization. With the subsequent stabilization of the country, however, it seems that internationalization in universities ended up becoming dependant upon personal networks. For instance, individual researchers remained in contact with researchers abroad through participation in international conferences and so on; they introduced advanced studies in foreign countries to the academic circles in our country; or they taught foreign studies courses. Individual-level activities such as these seem to have come to play a major part in the international activities of universities. It is likely that this happened as a result of each faculty or department, or each class or professor, having a high degree of autonomy. This autonomy meant that activities of the university as an organization were relatively weak, and there was little room for exploring strategies for the whole university. Under the current changing circumstances, however, this approach is no longer viable.¹)

Background to the internationalization of universities

Presented below are four points salient to the discussion of university internationalization in Japan.

(1) Global higher education trends, particularly in Europe

Under the EHEA (European Higher Education Area) and ERA (European Research Area) frameworks, universities in the EU are rapidly developing initiatives to facilitate the mobility of students and researchers and to optimize the attractiveness of their programs. Against this backdrop, it is becoming increasingly important for universities throughout the world to establish partnerships of genuine quality and to develop linkages internationally. Of particular importance is the developing EU tendency to place emphasis on linkages not only within the EU area but with institutions in other parts of the world, including Japan.

(2) Internationalization within Japan’s S&T strategy

The Japanese government’s third Science and Technology Basic Plan calls for moves to
enhance both the diversity and the standard of research conducted in Japan, by fostering world-class personnel and hosting outstanding researchers from other nations. The Plan underlines the need to support the organizational restructuring of universities to better attune them to the agenda of strengthening Japan’s capacity in the field of science and technology.

(3) Internationalization in response to global issues
Problems common to the entire global community, such as the environment and health care, are increasing in number and gravity. It is imperative that research addressing these problems is conducted in a framework of cross-border collaboration. Growing expectations are being placed on universities to use their knowledge assets in contexts of international cooperation.

(4) Internationalization as a key theme in Japanese university reform
Japanese universities are undergoing a process of reform to prepare them for increasingly intense inter-university competition generated by developments such as the incorporation of national universities and the onset of an era in which the number of undergraduate places will equal or fall below the number of would-be university students in Japan. The reform process calls for deployment of an organized approach to university internationalization that will play an instrumental role in both sustaining and bolstering the dynamism of universities and in revamping their management structures.

Toward an institutionally organized, pro-active strategy for internationalization
Against this background, what is expected of individual universities? Yamamoto (2006) stated that:

What is expected of an individual university is “an international strategy implemented in an institutionally organized and pro-active manner.”

Figure I-1-1 is a concept diagram of the international expansion of a university in an institutionally organized and pro-active manner.
There has been a tendency in the past for international activity to be dependent upon individual members of the university community. If activity is to become more efficient and effective, a strategic and institutionally organized approach must be taken to implementation of issues including the following:

- Provision of an improved environment for the acceptance of foreign researchers including one-stop service points and university-organized accommodation;
- Leverage of external resource funds;
- Structured training for university administrative personnel engaged in international operations.

For this purpose, therefore, it is important to formulate an institution-wide international strategy, establish goals and plans of action based on this strategy, and develop organizational systems to implement it.
2. Description of the project

(1) Purpose:

The Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities\(^1\) aims to assist each of the 20 pilot institutions selected by Japan’s Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT)\(^2\) to develop an “international strategy headquarters”, a cross-organizational structure that reflects the particular characteristics of the institution in question, and to support the pursuit of an institution-wide, organized international agenda through formulation of an explicit international strategy accompanied by organic collaboration between different arms of the institution. The program also aims to develop leading models for international strategy that will encourage universities other than those selected to apply their own creativity and ingenuity to consideration of new approaches to international strategy.

(2) Project budget:

¥500 million per year

(3) Project duration:

5 years: FY 2005 to FY 2009

(4) Flowchart of the project:

Implementation is commissioned by MEXT to both the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) and the Japan International Science and Technology Exchange Center (JISTEC).\(^3\) JSPS and JISTEC re-commission specific initiatives to the selected institutions. (Each institution is funded at ¥10 million – ¥40 million per year.) MEXT will conduct an interim evaluation after 3 years and a post-project evaluation after the project comes to an end.

---

\(^{1}\) For the sake of convenience, the Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities will be referred to throughout this report as “SIH” or “the SIH Project”.

\(^{2}\) The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology will be referred to in this report by its common abbreviation, “MEXT”.

\(^{3}\) The Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and the Japan International Science and Technology Exchange Center will be referred to in this report by their common abbreviations, “JSPS” and “JISTEC” respectively.
## (5) List of pilot institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Name of International Strategy Headquarters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>National Univ.</td>
<td>Hokkaido University</td>
<td>Hokkaido University Initiative for Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>National Univ.</td>
<td>Tohoku University</td>
<td>Global Operations Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>National Univ.</td>
<td>The University of Tokyo</td>
<td>Division for International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>National Univ.</td>
<td>Tokyo University of Foreign Studies</td>
<td>Office for International Academic Strategy (OFIAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>National Univ.</td>
<td>Tokyo Institute of Technology</td>
<td>International Planning Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>National Univ.</td>
<td>Hitotsubashi University</td>
<td>International Strategy Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>National Univ.</td>
<td>Niigata University</td>
<td>International Academic Support Office (IASO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>National Univ.</td>
<td>Nagoya University</td>
<td>International Exchange and Cooperation Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>National Univ.</td>
<td>Kyoto University</td>
<td>The Organization for the Promotion of International Relations (OPIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>National Univ.</td>
<td>Osaka University</td>
<td>International Affairs Board, Osaka University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>National Univ.</td>
<td>Kobe University</td>
<td>Office for the Promotion of International Exchange, Kobe University (OPIE-KU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>National Univ.</td>
<td>Tottori University</td>
<td>Headquarters for Planning and Promoting International Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>National Univ.</td>
<td>Hiroshima University</td>
<td>International Strategy Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>National Univ.</td>
<td>Kyushu University</td>
<td>Organization for the Planning and Coordination of International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>National Univ.</td>
<td>Nagasaki University</td>
<td>Center for International Collaborative Research, Nagasaki University (CICORN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Prefectural Univ.</td>
<td>The University of Aizu</td>
<td>Center for Strategy of International Programs (CSIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Private Univ.</td>
<td>Keio University</td>
<td>Organization for Global Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Private Univ.</td>
<td>Tokai University, Hokkaido Tokai University, Kyushu Tokai University</td>
<td>Head Office of International Affairs, Tokai University (HIAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Private Univ.</td>
<td>Waseda University</td>
<td>Office of International Research Promotion (IRP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Inter-University Research Institute</td>
<td>National Institutes of Natural Sciences</td>
<td>International Strategy Headquarters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## (6) Role of JSPS

JSPS undertakes the role of consulting with the pilot institutions as needed and performing comprehensive analysis of the activities at the pilot institutions while seeking advice from the University International Strategy Council which is comprised of experts chaired by Mr. Tsutomu Kimura, President for the National Institution for
Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE). JSPS extracts examples of best practice to develop models for university internationalization, and disseminates these outcomes to universities other than the 20 pilot institutions.

References:

II. Method for Developing Models
1. Themes of analysis

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the role of JSPS is to analyze the activities of the SIH pilot institutions, extract best practice, and develop models for the internationalization of Japanese universities.

There is a considerable degree of variation, however, between individual universities, and even among the 20 pilot institutions: they vary in size from large to small, in type from general to specialized, in location from urban to rural, and so on. This diversity makes it extremely difficult to develop a common model that is suitable for all Japan’s universities.

Furthermore, the concept of “international” can include a wide range of activities. If we were to address all of these points collectively, the focus of analysis would become somewhat diffused.

In view of the above, JSPS has established the following nine themes of analysis: angles from which to approach analysis of international activity in 20 pilot institutions and through which to extract cases of best practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JSPS</th>
<th>Nine themes of analysis for best practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Organization and governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Goal setting, action plans, and evaluation systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Attracting external funds for international education and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Participation in international partnerships and consortiums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Expansion of international activities based on specific transnational research projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Training and securing administrative personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Improving of services and support for foreign researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Expanding overseas study and research opportunities for young Japanese researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Establishing and operating overseas bases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In developing the above themes, reference was made to the “Internationalization Indicators (Checklist)” created by Mr. Shingo Ashizawa, one of the researchers participating in the project titled “Developing Evaluation Criteria to Assess the Internationalization of Universities” undertaken by Furushiro et al. (2006).  

Reference 1. Major categories of the “Internationalization Indicators (Checklist)”

(1) Mission, goals and plans of the university
(2) Structure and staffing
(3) Budgeting and implementation
(4) International dimension of research activities
(5) Support system, information provision and infrastructure (entrance examination, education, housing, multi-lingual aspects and the environment)
(6) Multifaceted promotion of international affiliation
(7) Internationalization of the university curriculum
(8) Joint programs with external organizations (academic exchanges, internships and others)


Additionally, the internationalization of universities is currently attracting attention as a national-level policy issue in countries overseas. In light of this, JSPS also took reference from the themes of analysis in case examples from Sweden2) and Norway3) where governmental bodies engage in analysis of internationalization in universities and extracting best practice cases in the same way as this program.


(1) The goals and strategies of the higher education institutions
(2) Organisation and support systems
(3) Internationalisation of undergraduate programmes
(4) The best institutions

### Reference 3. Analysis of International Practices of Higher Education Institutions in Norway

1. International research co-operation
2. International funding
3. Formal co-operation agreements
4. Student mobility
5. Internationalisation at home
6. Organising internationalization


The nine themes of analysis for the SIH project were formulated using the above case examples as reference and on the basis of discussions held by the University International Strategy Council. JSPS also took into account the current conditions and issues to be addressed in strengthening the foundations for international expansion and activity in Japanese universities.
2. Surveying the activities of pilot institutions, etc.

In developing models with the nine themes mentioned in the previous section, we placed importance on dialogue based on mutual trust and cooperation with those concerned in the 20 pilot institutions. Thus, separate meetings were arranged for the purpose of collecting information on the progress of activities in each pilot institution. In addition, symposiums were organized to share information on notable activities and survey the interests of participants.

(1) Meetings with each of the 20 pilot institutions

On the following occasions, separate 90-minute meetings for exchange of opinions were held with each pilot institution.

1st round of meetings – FY 2005: July to August 2005
2nd round of meetings – FY 2006: October to December 2006

In addition to these two rounds, other meetings to exchange opinions were arranged on a request basis. In this way, we have endeavored to consult closely with the pilot institutions and share information with those concerned in each institution.

(2) Site visits

Site visits were arranged at the following institutions to ascertain progress and exchange opinions with those concerned.

Hiroshima University: August 17, 2005
Kobe University: September 30, 2005
Osaka University: January 13, 2006
Tokyo Institute of Technology: March 15, 2006

(3) Information posted on the “international strategy headquarters” website of each institution

The pilot institutions have each established an international strategy headquarters website through which they provide updates on the progress of their activities. JSPS used these websites, each managed by the pilot institutions themselves, as a reference source to gain a deeper understanding of institutions’ activities.

Moreover, JSPS and JISTEC jointly established a dedicated website for the SIH program. This website contains links to the international strategy headquarters websites of each pilot institution as well as a wide range of information provided by the pilot institutions themselves. The SIH website also contains useful information for for other universities in Japan pursuing internationalization, such as JSPS research papers concerning university internationalization both within and outside Japan and updates on universities and academic trends throughout the world provided by JSPS overseas offices.
II. Method for Developing Models

Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities Website
URL: http://www.u-kokusen.jp/index_e.html
(4) Public symposiums

Public symposiums on the theme of the internationalization of universities were held as follows:

FY 2005 – First Symposium
Title: “Universities’ International Strategies – Toward Strategic and Institutionally Organized Internationalization –”
Date & Time: Monday, January 30, 2006 from 10:00 am to 4:50 pm
Venue: Sumitomo Hall, Shinjuku Sumitomo Building
Summary: The pilot institutions introduced the international strategies that they had publicly announced in December 2005, as well as progress of the international activities in the three sessions: (i) “Universities’ International Strategies – Building up Systems and Setting Goals” (ii) “International Development of Research Activities – Acquisition of External Funds and Overseas Office,” (iii) Internationalization at Home – Campus Internationalization and Staff Training.” Experts were also invited to this symposium, with whom broad-ranging discussion was held regarding the internationalization of universities.
Participants: 219 people

FY 2006 – Second Symposium
Title: “Universities’ International Strategies – Overseas Offices and Staff Training”
Date & Time: Wednesday, November 15, 2006 from 1:30 pm to 5:10 pm
Venue: Sokairo-Hall, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies (GRIPS)
Summary: Under the themes of “overseas offices” and “staff training,” issues requested by many respondents to the questionnaire implemented at the public symposium in FY 2005, various case examples were introduced by Nuffic (Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education, governmental NPO), Nagasaki University, The University of Tokyo, Kobe University and JSPS San Francisco Office.
Participants: 180 people
3. Methods of analysis

(1) Theme-specific analysis

In Chapter III, analysis is conducted according to each of the nine themes mentioned earlier. Each theme is discussed in three parts: (i) “Trends and issues”, (ii) “Notable activities” and (iii) “Analysis and recommendations”.

In (i) “Trends and issues”, prevailing conditions in Japanese universities are described from the theme in question. Survey data is introduced to underpin the presentation of current awareness of these conditions. Specific issues that need to be addressed are highlighted.

In (ii) “Notable activities”, unique initiatives that are applicable to other universities are extracted from analysis of international activity in the 20 pilot institutions. Since this report is an interim report produced just two years after the project was initiated, it is too early to assess outcomes in any definitive manner. Accordingly, rather than identifying “best practice” in this report, more attention is given to “notable activities” that have the potential to become best practice in the future.

In (iii) “Analysis and recommendations”, we consider not only why certain activities are notable but also what aspects of them may be particularly useful to other universities. Alongside recommendations for individual institutions, this section provides some recommendations demanding consideration at the governmental level.

(2) Scope of analysis

This report’s analysis targets international activities carried out by the pilot institutions in the first two years of the SIH project. Other progressive initiatives for internationalization are also included even if they prior to the project. Certain activities that are not directly funded by SIH are also addressed, provided they are headed by international strategy headquarters established under SIH and are consistent with the international strategy of the pilot institutions in question.

Although this project has the policy objective of contributing to the “development of methods for the internationalization of research environments,” we also attach importance to improving overall infrastructure for strategic and institutionally organized international expansion throughout the institution, including in the field of education. Accordingly, rather than ignoring conjunctions with educational affairs, this report aims to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the full spectrum of international activities in universities in fields ranging from education to research. In analysis of educational activities, emphasis is placed on graduate- and postgraduate-level initiatives, reflecting the priority of training a new generation of researchers.

References:

3) NIFU STEP (2005) Internationalisation policies and international practices in higher education institutions: A case study of five Norwegian higher education institutions, NIFU STEP Working Paper 23.
III. Theme-specific Analysis
1. Organization and governance

(1) Trends and issues

A need has been pointed out for universities to systematically and strategically undertake a process of internationalization. Consideration is given here to the kind of organizational framework that will needed to accomplish this objective. In determining the degree to which organizational management is being applied to university internationalization, we use the matrix in Fig. III-1-1 (developed by J.L. Davies in 1995).

Quadrant A of the matrix shows a minimal state of preparedness in which foreign researchers are staffed at a university, as their host researchers are forced to do the related administrative tasks because a central point (“one-stop service”) for conducting their processing and providing them with residency-support services has not been adequately established within the university. (Given the autonomous and decentralized nature of university education and research faculties, all universities may be said to fall into this quadrant to one degree or another.)

A core objective in the internationalization strategy of universities must be how to attract a large number of excellent foreign researchers by improving the campus environment for receiving them. Making these improvements will require that universities standardize and optimize the efficiency of their administrative and operational processes and procedures. Accomplishing this would help to move a university toward a quadrant D status.

More concretely, the following will need to be done to elevate a university from a quadrant A to D status. To promote campus-wide staffing of excellent foreign researchers, goals should first be set as to the quality and number of researchers desired, and an action plan devised that includes both personnel and financial provisions. Of course, a one-stop service point for foreign researchers must be established, an accommodating international environment created on campus, and a full-fledged support system put in place for their accompanying family members.

The above is an example of measures to be taken for a university to make the transition from a quadrant A to D status. In establishing a system for achieving this transition, a key element will be the organization and governance that the university applies in its internationalization strategy.

A survey taken by Yokota et al (2006) shows the state of organization and governance in efforts to internationalize Japanese universities. Some 37.2% of universities attached great importance to the establishment of a university-wide organization (headquarters) to strategically promote international education and research exchange. However, only 13.3% of universities actually had such headquarters. In particular, national universities had a very strong awareness of this issue, with 75.8% attaching great importance to the establishment of such an organization, but those actually having an organization accounted for only 40.6%. Among public and private universities, the proportions having a university-wide organization were only 8.3% and 7.3%, respectively. As described above, universities in Japan have not yet developed organizations sufficient to enable effective promotion of internationalization. With the exception of certain progressive cases, most universities that have set up a university-wide organization such as an international strategy headquarters have done so only as a result of the SIH Project.
The twenty institutions selected for the SIH Project began to establish international strategy headquarters, tailored to their own distinctive institutional characteristics, in FY 2005 (the first year of the project).

As would be expected, the schemes adopted by each headquarters vary considerably, but in many institutions, headquarters are headed by the President or Vice President and are composed of faculty and administrative staff from related departments.

In many cases the headquarters undertake planning functions, such as the development of an international strategy, but they also operate to oversee operations in divisions and departments engaged in international activity. There is a characteristic distinction between institutions that have established a new permanent organization to support the planning function of the headquarters, and those that utilize an existing organization for this purpose.

Most institutions attach importance to the following three points in the establishment of an organization.

A. Smooth cooperation between departments responsible for planning and those engaged in implementation;

B. Appropriate assignment of tasks and cooperation between the headquarters and departments;

C. Integration of the efforts of faculty and administrative staff (faculty-staff collaboration).

Notable activities conducted at some of the selected 20 institutions are outlined below.
(2) Notable Efforts

**Keio University: Flexible approach to international activity under Presidential leadership**

Traditionally, the International Center was responsible for international exchange operations at Keio University. In 2005, however, Keio established the Organization for Global Initiatives (OGI) together with the OGI Office, responsible for OGI-related operations. A cooperative structure has been developed whereby the OGI Office engages in planning of international activity from a strategic perspective, while the International Center implements these plans.

The OGI Office reviewed the university’s passive attitude toward concluding agreements, shifting policy to enable more active pursuit of interaction with prospective partner universities, while giving consideration to the issue of balance among nations, regions, and fields. As of December 2006, 52 more agreements had been concluded than in the previous fiscal year. The OGI Office is working to build faculty-level initiatives into full-scale university projects, through efforts such as developing exchange activities originating in individual faculties or graduate schools into university-wide agreements.

To facilitate prompt and effective promotional activities overseas, Keio University also established the Office of Communications and Public Relations, an independent body responsible for promoting the university internationally.

**Tokyo Institute of Technology: Development of a progressive action plan through cooperation between faculty and administrative staff**

This initiative at Tokyo Institute of Technology was initiated prior to the launch of the SIH project. In 2003, the Institute established the International Office (led by the Vice President) to supervise the planning of international activities. Importance was placed on establishing a system to allow the both faculty members and administrative staff to engage in discussion together, with the President taking strong leadership in efforts to raise awareness among faculty and staff. In preparing a policy paper on internationalization, the institute organized theme-based groups comprised of faculty and staff members, had each group draft a policy along the theme allocated to it, and prioritized the policies drafted.

**Waseda University: Coordination of functions between the International Affairs Division and the Research Promotion Division**

On June 1, 2005, the International Affairs Division and the Research Promotion Division jointly established the Office of International Research Promotion, realizing a system for cooperation between the two divisions. The Office is chiefly responsible for (1) the establishment of an international network with a focus on specific research projects such as the 21st Century COE Program, the Super COE Program and the Organization for Asian Studies, as well as the collection and dissemination of information and (2) environmental improvements such as the creation of an international exchange database and translation of university documents into English.

**Osaka University: Informal meetings between involving the headquarters and departments**

In June 2006, Osaka University began to hold separate meetings for exchange of opinions between personnel from the International Affairs Board and heads of individual university divisions and departments. The meetings were aimed at (1) comprehending conditions in each division and identifying their needs, (2) sharing information on the current state of
international exchange, (3) exchanging opinions on the activities of the International Affairs Board, and (4) requesting cooperation with surveys and new projects. By March 2007, the university headquarters had held meetings with 12 principal divisions out of a total of 41. The meetings yielded the following results related to international activities at the university:

A. Development of key individuals at departmental level and reinforcement of on-campus networks
B. Communication of requests to headquarters (the International Affairs Board) and promotion of efforts to resolve problems
   Example: Development of headquarters' policy on the organizational improvement of overseas offices, improvement of accommodation conditions, provision of lectures taught in English
C. Information sharing, internal and external PR
D. Dissemination of information on the functions of overseas offices.

(3) Analysis and proposals

The need for university-wide consensus
Decision-making in universities is essentially a bottom-up process. The issue therefore is how to introduce an international strategy with a top down aspect, and how to build university-wide consensus for it.

Types and functions of “international strategy headquarters”
Institutions may adopt different organizational types and governance styles depending on their specific circumstances. Organization and governance should be reviewed as required to reflect the development of each institution’s internationalization goals.

The 20 pilot institutions for SIH each display different characteristics in the activities of their “international strategy headquarters”. However, it is possible to categorize them roughly into four different types based on what kinds of functions they emphasize, as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Function emphasized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Specific projects type</td>
<td>Direct support for international activities of a specific division or department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Headquarters initiative type</td>
<td>Strategic international initiatives are formulated swiftly under the leadership of the headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Central control type</td>
<td>Centralized planning and progress management for the institution as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Departmental support type</td>
<td>Backup for international activities in each division or department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of “specific project type” international strategy headquarters, the university selects certain departments and educational and research fields for priority support, which is provided directly by the headquarters. The efforts of this type of university will be described later in “5. Expansion of international activities based on specific transnational research projects”.

The “headquarters initiative type” is located organizationally close to the President. This type of headquarters emphasizes functions such the provision of appropriate advice for internationalization and the planning of strategic initiatives. It enables prompt responses based on presidential intention.
“Central control type” headquarters develop a plan founded on an overview and comprehension of university-wide issues and problems. This type of headquarters seems to be very effective for promoting university internationalization in a steady, organized manner. “Departmental support type” headquarters provide logistic support for the internationalization of different arms of the organization while respecting their autonomy. This type of headquarters is often seen in relatively large-scale national universities.

**Functional coordination between international strategy headquarters and departments**

Both the “central control type” and “departmental support type” place importance on promoting self-motivated change in individual departments while preserving their autonomy. Headquarters provides departments with opportunities for exchanging information on good practice with other departments on best practice, thus enhancing overall levels of performance. This method is likely to be particularly effective in large-scale universities. (Example: Keio University)

**Promotion of internationalization through cooperation between faculty and staff**

In order to promote integration of faculty and administrative staff, it is necessary to develop an environment enabling collaborative participation in planning activities, as well as to raise their awareness of issues related to international strategy. (Example: Tokyo Institute of Technology)

**Cooperation and integration of multiple departments**

It is now common for the full range of university activities to encompass international elements. It is thus important, for example, to consider how to organize divisions responsible for research promotion and international affairs, and how to promote cooperation between them. Particularly notable here is the example of how a large-scale university’s headquarters can integrate functions of both research and international affairs. (Example: Waseda University)

**References:**


2. Goal setting, action plans, and evaluation systems

(1) Trends and issues

Most Japanese universities are implementing a variety of internationalization programs and international activities. But how often are these activities grounded in the founding spirit and institutional midterm goals and plans of the university concerned? Does the university have a clear philosophy and scheme to guide implementation of their programs and activities? According to a survey of internationalization in all four-year universities conducted by Yokota et al. (2006), the proportion of respondent universities that professed a clear vision or mission for internationalization was as low as one fifth (20.1%). More specifically, universities with a clear vision/mission accounted for 40.6% among all national universities, but only 14.6% among public universities and 16.0% among private universities (Figure III-2-1-a).

However, according to the same survey, 78.3% of universities responded that it is important to possess a vision/mission for university internationalization (this is an aggregate of those universities who responded with “important” and “very important”). Among national universities, 79.4% responded with “very important”, reaching close to 100% when combined with those that responded with “important”. With regard to private universities, 52.2% responded with “very important”: with the addition of those that responded with “important”, the proportion was 75.7%. The total of public universities that responded with “very important” and “important” was 61.0% (Figure III-2-1-b). Among national universities in particular, there is widespread recognition of the importance of developing visions or missions in education and research activities: it is likely that this has been triggered by the need to develop of midterm goals and plans as a result of the move to incorporation of national universities.

Although the need for internationalization of Japanese universities has long been acknowledged, as described above, only a limited number of universities possess clear philosophies or schemes for internationalization, set concrete goals and action plans under their philosophies and schemes, and actually pursue internationalization in practice. It would be no exaggeration to say that most Japanese universities have promoted internationalization in education and research activities on an ad hoc basis and following the lead of others, without first clarifying the purpose, goals, and direction of their internationalization initiatives. The one-fifth of universities that do possess clear philosophies and schemes for internationalization, and promote international education and research activities founded on them, can be described using the key terms “national,” “large scale (a large number of students),” “large foreign student population” and “long-standing”.

What of systems to evaluate internationalization? In the survey conducted by Yokota et al. (2006), only 8.8% of universities responded that they have (are implementing) a system for evaluation of their internationalization activity. The proportion was 21.9% among national university respondents, but as low as 6.3% and 4.5% for public and private universities respectively (Figure III-2-2-a). Furthermore the importance of evaluation systems was recognized by 59.7% of respondents (a total of those who responded with “important” and “very important”) – a lower proportion than recorded for the question on the importance of vision and mission. As many as 51.6% of national universities stated that an evaluation system was “very important”. The proportion reached 95.1% when combined with those that responded with “quite important”. Among private universities, however, only 27.2% responded with “very important” and the total of those that responded with “very important” and “important” was 53.1%. Among public universities, the total was 40% – less than half (Figure III-2-2-b).
Figure III-2-1 Clear vision and/or mission for university internationalization (implementation rate) and awareness (degree of importance)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Quite important</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure III-2-2 System for evaluation of university internationalization (implementation rate) and awareness (degree of importance)

Evaluations have been conducted not only in the field of internationalization but also across a broad range of educational and research activities. Third-party evaluation (accreditation) by an evaluation body became mandatory for universities in 2004. However, according to the results of the survey mentioned above, universities responded less positively to the implementation of an internationalization evaluation system than to the idea of developing a vision and mission for internationalization. At present, only a small number of universities have a philosophy or scheme for internationalization, so it makes sense that even fewer of them have developed a system to evaluate internationalization and international activities.

It is expected that more universities will establish both philosophies/schemes and evaluation systems for internationalization in the future, because many appear to attach importance to these tasks in spite of the low implementation rate at present. It is up to the 20 institutions selected for this SIH Project to develop case examples that can provide models for other universities.

(2) Notable Efforts

Tokyo Institute of Technology: A bottom-up approach to policy development through collaboration between faculty and administrative staff

The Tokyo Institute of Technology produced a policy paper entitled “Tokyo Tech’s Strategy for Internationalization” in July 2003, a pioneering effort in this field. In preparing the policy paper, the Institute conducted a satisfaction survey among its foreign students, faculty, staff, and tutors for foreign students. This enabled deeper recognition of the current state of internationalization and facilitated identification of problem areas. The Institute then organized four groups under the respective themes of exchange, projects, education, and infrastructure with each group composed of both faculty and administrative staff members. The groups each created a draft policy paper and set priorities for action among the different proposals presented. The process of formulating these drafts promoted greater cooperation between the faculty and administrative staff. The final policy paper begins by introducing the philosophy underpinning internationalization: why the Institute must pursue internationalization and what internationalization actually is. The paper then outlines a vision for the Institute’s future and a basic strategic approach to internationalization, before proceeding to delineate specific internationalization objectives in terms of education, research and governance, including numerical targets in each area. Care is taken to ensure that all parties within the Institute can develop a common understanding of the objectives. Lastly, the paper presents a timetable for internationalization, establishing deadlines for each individual objective.

Nagoya University: Setting goals, developing an action plan and improving systems for evaluation, utilizing the Academic Consortium (AC21)

As part of the move to incorporation, Nagoya University carried out a series of institutional reforms modeled on the University of Melbourne. Drawing on the latter university’s formulation of mid-term objectives, the “Nagoya University Internationalization Strategic Plan”, developed in December 2005, is organized hierarchically around items: Mission, Vision, Goal, Objective, and Action. The Mission is based on the “Academic Charter of Nagoya University” established in 2000. The Vision consolidates the university’s scheme for internationalization in the mid-term (until 2010) into three points, notably contribution to exchange with Asian countries and active participation in cooperation for international development. The Goal specifies targets to be reached in the process of developing international linkages to realize the internationalization scheme articulated in the Vision, across the four fields of research, education, development cooperation, and management. The Goal, Objective, and Action portions of the Strategic Plan are presented in a tree diagram.
which identifies more specific targets towards achievement of the Goal and describes how they should be pursued (an action plan) in an easily understandable manner. The five items are described concisely so that persons within the organization can share a common understanding of the university’s plans for internationalization.

Nagoya University plans to revise its Strategic Plan during the 2007 academic year by reference to advice solicited from the University of Sydney, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, and Tongji University, fellow members of the Academic Consortium (AC21). It also plans to utilize AC21 connections in its evaluation activities, conducting benchmarking with the University of Sydney in the field of education, and with the University of Warwick in research and business-academia collaboration.

Hiroshima University: Application of SWOT analysis by an overseas expert

Hiroshima University invited Mr. Bob Goddard, Director of International Relations for the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee and also Pro Vice-Chancellor of La Trobe University (responsible for strategy development), to its campus for two weeks in November 2002. This was realized with support from an “international competitiveness enhancement grant” from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). Hiroshima University asked Mr. Goddard to employ SWOT analysis methods to assess the university’s current position in terms of internationalization and international activities. Mr. Goddard produced 33 recommendations for strengthening the university’s international competitiveness. Based on these recommendations, Hiroshima University developed the “Hiroshima University Internationalization Strategy” before incorporation (September 2003), clarifying specific targets for internationalization. This was subsequently revised and released as the “New Hiroshima University Internationalization Strategy” in December 2005.

The new strategy is based on the university’s mid-term goals and mid-term plan, the “Long-term Vision for Hiroshima University” (established in January 2003), and the five guiding principles based on the university’s founding spirit. It sets six different strategic agendas – branding, universalization, networking, devolution, business models, and infrastructure maintenance – under the four pillars of promotion of internationalized knowledge, internationalized people, international social contribution, and an internationalized campus. Three to five objectives are set under each of the six strategies, describing specific, detailed action plans and the relationship of those action plans with the midterm plan. A particular feature is the reference material at the end of the strategy document, which provides examples of numerical objectives under the new strategy and calculations of targets for foreign student intake. The action plans are written in a strategic manner while clarifying the relationship with the university’s mid-term plan, and have been designed for ease of comprehension and shared appreciation by all members of the university community.

The new international strategy was evaluated highly by the Center for the Study of Higher Education of the University of Melbourne.

---

4 SWOT analysis is a framework used chiefly to develop a marketing strategy or a corporate strategy. It evaluates an organization from the four perspectives of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats. The purpose of SWOT analysis to assess the position of the organization comprehensively, based on an “external environment analysis” of business opportunities, external threats, etc. (“opportunities” and “threats” in the formulation mentioned above – factors that cannot be controlled by the organization), and “internal environment analysis” of factors such as core competence, organizational structure, etc. (“strengths” and “weaknesses” that can be improved by the organization).
(3) Analysis and proposals

One of typical management cycle follows a process of activity through the stages of “Plan”, “Do”, “Check” and “Act” – the PDCA cycle. This section applies the PDCA approach to the issue of university internationalization, examining “goal setting,” “development of an action plan,” and “development of an evaluation system”. Figure III-2-3 presents a PDCA cycle for university internationalization.

Figure III-2-3: PDCA cycle for university internationalization
As noted in (1), only a limited number of universities in Japan have specific goals or action plans for internationalization, or systems to evaluate internationalization and international activities. Many universities, including the 20 institutions selected for the project, engage in the activities given in “Plan” or “Do” in the right half of Figure III-2-3.

The PDCA cycle is in essence a model for improving operations in a spiral manner by repeating the plan-do-check-act process. A large number of universities in Japan are currently engaging in a process of repeated trial and error in the “Plan” phase. This phase is examined in detail in the following paragraphs.

The “Plan” phase can be divided into three stages of (i) analysis of the current situation, (ii) development of an international strategy, and (iii) formulation of an action plan. The stage of (i) analysis of the current situation can be further broken down, with the first process in this stage labeled “comprehension of the current situation”. This is not an easy task.

A common trait among universities cited in the “Notable Efforts” section above is that when developing international strategy, they worked first to gain a solid comprehension of their own conditions and the issues to be addressed. Tokyo Institute of Technology conducted a satisfaction survey, Nagoya University used the efforts of the University of Melbourne as a reference, and Hiroshima University invited the Director of International Relations for the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee as an expert of university internationalization, requesting him to analyze their current situation. These universities developed focused internationalization strategies based on comprehension of current conditions and identification of issues. Their strategies are placed clearly in the broader context of institutional mid- and long-term plans and goals, and the spirit of each institution’s foundation or university charter. Furthermore, they articulate action plans in distinct and easily comprehensible language and present them in a straightforward manner that enables the strategy to be shared throughout the university and recognized as a common goal. This form of presentation could well be followed by other universities.

The phases of “Check” and “Act” in the left half of Figure III-2-3 are unexploited fields for many universities in Japan. As is the case with analysis of current conditions in the “Plan” phase, it is important in these phases to provide sufficient feedback on the actual situation and draw upon the opinions of external experts and concerned parties. As demonstrated by Nagoya University’s introduction of a benchmarking approach using AC21, comparative analysis with partner universities and effective application of external opinions are particularly notable approaches.

With regard to the development methods and guidelines for evaluation of internationalization and international activities, experts are currently conducting trials and feasibility studies. It is expected that further research will be conducted with an orientation to practical applicability. Moreover, it is hoped that more universities will utilize the results of such research and develop better systems to evaluate their degree of internationalization and international activities.

**Notes**

I. PDCA cycle

The PDCA cycle is a classic management cycle that involves repetition of a plan-do-check-act process. The first “Plan” phase includes identification and examination of issues, based on analysis of the current situation. The “Do” phase involves implementing and developing solutions to issues. In the “Check” phase, the degree to which goals have been achieved is evaluated and if the issues have not been resolved, aspects that were not effective are identified. The final “Act” phase is connected with the next “Plan” phase by continuing (entrenching), modifying, or abandoning the initial plan, based on results of the “Check” phase. This spiral cycle enables management to promote continuous improvement. It is
considered important to measure and analyze processes to identify and modify the portions needing refinement and improvement, and make the improvement process serve as a serial feedback loop to implement the PDCA process continuously.\textsuperscript{3, 4}

II. Benchmarking

Put simply, benchmarking is “learning from best practice (good examples)” to address inefficiencies in business processes. It is an approach to achieve better management through identifying and analyzing best practice in management and operations: using this best practice to formulate indicators (benchmarks) against which to measure and evaluate current business operations and activities: comparing and analyzing the gap between current practices and best practice: and promoting continuous process reform to bridge that gap.\textsuperscript{5} A benchmark is a numerical indicator used to compare the current situation with the goal. Setting an appropriate benchmark is the most important task in benchmarking activities. Numerical evaluation gives objectivity and clarity to judgments, providing a concrete goal to constituent members of an organization (university). In other words, effective use of benchmarking activities comprises: (1) selecting an “ideal scenario” against which to pursue reform and improvement – namely, identifying best practice (good examples) in the business processes of an organization with top-level performance and results in a certain field, and (2) quantifying the “current situation” of the organization and the desired “goal” to enable continuous measurement and comprehension of the progress and outcomes of improvement activities.\textsuperscript{6}

The management approaches discussed in I and II above are now being applied actively to university management, education, and research. The benchmarking approach has quickly been adopted in university evaluation structures in Western countries. One example is an initiative of the European Centre for Strategic Management for Universities (http://www.esmu.be)\textsuperscript{7} which involved benchmarking among European universities under the themes of “internationalization” and “interuniversity cooperation” in 2005.

To conclude this discussion, Table III-2-1 presents the benefits of universities adopting a strategic approach to internationalization and international activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table III-2-1: Stages of university internationalization and international activity based on the PDCA cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3rd phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5th phase</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Attracting external funds for international education and research

(1) Trends and issues

In the wake of incorporation of national universities, many universities in Japan are being required to address issues of access to external funds and diversification of financial resources. The most common method of accessing external funds is to apply for and obtain funding allocated on a competitive basis. Recently, competitive funds are tending to account for an increasingly significant share of budget allocations to universities (Figure III-3-1), and universities are stepping up their efforts to attract such funds.

![Figure III-3-1 Changes in major financial support for universities by year](source: Prepared by JSPS, based on material published by MEXT)

The most common types of competitive, prioritized resource allocation to institutions are probably the support programs offered in various forms in the areas of education and research. In recent years, these programs have often tended to place an emphasis on “internationality”. The launch of the “Global COE Program” in FY 2007 as a successor to the “21st Century COE Program” symbolized the fact that “internationality” is becoming an important keyword for winning external funds. In addition to the Global COE Program, efforts to promote internationalization are being made across the fields of education, research, and collaboration between academia and industry. These efforts include: the “World Premier International
Research Center Initiative”, which started in the same fiscal year as the Global COE Program with the purpose of establishing research hubs to gather distinguished researchers from around the globe; programs for “improvement of the system to promote international collaboration of industry, academia, and the government,” which will start as part of the “University Intellectual Property Headquarters Development Project”; and the “Program to Promote Internationalization in University Education” which was launched in fiscal 2005.

A common element in the selection processes of these programs is emphasis on international validity and a development of a sound international network of educational and research institutions. As discussed in the next chapter “4. Participation in international partnerships and consortiums”, it is important to utilize good-quality international, interuniversity partnerships and international consortiums effectively in order to secure the competitive, prioritized domestic funds required for international activities.

Support programs offered by MEXT are not the only means of obtaining external funding for international activity. Accepting a project order for international development cooperation is another possible fund-raising measure. Previously, it was difficult for national universities to enter into contracts with aid organizations and accept project orders because they were not incorporated. Incorporation, however, has made it possible for any national university to bid for a project and accept an order as a contracting entity. As a result, national universities are now able to collaborate with the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) based on a trustee contract, as opposed to the previous system in which they could only become involved in response to a direct request (this is a shift from reactive to proactive participation). An increasing number of universities are registered with JICA as consultants (19 national universities and 17 private universities as of October 2006) and are accepting technical cooperation project orders.

Support programs offered by MEXT are not the only means of obtaining external funding for international activity. Accepting a project order for international development cooperation is another possible fund-raising measure. Previously, it was difficult for national universities to enter into contracts with aid organizations and accept project orders because they were not incorporated. Incorporation, however, has made it possible for any national university to bid for a project and accept an order as a contracting entity. As a result, national universities are now able to collaborate with the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) based on a trustee contract, as opposed to the previous system in which they could only become involved in response to a direct request (this is a shift from reactive to proactive participation). An increasing number of universities are registered with JICA as consultants (19 national universities and 17 private universities as of October 2006) and are accepting technical cooperation project orders.

Table III-3-1: Examples of project orders received by universities (as of October, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Representative body</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Strengthening of the Teacher Education Program</td>
<td>System Science Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>Naruto University of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Project for Improving Science and Mathematics Education at Upper Secondary Level</td>
<td>PADECO Co., Ltd.</td>
<td>Aichi University of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Strengthening Primary Teacher Training in Science and Mathematics</td>
<td>PADECO Co., Ltd.</td>
<td>Hiroshima University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Japan-China Meteorological Disaster Cooperative Research Center Project</td>
<td>The University of Tokyo</td>
<td>Japan Weather Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Project for Improving Higher Education Institutions through University-Industry-Community Links (Hi-Link) in Gadjah Mada University</td>
<td>Kyushu University</td>
<td>IC Net Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Project for Research and Education Development on Information and Communication Technology in ITS (PREDICT-ITS)</td>
<td>Kumamoto University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>Development of the Faculty of Economics and Management of the National University of Laos</td>
<td>Kobe University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>The Upgrading IT Education Project (Information Technology Bridging)</td>
<td>Tokai University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another method is to seek funding overseas. As funding systems are being internationalized progressively, obtaining overseas funding can serve as an important indicator of “internationality”. According to the “Report of the Survey of Scientific, Technological and Academic Activities in the Universities” (2006) published by the National Institute of Science and Technology Policy, however, the total funds provided by “foreign countries” stood at only 850 million yen (0.17%) out of the 498.3 billion yen of external research funds provided to the 677 national, public, and private institutions that responded to survey questionnaires. These figures demonstrate that universities obtaining overseas funds are still very much the exception.

(2) Notable Efforts

**Hitotsubashi University and Kobe University: Accessing EU funds as a hub for EU Studies**

The European Union (EU) has recently launched several projects to promote stronger partnership and cooperation with other regions, including North America and Japan. One of these is the “EU Institute” initiative, whereby the European Commission establishes centers for high-level academic research on the EU in locations outside the EU area.

Hitotsubashi University founded the EUIJ (EU Institute in Japan) Tokyo in April 2004 in partnership with the International Christian University, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, and Tsuda College, while Kobe University founded the EUIJ (EU Institute in Japan) Kansai in April 2005 together with Osaka University and Kwansei Gakuin University. Hitotsubashi and Kobe both serve as the managing universities for their respective Institutes. Using funds provided by the EU, both the Institutes engage in education and research on EU issues, as well as disseminating information and undertaking outreach activities.

Kobe University reports that it experienced secondary effects as a result of receiving funds from the EU, such as internationalization of its accounting department.

**Waseda University: Provision of business management training funded by the EU**

As part of a consortium with Institut d’Études Politiques de Paris, Universita’ Bocconi, and the School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London, Waseda University was commissioned to implement the “EU Executive Training Programme – Japan: ETP-J”. ETP-J is offered by the European Commission with support from the Association of European Chambers of Commerce and Industry, and provides Japanese language and business management training programs to selected business executives from EU member countries. It is designed to furnish opportunities for EU enterprises to explore business potential in the Japanese market, deepen their knowledge and understanding of Japan, and establish and promote new relationships with Japan. Waseda University provides six-month training courses in advanced Japanese language and business culture. This training is offered to executives who have already undergone a three-month intensive training program held at the three European universities mentioned above before they arrive in Japan. Subsequently to Waseda’s course, participants spend three months training at Japanese business enterprises. Waseda University has received grants from the EU as a result of its involvement in ETP-J.

**Hiroshima University: Receiving project commissions through joint venture arrangements**

Since incorporation universities have been permitted to receive direct commissions to undertake technical cooperation projects from JICA. In such cases a university can either
accept the entire project commission by itself, or can form a consortium with a consultancy firm. The latter arrangement is known as a joint venture.

Hiroshima University is a pioneer in this method and was the first national university to receive a project order in 2004. This order reflected positive evaluation of the university’s record of involvement in international development cooperation activities in developing countries, chiefly through the Graduate School for International Development and Cooperation and the Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education.

One of the advantages of forming a joint venture is that it enables the strengths of both parties to be utilized, combining the “knowledge (accumulated research and educational functions)” and “human resources (faculty, researchers, and students)” of a university with the expertise in documentation and project management of a consultancy firm.

Nagasaki University: Strategic fund-raising for international activities clearly identified as a task for the Center for International Collaborative Research

Nagasaki University’s Center for International Collaborative Research identifies “activities to obtain external funds” as the top priority in its mission. It aims to engage in international activities through cooperation projects implemented by the United Nations (UN), the World Health Organization (WHO), JICA, the World Bank, and other domestic and international organizations.

The university used the “funds to establish a research hub for emerging and reemerging infectious diseases” and the “special education and research funds and collaborative project funds” to establish bases in Vietnam in March 2006 and Kenya in September 2005, as well as applying funds from the SIH Project to enhance the organizational capability of its own Center for International Collaborative Research. Some activities were supported by funding from JICA. Operational costs for a drug development diploma course, opened in 2006, are shared equally between the university and the WHO.

(3) Analysis and Proposals

More opportunities for good-quality consortiums to access funding (Trends in the EU)

Particularly within the EU, there is a growing shift away from funds directed to individual institutional units and towards funding for networks. It is becoming more common for universities to form consortium relationships to develop their educational and research activities and access funds thereby. More funds flow into consortiums of good quality. Universities are seeking partners to form consortiums that can attract such funds. This tendency can be observed even in Japan, with more public resources being allocated on a competitive, prioritized basis. A structure is being developed under which funds will tend to flow to university networks capable of more organized collaborative activities.

The EU’s 7th Research and Development Framework Program (FP7), which began in 2007, places more emphasis on “internationality” encompassing areas outside the EU than its predecessor FP6. As a result, more cooperative programs with areas outside the EU, including Japan and North America, are being developed. The EU is earnestly seeking the active involvement of Japanese universities, but the number of universities participating remains low. Universities that have improved their organizational capabilities, including administrative systems, to facilitate access to funds from international sources are pioneering examples from which other universities should learn. The secondary impacts felt in terms of internationalization of administrative functions such as accounting should also be evaluated highly.

Hitotsubashi and Kobe Universities’ involvement in the “EU Institute” was introduced above, but the EU also offers a variety of other programs that can be utilized by universities
outside Europe, including Japan. These programs include the “Erasmus Mundus Program” designed to strengthen interuniversity collaboration and enhance the quality and competitiveness of higher education in Europe, and the “Marie Curie Actions” designed to increase the mobility of researchers in Europe.

**Increased opportunities to obtain international cooperation funds**

There is widespread demand for a more effective, efficient approach to Official Development Assistance (ODA) in Japan, with calls for a new emphasis on strategy and a shift from quantity to quality. In this climate, attention has been directed to the possibilities for government to promote intellectual international contribution by harnessing the intellectual resources of Japanese universities (research results and advanced human resource development functions).

These developments have made participation in international cooperation projects, and application of university “knowledge” thereto, one of the most important pillars of international activity in Japanese universities. It is notable that incorporation has provided national universities with more opportunities for collaboration with JICA and the Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC).

It is to be hoped that the efforts of individual universities can be accompanied by the development of further opportunities for many different universities to share their information and know-how, through “Support and Coordination Project for University Cooperation in International Development” by MEXT.

---

**Note: Acceptance of foreign students and trainees in JBIC's yen-loan-financed projects**

Collaboration between universities and the Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC), which was difficult in the past, has been increasing rapidly in the wake of university incorporation.

---

5 “Erasmus” is an exchange program for students and teachers in Europe. It is designed to increase the mobility of students and academics at higher education institutions within Europe and support learning and experience in foreign countries. A decision made in December 2003 led to the launch of the five-year “Erasmus Mundus Program” (with a budget of 230 million Euros) aimed at cooperation with non-EU countries and to promote the EU as a center of excellence. Erasmus Mundus targets master’s degree programs and includes (1) establishment of the “Erasmus Mundus Master’s Course” offered by a consortium composed of universities of at least three countries in Europe, (2) support for scholarship for foreign students (attending a masters’ course) and researchers from countries outside Europe, (3) conclusion of cross-border partnership agreements among universities across different countries, and (4) support for projects designed to enhance interest in higher education in Europe and support for the mutual credit transfer system with universities in third countries. As many as 100 “Erasmus Mundus Master’s Courses” have been established so far, supporting approximately 5,000 Master’s degree students from countries outside Europe, and more than 4,000 graduate students from EU member countries conducting research outside the EU. This program also provides support for teachers, with the participation of 1,000 teachers from within Europe and the same number from outside. As many as 100 partnerships have been formed with higher education institutions in non-EU countries.

6 “Marie Curie Actions” is the popular name for activities to promote the mobility and training of researchers, aimed at realization of the European Research Area (ERA). An annual average budget of approximately 680 million Euros (100 billion yen) is allocated for these activities under the EU’s 7th Framework Program (2007-2013). Activities include fellowship programs for individual researchers and programs to support institutions such as the Initial Training Network (ITN) designed to assist organizational, institutional exchanges and development of young researchers. The 7th Framework Program is strengthening support for exchange with non-European institutions including those in Japan, as well as exchange among institutions within Europe.
Table III-3-2: Cooperation between JBIC and universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2003</th>
<th>FY2004</th>
<th>FY2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of commissioned studies in which a university was involved</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of the above, number of contracts in which a university was a contracting party</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project Development Department, Japan Bank for International Cooperation, *Collaboration between the Japan Bank for International Cooperation and Universities (unofficial translation of title)*.6)

As is the case with JICA, there are various examples of collaboration between JBIC and universities. One major approach is that of proposal-based survey projects, in which universities can participate proactively. This scheme is aimed at conducting surveys to accumulate knowledge and data to inform the development of yen-loan-financed projects. Each survey is implemented based on a proposal made by the commissioned entities. It envisages universities, local authorities and NGOs as commissioned entities. (Entity type is also taken into account in evaluation.)

Furthermore, JBIC is accepting foreign students and trainees under yen-loan-financed projects as part of its human resource development efforts. As a new form of collaboration in addition to regular foreign student intake, JBIC is now offering programs to be implemented through cooperation between higher education institutions in Japan and a foreign country. These programs include the “Twinning Program” under a loan-financed project offered by the Malaysian Higher Education Fund (HELP 1 and 2), and the “Double Degree (Linkage Program)” under the Indonesian Advanced Human Development Project (III). JBIC holds a briefing session for these programs, and interested universities apply to participate.

**Improving systems for fund-raising**

In order for a university to establish collaborative relationships with good partners and obtain appropriate funds, it is important to gain a full comprehension of educational and research conditions within the university, collect a broad range of information on funding schemes both at home and abroad, and apply for funds in a strategic, focused manner. Nagasaki University’s approach is worthy of attention: this university improved its system through measures such as recruiting outside personnel, and its headquarters is now functioning effectively to obtain funding from external sources.

In addition, it will be necessary for universities to start revising their university regulations and improving their administrative procedures in areas such as finance, accounting and personnel. They will need to develop an institution-wide system that facilitates the task of obtaining funds from overseas.

**References:**


2) Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) (2005) “Kokusai kaihatsu kyōryoku sapōto sentā purojekuto [Support and Coordination Project for University Cooperation in International Development]”, in *Daigaku no tame no kokusai kyōryoku purojekuto jutaku no tebiki* [Introduction to Accepting an Entrusted
Online: http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/kokusai/kyouiku/seminar/06120610/019.pdf


Online: http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/kokusai/003/shiryou/06090103/001.htm

4. Participation in international partnerships and consortiums

(1) Trends and issues

Along with the progressive globalization of the higher education market, international partnerships between universities across national borders are expanding rapidly. The most common form of international partnership established under public frameworks at the university-wide level that of academic exchange agreements concluded between two universities. According to surveys conducted by MEXT (Results of the Survey on the State of Conclusion of Inter-university Agreements (as of October 1, 2004)), the number of interuniversity partnership agreements concluded by universities was 2,997 in FY 1990, but increased to 11,292 in FY 2004 (Figure III-4-1). In particular, the number has increased rapidly over the past several years and almost doubled between FY 2000 and FY 2004, attesting to the expansion in international partnership arrangements in Japanese universities.

In addition to these traditional partnerships, the number of consortium-type (or alliance [league]-type) arrangements bringing together multiple universities has been increasing in recent years. This is demonstrated by the fact that above-mentioned surveys began to include consortium-type agreements as a discrete survey category from FY 2004.

Typically, consortium relationships take the form of either partnerships established between two consortiums under a bilateral or regional framework, or kind of multinational league arrangement comprising a multiple number of universities. At first, Japanese
universities tended to form consortiums amongst themselves and then engage in exchange with similar consortiums overseas on a bilateral or regional basis. The above-mentioned MEXT (in FY 2004) reported 15 consortium-type arrangements with a total of 83 agreements, with all examples cited belonging to the bilateral consortium-to-consortium type of arrangement just described. Recently, however, universities sharing a common profile have begun to form alliance-type partnerships under an international framework. As a result, an increased number of Japanese universities, chiefly large research universities, are now participating in multilateral cross-border consortiums. Table III-4-1 lists the major international consortiums.

All the consortiums shown in Table III-4-1 are ambitious schemes envisaging a broad range of activities. Although the concept of a consortium is itself still young and many initiatives remain at the developmental stage, it is true that international consortiums already provide member universities with a framework for international deployment of various activities including education, research, and administration/management. Consortium-type organizational arrangements are becoming more sophisticated and competitive research funding for international alliances is also increasing. In response to this, more and more Japanese universities are seeking to use the opportunities furnished by participation in consortiums as a catalyst to greater international activity within their own organizations.

This section will report notable efforts in this area with a focus on (1) what leads Japanese universities to participate in international interuniversity partnerships and consortiums, (2) how universities contribute to consortium activities, and (3) how they utilize the opportunities brought by consortium participation to enhance their international activities and vitalize their organizations as a whole.

---

As typical examples of a consortium-type agreement, this survey detailed the “Agreement on the Network Scheme of Hyogo University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific,” the “Agreement on Student Exchange for the Design and Manufacture in Mechatronics Project,” the “Consortium japonais du Collège doctoral franco-japonais,” and the “Agreement for Friendship between universities in Jiangsu, China and Ishiwaka, Japan.(tentative title)”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/region</th>
<th>Consortium, etc.</th>
<th>Activities (including some activities in the planning phase)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Participating Japanese universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Asia              | AEARU (Association of East Asian Research Universities) | Student exchange, faculty exchange, development of common curricula and credit transfer systems, sharing facilities, equipment and information, joint research, workshops and international events, etc. | 1996    | Kyoto University (1996)  
                         |                                                    |                                                    |         | Osaka University (1996)  
                         |                                                    |                                                    |         | Tohoku University (1998)  
                         |                                                    |                                                    |         | Tokyo Institute of Technology (1996)  
                         |                                                    |                                                    |         | University of Tokyo (1996)  
                         |                                                    |                                                    |         | University of Tsukuba (1996)  |
| Pacific Rim region| APRU (Association of Pacific Rim Universities) | Annual university president meetings, senior staff meetings, APRU projects (knowledge and technology transfer among APRU member universities), joint research projects, distance education (including online education), research symposia, fellow programs (including holding a series of seminars on specific themes and award seed grants), doctoral student conferences, and student exchange (including summer programs for undergraduate students) | 1997    | Keio University (2002)  
                         |                                                    |                                                    |         | Kyoto University (1997)  
                         |                                                    |                                                    |         | Osaka University (1997)  
                         |                                                    |                                                    |         | University of Tokyo (1997)  
                         |                                                    |                                                    |         | Waseda University (1997)  |
| International     | Universitas 21                        | Conferences and meetings (for participants at various levels from top management to undergraduate students, and in various forms including field-specific and university-wide gatherings), student exchange (including study abroad programs, summer schools, and research presentation meetings), online graduate school programs, research-based interaction (researcher exchange and joint research), competitive research funds, publication of e-books, etc. | 1997    | Waseda University (2006)  |
| International     | INU (International Network of Universities) | Conferences and meetings (AGM, administrative- and student-level conferences/meetings and research workshops on internationalization and education), student exchange, faculty and staff exchange, research cooperation, joint programs (education), awards and grants (research fellowship and seed funding), benchmarking activities, etc. | 1999    | Hiroshima University (2000)  
                         |                                                    |                                                    |         | Ritsumeikan University |
| International     | WUN (Worldwide Universities Network) | Joint research, exchange of doctoral students and researchers through the International Research Mobility Scheme (IRMS), e-learning, interactive online video seminars, etc. | 2000    |                                                    |                                                    |         |                                                    |
| Asia              | Conference of Asian University Presidents | University president conferences, research and educational cooperation bases (network points and branch offices), student exchange (ASEP, common curriculum, and joint summer programs), and development of young researchers (acceptance at Kyushu University) | 2000    | Kyushu University (2000)  |
| International     | AC21 (Academic Consortium 21)         | Student exchange, faculty and staff exchange, sharing information on research areas of interest and academic activities, development of collaborative education programs, support for regional cross-cultural exchanges, and AC21 international forums | 2002    | Nagoya University (2002)  |
| International     | IARU (International Alliance of Research Universities) | Conferences and meetings, joint research, joint projects (workshops) related to various university activities, student exchange, faculty and staff exchange, summer schools, internships, and development of joint/bilateral degree systems | 2006    | University of Tokyo (1996)  |
| International     | CAAS (Consortium for Asian and African Studies) | Researcher exchange, student exchange, joint academic events such as international conferences, seminars, symposiums, and lectures, deployment of joint research projects, joint development of young researchers, and sharing publications and information | 2007    | Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (2007)  |

*1 The underlined universities are pilot institutions in the SIH Project.  
*2 The Conference of Asian University Presidents is not an “international consortium” but is included in the list because it is similar to one in that it is based on a partnership scheme, possesses a Charter, and engages in student exchange and other activities beyond the usual scope of a conference of university presidents.
(2) Notable efforts

Keio University: Strategic conclusion of interuniversity exchange agreements

Keio University is making efforts to establish university-level relationships with prominent overseas universities and research institutes because it is aware that it has fewer foreign students and agreements than other universities in Japan with a similar profile.

When establishing a new relationship, Keio takes the strategic approach of maintaining its strengths while overcoming its weaknesses: this entails a process of analysis of current conditions, surveys and site visits, followed by conclusion of agreements under the initiative of the international strategy headquarters and chiefly through the diplomatic channel of the President. In parallel with this, Keio is making efforts to develop existing faculty- or graduate school-based networks with prominent overseas educational and research institutes into university-wide agreements. As a result, between 2005 and 2006 the number of exchange agreements increased by 52 and the foreign student population by about 100.

Nagoya University: Taking initiative in a consortium

Nagoya University is a member of the Academic Consortium 21 (AC21), together with 24 other universities across 12 countries. AC21 was proposed by Nagoya University under the leadership of the President and established in 2002. Nagoya University called on its own partner universities to participate in the consortium and played a leading role from the preparation stage. The AC21 secretariat is located within Nagoya University. This led to a secondary effect of strengthening the university’s administrative systems. (See Chapter 6 “Training and securing administrative personnel” for related information.)

Nagoya University actively participates in International Forums and Student World Forums (both held every two years), benchmarking (see Chapter 2 “Goal setting, action plans, and evaluation systems” for a detailed description) and other activities conducted by AC21.

University of Tokyo: Enhancement of international presence through participation in consortiums

The University of Tokyo participates in several international consortiums established under regional frameworks, including the Association of East Asian Research Universities (AEARU), the Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU), and the International Alliance of Research Universities (IARU). These consortiums were all established around flagship universities in each country. Through active involvement in and contribution to these consortiums, the University of Tokyo is working to enhance its presence on the international stage.

AEARU, the first consortium in which the University of Tokyo participated, holds summer camps for students, theme-based workshops for researchers, workshops for administrative personnel, etc., in addition to general meetings and board of directors meetings. The university is actively involved in all these activities.

Osaka University, Kyoto University, Tokyo Institute of Technology and Tohoku University also participate in AEARU. (See 6. “Developing and securing administrators and staff” for discussion of Kyoto University’s activities in this forum.)

Hiroshima University: Utilizing a consortium framework to strengthen institutional profile

Hiroshima University has been participating in the International Network of Universities (INU) since 2000. INU comprises 12 universities across eight countries. Hiroshima University actively participates in INU’s student seminars, research workshops, shadowing programs for administrative personnel, conferences on education, distance education programs, etc. as a board member.

Hiroshima University, proclaims “the pursuit of peace” as one of its basic philosophies and is utilizing the consortium’s framework to deploy international initiatives in line with its
vision, providing a peace-themed subject (Peace and Change) taught in English for distance education using WebCT, and holding student seminars on the theme of “Peace” jointly funded by INU (with 55 participants). These activities underline the university’s distinctive character and strengthen its institutional profile.

**Tokyo University of Foreign Studies: Establishment of an international consortium under the initiative of headquarters**

Tokyo University of Foreign Studies established the Consortium for Asian and African Studies (CAAS) in March 2007 to develop linkage and promote cooperation with top-level overseas institutions in the field of Asian and African studies, and to form a world-standard hub for research and education in this field. The French National Institute of Oriental Languages and Civilizations (INALCO), Leiden University, the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences of the National University of Singapore, and School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London also participate in this consortium. Tokyo University of Foreign Studies led the establishment of the consortium and now serves as its administrator.

This is notable as a pioneering example for several reasons. It is one of the few consortiums in the field of arts and social sciences, it envisages international contribution from a basic research foundation, it is led by a Japanese university, and it was instigated through the leadership of the university’s international strategy headquarters.

**Tottori University: Interuniversity partnership developed from municipal-level exchange**

Tottori Prefecture has a long history of exchange and friendship with Gangwon Province in South Korea, Jilin Province in China, coastal states in Russia, and Tuv Province in Mongolia, all located around the Japan Sea. Developing out of the “Summit of North East Asian Regional Governments for International Exchange and Cooperation” attended by governors of all these provinces and states, the “Conference of North East Asian University Professors (tentative title)” was formed, with the involvement of universities in the region. The conference aims to promote academic exchange among member universities and resolve common issues for Northeast Asia by utilizing university resources. The first meeting will be held in fall 2007.

(3) Analysis and proposals

**Purpose of participating in consortiums**

It is believed that establishing or participating in a consortium brings the following benefits to universities.

(i) Enhancement of international prestige and presence

Recently, international activity in universities is coming to encompass more large-scale, well-organized partnership. Participation in and active contribution to a quality consortium is an important means for an institution to enhance its international prestige and presence. Many of the international consortiums cited above impose strict conditions for membership. Joining an top international consortium can thus serve as a tool to guarantee a certain level of university quality.

(ii) Strengthening the foundation for effective, efficient deployment of international activities

As stated earlier, participating in a consortium itself brings benefits to member universities. However, “participation” in a consortium is a means, not an objective. The important thing is to utilize opportunities brought by consortium participation in order to develop international activities and ultimately apply them to reform and improvement throughout the university.

In fact, consortium participation strengthens all areas of university activity, including education, research, and administration/management, and furnishes opportunities for effective, efficient deployment of various initiatives. Nagoya University conducts benchmarking, staff training, and research exchange utilizing a consortium it proposed itself.
This is a very interesting example in that the university is seeking to utilize opportunities brought through the consortium in its own organization’s administration and management, as well as in education and research activities.

(iii) Developing distinctive institutional character and enhancing university profile

Some universities are applying consortium activities to develop stronger institutional character and higher profile. For example, Hiroshima University is taking positive steps to develop activities in line with its basic philosophy of “the pursuit of peace”, utilizing a framework of international networks to engage in distance education, peace-themed student seminars and other projects. Tokyo University of Foreign Studies has established a discipline-based consortium under the initiative of headquarters, utilizing its “strength” in Asian and African studies. These are notable efforts.

(iv) Facilitating access to funding

Universities expect that participation in a consortium will work to their advantage in terms of obtaining external funds. Although any attempt to verify effectiveness in obtaining external funds would be premature at this stage, judging from directions in competitive funding allocation in Europe and Japan, there appears to be an international shift towards funding for consortium-based networks rather than individual institutions. In this regard, it is expected that participating in a prominent consortium that conducts substantial activities, and engaging in these activities in a positive manner, will be an important element in facilitating access to external funds.

Strategic approach to strengthening partnerships

A variety of international consortiums have been formed and developed internationally, but not many of them have involved Japanese universities as a driving force from the establishment stage. As shown in Table III-4-2, however, an increasing number of Japanese universities are leading the establishment of consortiums, assuming important posts in their operation, and working actively to develop initiatives within them. A large number of international consortiums are still in the developmental stage. Increasingly, Japanese universities will be expected to strengthen organizational partnerships with other member institutions, develop a win-win relationship in which all partners can enjoy benefits, and contribute to further invigoration of consortium activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Consortium</th>
<th>(FY 2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association of East Asian Research Universities</td>
<td>Vice President (President-designate):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AEARU)</td>
<td>Kyoto University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU)</td>
<td>Board member:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Network of Universities (INU)</td>
<td>Vice President: Hiroshima University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Consortium 21 (AC21)</td>
<td>Initiator/Secretariat/Steering Committee member:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nagoya University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium for Asian and African Studies (CAAS)</td>
<td>Initiator/Secretariat:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tokyo University of Foreign Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference of Asian University Presidents</td>
<td>Initiator/Steering and Administrative Liaison Committee member:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyushu University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A university serving as a consortium secretariat can benefit from a secondary effect of strengthening their own administrative capacity to perform international operations in general. This process often presents a major challenge for the university involved. It is desirable, however, that universities use such opportunities and experiences as a means to
further internationalize their administrative and management functions.

Many international consortiums and other organized international partnerships evolved out of joint research projects conducted in the past. Therefore, it will be important for headquarters to gain a sufficient grasp of activities within each individual division and department within their universities in order to promote and deploy university-wide international initiatives strategically. Some universities are developing international networks through such departmental activities. Keio University, for example, is attempting to harness the high-quality networks developed in each of its faculties and departments to formulate university-wide initiatives. Such efforts are important in that they provide university-wide support for progressive activities at individual departmental level as well as strategic deployment of international activity in the university as a whole.

While organizational partnerships can be developed out of discrete international joint research activities, there are also some cases where consortiums function to vitalize such activities themselves. Development of a university-wide framework produces mechanisms to promote and support international joint research, resulting in formulation of new research projects and streamlined management processes. Recently, some international consortiums have themselves instigated joint research initiatives. Under this method, rather than relying on a track record of joint research in its member universities, a consortium launches a research project based on a common area of interest coordinated among member universities, then invites faculty members from member universities to participate. This style of joint research provides individual researchers with opportunities to access wider international research networks.

Consortiums bring a wide range of opportunities, but they also present many challenges. The most difficult and important issue is securing funds to establish and maintain consortiums. Several consortiums currently operate by supplementing their fiscal base of membership fees with external funds such as voluntary contributions and international research funding schemes. However, such funding sources are not necessarily sufficient, and financial problems are undoubtedly restricting consortium activities. In order to secure sustainability and further develop their activities, it will be increasingly crucial for consortiums to devise more effective means for fund-raising.

Furthermore, a range of models for consortium organization could be explored. It would be beneficial to consider the possibility of developing new types of partnership, including consortiums with an element of international cooperation between industry and academia (plus government).

Reference

1) Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) (2005) Daigakutôkan kôryû kyôtei teiketsu jôkyôtô chôsa no kekka ni tsuite (heisei16nen 10gatsu 1nichi genzai) [Results of the Survey on the State of Conclusion of Inter-university Agreements (as of October 1, 2004)].
5. Expansion of international activities based on specific transnational research projects

(1) Trends and issues

Most of the 20 institutions selected for this project are approaching it from the perspective of how the “international strategy headquarters” should promote internationalization or international deployment on a university-wide, cross-divisional basis. However, Nagasaki University, Tottori University, and Niigata University take the approach of supporting international deployment of specific research projects on a priority basis, then applying the know-how obtained through these projects to other parts of the university. At Niigata University, the “international strategy headquarters” has gone so far as to select and support one single project from among the range of existing initiatives at the university.

Hokkaido University has set a relatively broad range of target fields and focused its support on projects under the theme of “Sustainable Development.”

Although not a discrete research field, a clearly-defined “Asia-oriented” approach is the focus for international strategy at Kyushu University. This theme provides the core for development of all the university’s strategic international initiatives.

Because internationalization through these approaches is intrinsically different from the general approach to across-the-board improvement, it has been selected for specific attention in this section.

The universities discussed here adopt a strategy of focusing on research projects and fields in which they have a pre-existing specialization that may have been recognized through selection under the 21st Century COE Program. Their international strategy headquarters support international deployment of these research fields on a priority basis, making maximum use of external funding and overseas activity bases and applying the outcomes generated to further efforts in other arms of the university.

Efforts made by the National Institutes of Natural Sciences (NINS), which is the only non-university institution selected for this project, will also be described here. Although they are different from the initiatives of the aforementioned universities, they provide another example of international deployment with the focus on research.

(2) Notable efforts

Tottori University: Using a track record of joint research as a base for further international activity

Tottori University is developing international initiatives in the fields of education and research on a university-wide basis under the theme of “combating desertification”. In October 2005 the university opened a base for education and research in Mexico, which was already an established site for field research undertaken by the university. The base is located within the Centro de Investigaciones Biológicas del Noroeste, S.C. (CIBNOR), with which the university had previously collaborated in education and joint research. The base is used as a hub for student study abroad programs, research activities and technical education (with plans to extend into South America in the future). Through participation in JICA projects and the like, the university has also developed constructive relationships with other countries involved in similar activities (China, Egypt and Mexico).

Nagasaki University: Strategic leverage of external funds and development of an international activity base founded on core fields of expertise

Nagasaki University provides comprehensive support for international activities connected primarily to the university’s chief research strengths – the fields of “tropical and infectious diseases”, “radiation medical science” and “marine environment and biological resources”. This support encompasses tasks such as obtaining funding, processing accounts and...
responding to inquiries. Selection under the 21st Century COE Program and the “Program of Founding Research Centers for Emerging and Reemerging Infectious Diseases” led to the establishment of a new base in Vietnam in 2006. In particular, the university plans to support research on “tropical and infectious diseases” first and subsequently apply its results to other fields.

Niigata University: Identifying and providing priority support for internationally competitive research projects within the university

Niigata University’s approach is to use its HQ for Global Strategy, established in June 2005, to identify in-house research resources with the potential for development into international-standard academic research, launch cross-university pilot projects, and focus support on the projects. (The current keyword for this initiative is GIS (Geographical Information Systems), with horizontal development of internal education and research initiatives on uses for GIS in medical and engineering fields, and international projects encompassing the fields of medicine, urban engineering and reconstruction science promoted through the university’s international network of partner institutions). The university's International Academic Support Office provides assistance to specific projects designated according to strategic criteria.

Hokkaido University: Aiming to create an international research “brand” in the field of sustainable development

This university’s international strategy headquarters, established under the President in 2005, selects in-house research projects that have produced results in the five characteristic research fields related to “sustainable development”: (1) global warming; (2) integrated water management; (3) establishment of a recycling-oriented global community; (4) stable procurement of food and forest resources; and (5) measures against infectious disease. Organic linkages are developed between the projects, and focused support is provided for them.

Kyushu University: Sending a clear “Asia-oriented” message and aiming to serve as a gateway to Asia

Kyushu University has proclaimed an “Asia-oriented” scheme for its future. It has hosted the “Conference of Asian University Presidents”, the “University Summit in Kyushu” and other events led by the university under Presidential initiative. The university also opened the Asia Center under the direction of the President. It is envisaged that the Center will function as a strategic education and research base capable of making policy recommendations and exercising other forms of influence in wider society.

In January 2007, the university established the “Team for the Planning & Coordinating of International joint research” within the Organization for the Planning and Coordination of International Affairs. The team is comprised of seven researchers in different fields with established track records in joint research in Asia. The researchers share examples of good practice and formulate ways to apply them to other divisions and departments within the university.

National Institutes of Natural Sciences: Creation of a trans-disciplinary international community capitalizing on institutional characteristics

National Institutes of Natural Sciences (NINS) has five independent, distinctive laboratories which deploy international academic research activities independently of one another. NINS is operated according to the basic notion that it significance lies in the circulation of academic research across a broad range of academic fields rather than confining research outcomes to the fields in which they were generated. Based on this notion, NINS aims to support the free international academic exchange of researchers in across many
different academic fields.

NINS is now considering the development of an “in-residence international joint research scheme” under which researchers from around the world would gather at NINS and engage in discussion and debate, with a view to creating new research fields and re-establishing the ideal of academism.

NINS established its international strategy headquarters in August 2005, with NINS President serving as the head. The International Cooperation Office was set up within the headquarters.

The establishment of the international strategy headquarters was used as an opportunity to develop a network of internal personnel in charge of international operations. These personnel meet regularly and share information and expertise from each laboratory for the purpose of yielding improvements for NINS as a whole.

(3) Analysis and proposals

Effectiveness of support for specific fields on a priority basis

The approach of providing support for international deployment in specialty fields may not work at large-scale universities which place importance on the autonomy of each department. However, this approach could be successfully applied in universities with limited human resources and funds for international activities.

Multifaceted utilization of “research” bases

Nagasaki University and Tottori University have established overseas bases as an indispensable part of their research strategy. It is noteworthy that these overseas bases are utilized not only for research activities, but also provide support for distinctive international education programs incorporating long-term overseas training, internships, and the like.

Important features of activities conducted by universities cited in “Notable Efforts”

Recently, domestic research funding schemes are increasingly demanding an international approach. It is notable that the universities cited above equate “research strategy” with “international strategy”, with the departments concerned collaborating under a unified approach and placing particular importance on fund-raising.

Also noteworthy is Nagasaki University's multi-tiered approach, successfully combining several different internal and external funds.

The approaches of Nagasaki University, Tottori University, and Niigata University share a common characteristic whereby the headquarters allocate human and physical resources on a priority basis to international deployment of specialty fields. Utilizing characteristic features to promote international development in a focused manner can serve as a viable option particularly for smaller-scale universities. All the efforts cited above are designed in order that the expertise they generate may be applied to other fields of activity. It is thus important to monitor how they develop into the future.

The approaches of Hokkaido University and Kyushu University involve prioritizing a certain interdisciplinary theme that is conceived as characteristic of the university, and developing international activity around this theme. Efforts of these universities are notable in that international activity highlights each university's distinctive character.

NINS's “in-residence international joint research scheme” is a substantial scheme that employs and international viewpoint to demonstrate the significance of integrating five laboratories with different attributes. It is hoped that the scheme takes concrete shape in the coming years.
6. Training and securing administrative personnel

(1) Trends and issues

As globalization in the fields of research and education continues to progress rapidly, universities seeking to expand and strengthen their international activities must now accord high priority to recruitment and development of administrative personnel to support their international efforts. All aspects of university activity – including research cooperation, educational affairs, business-academia collaboration, accounting/finance and personnel affairs – now encompass “international elements”. Personnel involved in management are increasingly required at least to have an international viewpoint and the ability to resolve problems containing such international elements.

This chapter will discuss how to secure and train personnel needed to support university-wide international deployment: not only those in charge of international exchange and foreign student affairs, but general administrative staff also.

Enhancement of the quality of university administrative personnel, not only those directly involved in international operations, is recognized as an important issue in university reform. Yamamoto (2006) discussed the type of personnel required by universities as follows:

The recent trend to greater complexity and sophistication in university management conditions has brought growing demand for personnel who possess advanced specialist expertise and can utilize it practically, or who can exercise leadership based on these skills. They belong to quadrant I in the figure [Figure III-6-1] . . . . Universities need personnel who have “problem-solving ability”. This applies to both management staff with either academic or administrative backgrounds, and to non-managerial specialists. I call this class of personnel “Professionals”.1)

As shown in Figure III-6-1 and based on Yamamoto’s diagram, the required types of personnel are:

A. “Professionals” needed for strategic international deployment. It is envisaged that these will be individuals capable of advancing the university’s international strategy through channels including those listed below, while ensuring consistency with university-wide strategy for education and research.

- Planning and development of international strategy
- Formulation, evaluation, and administration of action plans
- Establishment of cooperative ties with overseas universities, etc.
- Obtaining domestic/overseas external funds for international activity
- Management of activity bases overseas
Figure III-6-1 Abilities required of university administrative staff and personnel corresponding to these requirements

B. “Specialists” in international operations. These are individuals who have strong international orientation and advanced expertise in areas such as the following:
- International intellectual property management
- International laws and regulations (conclusion of partnership agreements, etc.)
- Risk management
- Provision of services to foreign researchers and students
- International accounting processing

It is expected that work requiring deployment of such specialists will increase in the future.

Needless to say, the distinction between A. “professionals” and B. “specialists” is not a clear-cut one. Duties of an intermediate nature, and personnel to engage in such duties, will also become necessary.

On the other hand, demand for personnel in quadrant II of the diagram, “generalists who are not involved in international operations at all”, will most certainly decline into the future.

The 20 institutions selected for this project are engaged in a variety of efforts to deploy “professionals” and “specialists”. In addition to efforts in staff development (training) and utilization of external human resources, some universities have begun to reform their systems to establish specialist career paths for employees. The following section introduces notable efforts in this area.

(2) Notable efforts

Kobe University: Establishment of a specialist career path
Kobe University is planning to establish a specialist career path for personnel in charge of international planning. Currently, the university is preparing to implement an internal
personnel recruitment system for the position of exchange coordinator from FY 2008. In addition, realizing that there is a limit to how much mobility can be achieved in-house, the university has also started to consider possibilities for personnel exchange among universities in the Kansai area.

**University of Tokyo: Comprehensive enhancement of personnel quality**

The University of Tokyo aims to establish a new university management model founded on a “decentralized, autonomous, coordinated system”. As one of the core components of this model, it formulated an initiative for “development of administrative personnel to support education and research”, aimed at enabling administrative personnel to develop of a broad range of experience and expertise. The university places importance on the enhancement of comprehensive ability levels of personnel including the ability to handle international operations. From this perspective, the University of Tokyo uses a unique method of recruiting and selecting employees. We should pay attention to this university as a model for future directions in staff development.

**Tokyo University of Foreign Studies: Active use of current students**

Taking advantage of its status as a foreign language university, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies places student interns in charge of selected areas of international exchange operations. As well as providing the interns with work experience before graduation, this system offers a means for expanding students' horizons in regards to career choices. The university began to recruit interns in May 2006. A total of four students were assigned to international exchange operations as of March 2007.

**Nagasaki University: Utilizing external human resources with advanced expertise**

The Center for International Collaborative Research, established in April 2005, recruits administrative personnel with experience at international organizations, etc. and appoints them as project coordinators in accordance with their respective experience and abilities. These personnel engage in internal and external coordination and facilitate a swift and integrated approach to the project process from planning through implementation.

**Nagoya University: Utilizing a consortium in initiatives for staff development**

Nagoya University, which proposed the establishment of Academic Consortium 21 (AC21) and serves as its Secretariat, uses AC21 as a venue for its administrative personnel to gain wider experience. Personnel are posted for a period of around a week at a time to symposiums and other activities organized by AC21 both at home and abroad.

**Kyoto University: Utilizing a consortium in initiatives for staff development**

Kyoto University holds the “University Administrators’ Workshop” to provide opportunities for exchange of opinions among personnel in charge of international exchange, chiefly from AEARU and APRU member universities. The 1st and 2nd workshops were held in March 2006 and February 2007, respectively. The 2nd workshop was attended by personnel from Kyoto University, 14 universities in Asia and 10 other Japanese universities, most of which were selected as pilot institutions under the SIH Project. Attendees made presentations and exchanged opinions on the current state of international exchange and future issues. The common language for the workshops is English.

**Tottori University: Staff development utilizing overseas bases**

In consideration of the location of its overseas bases, Tottori University started “trilingual” training in June 2005 to train personnel to communicate in three languages: Japanese,
English, and one of Spanish, Korean or Chinese. Spanish and Chinese trainees are sent to the university’s bases in Mexico and China respectively, to allow them to accumulate on-ground experience. Korean language trainees are sent to Kangwon National University in South Korea.

Other Universities
Selection under the SIH Project has provided a stimulus for other institutions to strengthen the practical aspects of their language training initiatives. There is a tendency to conduct not only English language instruction, but multilingual (Chinese, Korean, Spanish, etc.) training in accordance with particular strategic priorities. There are also some institutions which have initiated or strengthened overseas training systems. Many of them send personnel to partner universities under exchange agreements. It is increasingly common to engage in thorough discussion on training details in advance, exploring possibilities for training in practical operations as well as pure language instruction.

(3) Analysis and proposals
As stated in (1), it is ideal if an institution can assign the type of “professionals” envisaged by Yamamoto to support international activity.

The following paragraphs will discuss efforts to convert personnel in quadrant III of Fig. III-6-2 to quadrant I. Efforts are classified into: A. Staff development (Training); B. Utilization of external human resources; and C. Improvement of career paths.

A. Staff development (Training)
In order to enhance the expertise of administrative personnel – that is, to promote a left-right vector movement in Figure III-6-2 – well-developed training programs and OJT can effective.

Training to enhance specific expertise will be necessary for the promotion of movement from quadrant III to IV (“specialist”), while more comprehensive training programs need to be considered for promotion of movement from the quadrant III to I (“professional”). For “generalist” staff in quadrant II, it is important to provide both specialist and general awareness-based training programs, ensuring that these programs allow personnel to utilize their accumulated management experience.

From the perspective of ensuring that training is effective and efficient, reference can be made to training programs conducted in cooperation with partner universities in international consortiums and those conducted jointly by a multiple number of universities, not only a single university. Cases where universities have utilized overseas bases effectively for staff development are also of considerable interest.

B. Mobilizing external human resources
A large number of institutions enlist personnel from outside as a means to achieve more immediate effects. Individuals with expertise and rich experience in international operations are being recruited from private enterprises, international organizations, etc. and placed in positions where they can not only contribute to enhancement of the institution’s international activity, but also provide a kind of “shot in the arm” for internal personnel, exerting a positive influence particularly on younger employees. The SIH Project has been utilized by pilot institutions to recruit approximately 30 personnel, more than half of whom were sourced through open recruitment.

Another useful reference is provided by some institutions’ efforts to mobilize their graduate student and foreign student bodies as a source of human resources. This approach is notable in that it enables the latent potential of these students to be plowed back into the university, yielding education benefits for the students at the same time.
C. Development of career paths

A further notable example is an ambitious effort aimed to develop well-balanced personnel by providing an incentive of promotion, especially to administrative personnel with skills as international “specialists”. This scheme is interesting in that it envisages not only in-house development, but includes a plan to allow staff to accumulate experience through postings to other institutions.

As stated above, unique initiatives are being pursued in each university. In regards to A. Staff development (Training), however, the need to provide more specialized training programs has intensified in recent years, and it is likely that small-scale universities in particular will have difficulty conducting structured, effective training on their own.

This issue has been addressed in some cases overseas. Nuffic (the Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education), a government NPO, operates a training system for administrative personnel at universities, while EAIE (European Association for International Education) offers various training courses across multiple countries and tailored to different levels.

JSPS operates an “international academic exchange training” initiative through JSPS Overseas Offices and Tokyo Head Office for administrative personnel at national university corporations and inter-university research institutes. The training offers opportunities to study practical operations in the field of international academic exchange, as well as foreign language training and overseas on-site training, to cultivate personnel who have advanced expertise and are capable of assuming active roles at the front lines of international exchange, thus making major contributions to university internationalization. In addition, MEXT holds the “Long-term Educational Administrators Program for International Exchange: LEAP” to enhance the international orientation of administrative personnel at universities.

There is high demand for provision of further programs for integrated training transcending divisions between national, public, and private institutions. It would be meaningful for the parties concerned to consider how public organizations could best support such training in the future.

---

8 JSPS established the “JSPS Project Team for Supporting University Internationalization” (headed by the President) in April 2006 to provide comprehensive support for the internationalization of Japanese universities through training related to international operations for personnel from national universities, etc. and activities to support university internationalization provided by JSPS Overseas Offices.

9 The LEAP offers one-year language and international operation training in the U.S. to personnel from national universities, etc. who are in charge of duties for accepting foreign students and researchers. This program is designed to provide these personnel with an opportunity to enhance their abilities and deepen understanding of education in the U.S.
Figure III-6-2 Abilities required of university administrative staff involved in international operations and types of personnel corresponding to those requirements

Source: Prepared by JSPS based on “Abilities required of university administrative staff and personnel corresponding to these requirements” (Yamamoto 2006).

Reference:
7. Improving services and support for foreign researchers

(1) Trends and issues

“Recruiting distinguished human resources from abroad” is one of the major focuses of the international strategy adopted by many universities. It is also a topic that has been accorded priority in recent years as part of Japan’s overall international strategy. The number of foreign researchers accepted by Japanese universities reached 31,408 in FY 2004. The number has remained almost unchanged over the past several years, but the 2004 figure is almost 2.5 times higher than that recorded a decade earlier.\textsuperscript{1)\textsuperscript{1}} Acceptance of foreign students has also been promoted actively in the wake of the “plan to accept 100,000 foreign students” adopted in 1983. The number of foreign students increased from around 10,000 immediately after adoption of the plan to approximately 120,000 in 2006,\textsuperscript{2)\textsuperscript{2}} demonstrating Japan’s steady recruitment of distinguished human resources.

However, it has been pointed out that the total number of foreign researchers accepted by Japan is still small when compared with other countries. The present situation is characterized by a gradual increase in intake of short-stay foreign researchers whose period of stay in Japan is less than 30 days, juxtaposed with lack of growth in the number of long-stay researchers (Figure III-7-1).\textsuperscript{1)\textsuperscript{1}}

![Figure III-7-1 Number of foreign researchers by length of stay in Japan (short term and long term)](source: MEXT (2006) Outline of International Research Exchanges (FY2004) (unofficial translation of title).\textsuperscript{1})

Foreign faculty members account for only 3.6\% of all faculty at Japanese universities – still much lower than the 19.3\% in the U.S. and 17.6\% in the U.K. Another widely-recognized problem is that most foreign students studying at Japanese universities are undergraduate students, while the number of graduate school enrollments has remained largely unchanged. The proportion of foreign students at graduate school level in the fields of science, engineering, and agriculture is only 9.3\% in Japan, far lower than the 38.8\% in the U.S., 33.5\% in the U.K., and 18.6\% in France (Table III-7-1).\textsuperscript{3)\textsuperscript{3}}
Table III-7-1 International comparison of the percentage of foreigners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>U.K.</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All researchers</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-doctoral fellows</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In science, engineering, and agriculture</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhDs</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In science, engineering, and agriculture</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate school students</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In science, engineering, and agriculture</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate students</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In science, engineering, and agriculture</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Produced by MEXT based on statistics from each country

Needless to say, advanced levels in research and education are required to attract talented foreign researchers and students. It is equally important, however, to establish a robust and well-structured system to address the entire sequence of events from before those researchers and students come to Japan, throughout their stay here, and after they depart.

With respect to support at the pre-arrival stage, universities have steadily been developing their recruitment activities such as “establishment of scholarships” and “overseas PR initiatives”. Support after leaving Japan is commonly promoted through provision of personal networks such as alumni associations. It is expected that such post-departure initiatives will increase in scale and quality as a result of the recent increase in the number of foreign researchers accepted by Japanese universities. In contrast, support during the stay in Japan has been identified as one area in particular need of improvement.

Respondents in a JSPS survey of JSPS foreign fellows⁴ stressed the need for more “information in English”, “internationalization of libraries”, “support for accommodation and everyday living”, and “support for accompanying family members”, suggesting the importance of furnishing greater support across a range of lifestyle areas and providing an environment more conducive to the intake of foreign researchers.

In practice, however, only a limited number of universities are making organized efforts to improve their support systems. For example, only 13.5% of national, public, and private universities in Japan offer “multilingual services at libraries and computer centers” and only 7.8% provide “translations of in-house documents and rules in multiple languages”.⁵ Furthermore, only 3.3% of universities have developed an organization-wide action plan to promote greater involvement of foreign faculty members,⁶ indicating a low degree of awareness of the need to improve the environment for acceptance of such researchers.

As a result of the lack of institutional-level response to issues involved in acceptance of foreign researchers, individual Japanese researchers are forced personally to provide support.
for the researchers they host. Figure III-7.2 below shows what kinds of persons or organizations JSPS foreign fellows approached for assistance when they faced non-research-related problems during their stays in Japan. This clearly indicates the weakness of Japanese universities’ organizational support systems and the need for stronger university-wide efforts.

**Figure III-7.2 Persons (organizations) approached by JSPS foreign fellows for assistance when they faced non-research-related problems during their stays in Japan**  
Source: Prepared by JSPS based on *Results of JSPS Postdoctoral Fellowship Program Evaluation Questionnaires (June and September, 2006).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese researcher hosting the foreign researcher</th>
<th>Fellow researcher</th>
<th>Organization that accepted the foreign researcher</th>
<th>JSTEC</th>
<th>Government/municipality</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above paragraphs have described the current conditions and needs in regard to support for foreign researchers during their stay in Japan. It was noted that support systems at the pre-arrival stage, on-site in Japan and post-departure are all necessary parts of hosting distinguished foreign researchers, and that a wide variety of initiatives must be pursued for this purpose. The section below introduces notable efforts made by the institutions selected for SIH, presented in chronological order.

(2) Notable efforts

**A. Overseas promotional activities, recruitment, fellowship programs, etc. (Pre-arrival services)**

**Keio University: Focus on Strategic Overseas PR**

Conscious of the fact that it is less well known internationally than it is within Japan, Keio University is deploying a strategic approach to promotion targeting not only domestic audiences but international ones too. In particular, the university has focused its efforts on provision of information, identifying its website as the most convenient and accessible source
of information for foreign researchers and students and moving to enhance content on the site in languages other than Japanese. The university established the Office of Communications and Public Relations under the control of the President in July 2006 to disseminate information on its international partnership and academic activities at home and abroad. It is aiming to realize synergetic effects in international PR and international deployment through collaboration between the Office of Communications and Public Relations and the Organization for Global Initiatives Office, which was also established under the auspices of the President.

**University of Tokyo:** Collaborating with private enterprise to establish a fund for intake of talented Chinese students

The University of Tokyo established the “University of Tokyo ASATSU DK China Scholarship Fund” in FY 2005 for the purpose of recruiting highly talented students from China. The fund was established through a donation of around 300 million yen from ASATSU-DK Inc., and began to operate in FY 2006. Each year, two or three students are selected from each of Peking University, Tsinghua University, and Fudan University – the top three universities in China – and provided with scholarship funds to study at the University of Tokyo. Approximately 100 students applied for the FY 2006 scholarship program from Peking University alone. The fund is serving as a means for the university to recruit top-quality students from China.

**Tokyo Institute of Technology:** Establishing a program to accept graduate school students from abroad in cooperation with a research institute (Tokyo Tech - RIKEN International School)

The Tokyo Institute of Technology concluded a partnership and cooperation agreement with RIKEN (the Institute of Physical and Chemical Research) in February 2006 and launched the “Tokyo Tech - RIKEN International School” program to accept graduate school students from abroad. 10 doctoral students from foreign countries (especially from countries in East Asia) are accepted every year and provided with opportunities for research in fields considered to have future potential by the two institutes. Tokyo Institute of Technology grants a degree to students completing the program, which is scheduled to start in fall 2007.

**Hitotsubashi University and the University of Aizu:** Catering to inbound foreign students by establishing October admission degree programs taught in English

The University of Aizu established two regular graduate school courses in which students of any nationality can enroll in either April and October. Hitotsubashi University also opened two October-admission graduate courses (MBA and DBA courses in international business strategy offered by the Graduate School of International Corporate Strategy, and the Asian Public Policy Course offered by the School of International and Public Policy).

In addition to the October admission period, both universities’ programs are tailored to suit foreign students in various other ways, such as provision of curriculums taught entirely in the English language and systems for approval of admission that do not require applicants to come to Japan first.

**Nagoya University:** Utilizing a consortium to hold local pre-departure orientations for students scheduled to study in Japan

Nagoya University opened the “Nagoya University Shanghai Liaison Office” in November 2005 with the cooperation of Shanghai Jiao Tong University, which is a member of the “Academic Consortium 21 (AC21)” initiated and led by Nagoya University. Utilizing this Shanghai Liaison Office, the university held a pre-entry orientation in September 2006 for Chinese students scheduled to enter the university. The university is also promoting
interaction between Japanese and Chinese students through these orientations, calling on its Japanese students currently studying in China to attend the sessions and answer questions from Chinese students.

B. Securing accommodation (On-site services in Japan 1)

Tokyo Institute of Technology and Hiroshima University: Securing accommodation by wholesale renting of private apartments

“Senzokuike International House” is a private apartment building rented by the Tokyo Institute of Technology on a 10-year contract and used to accommodate female researchers – including those from outside Japan – as well as foreign students and Japanese students at the institute. The first tenants took up residence in October 2005.

Hiroshima University rents accommodation from Hiroshima Prefectural Housing Corporation and on-leases it to foreign researchers. The first tenants moved in to this accommodation in April 2007. The university is also working to identify potential risks involved in this initiative, such as vacancies due to shortage of tenants and problems that may arise in the course of tenancy, and formulating strategies to manage these risks.

Tohoku University: Securing accommodation through PFI

Tohoku University began to construct a dormitory for foreign and Japanese students based on the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) Law, receiving authorization from the MEXT in FY 2003. The resulting facility was opened in March 2007 under the name of “University House”. To undertake this project, the university adopted the “BTO (Build-Transfer-Operation)” approach, whereby university real estate was leased to a private enterprise free of charge and the enterprise raised funds, constructed the facility and transferred ownership to the university, while continuing to perform certain duties specified in the contract. There were very few precedents of universities constructing facilities under the PFI Law, to Tohoku University employed an expert advisor to compensate for lack of in-house know-how.

“University House” is occupied by both foreign and Japanese students. (It can accommodate up to 130 foreign students and 286 Japanese students.) Each unit in the facility is composed of eight private rooms and one open living room (common-use space). One of the characteristics of the dormitory is that the ratio of foreign students to Japanese students in each unit is kept to 2:6 or 3:5, in order to enable students to develop an international mindset through daily exchange.

Keio University: Active wholesale renting of private apartments and construction of a dormitory for common occupancy by Japanese and foreign students

Keio University has taken an active approach to renting private apartment buildings to secure accommodation for foreign students and researchers. It has a total of 231 apartments for foreign students (including 223 apartments at four university-rented apartment buildings) and 42 apartments for foreign researchers (including 29 apartments at two university-rented apartment buildings) as of April 2007.

In addition to these, the university constructed the “Shimoda Student Village”, its first dormitory for foreign students, in March 2006. This is a rare type of facility in that accommodation for athletic club students and accommodation for foreign students are both contained in the same building, although in separate areas. The university is also utilizing vacant rooms in the foreign student section to accommodate foreign researchers. By positioning construction of this facility as the first big project for its 150th anniversary celebrations, the university was able to resolve various problems such as fund raising which often make it difficult to undertake such projects.
Nagoya University: Effective use of an employee dormitory

Upon incorporation, Nagoya University remodeled 26 of 61 apartments at the “Idaka-cho Residence” usually used for employees, as accommodation for foreign researchers. Completed in March 2005, the apartments began to accept foreign researchers in April 2005.

This is a good example of utilizing exiting resources to enhance accommodation options for foreign researchers. It also promotes international exchange between these researchers and university staff who live in the same facility.

Kyoto University: Utilizing public housing in collaboration with a municipality

In 2004, for the first time in Japan, Kyoto Prefecture began to make its public housing complexes available on a priority basis to foreign researchers and students who engage in studies, educational activities or research at a university, graduate school, or public research institute within the prefecture. This is an example of positive efforts to secure accommodation through cooperation between a universities and local government.

C. Development of international-standard education and research environments (On-site services in Japan 2)

Waseda University: Improvement of support for foreign researchers from the “research” aspect

Waseda University is making efforts to encompass not only “living” but also “research” as a theme in its support initiatives for foreign researchers. In order to enhance these researchers’ access to research funding, the university has translated approximately 80% of its internal research fund information into English and posted the information on the website of the Office of International Research Promotion. Furthermore, the university worked to standardize English translations of terminology related to research support – an issue frequently raised by its researchers in the past – and compiled an “English Glossary of Research Support Terms”. This Glossary is posted on the website of the Office of International Research Promotion, and updated as necessary.

Waseda aims to further strengthen its research support system into the future, with plans including formulation of university regulations on research ethics in English.

University of Aizu: Active recruitment of foreign faculty members

-- Developing a foreign faculty support system with special staff --

The University of Aizu has been employing both Japanese and foreign faculty members through open international recruitment since its foundation in 1992. Non-Japanese faculty are highly represented, accounting for as much as 60% of the total faculty population at the time of establishment and approximately 40% as of 2006.

From the outset, the university worked to eliminate differential treatment between Japanese and foreign faculty members and use English as the official language of communication. Standard regulations in other universities at the time required foreign faculty members to be recruited under fixed-term employment contracts, with the possibility of being re-employed on a tenure basis at the end of the contract term dependent on the results of performance evaluation. Foreign faculty members at the University of Aizu, however, were guaranteed post-contract tenure from the time they were first recruited. These and other initiatives have focused on eliminating all forms of nationality-based disparity in treatment, and the university continues to work to create an environment that enables non-Japanese academics to apply for faculty vacancies without anxiety. (The university abolished the re-employment system for foreign faculty members when it was incorporated in April 2006.)

At the same time as advancing the cause of internationalization, active recruitment of
foreign faculty members necessitates even higher degrees of support and consideration for them. In order to develop and improve its environment for accepting foreign faculty members, the University of Aizu has assigned special staff (non-regular staff) to dedicated to providing support services to its foreign researchers. Specific initiatives include (1) implementation of a one-stop service where (four) “special staff for foreign faculty members” assist foreign faculty members to resolve issues in daily life, (2) complete bilingualization of university rules and documents chiefly by three “interpreter/translator” staff members, and (3) support for obtaining external funds provided by personnel in the Center for Strategy of International Programs.

D. Campus internationalization and assistance in daily life (On-site services in Japan 3)

Hiroshima University: Holding international forums and symposiums under the theme of “campus internationalization”, gathering together foreign researchers, students, and faculty members

Hiroshima University has established “Creation of a Friendly University” as one of its international strategies. As part of this strategy, the university holds discussion forums, etc. under the theme of “Campus Internationalization”, involving foreign researchers and students, and faculty members of the university, and inviting guest speakers from abroad. Specific events are as follows:

- **“Campus Internationalization” Forum (March 27, 2006)**
  The university invited panelists from the University of California at Berkeley and Monash University to report on initiatives at their respective universities under the theme of “Campus Internationalization”. Foreign faculty members and students of Hiroshima University, as well as their Japanese counterparts, participated in the forum and contributed to active discussion on ways to realize “Campus Internationalization”.

- **“Discussion Meeting on Library Services for Foreign Students and Researchers” (November 14, 2006)**
  Organized as a pre-session to the international symposium on library services and staff development (November 14, 2006), a discussion meeting was held involving librarians from overseas universities (Uppsala University, Flinders University, and the University of Auckland), as well as foreign researchers, foreign students, and staff of Hiroshima University. The participants discussed the development of better library services for foreign researchers and students.

Tokai University: Questionnaire survey of foreign researchers and students

From October to December 2006, Tokai University conducted a questionnaire survey among foreign researchers and students enrolled at the university, using survey results as a reference in restructuring support operations for accepting foreign researchers and students.

University of Tokyo: Initiating a trial one-stop service at a single campus

The University of Tokyo plans to operate the “Kashiwa International Office (Kashiwa IO)” on a trial basis at Kashiwa Campus in 2007 to provide a one-stop service point for foreign researchers and students. Services offered at Kashiwa IO will include provision of information on daily living issues.
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Kyoto University, Hitotsubashi University, and Nagoya University: Developing manuals and guidebooks to support foreign researchers and students

Tokyo University of Foreign Studies created the *TUFS Multilingual Manuals*, a guidebook on working conditions and employment procedures in English and Arabic, based on experiences obtained through the one-stop service offered to foreign researchers and the results of a questionnaire survey of foreign researchers. The university posted the English version on its internal website in March 2006, followed by the Arabic version in August 2006. It plans to produce a French version in the future.

In a similar vein, Kyoto University published the *Handbook for Foreign Researchers*, a guide to daily life for foreign researchers at the university, in December 2006. The handbook is distributed to researchers through each department.

Meanwhile, Hitotsubashi and Nagoya Universities are among the small number of universities that have developed handbooks for faculty and staff dealing with foreign researchers and students. The former produced the *Foreign Students’ Handbook for Faculty and Staff -Q&A- (unofficial translation of title)* in December 2006, while the latter created the *Nagoya University Administrative Manual for Accepting International Researchers* in March 2007.

Osaka University: Launching a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students

Osaka University launched the “GCN Osaka” website (trial run started in May 2004) primarily for foreign researchers and students who are currently enrolled at the university or who will join the university shortly. The website offers information on topics including learning the Japanese language, health and medicine, child-raising, housing, job vacancies, scholarships and visas. In addition to faculty members and staff of the university, foreign researchers and students, international exchange groups in the community, and volunteers all participated in the development of website content. The creation of the website itself involved formation of a new community of like-minded individuals.

E. Networking among foreign researchers (Post-departure services)

Tokyo University of Foreign Studies: Creating a network through effective involvement of former foreign staff, associates and students

Tokyo University of Foreign Studies is promoting the creation of the “TUFS Global Community”, a networking organization comprising people associated with the university. Specifically, the university plans to involve both Japanese and non-Japanese individuals who worked for, stayed at, or were enrolled at the university in the past and are currently scattered around the globe (including past trainees at the Japanese Language Center for International Students). These individuals will be known as “TUFS Associates.” The university also plans to appoint “TUFS Ambassadors” from among persons who play a central role in the community, entrusting them with functions of overseas liaison for the university.
Osaka University: Creating an online alumni network

Osaka University manages “GCN Worldwide”, a website developed by the university to create a network of alumni living in Japan and abroad, including foreign researchers and students. This website promotes ongoing information exchange among alumni, distributes messages from the university to alumni, and facilitates class reunions in various areas. The university integrated the website into “GCN Osaka” in July 2006 so that current students and graduates can share and exchange information more easily. Approximately 1,200 graduates and about 3,600 external people associated with the university were registered as of March 2007.

(3) Analysis and proposals

Necessity of university-wide goal setting and resource input

Improving the environment for intake of foreign researchers is essentially a challenge that requires time, labor, and funds. Systematic efforts incorporating both university-wide goal setting and appropriate resource allocation are needed to meet this challenge. In this regard, it is very important to position improvement of the intake environment as an explicit part of the university’s “internationalization strategy”, set concrete goals, and build a university-wide consensus on prioritized allocation of resources.

At present, the number of foreign nationals employed on a long-term basis as researchers or faculty members of a Japanese university remains low. If this number grows above a certain proportion, however, it will become more important to set practical university-wide goals and engage in practical action to improve intake systems, such as translating university documents into foreign languages and establishing a standard official language for use at meetings.

When developing strategies to attract top researchers, universities would be advised to refer to the support systems employed at research institutes that are already accepting many foreign researchers, such as RIKEN10 and the National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST).11

Expansion of opportunities to accept foreign researchers in cooperation with other institutions

Recently, more and more universities are establishing curricular programs taught in English as a means to recruit talented foreign students. However, to recruit the same quality of graduate school students – who are more young researchers than students in the traditional sense – it will be more effective to develop programs with enhanced content through means such as organized cooperation with other research institutes.

10 RIKEN is pioneering the production of internal documents in English and the establishment of one-stop service points with a goal of making 20% of its researcher population non-Japanese. For example, RIKEN Wako Institute established the International Cooperation Office and ICO (International Cooperation Office) Room to provide foreign researchers with various forms of support such as counseling services and information provision related to housing, education of children, and other daily life issues, as well as opportunities for exchange with the local community. The Center for Developmental Biology, RIKEN Kobe Institute, also established an Office for Science Communication and International Affairs and created a one-stop service point for foreign researchers.

11 AIST established the “AIST International Center (AIC)” to support foreign and host researchers working at AIST. The AIC is making efforts to improve the international research environment through various forms of assistance in daily living issues, information provision, support for applications to the Bureau of Immigration, publication of handbooks in English, Japanese language training programs, provision of accommodation, and so on.
Expanding accommodation options

Whether they are in Japan for a short stay (less than one month) or a longer term, foreign researchers are most accommodated in general off-campus facilities (hotels, private apartments, etc.). Only 24.1% of short-stay researchers and 37.8% of long-stay researchers use a university facility (Figure III-7-3). Regarding foreign students, only 23.5% stay at public accommodation for foreign students (Figure III-7-4), indicating that provision of university accommodation is clearly lagging behind the increase in the number of foreign researchers, etc. being accepted. “Expanding accommodation options” is believed to be an urgent issue for Japan in its efforts to accept more researchers, etc. from abroad.

Several institutions are working to secure accommodation through entering into wholesale lease agreements with owners of private apartments, cooperating with local governments, making more effective use of existing accommodation facilities, and employing the PFI approach. Universities will need to consider these precedents when formulating their own measures to secure accommodation for foreign nationals. For national universities in particular, the 2004 shift to incorporation has enabled access to a wider range of options than before, with the PFI approach and guarantor systems now available. From now on, national universities’ efforts to address the accommodation issue will be worthy of particular attention.

Foreign researchers and students have difficulty finding both “accommodation” itself and a “guarantor” for lease agreements when they come to Japan. Researchers and faculty members of host institutions sometimes have to find accommodation or become guarantors personally. Such a situation has long been a major impediment to acceptance of greater numbers of foreign researchers and students in Japan. To address this issue, Japanese universities need not only to exercise their own ingenuity and devise ways to utilize in-house resources more effectively, but also to collaborate with municipalities and other community groups in efforts to procure more accommodation options, provide assistance in securing them, and function as guarantors for foreign researchers and students.

Figure III-7-3 Types of accommodation used by foreign researchers

(a) Short stay (less than one month)  (b) Long stay (one month or more)
Cooperation with local government

The environment for accepting foreign researchers can be improved in many cases through cooperation between universities and local government. In relation to the task of increasing accommodation options as discussed above, for example, Kyoto Prefectural Government is placing foreign researchers, etc. in Kyoto public housing complexes on a priority basis. In Kyoto and Fukuoka prefectures, local government bodies, community internationalization groups, universities, etc. serve as guarantors when foreign students rent private accommodation, thus obviating the need for students to find their own guarantors.

Some municipalities, such as Tsukuba City, focus on internationalization of educational opportunities for the children of non-Japanese residents.

As stated above, cooperation with local governments and community groups may lead to improvements in the environment for accepting foreign researchers and, in this respect, each university should seek ways to collaborate organically with municipal authorities.

Developing shared understandings with foreign researchers

In order to improve the environment for accepting foreign researchers, it will be necessary to listen to their opinions and requests and develop shared awareness of issues. At this stage, however, efforts to listen and respond to the needs of such individuals could hardly be termed satisfactory. Several institutions selected for this project have held symposiums on “Campus Internationalization” gathering both foreign and Japanese faculty members and students, conducted questionnaire surveys and engaged in other efforts; other institutions should seek actively to develop similar initiatives.

Establishment of one-stop service points

Some noteworthy efforts have been made to realize one-stop service that provide a comprehensive approach to assistance in daily living issues, information and other services for foreign researchers, etc. Large-scale universities, in particular, have difficulty taking a centralized and focused approach, but several institutions selected for this project introduced a one-stop service on a trial basis in certain departments or campuses. These institutions plan to expand the spectrum of the service horizontally in the future; we should pay attention to how these initiatives develop.
Effective use of online media

In the case of foreign students, orientation sessions and other collective means of information provision can be used because the students all enroll at the same time. In contrast, foreign researchers and faculty members can be accepted at a university under different systems and at different times, meaning that efforts to provide them with daily life-related information are often not sufficient. Several institutions have produced manuals for accepting foreign researchers. It is hoped that such efforts will spread to other institutions in the future.

By utilizing their websites, universities can provide information to foreign researchers regardless of time and place both before they come to Japan and after they leave. In addition, websites allow information exchange among users. A website is particularly effective in terms of information provision to foreign researchers after they leave Japan and establishment of networks among them.

Enhancing access to research funds

With the increase in the number of foreign researchers and faculty members accepted by Japanese universities, it has become more important to establish systems related to research fund acquisition for them, including provision of multilingual information on internal research funding opportunities. In reality, however, 31.8% of universities still have internal research funds for which foreigners cannot even apply\(^7\), so it will be necessary to conduct a comprehensive review including a revisions to the way internal research fund systems themselves are structured.

The need to provide support for foreign researchers to access research funds is not simply an internal issue for each individual university. Broader efforts need to be made to address the internationalization of the research environment as a whole, including provision of multilingual services by the national government and public bodies in relation to both information on competitive funds available and their application procedures.
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3) Unpublished material provided by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT).
4) Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) (2006) *JSPS gaïkokujin tokubetsu kenkyûn jigyû Program Evaluation Questionnaire 2006nen 6gatsu shûkei oyobi 2006nen 9gatsu shûkei* [Results of JSPS Postdoctoral Fellowship Program Evaluation Questionnaires (June and September, 2006)].
8. Expanding overseas study and research opportunities for young Japanese researchers

(1) Trends and issues

According to survey results, 37% of Japan’s top researchers with high global citation rankings have experience working overseas, and the majority of researchers with post-doctoral experience undertook their post-doctoral fellowships abroad.¹ These results suggest that in order to foster scholars who can play an active role internationally, it is important to provide researchers with opportunities to gain experience overseas at an early stage.

The overall number of Japanese researchers posted abroad has been increasing steadily. However, the number of long-term postings (over 30 days) is actually tending to decrease.² This indicates that in reality, overseas experience for researchers is not necessarily being advanced (Figure III-8-1).

One characteristic of outbound overseas programs offered by Japanese universities is that an overwhelmingly larger number of them operate at undergraduate level than at graduate school level (Table III-8-1).

A study conducted by Yokota et al. (2006) revealed that Japanese universities usually only send “between one and nine” graduate students abroad at any one time, while very few universities had organized “double degree” programs or “curricular programs with mandatory study abroad”.

In summary, outbound study abroad programs at Japanese universities generally focus on the undergraduate level while development of systematic study abroad programs at graduate level lags behind significantly.
### Table III-8-1 Number of students sent abroad under study/training abroad programs in FY 2004 (Multiple answers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number of students sent abroad</th>
<th>Number of universities with a study abroad program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>10-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Not longer than 2 months</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 months – 1 semester</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year or more</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate school</td>
<td>Not longer than 2 months</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 months – 1 semester</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year or more</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Yokota et al. (2006)

According to the study conducted by Yokota et al. (2006) (Table III-8-2), major issues in study/training abroad programs are the “lack of foreign language ability (74.4%)”, “small number of applicants (52.7%)”, “insufficient risk management systems (44.0%)”, “disadvantage in job hunting (27.4%)”, and “difficulty in transferring credits earned during study abroad (25.3%)”.

### Table III-8-2 Issues in study/training abroad programs (Multiple answers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Number of Universities responding</th>
<th>% (of 277 universities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of foreign language ability</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small number of applicants</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient risk management systems</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantage in job hunting</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in transferring credits earned during study abroad</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More applicants from certain departments or courses</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large administrative burden</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity in study progress at home university</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cooperation from faculty members or departments</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total number of responses: 277*

Source: Yokota et al. (2006)

Meanwhile, Yokota et al. (2006) also described the following trends:

Regarding future policy on study/training abroad programs for Japanese students, 22% of universities indicated that they were “planning to expand substantially” and 35% responded “planning to expand slightly”. This proves that a majority of Japanese universities (56%) have a intend to expand such programs. On the other hand, no university indicated that plans to scale down such programs. Figures from different categories of university show . . . 51 of 64 national universities (approximately 80%) planning to expand study/training abroad programs. This percentage is almost twice that of public universities (42.3%) and private
universities (52.8%). National universities, which have conventionally been rather passive about developing study/training abroad programs for students, have begun to work on such programs at last.

As stated above, organizational efforts at graduate school-level in particular are important in expanding outgoing mobility opportunities for Japanese students and researchers. Further active efforts are expected, particularly in national universities.

The section below highlights some noteworthy initiatives pursued by the pilot institutions to expand outgoing mobility opportunities for Japanese students and researchers.

(2) Notable efforts

**Tohoku University: Concluding joint curriculum (double degree) agreements with three leading institutions in the world over a year and a half under the initiative of headquarters**

Tohoku University concluded joint curriculum (double degree) agreements with INSA-Lyon and Ecole Centrale in France and Tsinghua University in China over a year and a half under the initiative of its Global Operation Centre (GOC) established in June 2005. The university’s Executive Vice President for Research and International Affairs serves concurrently as GOC director, and the university recruited two international development managers from the private sector through open recruitment. As a result of these efforts, the university developed a system that allows prompt negotiation, internal coordination, and decision making, and succeeded in concluding the above three agreements in a short space of time. It opened a U.S. office in Los Altos, California, in May 2006 with a view to further expansion of joint education programs. The university also opened a China office in Beijing in April 2007. It is considering opening an office with similar functions in France as well.

**Tottori University: Utilizing an overseas base in outbound programs**

From October to December 2006 Tottori University implemented an overseas practical education curriculum integrating lectures and fieldwork at the Northwest Center for Biological Research (CIBNOR), the university’s research base in Mexico. Faculty and administrative personnel were posted specially to work with CIBNOR staff to provide support for the students participating in the program.

**Kyushu University: Overseas experience program utilizing donations from foreign alumni**

Using funds donated by a Taiwanese graduate of Kyushu University who went on to become a successful entrepreneur in the United States, the university launched an entrepreneur education program (“Kyushu University - Robert Huang Entrepreneurship Program”) in 2006. Under the program, 20 students of the university undergo a one-week on-site program including informal discussion with prominent entrepreneurs and engineers in Silicon Valley, exchange with college students (including Japanese and American students enrolled at Stanford University), and visits to high-tech enterprises and immigrant localities. The program is implemented with support from the university’s California office.

**Osaka University, Nagasaki University, Hitotsubashi University, and Kyoto University: Development of a risk management manual**

Osaka University: Produced the “Osaka University Crisis Management Guideline” for international exchange, etc. in FY 2005.

Waseda University: Strengthening risk management systems based on services offered by a private enterprise

In July 2006 Waseda University introduced a risk-handling support system developed and operated by a private company. Services provided by the company include regular provision of local risk information for students and faculty/staff abroad and 24-hour free call center services.

Tokyo University of Foreign Studies: Overseas risk management training

The university invited risk management experts in July 2006 to operate a two-day intensive “Overseas Risk Management Training” program for faculty/staff and students.

Tokai University: Development of a traveler tracking system

In response to the growing number of visits to foreign countries by students and faculty/staff as a result of the expansion in international activities, in FY 2006 Tokai University began developing a traveler-tracking system as part of its risk management strategies. The university plans to start trial operations of the system in FY 2007. It will oblige students and faculty/staff going abroad to register their travel information (departure and return dates, destination country, and reason for the travel) in advance and encourage them also to register means of travel, specific destination cities/countries, contact information, etc. Users input information online, and ID codes are issued for all data registered.

The university also plans to use data accumulated in this system to analyze trends in overseas travel among students and researchers.

Keio University: University-wide goal setting

Under the initiative of the Organization for Global Initiatives (OGI), Keio University has taken an institution-wide approach to setting concrete numeric goals regarding intake of foreign students and dispatch of Japanese students on overseas programs. Specifically, it plans to achieve the goal of 1,000 inbound and 1,000 outbound students in FY 2007, the university’s 150th anniversary. As of FY 2003 these numbers were 636 and 355 respectively.

Waseda University: Mandatory study abroad program

The School of International Liberal Studies, established by Waseda University in 2004, sets a one-year mandatory study abroad program as a condition for graduation, with students going abroad from the second semester of the sophomore year to the first semester of the junior year.

Students are free to choose their preferred destinations, with approximately 70% selecting Western countries. The university plans to introduce measures to promote study abroad in non-Western and non-English-speaking countries.

The university’s Center for International Education coordinates support services for students studying abroad.

(3) Analysis and proposals

Need for strategic and organized study abroad programs

It is widely recognized that giving students and researchers opportunities to gain experience overseas at an early stage is very important from the perspective of enhancing the quality of education and research and increasing a university’s appeal to prospective students. However, not much progress has been made in developing organized approaches to enhancement of study abroad programs. In particular, there are very few systematic
programs for graduate school students.

In contrast, many universities in Europe are developing courses and programs that enable students and researchers to undergo education and experience research at institutions other than their home university. In the context of Europeanization of education and research, it is recognized that these moves can contribute to improving the quality of education and research and increasing the appeal of the universities.

Establishing partnerships with prominent universities around the world and developing attractive study abroad programs has thus become an important theme from an international strategic perspective. All universities around the world are currently seeking good partners.

There is a tendency for many Japanese universities to accept a larger number of foreign students and researchers than the students and researchers they send abroad. Some universities, however, perceive improvement in outbound study abroad programs as a more urgent issue than accepting foreign students/researchers, and set numeric goals to achieve balance between the overall numbers of students/researchers sent abroad and those accepted. Development and enhancement of study abroad programs are tasks that require time, labor, and funds. Therefore, an approach that positions them clearly as strategy issues and sets specific goals is likely to be effective in achieving practical progress.

Development of a “risk management” system for outbound programs

Major issues in study/training abroad systems offered by Japanese universities are the “lack of foreign language ability,” “small number of applicants,” “insufficient risk management systems,” “disadvantage in job hunting,” and “difficulty in transferring credits earned during study abroad” (Yokota et al. [2006]).

Development of a risk management system is an issue that universities cannot avoid when they expand outgoing mobility opportunities for researchers and students. Some universities are making notable efforts to improve their risk management systems.

It will be beneficial for Japanese universities to develop shared awareness and work together on the issue of risk management rather than attempting to tackle it on an independent basis, particularly because its encompasses issues requiring specialist expertise. It is necessary to establish a mechanism for all universities to share information on risk management and cooperate with one another in the development of experts and implementation of training initiatives.

Utilization of overseas bases

Note should be taken of universities that have established an overseas research base as a training site and utilize the base as a support office for study abroad programs.

National-level efforts to expand outgoing mobility opportunities

Funding agencies overseas are promoting initiatives to provide more outgoing mobility opportunities to students and young researchers. These include the “Partnership for International Research and Education (PIRE) Program” in the U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF), designed to provide overseas experience for young researchers, and the “Initial Training Network” project proposed under the Marie Curie Actions in the EU.

In Japan, JSPS has launched the “International Training Programs (ITP)” for young researchers as a new project for FY 2007. In this project, JSPS provides young researchers with research opportunities at overseas institutions (for periods of two months to one year) under organizational collaboration between Japanese universities and overseas partner institutions (universities, research institutes, enterprises, etc.) (see Figure III-8-2).

It is important to develop this kind of funding mechanism and create opportunities for universities to exchange information on an international level.
Figure III-8-2 International Training Program (ITP) for young researchers

International Training Program (ITP)
(JSPS's new initiative for FY2007)
~Strengthening overseas research & education opportunities for young researchers~

Organizational support for research training abroad to
Young Researchers/Post-doc./Graduate Students
(10 persons/2 months - 1 year) per university
20 million yen ×10 university ×5 years

University

overseas research and education opportunities
- Implementation of joint research projects
- Participation in educational programs
- Internships

Periodical Exchange of Information
Multi-funding under flexible collaboration

The cost sharing, if established with partner institution(s), will be highly evaluated as a merit in the project selection process.

Overseas Partner Institutions
A Univ.
B Univ.
C Research Institution
D Company

Overseas Funding Agencies
NSF
DFG
EU
Other Funds
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9. Establishing and operating overseas bases

(1) Trends and issues

According to the results of a survey conducted by MEXT\textsuperscript{1)}, 64 universities had established a total of 170 overseas bases as of October 2004. Of these, 60% were set up in the five years immediately preceding the survey date (Figure III-9-1). 51.2% of the bases are located in Asia. In particular, 28 universities have established a base in China (Figure III-9-2).

![Figure III-9-1](image)

**Figure III-9-1** Number of overseas bases established by Japanese universities, etc.
Source: Prepared by JSPS based on MEXT (2005) *Results of the Survey on the State of Conclusion of Inter-university Agreements (as of October 1, 2004).*

![Figure III-9-2](image)

**Figure III-9-2** Location of overseas bases established by Japanese universities, etc.
Source: MEXT (2005) *Results of the Survey on the State of Conclusion of Inter-university Agreements (as of October 1, 2004).*
In terms of the roles accorded to these overseas bases, national universities attach importance to “support for research collaboration,” while private universities tend to emphasize “support for educational activities”. It appears that private universities expect their overseas bases to assume more comprehensive support functions than their counterparts in national universities (Table III-9-1).

The total number of overseas bases will is expected to increase further at least over the next several years, in line with the expansion of overseas activities in Japanese universities.

Table III-9-1 Number of overseas bases by function and type of university (Multiple responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>National university</th>
<th>Public university</th>
<th>Private university</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for activities such as research collaboration with local universities, etc.</td>
<td>63 (79.7%)</td>
<td>6 (85.7%)</td>
<td>22 (35.5%)</td>
<td>91 (61.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities to recruit foreign students (including entrance examinations)</td>
<td>13 (16.5%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>29 (46.8%)</td>
<td>43 (29.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas staff training</td>
<td>5 (6.3%)</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
<td>15 (24.2%)</td>
<td>20 (13.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site support related to students’ study abroad and internship programs</td>
<td>25 (31.6%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>23 (37.1%)</td>
<td>49 (33.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a network with foreign graduates and researchers who have returned to their home country (Management of alumni association activities, etc.)</td>
<td>19 (24.1%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>25 (40.5%)</td>
<td>45 (30.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting information on local education and research conditions</td>
<td>49 (62.0%)</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
<td>38 (61.3%)</td>
<td>94 (63.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas promotional activities for the university/institution</td>
<td>31 (39.2%)</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
<td>37 (59.7%)</td>
<td>75 (50.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note 1) The figures represent the number of bases for each item, expressed as a percentage of the total number of bases.

(Note 2) Shaded boxes are over 40% (within each university type).

Source: Prepared by JSPS based on MEXT (2005) Results of the Survey on the State of Conclusion of Inter-university Agreements (as of October 1, 2004)
The number and location of overseas bases (with staff stationed) established by the 20 institutions selected for this project are shown in Figures III-9-3 and III-9-4. The number of overseas bases has more than doubled between 2003 (39 bases) and July 2007 (73 bases). The bases are located in China (19.1%), U.S. (16.4%), and Europe (21.9%).

The increase in the number of overseas bases is probably attributable to the rapid increase in levels of international activity in Japanese universities. However, some intellectuals and associated parties are concerned that the approach to establishment of overseas bases appears to be slightly haphazard and that these bases may not be functioning effectively. Others point out that even within the same city/region, Japanese universities will often establish entirely independent bases, precluding full use of bases to demonstrate Japan’s university/academic presence as a whole.

The opinions cited above are addressed in the course of discussion on notable efforts made by the 20 pilot institutions, as follows.

(2) Notable efforts

**Tottori University: Utilizing an overseas base as a training site for young researchers – including students – and staff**

Tottori University opened a base in Mexico, the site for its research on arid areas, in October 2005. As well as serving as a hub for research activities, the base is utilized as a site for human resource development. In 2006, the university invited its Japanese students to apply for participation in a practical overseas training integrating lectures and field work. Selected students and faculty members were sent to the Mexico base in the same year, with the base providing on-site support to the participating students. The base is also used effectively as a site for staff development, with university
administrative personnel sent to both it and the university’s two bases in China to undergo on-site training in liaison and coordination functions.

**Nagasaki University: A full-scale research base envisaging human resource development functions**

With the support of external funding, Nagasaki University has established bases for research on infectious diseases in Kenya and Vietnam, in September 2005 and March 2006 respectively. Both have university personnel stationed full-time. A unified approach is taken to administration of these bases, with university “headquarters” operating and managing them and providing services for faculty and staff members stationed locally. The university also aims to realize a one-stop service point for these bases, catering to both personnel within the university and external parties.

The university has also developed various rules relating to overseas postings such as the “Rules on Remuneration for Employees Stationed at Nagasaki University’s Overseas Education and Research Project Bases (unofficial translation of title)” (established in March 2006). In February 2006 it also created a “Risk Management Manual for Overseas Trips and Transfers of Staff (unofficial translation of title)”, outlining risk management procedures related to overseas activities. The university, with “headquarters” playing the central role, is working on various reforms incidental to the establishment of overseas bases, such as creation of project operation and management manuals, support for management activities, negotiations related to export/import procedures, and introduction of a fixed-term employment system.

The university is currently considering utilizing its overseas bases in the establishment of a stand-alone graduate school for human resource development in the fields of tropical medicine and international public health.

**Nagoya University: Utilizing an overseas base for pre-entry orientation**

Nagoya University established its first overseas base for university-wide initiatives in Shanghai in November 2005. It used the base as the venue for a preparatory orientation for Chinese students scheduled to enroll in the university in September 2006.

**Tokyo University of Foreign Studies: Japan’s representative base in the Middle East**

The university established a base in Beirut in 2006. This is the only base in the Middle East operated by a Japanese university. The university aims to make the base available widely for use by researchers at home and abroad, utilizing its position as one of only a few research bases in the Middle East bases and as a joint-use research facility with the Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa attached to the university.

**JUNBA (Japanese University Network in the Bay Area): Enhancing international activity through cooperation among multiple bases in the same area**

Recently, there has been an increase in the number of Japanese universities establishing bases in the San Francisco Bay Area around Silicon Valley. An “Interuniversity Liaison Committee (unofficial translation of title)” was established in 2004 with the main objective of facilitating information exchange among these bases. In response to demand for “more cross-utilization of networks developed by other bases” and “unity to showcase Japan’s presence as a whole”, the committee strengthened its organizational structure was re-launched in summer 2006 as JUNBA (Japanese
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University Network in the Bay Area). JUNBA promotes collaboration among Japanese universities operating bases in the U.S., for purposes such as the further internationalization of Japanese universities, development of internationally-minded human resources, and the pursuit of collective projects with industry. It also aims to contribute to development of education and research in Japan and the U.S., and the creation of new industries. Member institutions are Osaka University, Kyushu University, Kagoshima University, Tohoku University, and Hosei University. The JSPS San Francisco office is serves as the JUNBA secretariat.

(3) Analysis and proposals

Efficient, effective establishment and operation of overseas bases

Establishing and operating an overseas base requires considerable funds, time, and effort. Universities should take full account of cost effectiveness issues and examine the optimal approach before setting up a base. There are various types of overseas bases, but universities should note that apart from establishing an independent office, which requires a large amount of funds, several other options are available.

JSPS introduced a new system in FY 2006 to allow universities to station faculty/staff at JSPS overseas offices on a costs-only basis. Keio University has already stationed personnel at the JSPS London office. JSPS hopes that many Japanese universities will use this option, which offers a kind of “joint office” approach as a foothold for international deployment. JSPS opened an office in Beijing in April 2007 to support Japanese universities involved in the growing trends to greater academic exchange among Japanese and Chinese universities.

Reference can also be made to the approach by which an overseas office is set up jointly with the municipality in which the university is located.

Another option is the “mutual office” system, a method whereby institutions in an established exchange relationship set up overseas offices at each other’s premises. This method may become inconvenient when the university tries to deepen an exchange relationship with any institution other than the partner institution, but it does enable universities to open overseas offices at low cost if they have a clear objective and an established partner.

Another effective measure can be to commission the operation of an overseas office to a graduate or somebody else living in the area, particularly if the university envisages that the office’s only functions will be collection and provision of information, PR activities, liaison and coordination.

Table III-9-2 Patterns for establishment of overseas bases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Outline</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent office</td>
<td>Establishing independent office premises</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint office</td>
<td>Sharing an office with another institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual office</td>
<td>Setting up an overseas base at each other’s premises</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission to individual</td>
<td>Commissioning simple functions to a local individual (without opening an office)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emphasis on comprehensiveness

Considering the cost involved, universities would be wise to utilize any new overseas bases they establish as full-scale comprehensive branch offices, rather than limiting them to specific functions.

As stated in (1) above, it is notable that private universities tend to expect more from their overseas bases than national universities do. This is can be attributed primarily to the fact that many of the overseas bases opened by national universities were designed to provide specialized support for specific research; however, it also indicates that private universities expect their bases to function in a more comprehensive manner and are more conscious of cost issues.

The efforts made by Tottori University and Nagasaki University are worthy of note here as examples of how overseas bases can be utilized effectively and comprehensively. These universities opened their bases primarily for research activities, but seeing potential for application to human resource development, they now use them to pursue educational initiatives as well.

Support for cooperation among overseas bases

Attention should also be drawn to the efforts of JUNBA, under which overseas bases located in the same area cooperate with one another and try to expand the presence of Japanese universities within the context of a competitive relationship. It would probably be meaningful for many Japanese universities with bases in China and Southeast Asia to establish a similar partnership.

The JSPS San Francisco office serves as the JUNBA secretariat. JSPS should provide active support in other regions outside the San Francisco Bay Area.

Support systems for Japanese universities as a whole

The governments of several Western countries are actively pursuing overseas promotional and marketing activities in the fields of higher education and research & development. Examples include the UK’s British Council, Germany’s DAAD (Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst) and DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft), and the Netherlands’ Nuffic (Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education). In addition to support for bottom-up activities such as in the case of JUNBA described above, initiative at national governmental level is important. Organizations concerned with the internationalization of Japanese universities should further cooperate with one another for this purpose.

Reference:

1) Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) (2005) Daigakutôkan kôryû kyôtei teiketsu jôkyôtô chôsa no kekka ni tsuite (heisei 16nen 10gatsu 1nichi genzai) [Results of the Survey on the State of Conclusion of Inter-university Agreements (as of October 1, 2004)].
III. Theme-specific Analysis

* Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) (2005) Daigakutôkan kôryû kyôtei jôkyôtô chôsa no kekka ni tsuite (heisei 16nen 10gatsu 1nichi genzai) [Results of the Survey on the State of Conclusion of Inter-university Agreements (as of October 1, 2004)].
Produced based on data and information provided in reports on development and initiatives related to the Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities, FY 2005 activity plans, opinion exchange meetings held in FY 2005, etc.
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Figure III-9-4 Overseas bases of the 20 institutions

※ This material is created by "Results of the Survey on the State of Conclusion of Inter-university Agreements (as of October 1, 2004)" conducted by Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, the document preparing for the "Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities", its program planning document for FY 2005, and the opinion exchanging meeting in FY 2005.
IV. Overseas Trends in University Internationalization
1. Background

It is not only Japan in which “internationalization of universities” is recognized as an important political issue. Many other countries are also engaged in a variety of active efforts at governmental or institutional level.

In a survey of universities around the world conducted by the IAU (International Association of Universities) in 2005, 73% of respondents attached high priority to internationalization efforts. In contrast, national university association(s) (49%) and governments (46%) attached relatively low priority to internationalization (Figure IV-1-1).

By region, national university association(s) and governments attached higher priority to internationalization efforts in Europe (53%) and the Asia Pacific (54%) than other regions (Figure IV-1-2).

---

**Figure IV-1-1 Importance of internationalization for HEIs aggregate analysis**


**Figure IV-1-2 Importance of internationalization for HEIs aggregate analysis**

According to the IAU survey, the percentage of universities having an institution-level internationalization policy/strategy increased from 63% in 2003 to 82% in 2005 – a 19% increase in two years (Figure IV-1-3). A breakdown of regions showed that a larger percentage of universities in the Asia Pacific region (88%) and Europe (84%) had an internationalization policy/strategy (Figure IV-1-4).

**Figure IV-1-3 Aggregate HEI analysis existence of internationalization policy/strategy**

**Figure IV-1-4 Regional level HEI analysis existence of an internationalization policy/strategy**
The greatest impediment to the university internationalization is viewed as “lack of faculty interest and involvement” rather than “absence of financial and material resources and support at institutional level” (Table IV-1-1).

Table IV-1-1 Obstacles to implementing internationalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>Ordinate ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of faculty interest and involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative inertia or bureaucratic difficulties</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited experience and expertise of staff to implement Internationalization plan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of policy/strategy to guide the process</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International work is not recognized for promotion or tenure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little recognition or interest in internationalization by senior leaders</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of financial and material resources and support at institutional level</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing priorities for time and resources in the institution</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial support from the national level</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The top three elements advocated in policy/strategy for university internationalization are (1) international institutional agreements/networks, (2) outgoing mobility opportunities for students, and (3) international research collaboration (Table IV-1-2).

Table IV-1-2 Most common elements of internationalization policy/strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinate ranking</th>
<th>Element of Internationalization Policy/Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>International institutional agreements/networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outgoing mobility opportunities for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>International research collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Outgoing mobility opportunities for faculty/staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Visiting international scholars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>International dimension of curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Area studies, foreign language, internationally focused courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>International development projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Recruitment of fee-paying foreign students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Joint/double/dual degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Recruitment of foreign faculty/researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>International/inter-cultural extra curricular activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Recruitment of non-fee paying foreign students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Liaison with community based cultural and international groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Distance education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Delivery of education programs abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Establishment of branch campuses abroad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In respect to the benefits and risks of internationalization, universities responded as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More internationally oriented students and staff (22%)</td>
<td>Commodification and commercialization of education programs (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved academic quality (21%)</td>
<td>Increase in number of foreign ‘degree mills’ and/or low quality providers (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen research and knowledge production (15%)</td>
<td>Threat of brain drain (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovations in curriculum, teaching and research (14%)</td>
<td>Glowing elitism in access to international education opportunities (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater international understanding and solidarity (12%)</td>
<td>Overuse of English as a medium of instruction (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of cultural or national identity (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In light of the macro-level trend to university internationalization around the world, JSPS decided to conduct a survey of efforts for university internationalization recognized as an important part of the national agenda in foreign countries. The methods employed in this survey are described later. The survey addressed both government-level initiatives and efforts made by individual institutions, in the hope that results will stimulate greater efforts towards internationalization of Japanese universities, serve as a reference for universities engaged in such efforts, and furnish suggestions for initiatives at the governmental level.

In implementing this survey, JSPS aimed not simply to gather data but also to disseminate information on the SIH Project and conditions in Japanese universities.

2. Overseas survey

Based on the opinion of the University International Strategy Council, JSPS used the following three methods to gather data on overseas trends in university internationalization.

A. Field survey at overseas universities, etc.
B. Participation in the “Workshop on the International Mobility of Researchers” held by the Steering and Funding of Research Institutions (SFRI), OECD Committee for Scientific and Technological Policy (CSTP)
C. Utilizing JSPS overseas offices to collect information relevant to provision of support for university internationalization.

(1) Field survey of overseas universities, etc.

JSPS decided to start with a survey of European universities pursuing internationalization initiatives as part of the rapid development of “Europeanization” in both education and research. The survey targeted universities in non-English speaking countries in particular, as they face many of the same challenges as Japan. As stated in “1. Background”, university internationalization is considered a priority not only by the institutions themselves, but by governments throughout Europe. For this reason, JSPS included government agencies in the survey.
Data was gathered primarily from interviews with personnel in charge of international strategy and internationalization at universities, and personnel in charge of university internationalization policy in government agencies. Survey staff visited universities and government agencies in France and the Netherlands from February 12 to 19, 2006. Details of the survey results are described in the references at the end of this report.

Outline of the survey in France and the Netherlands [Briefing paper for the 3rd University International Strategy Council Meeting]

In the rapid movement toward Europeanization of higher education founded in the Bologna Process, both governments and individual institutions in France and the Netherlands are highly conscious of an urgent need to respond to the issue of “university internationalization”. A variety of initiatives are being instituted in the two countries: some of the more notable initiatives are outlined below.

1. France
   (1) Government agencies
       A. Ministry of Education and Research
          · Universities and the Ministry of Education and Research discussed the four-year contract system. “Internationalization” has been one of the key issues in recent contract renewals.
          · The Ministry is discussing a proposal for amendment of the Immigration Control Law incorporating extension of the maximum period of stay aimed to promote the mobility of students (primarily doctoral students) and researchers, and simplification of processes for converting student visas into working visas after graduation.

       B. Ministry of Foreign Affairs
          · The French government initiated the “Competitive Clusters” program in 2005 to support the formation of characteristic local clusters through cooperation among universities, research institutes, and private enterprises (examples: cancer research in Lyon, nanotechnology in Grenoble, and aerospace engineering in Toulouse). These clusters will be used as hubs to promote international collaboration.

   (2) Grandes écoles
       A. École Centrale Paris (ECP)
         · ECP is one of France’s grandes écoles in the field of engineering. It is characterized by rigorous entrance requirements, a high standard of education closely linked to research activity, close cooperative ties with enterprises, and a focus on international education.
         · “Internationalization” is the top-priority issue. ECP develops its internationalization policy based on surveys of trends in overseas international education institutions and industry needs. Actual international operations are handled by each department.
         · ECP is promoting a double degree program at master's course level, utilizing T.I.M.E. (Top Industrial Managers for Europe), a consortium established by ECP. Keio University and Tohoku University in Japan are members of the consortium.
         · Internships (from six weeks to one year in duration) are a compulsory component of the core course. IHI Corporation in Japan is one of the enterprises to which students are sent.
         · For student exchange, both ECP and partner institutions offer pre-departure foreign language courses and require students to attain sufficient proficiency in the relevant foreign language before they travel to the country in question. (ECP has a policy that educational programs should be conducted in French, although English is widely used in research activities.)
(3) Universities
A. Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne
   · There is university-wide concern about internationalization. Developing an image as an
     “international university” is important.
   · French is used in principle in all regular educational programs. The university offers a
     course for foreign students where lectures are given in English in the first year and a master’s
     program is conducted in French in the second year.

B. Université Paris-Sorbonne Paris IV
   · The university established an internationalization promotion steering committee under the
     leadership of the President in December 2005. Each of the 20 faculty members on the
     committee is assigned responsibility for a particular region.
   · The university’s midterm plan (2006-2009) establishes integration of foreign
     students/researchers and French students/researchers as a basic institutional goal.

2. The Netherlands
(1) Nuffic (Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education)
   · Nuffic has set up a helpdesk for people associated with Dutch universities, foreign students
     and foreign researchers. Many people use it for assistance with immigration procedures.
   · As part of ERA-MORE (the European Network of Mobility Centers) led by the EU
     Commission, Nuffic is creating a database for access to information on researcher job
     vacancies, fellowships, research grants, health insurance, pension insurance, family affairs,
     accommodation, etc.
   · Nuffic conducts training in international affairs for university staff.

Key points in the Netherlands Ministry of Education policy paper on internationalization
( November 2004):
   a. Strengthening the European Higher Education Area
   b. Making internationalization mainstream
   c. Strengthening the shift from quantity to quality
   d. Promoting brain circulation

(2) Universities
A. University of Amsterdam
   · Employs a diffused system where each department handles international affairs directly
     (Mainstream model)

B. Leiden University
   · “Leiden World Wide”, an organization auxiliary to the university, previously played the core
     role in international activities. The system was reviewed in 2005 and international operations
     were re-incorporated into the main internal university structure.
   · The university appointed Dr. Robert Coelen from Australia as Vice President International
     and established a headquarters system directly subordinate to the President (central office).
     The Vice President functions as a planner and consultant on international activities
     undertaken in each department.
   · The university developed and announced a new international strategy in April 2005
     (“Focusing on Talent”).

(2) Involvement in OECD/SFRI Workshop
A. Outline
   Under the auspices of the OECD Committee for Scientific and Technological Policy (CSTP)
Working Group on the Steering and Funding of Research Institutions (SFRI), a “Workshop on the International Mobility of Researchers” was organized by OECD, MEXT and JSPS in March 2007.

This workshop was designed to explore possibilities for measures to promote good “brain circulation”. Specifically, it was designed to gather information on each government- and institution-level efforts made in each country to enhance the international mobility of researchers, analyze the effects of these measures, compile case examples of good practice, and furnish them as a reference source for policymaking in each country in the future.

The workshop was led by Japan under the strong initiative of MEXT, which commissioned the SIH Project. SIH was introduced to participants as a distinctive government-level effort aimed to enhance the international mobility of researchers. Seven of the SIH pilot institutions made presentations on their own efforts to achieve greater international mobility of researchers through institutional internationalization.

B. JSPS survey “The International Mobility of Researchers: Policy Support at National and Institutional Levels”

As one means to gaining a better understanding of the current degree of international mobility of human resources in the field of science and technology, prior to the workshop MEXT and JSPS conducted an online survey on actual national and institutional policies and initiatives to promote the mobility of researchers.

An outline of the survey is given in the reference section at the end of this report.

C. Outline of discussions at the workshop

At the workshop held on March 28, 2007, presentations and discussions held principally around three themes: (1) the scale, direction, and impetus for international researcher mobility, (2) issues and options to enhance this mobility, and (3) overview (case studies) of government- and institution-level measures made in each country.

As with any form of population shift, the mobility of researchers is a very complex phenomenon. Elements such as scale, period, type of mobility, destination and motivation are intertwined in a highly diverse and composite manner. Therefore, mobility cannot be explained by reference to simple factors such as the demand and supply of researchers, pull and push factors in mobility, and brain drain and gain. Monetary incentives (scholarships, grants, preferential tax treatment, etc.) are certainly important and indeed vital to strengthen the incentive for mobility, but they are not the top priority.

Each country expressed its views on the political background and issues regarding the international mobility of researchers (expected and unexpected outcomes, etc.). All countries agreed that inviting talented human resources from all over the world and promoting international exchange and circulation of these human resources are important means to generate innovation, and that such efforts will increase national competitiveness and research capability. At the same time, however, it was suggested that the “talent war” – the phenomenon of intensified international competition for human resources – is becoming more and more intense as developed countries take a more active approach to promoting inflow, return, and recruitment (settlement) of talent from abroad in response to changes in their domestic population structure (particularly since the 1990s). (In response, the U.S., Australia, and other developed countries stated that they have not instigated any specific government-level measures to attract talent and that such measures would not be effective even if they were taken. According to these countries, the process by which researchers select the location for their research activities is usually personal and voluntary, so it is not appropriate to over-emphasize the “talent war” phenomenon.)

Most participants agreed that providing a more attractive research environment is one of the important incentives to increase the inflow and return of researchers. Many countries
noted the importance of science and technology programs such as the development of Centers of Excellence and clusters. In respect to conventional measures to promote the inflow of researchers such as fellowships and grants, participants reported trends such as: (1) fellowships and grants for “star researchers” and senior researchers with established status, in addition to those provided for young researchers; (2) those requiring interactive exchange between researchers in different countries (to avoid an increase in one-way researcher movement); and (3) in Europe and Africa, those intended for researcher exchange within a single region or continent. On the other hand, the question of equity was raised, with some participants pointing out that developing countries are at a disadvantage in terms of access to fellowships and grants and cost burdens related to mobility.

Several measures were reported as means to increase the mobility and diversity of researchers without providing direct monetary incentives. These included: (1) university-institution-level provision of support services to foreign researchers and their families to address issues related to community life and adaptation to different cultures (especially in non-English-speaking countries); (2) creating a network between domestic researchers currently abroad and researchers/institutions in the home country, and maintaining connections between host researchers/institutions and foreign researchers who have returned home (including virtual networks utilizing IT); (3) special preferential treatment for researchers in immigration control and visa systems (linked to immigration policy and measures to promote growth in economy and industry), (4) improving the portability of social security systems, and (5) support for career development after international experience (especially for young researchers). Furthermore, the importance of internationalizing universities/institutions that accept foreign researchers was pointed out, and the SIH Project introduced as one of Japan’s initiatives in this area. Kyushu University, one of the 20 SIH pilot institutions, made a presentation on its strategic effort to promote exchange of researchers with Asian universities.

In relation to research on the mobility of researchers, examples of data collection and analysis techniques from Norway and Australia were introduced. Presenters highlighted the importance of improving data quality, as well as increasing data quantity, and understanding the processes involved.

Based on the discussions above, the OECD secretariat raised issues regarding the quantity and balance of researchers, including (1) the appropriate level of international researcher mobility (some countries suggested 10%), (2) balance between short-term and long-term movements of researchers, and (3) balance between young researchers and senior researchers. Another issue raised was how to achieve the appropriate level of and balance between training, experience, skills, and expertise to be accumulated through international movements. Some countries pointed out that future analysis should note that these issues depend to a significant degree on researchers’ individual choice as a major factor in determining patterns of international mobility. As a result of these discussions, the majority agreed that it would be difficult for the OECD to establish an appropriate level of international mobility of researchers because conditions and contexts vary considerably among countries.

Some counties expressed the opinion that it is necessary to re-assess why the international mobility of researchers is necessary in the first place, and what type of international mobility will bring what kind of specific benefits. Other countries asserted that artificial control (political intervention) to increase or regulate the mobility of researchers would be difficult because researchers are not very sensitive to international borders and the basis for moving abroad in many cases is provided by personal connections with other researchers internationally or research collaboration.

Subsequently, the OECD secretariat reported the results of a pilot survey of measures taken by Japan, Australia, Canada, and South Africa to increase the international mobility of
researchers. The secretariat expressed its willingness to conduct a survey of OECD member countries and requested cooperation. Following that, Japan reported the results of a survey of measures taken by government agencies and major universities in various countries to increase the international mobility of researchers. This study was conducted by MEXT with the cooperation of JSPS. In reporting the results, Japan suggested that the OECD conduct an official survey using the results of the MEXT/JSPS study as a reference, because those results, although not comprehensive, had identified various significant policy trends.

Responding to Japan’s suggestion, some countries noted that the results of the pilot study were very interesting and that a compilation of successful measures undertaken by OECD member countries would serve as an important means of support for each country’s efforts to formulate policy to promote the mobility of researchers. Other countries said that it would be very beneficial for governments of the member countries if OECD created a document that not only describes the various measures taken by member countries, but also identifies which ones were successful and unsuccessful. The U.K. is already engaged in the analysis of trends in measures taken by each country, but is facing a major challenge in terms of access to information on the effectiveness of those measures. Some countries requested that the OECD also conduct a survey of trends within researcher communities, in addition to government-level trends, and that such a survey should address the issue of mobility periods (whether researcher movements are short- or long-term).

(3) Information collection utilizing JSPS overseas offices

JSPS overseas offices gather information on university internationalization in the countries/regions in which they operate. This information is published on the SIH website.

As many as 48 topics had been posted on the website as of March 2007. Some characteristic examples are introduced below.

- **The U.S. National Institutes of Health (NIH) research grants – conditions for award to foreign institutions [JSPS Washington office]**

  Scientific research grants from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) are available not only to universities and research institutes in the U.S. but to foreign institutions as well.

  The minimum requirements considered when selecting foreign institutions are (1) whether or not the applicant is the only institution in the world that can carry out the proposed research, and (2) what benefits the research outcomes can yield for the health sciences in the U.S. and the health and lives of U.S. citizens.

- **MIT and Singapore on track to build a major new research center [JSPS San Francisco office]**

  The Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and National Research Foundation of Singapore announced that they are planning to jointly construct a major new research center in Singapore in 2007. The planned Singapore–MIT Alliance for Research and Technology (SMART) Center is expected to function as a knowledge hub for exchange between MIT and world-class Singaporean researchers in cutting-edge science and technology fields.

- **Provision of overseas research opportunities to graduate students (Princeton University) [JSPS San Francisco office]**

  Princeton University offers the “Global Network on Inequality”, an overseas training program for graduate students in sociology and politics. This program provides students with an opportunity to study at leading overseas research institutes such as Sciences Po and the London School of Economics.
AvH initiates the “International University” contest in 2006 – Winners to be awarded the title of “Welcome Centre for Internationally Mobile Researchers”

In 2006, the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (AvH) initiated a contest to select German “international universities” attractive for researchers all over the world. This contest is held jointly with the Deutsche Telekom Foundation and the Stifterband für die Deutsche Wissenschaft: Donors’ Association for the Promotion of Science and Humanities in Germany.

As many as 32 German universities participated in the first contest, and Bochum University, Bonn University, and Marburg University were selected.

Internationalization of higher education in the U.K. [JSPS London office]

A forum on “internationalization of higher education” was held at the University of Warwick in the U.K. from May 10 to 12, 2006 (organized by the Institute of Education, University of London). The JSPS London office participated in the forum and posted a report on it.

Report published by the Swedish National Agency for Higher Education on May 22, 2006 [JSPS Stockholm office]

The Swedish National Agency for Higher Education published a report on May 22, 2006. The report describes current conditions in Sweden’s higher education sector, highlighting trends such as a decrease in the number of PhDs and an increase in the percentage of foreign students among applicants to universities.

Moves to re-integrate universities in France [JSPS Strasbourg office]

One of the reasons for poor showing of French universities in the Academic Ranking of World Universities announced by Shanghai Jiao Tong University in 2003 is believed to be “segmentation”. Currently, integration of France’s universities is proceeding based on a proposal made by the Ministry of National Education, Higher Education and Research. Through establishment of comprehensive universities, France is working actively to provide university students with more international curricular programs and to open its universities to foreign talent.

“European Higher Education Fairs (EHEF)” held in Bangkok [JSPS Bangkok office]

EduFrance, DAAD, Nuffic, and the British Council jointly held “European Higher Education Fairs (EHEF)” in several cities in Asia from September 2006 as part of the European Commission’s “Asia-Link Programme”.

One of these fairs (and an Asia-Link Symposium) was held in Bangkok, Thailand on November 10, 2006. The JSPS Bangkok office reported on its participation in the fair.

Reference:


Bibliography:

V. Conclusions
1. Relationship between the types of international strategy headquarters and each theme

Chapter III discussed notable efforts according to each of the nine themes for analysis. In this chapter, we review what functions of international strategy headquarters are effective for what activities, and how the different themes are interrelated within the context of a single institution.

“1. Organization and governance” in Chapter III presented four types international strategy headquarters functions: “(1) specific projects”, “(2) headquarters initiative”, “(3) central control”, and “(4) departmental support”. Table V-1·1 represents an attempt to correlate these types with each of the nine themes for analysis, by tabulating the effectiveness/importance of each type in the context of each theme.

Types (1) and (2), “specific projects” and “headquarters initiative”, offer superior maneuverability, making them effective in areas that require the exercise of prompt and appropriate judgment based on international trends, such as “3. Attracting external funds for international education and research” and “4. Participation in international partnerships and consortiums.”

On the other hand, the “central control” type (3) is effective for gradual improvement founded on an institution-wide plan. Only this type can yield success in “2. Goal setting, action plans, and evaluation systems”. Elements of the “central control” type will also be important to achieve steady improvement under “6. Training and securing administrative personnel”, “7. Improving services and support for foreign researchers”, and “8. Expanding overseas study and research opportunities for young Japanese researchers”, all of which are closely associated with cross-organizational resource allocation and long-term planning.

Type (4), “departmental support”, is an approach that respects the autonomy of each department. It can support efforts in “6. Training and securing administrative personnel”, “7. Improving services and support for foreign researchers”, and “8. Expanding overseas study and research opportunities for young Japanese researchers”, provided headquarters furnishes a list of support options for departments. This approach’s capacity for advance planning, however, is weak.

Table V-1·2 (shown at the end of the chapter) summarizes the characteristic features of each pilot institution’s activities up to April 2007 and the roles of their respective international strategy headquarters as classified tentatively by JSPS based on the categories described above. The type of headquarters operated by any one institution may change according to the nature of the institution’s activities in the future.
### Table V-1-1 Relationship between type of international strategy headquarters and each theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Specific project</td>
<td>Direct support for international activities of a specified division or department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Headquarter</td>
<td>Strategic international initiatives formulated swiftly under the leadership of the headquarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Central control</td>
<td>Centralized planning and progress management for the institution as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Departmental support</td>
<td>Backup for international activities in each division or department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Interrelation between different themes

Naturally, the nine themes are interrelated: improvements in any one area can lead to positive feedback across the entire spectrum of activity. As an example of this in practice, the relationship between themes “7. Improving services and support for foreign researchers” and “8. Expanding overseas study and research opportunities for young Japanese researchers” — in other words, the relationship between efforts to accept researchers and efforts to dispatch researchers — is reviewed below as an example.

As shown in Table V-2-1, initiatives under each of the two themes will work to promote inbound and outbound movement of researchers. Higher levels of researcher mobility will, however, also generate a greater degree of international activity and in turn enhance the institution’s international profile – thus activating initiatives in other themes, namely “3. Attracting external funds for international education and research,” “4. Participation in international partnerships and consortiums,” and “6. Training and securing administrative personnel”.
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3. Development of international activity through synergic effects

By what processes can research exchange at the individual level develop into a solid, organized international exchange program? Figure V-3-1 presents a model for the development of international activity, by reference to initiatives in the 20 pilot institutions.

The origins of most international exchange programs lie in personal exchange between individual researchers. When both sides to the exchange are internationally competitive, such exchange often develops into a major team-based joint research initiative. In many cases, funding support for research bases needs to be attuned to possibilities for exchange and training among young researchers.

For some research projects, setting up a research base in the partner country may be effective, while others may feature an international cooperation approach. Development of on-ground research activities in the partner country will contribute to the development of that country's young researchers.

If the quality of international research collaboration improves and the research base develops a capacity to attract domestic and foreign researchers, it can also serve effectively as an first-rate international training site – a foundation for organized exchange in the field of education.

The quality of education and research activities will improve in a synergic manner in each stage of the process by which international activity develops, expanding opportunities to obtain external funds at the same time.
4. Future challenges

As discussed above, there are many types of international strategies and each of the pilot institutions has already initiated its own distinctive activity profile. Because Japanese universities have only just begun to make organized efforts toward internationalization, it is too early to attempt analysis of outcomes at this stage. At the least, however, this report has been able to present a variety of options for universities developing international strategy. JSPS will continue to promote the development of models and work to analyze the outcomes of notable efforts discussed in this report. It will also be important to solicit reviews of internationalization initiatives in Japanese universities from foreign experts and persons associated with universities overseas.

According to the IAU survey of universities around the world described in Chapter IV, “lack of faculty interest and involvement” was often cited as an “impediment to university internationalization.” This suggests that building “internal consensus” is the most important issue for university internationalization, particularly for “internal internationalization”. Needless to say, the leadership of university presidents is important here, but it is also very worthwhile to encourage a wide range of faculty and administrative staff to learn more about the context in which Japanese universities
operate, the current state of their own institutions, and successful efforts being pursued by other institutions.

JSPS hopes to use symposiums and other forums to introduce Japanese universities’ internationalization efforts to a wider audience, share information and provide opportunities for exchange of opinions.

As a new project for FY 2007, JSPS launched the “International Training Program (ITP)” to support Japanese universities’ efforts to expand outgoing mobility opportunities for young researchers. It also initiated support for international activity by making JSPS Overseas Offices available for use by Japanese universities. From its perspective as a funding agency, JSPS aims to continue not only to engage in analysis of university internationalization but also to explore measures for providing more effective support for international activity in Japanese universities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of institution</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Type of international strategy headquarters</th>
<th>Initiation type</th>
<th>Organisation and governance</th>
<th>Goal setting, action plan and evaluation systems</th>
<th>Attracting external funds for international research</th>
<th>Participation in international partnerships and consortia</th>
<th>Development of international research projects</th>
<th>Training and security requirements</th>
<th>Security and risk management</th>
<th>Expanding overseas activities and research opportunities for Japanese researchers</th>
<th>Establishing and operating overseas bases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hokkaido University, Initiative for Sustainable Development (HUISD)</td>
<td>Selecting internal research activities with a track record in five distinctive fields, dedicated to &quot;sustainable development&quot;, global warming, integrated water control, establishment of a global recycling-oriented society, securing funds and financial stability, and measures against infectious diseases, developing organic linkages between them, and providing focused support for them.</td>
<td>Headquarters initiative type</td>
<td>Central control type</td>
<td>Development of cross-disciplinary action plans through the secretariat of the President and the headquarters initiative office.</td>
<td>Development of a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Utilizing a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Creation of an international consortium under the initiative of headquarters.</td>
<td>Establishment of an international website for pre-entry orientation</td>
<td>Developing manuals and guidebooks to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Creating an online alumni network.</td>
<td>Establishing and operating overseas bases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tohoku University, Graduate School of Letters (GSL)</td>
<td>Strategic efforts led by the GOC aimed to develop joint education programs at master’s and doctoral levels, effective utilization of external human resources to strengthen internal systems.</td>
<td>Headquarters initiative type</td>
<td>Central control type</td>
<td>Development of a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Utilizing consortiums in initiatives for staff development (AC21).</td>
<td>Development of a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Creation of an international consortium under the initiative of headquarters.</td>
<td>Establishment of an international website for pre-entry orientation</td>
<td>Developing manuals and guidebooks to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Creating an online alumni network.</td>
<td>Establishing and operating overseas bases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Tokyo, Graduate School of Agricultural, Forest and Related Sciences (AGF)</td>
<td>Establishing one of the world’s few international consortiums in the field of humanities and social sciences under the initiative of headquarters. The only Japanese university established a comprehensive strategy centering on higher education and research for the 21st century.</td>
<td>Headquarters initiative type</td>
<td>Central control type</td>
<td>Development of a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Utilizing a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Establishment of an international website for pre-entry orientation</td>
<td>Creation of an international consortium under the initiative of headquarters.</td>
<td>Establishment of an international website for pre-entry orientation</td>
<td>Developing manuals and guidebooks to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Creating an online alumni network.</td>
<td>Establishing and operating overseas bases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tokyo Institute of Technology, Graduate School of Engineering (GSE)</td>
<td>Developing a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Headquarters initiative type</td>
<td>Central control type</td>
<td>Development of a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Utilizing a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Establishment of an international website for pre-entry orientation</td>
<td>Creation of an international consortium under the initiative of headquarters.</td>
<td>Establishment of an international website for pre-entry orientation</td>
<td>Developing manuals and guidebooks to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Creating an online alumni network.</td>
<td>Establishing and operating overseas bases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Keio University, Graduate School of International Studies (GSIS)</td>
<td>Making efforts to improve educational, research, and administrative systems, such as benchmarking, pre-entry orientation, and staff development, by effectively utilizing an international academic consortium (AC21). The university was the driving force behind AC21’s establishment and serves as its secretariat. Its own administrative systems have been internationalized as a secondary effect of serving as the AC21 secretariat.</td>
<td>Headquarters initiative type</td>
<td>Central control type</td>
<td>Development of a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Utilizing a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Establishment of an international website for pre-entry orientation</td>
<td>Creation of an international consortium under the initiative of headquarters.</td>
<td>Establishment of an international website for pre-entry orientation</td>
<td>Developing manuals and guidebooks to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Creating an online alumni network.</td>
<td>Establishing and operating overseas bases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Huisinking University, Graduate School of Maritime Studies (GSMS)</td>
<td>Making efforts to improve educational, research, and administrative systems, such as benchmarking, pre-entry orientation, and staff development, by effectively utilizing an international academic consortium (AC21). The university was the driving force behind AC21’s establishment and serves as its secretariat. Its own administrative systems have been internationalized as a secondary effect of serving as the AC21 secretariat.</td>
<td>Headquarters initiative type</td>
<td>Central control type</td>
<td>Development of a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Utilizing a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Establishment of an international website for pre-entry orientation</td>
<td>Creation of an international consortium under the initiative of headquarters.</td>
<td>Establishment of an international website for pre-entry orientation</td>
<td>Developing manuals and guidebooks to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Creating an online alumni network.</td>
<td>Establishing and operating overseas bases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Osaka University, Graduate School of Science and Engineering (GSSE)</td>
<td>Making efforts to improve educational, research, and administrative systems, such as benchmarking, pre-entry orientation, and staff development, by effectively utilizing an international academic consortium (AC21). The university was the driving force behind AC21’s establishment and serves as its secretariat. Its own administrative systems have been internationalized as a secondary effect of serving as the AC21 secretariat.</td>
<td>Headquarters initiative type</td>
<td>Central control type</td>
<td>Development of a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Utilizing a comprehensive website to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Establishment of an international website for pre-entry orientation</td>
<td>Creation of an international consortium under the initiative of headquarters.</td>
<td>Establishment of an international website for pre-entry orientation</td>
<td>Developing manuals and guidebooks to support foreign researchers and students.</td>
<td>Creating an online alumni network.</td>
<td>Establishing and operating overseas bases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table V-1-2 Characteristics of initiatives pursued by each of the 20 institutions selected for the “Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities” Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of institution</th>
<th>Name of international strategy headquarters (Headquarters URL)</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Type of international strategy headquarters</th>
<th>Description and overview</th>
<th>Activities and plans for internationalization</th>
<th>Achievements and outcomes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tokai University</td>
<td>Office for the Promotion of International Exchange (<a href="http://www.shellfish-ua.org/index.html">http://www.shellfish-ua.org/index.html</a>)</td>
<td>Flexible approach to internationalization under President's leadership</td>
<td>Headquarters initiative type</td>
<td>Cooperation with international organizations and institutions</td>
<td>Strategic leverages of internationalization as a mission</td>
<td>- Enhanced collaboration with European institutions</td>
<td>- Utilizing an overseas base as a training site for young researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nagasaki University</td>
<td>Center for International Collaborative Research (<a href="http://www.cochlear-nagasaki.org/index.php">http://www.cochlear-nagasaki.org/index.php</a>)</td>
<td>Flexible approach to internationalization under President's leadership</td>
<td>Headquarters initiative type</td>
<td>Cooperation with international organizations and institutions</td>
<td>Strategic leverages of internationalization as a mission</td>
<td>- Enhanced collaboration with European institutions</td>
<td>- Utilizing an overseas base as a training site for young researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Kyushu</td>
<td>Office for the Promotion of International Exchange (<a href="http://www.isc.kyushu-u.ac.jp/intlweb/index.htm">http://www.isc.kyushu-u.ac.jp/intlweb/index.htm</a>)</td>
<td>Flexible approach to internationalization under President's leadership</td>
<td>Headquarters initiative type</td>
<td>Cooperation with international organizations and institutions</td>
<td>Strategic leverages of internationalization as a mission</td>
<td>- Enhanced collaboration with European institutions</td>
<td>- Utilizing an overseas base as a training site for young researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Osaka University</td>
<td>Office for International Research Promotion (<a href="http://www.isc.kyushu-u.ac.jp/intlweb/index.htm">http://www.isc.kyushu-u.ac.jp/intlweb/index.htm</a>)</td>
<td>Flexible approach to internationalization under President's leadership</td>
<td>Headquarters initiative type</td>
<td>Cooperation with international organizations and institutions</td>
<td>Strategic leverages of internationalization as a mission</td>
<td>- Enhanced collaboration with European institutions</td>
<td>- Utilizing an overseas base as a training site for young researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>National Institute of Natural Sciences</td>
<td>International Strategy Headquarters (<a href="http://www.isc.kyushu-u.ac.jp/intlweb/index.htm">http://www.isc.kyushu-u.ac.jp/intlweb/index.htm</a>)</td>
<td>Flexible approach to internationalization under President's leadership</td>
<td>Headquarters initiative type</td>
<td>Cooperation with international organizations and institutions</td>
<td>Strategic leverages of internationalization as a mission</td>
<td>- Enhanced collaboration with European institutions</td>
<td>- Utilizing an overseas base as a training site for young researchers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Type of international strategy headquarters* classifications have been developed by JSPS on a tentative basis, based on the characteristics of initiatives in each pilot institution up to April 2007. The classifications may change according to the nature of each institution’s activities in the future.
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France
1. Directorate General for International Cooperation and Development, French Ministry of Foreign Affairs
http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/

Interviewees: Andre Siganos, manager responsible for interuniversity scientific exchange
Michel-Louis Pasquire, officer in charge of international exchange

Background
- Introduced by the division responsible for interuniversity exchange in the French Embassy in Tokyo, Japan. Mr. Siganos was formerly a cultural counselor at that Embassy and has considerable insight into academic trends in Japan and JSPS projects.
- In partnership with the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, JSPS is implementing support projects for collaboration among young researchers (SAKURA and CHORUS) as a means to promote academic exchange between Japan and France.

JSPS also implements the Japan-France Joint Doctors’ Course Program (student exchange between consortiums) as an interuniversity exchange initiative under the “Advanced Student Exchange Pilot Project Support Program” (completed in FY 2005) of the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology.

International Activity Utilizing French “Local Clusters”
- The French government initiated “Competitive Clusters” in 2005 as a government-wide initiative to support the development of characteristic local clusters through cooperation among universities, research institutes, and private enterprises. The French government plans to use these local research bases as hubs for promoting international collaboration. The government envisages that the project will operate for a period of six to ten years.

Examples: cancer research in Lyon, nanotechnology in Grenoble, and aerospace engineering in Toulouse
- The underlying purpose of this project is to form local science and technology communities and achieve broader recognition of priority research fields by promoting collaboration among research institutes regardless of the sectors in which they operate. The clusters are also expected to play a part nurturing and attracting young researchers, as well as providing an efficient and intensive means to enhance France’s overall research capabilities in the field of science and technology.
- The central government (Ministry of Youth, Education and Research, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Economic Reform Agency, etc.) and local governments provide financial support.

Presence of France in Global Competition and Europeanization
- It is important for the government to enhance the “attractiveness of France.”
- Support measures must be developed so that students from French-speaking African countries...
countries and former French colonies will maintain connections with France after they return home.

- By providing education and research training in these countries as part of international development assistance, the French government can promote greater autonomy in African countries (support for capacity building) and enhance the value of France itself.
- In the field of international cooperation, the French government is seeking to develop support projects involving multiple countries such as European and Asian countries including Japan.

2. International Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Youth, Education and Research
http://www.education.gouv.fr/index.php
Interviewees: Elie Cohen, advisor for the Ministry of Youth, Education and Research
Marc Melka, officer responsible for the Asia Pacific region

Background
- Introduced by the division responsible for interuniversity exchange at the French Embassy in Tokyo.
- France’s higher education system was reformed as a result of introduction of the Bologna Process designed to form a European higher education zone.
- Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR) was established in February 2006 to promote and develop of France’s priority research fields. The ANR secretariat is located in the Ministry of Youth, Education and Research.

Recent Issues in French Higher Education
- Reform of France’s higher education system: A licence / master / doctorat (LMD) system has been introduced (three-year undergraduate course, two-year master’s course, and three-year doctorate course). Universities and grandes écoles will both shift to new credit and semester systems etc. from the next university year.
- Students’ mobility: The number of foreign students decreased for a period during the 1990s. The French government has strengthened international strategy since 1998. As a result, the number of foreign students increased from just over 130,000 to more than 260,000 at present, accounting for approximately 14% of the total student population.
- EU network: The number of French students who participate in the Erasmus Project remains unchanged.
- Language: Balance between use of French and English
Rather than simply setting French language proficiency as a requirement for admission, there must be a shift in attitude and positive measures to promote the idea of developing proficiency in French as an outcome of study in France, as well as highlighting the idea of “study in Europe (not only in France)” (opportunities to study in other European countries while studying in France). This is particularly crucial to recruiting highly talented students at master’s and doctoral levels. It is also necessary to promote the French language itself overseas and provide more support for foreign students to learn French while studying in France.
At the same time, there is need for an increase in double/joint degree programs and development of programs taught in an English language medium.
- It is not believed that there will be any decrease in demand for and attractiveness of the French language in the labor market. The demand for human resources with competency in English, French, and another language is thought to be high.

Application of the French Government’s Programs to a Contract System
- To respond effectively to changes in the higher education system, the Ministry of Youth,
Education and Research and universities need to develop a shared appreciation of objectives and goals. As a tool to achieve this, a (four-year) finance and management contract system between the ministry and universities is being utilized. The system itself has been in use since the 1980s.

- The contract covers all matters related to university management such as education, research, international activities, student services, personnel affairs, finance, and facilities.
- The ministry and a university discuss a contract based on a proposal (plan, outcome indicators, and implementation period) prepared by the university. Before finalizing the agreement, the parties engage in ongoing negotiation to ensure that it will reflect the government’s key measures and the objectives and goals for higher education, including focused allocation of financial resources.

Recent contract renewals, in particular, have positioned “internationalization” as one of the key issues.

- Matters included in the contract are subject to evaluation at completion of the contract period.

**Efforts to Promote Researcher Mobility**

- The French government submitted a bill to amend the Immigration Control Law in early February and intends to enact it quickly in March. The objective of the amendment includes extension of the period of stay, simplification of changing visa status to working visa after graduation, etc. aimed to promote students’ (primarily doctor’s course students’) and researchers’ mobility.
- The French government plans to recruit approximately 3,000 new researchers over the next three years in addition to the fixed positions at universities, etc. as one of measure (to be enshrined in law) to develop careers and improve compensation for young researchers. All universities, research institutes, and laboratories jointly established by a research institute and a university will be covered by this measure.
- In the case of universities, young researchers who are employed under this system will be hired as full-time faculty members depending on their performance after the provisional year (one-year probation period). However, their promotion process is complex because university faculties are is public employees. In the case of the National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS), on the other hand, researchers are recruited directly.
- Another measure taken by the French government is encouraging French researchers to return home. The government is implementing projects for postdoctoral-level young researchers and the “Chaires d’Excellence” (project for researchers who have achieved internationally recognized results). In the latter, the number of senior researchers increased from five at the beginning to fifteen.
- The government is paying attention to Asia and particularly China, in addition to former French colonies, in its regional strategies.

**3. Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne**
http://www.univ-paris1.fr/index.html

Responders: Yvonne Flour, vice president (responsible for academic activities)
Rosalind Greenstein, researcher
Francois Gaudu, professor

**Background**

- Introduced by the division responsible for interuniversity exchange of the French Embassy in Tokyo.

**Positioning of Internationalization**

- International activities are basically pursued by respective departments and researchers.
The university has a sense of crisis about promoting university-wide internationalization under globalization and recognizes the necessity of establishing the image of an “international university” to enhance its prestige.

Educational Programs
- Regular curricular programs are basically taught in French. However, the major of Applied Mathematics of the Economics and Fiscal Science Course offers a curriculum for foreign students where lectures are given in English in the first year and a master’s program is provided in French in the second year (a transition diploma structure). The first-year curriculum includes intensive French classes.
- The university focuses on quality rather than quantity in accepting foreign students. It emphasizes recruiting higher-level students.
- Recently, the university opened a master’s course in Romania and a diploma course in China.

Organizational Structure
- The International Affairs Department is placed under the Vice President with three to four staff members. The department handles student exchange programs in an intensive manner, but daily support for foreign students is provided by each department.

4. École Centrale Paris (ECP)
http://www.ecp.fr/index_html_en
Interviewees:
  - Daniel Grimm, Professor, Vice President
  - Emile Esposito, Professor responsible for policy measures
  - Jean-Hubert Schmitt, Professor, Director of Research
  - Barbara Catalano, Director of the International Exchange Department
  - Fouad Bennis, Director of international exchange at the Nantes Campus

Background
- ECP is one of the France’s grandes écoles in the field of engineering. It is a high-level professional education institution with a small number of students.
- To enter a grande école requires completion not only of the baccalauréat (certification of high school degree) but also the scientific baccalauréat. Students need to pass the competitive examination of each grande école after completing two-year grande école preparatory classes. (Number of students reaching baccalauréat age: 760,000; number of students admitted by ECP: 1,200)
- Sixty percent of the budget of the four universities of École Centrale Intergroup (Lyon, Nantes, Paris, and Lille) is publicly funded, while 40% is privately funded.
- The group has 650 doctor’s course students, 260 full-time researchers, 600 full-time faculty members, and 1,950 part-time instructors (chiefly engineers playing an active role on the business front).

Educational System
- ECP emphasizes basic ability in science and mathematics through a five-year integrated educational program (two-year preparatory class, two-year grande école core course, and one-year grande école advanced study). It aims to develop well-rounded engineers with deep understanding of theories and concepts.
- A master’s degree is awarded upon completion of ECP. Students who hope to earn a doctoral degree continue to engage in research activities at ECP.
- ECP believes that its system is incompatible with the two-cycle system (three-year
undergraduate course and one- to two-year master’s course) advocated in the Bologna Process.

- Internships is a compulsory element of the core course. The period of internship is between six weeks and three months including six-week overseas internship. ECP sends students to IHI Corporation in Japan.

In addition, full-time internship is mandatory in the advanced study stage.

Double Degree Program at Master’s Level
- ECP is promoting double degree programs at master’s level, utilizing a consortium named T.I.M.E. (Top Industrial Managers for Europe) established by ECP in 1989. (https://www.time-association.org/)

This system is aimed to provide ECP students with an opportunity to study abroad without interrupting the five-year integrated program, and to accept the most distinguished students from abroad.

- Regarding the student exchange programs, both ECP and partner universities operate compulsory foreign language courses and students must acquire sufficient foreign language ability. This is a measure based on recognition that learning foreign languages and acquiring the ability to adapt to and understand different cultures will contribute to development of human resources who can respond to globalization in a real sense.

- Learning English is essential because English is frequently used as a tool for communication in the faculty’s actual research activities and communication with faculty and foreign students at laboratories. However, ECP thinks that teaching its programs in French (the local language) will enhance understanding.

- Keio University and Tohoku University in Japan are members of the consortium. ECP is currently negotiating with other universities.

- Regarding students from Japan, ECP has difficulty evaluating (academic) ability. ECP cannot judge whether the student has the academic ability required by ECP due to differences is subject/course descriptions, evaluation terms, etc.

- ECP is considering requiring students who do not participate in the double degree program to participate in other international activities.

Research Activities and Collaboration with Other Universities, etc.
- ECP is deploying various research activities with a primary focus on eight laboratories under collaboration with the National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS) and industry.

- ECP opened a research master’s course in collaboration with other universities in 2004. This course enables students to learn basic research methods, etc. and plays a role of supplemental education for students who hope to advance to the doctoral course.

Organization for International Activities
- “Internationalization” has been the top-priority issue over the past 20 years.

ECP's internationalization policy is developed based on surveys of trends in higher education institutions overseas conducted by the faculty of the International Affairs Division, as well as industry needs. ECP is developing a specific implementation plan, and its missions, etc. penetrate throughout the institution.

- The International Affairs Department that controls international operations is located under the director of the Educational Affairs Department. However, actual international affairs are handled by each department.

- “Internationalization” is naturally envisaged under the contract with the Ministry of Youth, Education and Research. ECP receives other government research funds in addition to the funds provided by the ministry.
5. Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE), Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

http://www.oecd.org/department/0,2688,en_2649_35961291_1_1_1_1_1,00.html

Interviewees: Jacqueline Smith, IMHE officer responsible for EDU/EMI
Hiroyuki Hase, Education and Training Policy Division
Accompanied by: Ei Takeuchi, First Secretary of the Permanent Delegation of Japan to the OECD

Recent Activities related to Internationalization
- In 1998, OECD/IMHE conducted a survey of internationalization and quality assurance in higher education. Contexts and meanings of “internationalization” vary by country and there are a variety of different efforts, activities, and backgrounds to internationalization in higher education.

The results of the survey are compiled in a publication entitled *Quality and Internationalisation in Higher Education* (1999). Efforts in the International Quality Review Project (IQRP) are described in the publication as research on methods to evaluate internationalization in higher education.

- This publication is a sequel to *Strategies for Internationalisation of Higher Education – A Comparative Study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the United States of America* (1995) and *Internationalisation of Higher Education in Asia Pacific Countries* (1997). By reading the three publications together, readers can gain a better understanding of the meanings of and efforts towards internationalization made by higher education institutions around the world, as well as differences in backgrounds and incentives. The publications also reveal differences in how internationalization efforts are evaluated.

- OECD/IMHE is currently conducting a statistical survey of faculty and researchers from a demographic viewpoint, and is interested in the issue of researchers’ mobility in the field of science and technology.

6. Université Paris-Sorbonne Paris IV


Interviewees: Flora Blanchon, Professor responsible for Asia
Sylvie Guicharad-Anguis, Researcher (former JSPS fellow)

Positioning of Internationalization
- The university is promoting internationalization with the aim of becoming a world-class research and education institution, based on the scheme formulated by the European Higher Education Area.

- The faculty and staff believe that international exchange will promote the traditional research and academic strengths of the university and bring benefits to students from around the world by the introduction of the three-cycle system of undergraduate, master’s, and doctoral courses based on the Bologna Process.

Organizational Structure
- In 2004, the International Affairs Division became independent of the Educational and Academic Affairs Division and set up an office (International Relations Division with eight personnel) directly linked to the staff under the President.

In December 2005, the university established the Internationalization Promotion Steering Committee under the leadership of the President. The committee is responsible for development and implementation of the university’s internationalization policy.

- Each of the 20 faculty members on the committee is assigned responsibility for a particular region. The International Relations Division, as the only administrative organ involved in
internationalization, is in charge of the administrative affairs of the Internationalization Promotion Steering Committee, collects technical data and materials related to internationalization, and keeps in close communication with the Scientific Policy Board as well as the Board of Directors, which is the top organ in the university.

Contract with the Ministry of Youth, Education and Research
- Integration of foreign students/researchers and French students/researchers is a basic goal of the current four-year contract (2006-2009).
Specifically, the university aims to simplify the application system for foreign students as soon as possible. It also plans to establish a French language learning support system for foreign students and promote study abroad programs for French students in response to the expansion of the Socrates/Erasmus Program.
- The Ministry of Youth, Education and Research evaluates French universities every two years. The ministry compares and ranks the universities. However, the evaluation results are not made available to the general public.

Educational Programs
- The university opened an extension campus in Abu Dhabi and is providing education in the French language. There are some high schools in Abu Dhabi that teach their curriculums in French, and it is expected that graduates from these high schools will enter the university.
- The university hopes to activate cooperation and exchange with Japanese universities in the fields of humanities and social science. It has agreements with Hiroshima University, Nagoya University, and Waseda University.
- Many universities in Paris do not have their own accommodation. The issue of accommodation is an impediment to accepting foreign students.

The Netherlands
7. Nuffic (Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education)
http://www.nuffic.nl/
Interviewees: Jindra Divis, Director of the Dutch NARIC/ENIC
            Dirk Haaksman, Deputy Director of the Centre for International Recognition and Certification
            Astrid Scholten, Manager responsible for evaluation, Centre for International Recognition and Certification
            Marijke Blom-Westrik, Centre for International Recognition and Certification
            Janina Victor, international academic exchange policy advisor
            Jacques van Vliet, Manager of the International Marketing Department
Accompanied by: Masahiko Chiseki, Osaka University Groningen Center (until February 17, 2006)

Background
- Nuffic was founded in 1952 by Dutch universities. It originates from an institution that was responsible for educational and development projects in Indonesia. Nuffic is currently a government-affiliated nonprofit organization composed of the following four departments.
  Development Cooperation:
  Cooperation for development of higher education in developing countries based on EU and Dutch government funds
  International Marketing:
  Support for Dutch universities' foreign student recruitment activities
Nuffic has offices in China, Indonesia, and Vietnam at present and plans to increase the number of offices to ten in the future. It also has affiliated offices in Hong Kong and Taipei.
International Academic Relations (internationalization) (Scholarship Unit and Policy/Expertise Unit):
Promotion of scholarship programs for both inbound and outbound students, international interuniversity exchange and cooperation, and improvement of the environment for accepting foreign students/researchers

Credential Evaluation:
Evaluation of academic credentials and diplomas issued by foreign institutions and submitted by foreign applicants who hope to study at a Dutch university, and evaluation of immigrants’ job qualifications and academic/expertise certificates.

Credential Evaluation
- As a result of the promotion of mobility of students and workers including researchers within the EU, it has become more important to ensure correct understanding and evaluation of academic credentials, diplomas, and various certificates of qualification issued in foreign countries. To respond to this need, the National Academic Recognition Information Centres (NARIC) and the European Network of Information Centres (ENIC) have been established as networks of information centers in the EU related to evaluation of credentials and qualifications.
  Nuffic is serving as the Dutch center for both these networks.
- Twelve evaluators (full time/part time) are in charge of different areas, languages, and educational systems (U.S. and U.K. types), and give advice to universities based on the results of their evaluations.

Effects of the Bologna Process
- The Netherlands initiated reform based on the Bologna Declaration as early as September 1, 2002. It plans to complete the shift to the Bologna Process (three-year undergraduate course and one- to two-year master’s course) in 2005 or 2006 at undergraduate level, and in 2006 or in 2007 at master’s level.
- In terms of students’ mobility, diploma mobility (global mobility of degree-seeking students) is increasing among students undertaking a master’s or doctor’s course, while credit mobility (studying abroad for one to several semesters, transferring the credits earned during this period to the home university, and graduating from the home university) is increasing among undergraduate students. In respect of diploma mobility, in particular, major impetus is being provided by the Erasmus Mundus scholarship that allows students to study at multiple universities and earn a master’s degree (joint degree program).
- Universities in Europe expect that student exchange centered on joint degree and double degree programs will be expanded in the future because the universities do not want to lose their home country students permanently.

Response to Researcher Mobility
- Helpdesk activities: ERA-MORE
  Nuffic set up a helpdesk for people associated with Dutch universities and foreign students/researchers. Many people are using it for immigration control procedures.
  The helpdesk for researchers functions as an ERA-MORE (the European Network of Mobility Centers: European Research Area-Mobile Researchers) portal. Establishment of these portals is promoted by the EU Commission in the Netherlands. The commission plans to further develop the portal over the next three years.
  The helpdesk provides practical information on matters such as health insurance, pension insurance, family affairs and accommodation, in addition to information on researcher job vacancies, fellowships, and research grants. Nuffic is currently creating a database of such information.
Nuffic is strengthening networking with industry to involve corporate researchers in addition to those attached to universities.
- Provision of training programs for university staff
  Nuffic holds training for administrative personnel who are newly assigned to international exchange, training on immigration control procedures (on a fee-paying basis), and individual seminars to support improvement of international affairs at universities.
- Survey activities
  Nuffic conducts periodical surveys of students/researchers’ mobility in the Netherlands. It also conducts surveys commissioned by the Dutch government on impediments to the researcher mobility scheme suggested by the EU Commission.

Government-level Internationalization Efforts
- Nuffic noted the following four points as characteristic of internationalization in the Netherlands.
  a. The country is fully prepared for introduction of the new student exchange system within Europe.
  b. A growing number of German students are coming to the country seeking to earn master’s degrees.
  c. The number of privately financed foreign students increased until 2003 but began to decrease subsequently. This is probably a rebound from the rapid, short-term increase in foreign students that exceeded capacity in Dutch universities.
  d. There has been a steady increase in the number of curricular programs taught in English by Dutch universities (1,300 programs at present).
- The Ministry of Youth, Education and Research published a policy paper on internationalization in November 2004. The ministry publishes these papers every several years. The key points of the most recent policy paper are as follows:
  a. Strengthening the scheme of the European Higher Education Area
  b. Mainstreaming internationalization
  c. Strengthening the shift from quantity to quality
  d. Promoting brain circulation
- Establishment of a university “Code of Conduct” – A code related to accepting foreign students is currently under development.

8. University of Amsterdam
http://www.english.uva.nl/
Interviewee: Mariette J. J. Diderich, international exchange/academic measures advisor

Organizational Structure
- The University of Amsterdam is implementing international activities as one of the basic activities in the mainstream of the university’s education, research, and management/operation, adopting a system where each department promotes internationalization individually (a mainstream model).
- The internationalization policy of the university is incorporated into the university-wide policy on education and research and plans are developed every four years. Internationalization policy is determined at a meeting of the executive board composed of the university’s directors and deans.
- “Internationalization” is positioned as a high-priority issue under the strong leadership of the president.
The university attaches more importance to internationalization from educational aspects than to research aspects and encourages incorporation of international elements into the curriculum.

- Internationalization is reviewed as part of accreditation by the government (Ministry of Education). The processes of accreditation and quality assurance review (evaluation) are integrated and also linked to the evaluation of plans and goals conducted every four years using a benchmarking approach.

Educational Programs
- Upon the introduction of the Bologna Process, the former four-year first degree programs were reorganized into three-year baccalaureate degree and one-year master’s degree programs. This made the overall curricular structures tight and inflexible, preventing students from spending a year abroad, so study abroad patterns have been changing recently. An increasing number of students now apply for joint or double degree programs to avoid wasting time.

New Scholarship System
- The Dutch government abolished financial support for students from non-EU countries in 2008. Funds previously used for this support have been transferred to new foreign student scholarship programs. Therefore, each department is required to have a clear policy and a concrete plan for accepting foreign students.
- With regard to financial support for the Socrates/Erasmus Program, the European University Association (EUA) is lobbying the EU Commission on behalf of universities.

9. Leiden University
http://www.leiden.edu/

Interviewees: Robert Coelen, Vice President International
Hendrik Jan Hobbes, Manager responsible for international collaboration

Organizational Structure
- “Leiden World Wide”, an organization auxiliary to the university, was previously responsible for international activities, chiefly the recruitment of foreign students. The system was reviewed in 2005, with personnel reshuffled and international operations were re-incorporated into the main internal university structure with personnel.
- The university appointed Dr. Robert Coelen, a Dutch researcher who has 13-year experience as an executive officer, etc. at an Australian university, as Vice President International and established a headquarters system directly subordinate to the President (central office).
- The role of the Vice President includes not only management of the university-wide strategy but also a planning/consultancy function, examining past results and current research/educational activities in each department and exploring how they can be developed into new international activities.

Background to Reorganization
- In conjunction with the launch of the university-wide five-year plan for 2005 to 2010, Leiden University began to consider a new international strategy in March 2004. It developed and announced the strategy “Focusing on Talent” (original title in Dutch) in April 2005.

Based on the ideal of “aiming to become a world-class research university”, the university confirmed that it would endeavor to enhance the quality of activities in recruiting distinguished human resources and accepting talented foreign students, as well as improving the quality of education and research.
The university recruited a large number of foreign students under the initiative of the executive office before the new international strategy was developed. In doing so, however, the university did not give sufficient consideration to the opinions of its departments and faculty members in terms of assuring the quality of foreign students and educational programs. This increased discontent within the university.

Current Efforts

- Leiden University is considering an action plan to realize international strategy under the initiative of the President and Vice President. However, it is necessary to develop a master plan based on an understanding of internationalization needs and intentions of each department. To this end, the university is promoting internal coordination with the Vice President playing the role of consultant.
- The headquarters (central office) is responsible for comprehending the current state of internationalization (position of Leiden University in Europe and the world) and determining the future direction, vision, and plan.
- In reality, research universities have difficulty implementing unified university-wide international programs. Therefore, it is necessary for each department to develop international activity programs based on its characteristics and needs.
- The headquarters (central office) needs to enhance motivation and give incentives to each department to engage in international research/educational activities.
- The university plans to teach all master's course curriculums in English within several years (in line with the Netherlands’ reform of the higher education system).

This is a measure based on the judgment that students in the EU will be able to select a master’s course program at any university within the EU after completing the undergraduate curriculum, and that Leiden University will need to offer the curriculum in English if it is to recruit many students from both the Netherlands and other European countries.
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Executive Summary

• The Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) and the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) have conducted a survey of current policies and initiatives at the national and institutional levels which promote international researcher mobility.

• The survey was intended to provide a broad overview and to look at typical or distinctive examples in the context of a summary of general trends.

• The result of the national survey indicates that current efforts by countries can be roughly classified into the following four categories:

  (1) Support for incoming and outgoing researchers;
  (2) Support for the return and reintegration, and networking of overseas researchers;
  (3) Promotion and international publicity and marketing of higher education and R&D; and
  (4) Support for initiatives that focus on immigration.

• In surveying initiatives to improve international researcher mobility at the institutional level, we focused on the following five aspects:

  (1) Provision of fellowships and grants by the university itself;
  (2) Research and education exchanges among multiple universities via institutional alliances and consortia;
  (3) International strategic plans developed for the university as a whole and arrangements for implementing international activities on campus; and
  (4) Establishment of overseas research facilities and efforts to attract overseas research institutes to set up on campus.
  (5) Social and cultural support for overseas researchers (e.g., housing, provisions for family, language support, etc)
In analyzing the efforts, there is an undeniable development that involves regional (e.g., European) initiatives to improve international researcher mobility.

The multi-layered co-existence of initiatives on a regional level, on a national level, and on an institutional level has generated synergistic effects in encouraging further efforts by countries throughout the world.

1. Study Outline
1.1 Study Framework

The Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) and the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) have conducted a survey of current policies and initiatives at the national and institutional levels which promote international researcher mobility. The study aims at understanding what is happening in the arena of international mobility of human resources in the Science and Technology (S&T) field.

The study was conducted as a web-based survey over the period of 30 January to 23 February 2007. The main sources referenced were the websites of government bodies and Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the relevant countries, mainly the OECD member countries (see the lists in page 9 -10).

The limitations of the current study need to be acknowledged. The survey was conducted under severe time constraints, and data sources were limited to the websites available in English and in Japanese. Therefore, the survey does not provide a comprehensive review of all initiatives taken by the countries and the HEIs in relation to international researcher mobility. Nevertheless the study does provide a broad overview of the general policy trends and distinctive examples in the relevant national and institutional contexts.

Notwithstanding the above noted limitations, the current study represents an important addition to the document prepared by the OECD secretariat. The survey findings will be utilised, for example, as follows:

(1) For the JSPS, to develop a model and identify good practices for its on-going programme, Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities;
For delegates from other countries, to refer to as basic data for future country surveys conducted by the Working Group on the Steering and Funding of Research Institutions (SFRI)

- For the purposes of this study, “researcher” was defined as research personnel enrolled in doctoral courses or higher and included doctoral candidates, post-doctoral fellows, teachers and researchers at universities and other HEIs, and researchers at research institutes.

- This report consists of two parts: National Survey and Institutional Survey. Research methods for each part are summarised below.

1.2 Research Methodology

**National Survey**
- For the purposes of this study, “researcher” was defined as research personnel enrolled in doctoral courses or higher and included doctoral candidates, post-doctoral fellows, teachers and researchers at universities and other HEIs, and researchers at research institutes.

- This report consists of two parts: National Survey and Institutional Survey. Research methods for each part are summarised below.

- The national survey primarily targeted the OECD member countries, but when considered appropriate, also included countries such as China and South Africa, which are undertaking some interesting initiatives to attract researchers internationally.

- When referring to specific measures, we have supplemented web-based information wherever possible with references and comments made at past OECD/CRSP/SFRI meetings regarding initiatives taken by countries to improve international researcher mobility.

- We have summarized specific initiatives taken by the countries. The following list of information was included wherever possible: programme names, objectives, background, targets, start year, period, budget, responsible organisations, eligibility criteria, annual budget, outcomes, etc... These subject headings are based on those used in the Pilot Survey among four countries conducted by OECD/SFRI in 2006/2007.

**Institutional Survey**
- For the institutional survey, we first selected a target sample of 30 universities. In selecting the target institutions, we consulted the Times Higher Education Supplement, *The Times Higher World University Rankings 2006*, focusing primarily on
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higher-ranked institutions. A total of 20 institutions were chosen, balancing languages and geographical distribution: 11 universities were selected as English-speaking institutions from Europe and North America, and 9 universities were chosen from non-native English-speaking countries around the world (see the list in page 9). To these we added the top 10 universities in Japan to make the total of 30 universities.

- In surveying initiatives to improve international researcher mobility at the institutional level, we focused on the following five aspects:

  (1) Provision of fellowships and grants by the university itself;
  (2) Research and education exchanges among multiple universities via institutional alliances and consortia;
  (3) International strategic plans developed for the university as a whole and arrangements for implementing international activities on campus; and
  (4) Establishment of overseas research facilities and efforts to attract overseas research institutes to set up on campus.
  (5) Social and cultural support for overseas researchers (e.g., housing, provisions for family, language support, etc)

- We identified examples of specific initiatives by institutions based on the above frame of reference and tabulated them according to the following headings: programme names, objectives, background, targets, start year, period, budget, responsible organisations, eligibility criteria, annual budget, results, etc. As with the country survey, the subject headings are based on those used in the Pilot Survey among four countries conducted by OECD/SFRI in 2006/2007.

- Regarding specific programmes such as grants and fellowships, we only included those implemented on a university-wide basis, excluding programmes and provisions provided and managed at the school/college/faculty/department level.

Note
- Because of the limited data sources used to conduct both surveys, it was not possible to develop a comprehensive picture of the various programmes. It should be noted that blanks on the worksheets indicate areas where web-based information was not available; the blank space in the table does not necessarily mean that the item in question does not exist.
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## List of Countries referred to in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD member countries</th>
<th>Non-member countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Region/Sub-region

- EU
- Nordic Council
Innovative Models for Promoting the Internationalization of Japanese Universities (Interim Report)

List of Universities referred to in this study

Universities in English-speaking countries of Europe and North America

- Australian National University
- California Institute of Technology
- Harvard University
- Imperial College London
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- McGill University
- Stanford University
- University of Auckland
- University of Cambridge
- University of Oxford
- Yale University

Universities in non-native English-speaking countries

- Copenhagen University
- Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris
- Eindhoven University of Technology
- ETH Zurich
- Indian Institutes of Technology
- National University of Singapore
- Peking University
- Seoul National University
- University of Heidelberg

Universities in Japan

- Hokkaido University
- Keio University
- Kyoto University
- Kyushu University
- Nagoya University
- Osaka University
- The University of Tokyo
- Tohoku University
- Tokyo Institute of Technology
- Waseda University
2. National Survey

2.1 Findings

Overview

• Looking at the situation of international researcher mobility from a broad perspective, European countries have notably undertaken extensive and comprehensive initiatives to promote international researcher mobility under a variety of EU programmes, including, for example, ERASMUS and the Marie Curie Actions.

• On the other hand, fast growing economies such as China and Thailand are continuing with advanced and characteristic efforts to promote the return and reintegration of overseas researchers.

Promotion Strategies

• Current efforts by countries can be roughly classified into the following four categories:

  (1) Support for incoming and outgoing researchers;

  (2) Support for the return and reintegration, and networking of overseas researchers;

  (3) Promotion and international publicity and marketing of higher education and R&D; and

  (4) Support for initiatives that focus on immigration.

Following are some examples focusing on the characteristics of each category.

Supporting Incoming and Outgoing Researchers

• Multiple countries have been actively pursuing programmes to support incoming and outgoing international researchers. Of particular note is a marked increase in recent years in the number of invitation programmes for top overseas researchers with proven track records. This appears to be an international trend as countries in Europe, as well as Canada, Japan, China and South Africa are now involved in such projects. Such growing emphasis on this type of programme on a global basis indicates that international competition for talented and highly skilled researchers will become more intense.

• Other programmes that target incoming mainly younger researchers, post-doctoral fellows for example, are also being implemented on a bilateral basis. While such programmes are not covered by this study, it was found that some countries like Norway are taking a more strategic approach in regard to such programmes, offering them only to researchers from fast-growing economies. Other countries like France, Germany, Japan, the United States and Australia generally open such programmes to
all overseas individuals regardless of nationality.

- Although these types of programmes are mostly designed for individual researchers based on their own records of research, Norway employs a different approach as exemplified by its Personal Visiting Researcher Programme in which grants are awarded to researchers who become involved in, and will likely make a contribution to, research projects launched by the relevant receiving institutions. The rationale behind this approach is an expectation of better results from such research projects and more effective use of grants through the recruitment of top researchers with specifically skills sets required for undertaking superior-level projects.

- In regard to programmes to support outgoing researchers, most countries gear such programmes toward younger researchers at the postdoctoral level or equivalent. The number of these programmes, which are mostly offered by “major powers” such as France, Germany, and Japan, is slightly smaller than that of the above mentioned more recent type of programmes to receive overseas researchers which have been actively developed by many countries and burgeoning in recent years. This proximity in number could be explained by the fact that the systematic basis of sending researchers overseas has been well developed under bilateral and regional (e.g. EU) programmes, thus reducing, to a considerable extent, the necessity to further develop open-type programmes on a national level.

- Some recently developed programmes to support outgoing researchers involve initiatives to strengthen institution-supported funds for institutional efforts to support excellent researchers going abroad. Illustrative examples include: Japan’s JSPS International Training Programme (ITP) which started from 2007; the United States’ NSF Partnerships for International Research and Education (PIRE) launched in 2005; and Initial Training Networks under the 7th Framework Programme of the EU which starts from 2007. These programmes cover a wide range of younger researchers at the start of their career, including both PhD students and post-doctoral fellows, and are intended to provide individuals with opportunities to undergo training at overseas partner institutions. Although the programmes are chiefly designed to support fixed-term mobility of outgoing researchers, they are noteworthy for their potential effect to stimulate competition among universities in building an attractive educational environment in education and research, thus influencing the mobility of younger researchers.

Supporting the Return and Reintegration, and Networking of Overseas Researchers
There have been a growing number of so-called “reverse brain drain” policies and initiatives enacted to support the return of overseas professionals. Along with the increased mobility of individuals, an increasing number of advanced and semi-advanced countries have been taking measures to support the return of overseas researchers in recent years. These policies and initiatives include Australia’s “Backing Australia’s Ability” programme which is being developed on a national level as well as the EU’s International Reintegration Grants (IRG) and European Reintegration Grants (ERG), both of which are being developed at a regional level under the Marie Curie Actions. Such drives, however, are especially pronounced in Asian countries which have been suffering from more notable cases of “brain drain.” In addition to South Korea, which has been actively making efforts to cope with this issue, China and Thailand have developed programmes to encourage and support returning researchers by covering the costs of creating a research environment that the researchers can return to.

The efforts of China and Thailand have extended beyond initiatives for the return and reintegration of overseas researchers to cover short-stay visitor programmes in which researchers from the relevant country who have been resident abroad could return home temporarily to deliver single isolated lectures and/or closely packed series of lectures and thereby transfer knowledge so as to create a network for the further development of the relevant country and its research and development activities.

The drive to network overseas researchers is also growing in Europe, though to a lesser extent than in China and Thailand. For example, Austria and Germany are undertaking initiatives to promote networking of their own researchers in active service in North America, while other policies focus on encouraging communication (“brainpower austria” and “GAIN” programmes). Austria’s initiatives include programmes to support the return and reintegration of overseas researchers by supporting traveling expenses required to attend job interviews for overseas researchers who wish to return home as well as foreign researchers who wish to come to Austria. In addition to “reverse brain drain” policies, efforts to “network compatriot researchers overseas” are growing.

**Promotion and International Publicity and Marketing of Higher Education and R&D**

Another marked recent trend is the growing number of national initiatives to promote international publicity and marketing of higher education and R&D. This has stimulated national organisations for academic exchange such as Britain’s British Council, France’s CNRS, Germany’s DAAD and DFG, South Korea’s KOSEF, the Netherlands’ Nuffic, NSF in the United States and JSPS and JST in Japan. These organisations re-emphasize traditional approaches to publicity and marketing while actively promoting international publicity and marketing through overseas offices. For example, Nuffic held “The European Higher Education Fair” in Asian countries under
a joint initiative with the British Council, while DAAD has joined with EduFrance to promote education and R&D in Europe throughout the globe while at the same time working to strengthen and fine tune its publicity and marketing strategy for certain countries.

- In Germany, the Federal Ministry of Education and Research in collaboration with various stakeholders is carrying out the “Hi! Potential” campaign, a joint initiative for international promotion of study, research and training in Germany. The country’s prime minister has also served as a face of the campaign which demonstrates the emphasis being placed on higher education and R&D.

- Enhancement of national level awareness-raising activities to boost research environments also serves as a measure to attract overseas researchers.

**Initiatives that Focus on Immigration**

- One of the most popular initiatives relating to the issuance of visas and residence and work permits is the move to give preferential treatment to professional human resources with specialized expertise under immigration control schemes. These include: (i) formation and expansion of a special framework for human resources with specialized expertise; and (ii) introduction of a point system in which the adequacy of issuing a residence permit to an overseas researcher is determined on the basis of scores calculated and registered based on the researcher’s educational background and qualifications. Examples of the move under the above (i) include the formation of the framework for “intellectual immigrants” by the Netherlands and the expansion of the framework of HI-B visas by the United States. Moves that fall under the above (ii) may be characterized by the way in which they are more conducive to heightened objectivity and transparency in the visa process and/or the approval of other relevant permits rather than relying solely on the policies of (i). The latter strategy has mainly been carried out in Commonwealth countries such as the United Kingdom, Canada and New Zealand, while Germany is now in the process of introducing such a system. In France where preferential treatment is given to talented and skilled overseas human resources under the Immigration Reform and Control Act, the immigration control system forestalls a brain drain by requiring immigrants from developing countries either to obtain approval of the country from which they come from or by granting limited residence permits. In recent years, such initiatives have become more focused on giving special consideration to talented and skilled human resources in the context of tightened requirements for receiving immigrants under the immigration policies of many Western countries.

- Another initiative that has become popular in recent years is the move for a country to give preferential treatment in issuing a residence permit to students from overseas who
have graduated from its own higher education institutions. France, Germany and Scotland allow such overseas students to stay in the relevant country for a fixed period of time to give them sufficient time to find a job. Singapore requires scholarship students from ASEAN countries who have been educated in its higher education institutions to work in the country for a period of two years, the observance of which results in automatic authorisation to stay in the country on a permanent basis.

- In recent years, many Western countries have revealed a policy of receiving immigrants in a more visible manner by developing and/or improving preferential treatment for talented and skilled human resources while strengthening the requirements for receiving immigrants under the scope of immigration control.

- While there may be no direct implications on immigration control policy, Denmark and Sweden give tax incentives to overseas researchers received by the relevant country by allowing them tax exemptions or reductions on a temporary basis.

**Others**

- Other noteworthy recent developments include a shift to multiple funding sources and internationalisation of funding, as exemplified by the Internationally Coordinated Initiatives (ICIs) undertaken by Australia. This programme is intended to co-fund with foreign funding institutions joint international research projects undertaken by Australian higher education and research institutions and their overseas counterparts. A similar sort of programme is undertaken by the U.S.-based NSF and the EU, presenting a prospect for future growth.

- Another noteworthy recent development is a Singapore government-led project in which a research town known as Biopolis that houses many institutes of higher learning and research institutes was developed. Through this initiative, Singapore is attracting overseas universities and research institutes as well as overseas enterprises to further develop the research town into a hub of research in the Asian region.

- It is expected that these initiatives will influence international researcher mobility by generating opportunities of international research cooperation and exchange and further promoting such activities.

- As stated above, we have obtained an overview of current efforts by countries to promote international researchers mobility. In analyzing the efforts, however, there is an undeniable development that involves regional initiatives to improve international researcher mobility. Typical examples of these initiatives include ERASMUS, as an education and exchange programme undertaken by the EU, Marie Curie Actions under the scheme of the 6th and 7th Framework Programmes of the EU, as referred to above,
and NordForsk as undertaken by the Nordic Council. The Marie Curie Actions focus mainly on the mobility of individuals and offers programmes to specifically promote international researcher mobility. This comprehensive programme covers long- and short-term support for outgoing and incoming researchers as well as support for the return and reintegration of researchers and the settlement of overseas researchers and has had a significant influence on policies and initiatives adopted and taken by various countries.

- Also noteworthy is a funding programme undertaken by the European Research Council (ERC) that will be newly established under the 7th research framework of the EU. This programme is likely to influence researcher mobility on a regional level as it will bring top-level researchers that play an active role in Europe in to competition for grants as it does not have any limits in regard to the nationality of candidates.

- On a regional level, there is a growing trend to follow Europe, which is taking the lead in researcher exchange, in the Asia-Pacific region, as exemplified by the University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific (UMAP) programme to promote the mobility of persons in terms of higher education exchange. As the Asia-Pacific counterpart of the ERASMUS programme, UMAP, though currently focused on the exchange of students, particularly at the undergraduate level, is set to expand to cover researcher exchange, thus retaining the potential to become a tool to enhance international researcher mobility. Another new drive geared toward reducing institutional barriers to international researcher mobility is also being observed, as exemplified by Japan’s proposal at a recent APEC meeting to expand the APEC Business Travel Card scheme, which eliminates the necessity for businesspeople to obtain a visa for short-term business visit in the region, to cover researchers.

- On an institutional level, there are a variety of initiatives that are likely to improve international researcher mobility. A noteworthy example is the Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities programme being undertaken by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science with the support of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. This initiative is characterized by the fact that the national government supports an internationalisation activity on an institutional level in non English-speaking countries that is inherently faced with linguistic barriers in its effort to become more internationalized.

- As indicated by the history of development of institutions in Europe, the multi-layered co-existence of initiatives on a regional level, on a national level, and on an institutional level has generated synergistic effects in encouraging further efforts by countries throughout the world.
3. Institutional Survey

3.1 Findings

**University-sponsored fellowship/ grant programmes**

- University-sponsored fellowships and grants provide a measure of how much the university is involved in sending or inviting international researchers and reflect the stance (motivation, uniqueness) of each university. We collected information on the fellowship and grant programmes of individual universities because we regard this as an important indicator of the international mobility of researchers.

- In this survey, we looked only at fellowships targeted at students and researchers at the doctoral or higher level funded primarily by the university and offered on a campus-wide basis (i.e., we excluded faculty- or department-level programmes).

- Seven of the 10 Japanese universities surveyed offered their own fellowships. These are intended principally to take in overseas researchers or to assist Japanese researchers to go overseas.

- Of the 20 universities in European and American English-speaking countries, non-native English-speaking countries, 8 offered their own fellowships. Two universities listed as eligibility criteria students/researchers other than those from the home country (University of Cambridge, Peking University). Five specified the nationality of incoming researchers or destination country for outgoing researchers for fellowships offered under an alliance programme (Australian National University, ETH University etc.), while four made no reference to nationality in the descriptions of their programmes (MIT, Yale University, etc.).

- MIT is an illustrative example. This institution collects funds from 20 sponsors (foundations, endowments, etc.) and utilizes these funds to offer its own MIT fellowships (postdoctoral fellowships). Nationality is not an eligibility criterion for the fellowships, which are given to students who are screened and selected by MIT itself. The fellowships normally provide a stipend only, but may also cover insurance and travel expenses if the sponsor agrees. Like MIT, the University of Cambridge funds its fellowships (The Cambridge Trusts) with money collected from multiple sponsors, subsidizing a portion of living expenses for non-British students.

- At universities in European and American English-speaking countries, non-native English-speaking countries, there are fellowships funded solely by the university in question as well as fellowships funded by both the university and foundations. However, many fellowships are funded solely by a foundation, with the foundation handling applicant screening, therefore they are not covered in this survey.
There are almost no references to family subsidies and no assistance for the traveling expenses of families in cases where the researcher is required to travel. This is true of Japan, English-speaking countries and non-English-speaking countries. The University of Singapore states specifically that no assistance is available for family traveling expenses.

Some universities offering fellowships designate expenses for items related to research activities, such as books (examples: Peking University, University of Singapore, California Institute of Technology, etc.) while others merely refer to living costs or a stipend (McGill University, University of Auckland, Copenhagen University, etc.). The amount of funds provided also varies considerably.

There were relatively few examples of campus-wide programmes providing grants for international research activities or projects, which are key to improving researcher mobility.

Other noteworthy examples apart from the above are the Lautenschläger-Research Prize offered by the University of Heidelberg, which provides a grant of EURO 250,000 over two years for high-quality research activities involving international collaboration, and the CHF 20,000 grant for three months provided under University of Zurich’s Sino-Swiss Science and Technology Cooperation Research Fellowship Programme, which is aimed at bolstering research with China.

Alliances and consortia

Quite a number of international alliances and networks involving multiple universities state as their objectives the promotion of researcher exchanges and joint international research as well as collaboration aimed at nurturing younger researchers, suggesting an organised attempt among HEIs to improve international researcher mobility. Accordingly, we collected information about alliances and networks among the target universities where these function as an organised framework to improve international researcher mobility.

The definition of “alliance” used in the survey was as follows:

(1) Primarily, an inter-university collaborative arrangement with participation by universities in at least three countries
(2) Universities play the lead role (i.e., in principle there is no involvement of international organisations or other bodies)
(3) The agreement is entered into at the university level (i.e., department-based arrangements were, as a rule, excluded)
(4) In principle, the alliance has an existing membership and is involved in substantive activities under university leadership
We have summarised in table form membership of major alliances among the 30 universities surveyed.

Alliances may exist at the regional level or the international level. Regional-level alliances are especially common in Europe but the number of alliances in the Asia-Pacific area has grown in recent years.

The regional nature of alliances influences the level of participation at the institutional level. Looking at alliance membership among the universities surveyed, we note that European and Asian universities are especially keen participants in alliances.

The University of Cambridge, the University of Oxford, Imperial College London and Copenhagen University in Europe, University of Singapore and Peking University in Asia, and Australian National University in Australia are members of both worldwide and regional alliances. These universities are probably aiming to strengthen networks both with universities in neighboring countries as well as those located in more distant areas.

Japanese universities are conspicuous by their membership of alliances in the Asian-Pacific region, such as APRU, AEARU and ASAUHL. Japanese universities are also proactive in organizing alliances, as exemplified by Conference of Asian University Presidents (centred around Kyushu University). The impact of Japanese universities’ focus on Asia in their international strategies (discussed later) is evident here.

Compared to European and Asian universities, which are keen participants in alliances, North American universities tend to be members of few alliances. This is probably because university associations and networks within the US itself are highly developed.

Many networks and alliances advocate international researcher and student mobility, but how effective these networks and alliances are in furthering international researcher mobility is not clear from the web-based information gleaned in this study. Further investigation of regionally based and worldwide alliances is necessary.

**International strategies**

International strategies are an embodiment of universities’ efforts to promote international exchange among researchers at a campus-wide level and from a
medium-to-long-term perspective. Specific actions are grouped under such headings as participation in alliances and consortia, promotion of international joint research, establishment of overseas facilities, and others related to researcher mobility. We gathered information on universities’ international strategies to assist in developing a picture of the level of international mobility among active researchers.

- All of the Japanese universities studied in this survey have clearly stated international strategies and they are promoting internationalisation on an organisation-wide basis. Reasons for this include (1) desire by universities to make up for lost time in developing an international focus; (2) the activities of MEXT to support the objectives of universities. For example, the Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities was inaugurated in 2005 to create an internationally competitive research environment that would attract high-caliber researchers both from within Japan and overseas. MEXT has provided a total of JPY 5 million (per year) to 20 selected universities (including the 10 Japanese universities covered in this survey).

- The university strategies about which we were able to obtain information all refer to “promotion of the university’s internationalisation,” “internationalisation of researchers” and “acceptance of overseas researchers.” Improving researcher mobility is thus a common theme of all strategies.

- A feature of Japanese universities is that many have outlined specific Asian strategies. Examples of universities that look towards Asia are Kyushu University, with its “Strategy focused on Asia,” Waseda University, which talks of “joint creation of knowledge in the Asian-Pacific region,” and Osaka University, with its policy of broadening research fields by establishing a joint research community in the Asian region.

- Yale University’s international strategy has a three-fold aim: preparing students for leadership and service in an increasingly interdependent world, attracting the most talented students and scholars to Yale from around the world, and positioning Yale as a global university of consequence. It emphasizes activities in China particularly in its international strategy.

- The University of Cambridge has a campus-wide international strategy. This includes promoting collaboration with overseas universities and specialist institutes in various countries. It carefully selects the world’s leading institutes as collaboration and alliance partners and specifically cites strengthening collaboration with MIT and Tsinghua University in its strategy.

- Part of the International Strategy known as the “Task Force on International Project and Site,” was executed at Harvard University.
We found that non-Japanese universities also tend to promote international activities, but we could not find much evidence of specific campus-wide international strategies among the universities covered in this web-based survey. That said, (1) there may have been instances among universities in non-English-speaking countries where strategies were posted in the local language (local-language web pages were not reviewed in this study) or (2) rather than an independent international strategy, the relevant strategy may be incorporated into the university’s overall strategy. The lack of information should not, therefore, be interpreted as meaning that there is no international strategy. We found, in fact, some examples of non-Japanese universities with stated international strategies.

University of British Columbia (Canada) and Delft University of Technology (Netherlands) have separately defined international strategies, but these universities were not included in the sample covered in this study.

**Overseas facilities**

Overseas facilities are located in areas selected because of their relevance to the promotion of international exchange, and they are intended to serve as the locus of vigorous activities. Their role is to promote international exchange of researchers by collecting and disseminating information and implementing local surveys. We gathered information on overseas facilities as illustrative of initiatives to promote international strategies aimed at advancing researcher mobility.

A feature of Japanese universities is their keenness in establishing overseas facilities. Many have multiple facilities in different overseas locations.

Regions where many Japanese universities have established facilities to represent the university as a whole are North America (west coast), Europe, China and Southeast Asia. There has been a notable move recently to set up facilities in Asia, especially China and Southeast Asia. However, these facilities do not have a long history, with many having been set up in the past few years. Rather than actual research, their role is largely confined to clerical activities such as PR, student recruitment, promotion of researcher exchanges and local information gathering. We expect that overseas facilities will expand from being mere clerical offices to become proper research bases going forward.

There are also universities that have established international research facilities as part of academic-industrial alliances. For example, Japan’s Waseda University has set up the WASEDA-OLYMPUS Bioscience Research Institute in Singapore’s Biopolis, a research town that houses many institutes of higher learning and research institutes.
has established this jointly with a manufacturer of optical and medical equipment and
is promoting international research activities and the formation of scholar networks.

- These positive steps to utilize academic-industrial alliances, secure overseas researchers
  and conduct cutting-edge research have attracted attention. The development of these
  facilities should promote greater reciprocity (sending and receiving researchers) among
  Asian universities going forward.

- An example of an initiative by a European/American university in an English-speaking
country is Stanford Japan Center. This is Stanford University’s sole overseas facility
and it is involved in promoting international research exchange. It does not merely
perform a clerical function like the aforesaid facilities of Japanese universities, but has
a long history as a research base and is active in promoting international research.

- Singapore University has been active in establishing overseas facilities and now has
bases in five countries. Its facility in Bangalore, India is particularly interesting. The
aim of this facility is to enable Singapore university students to work in Bangalore
while studying for one year at the Indian Institute of Science (IISc). It aims to function
as an overseas facility for graduates, and includes promoting advances in IT
technology as one of its goals.

- There are some universities in European and American English-speaking countries,
non-native English-speaking countries do not have overseas facilities.

- However, the German Academic Exchange Service (known by its German acronym
DAAD), which was established jointly by German universities, and the Finnish
Institute, established by a private foundation focused on universities to promote
academic-industrial alliances, have overseas facilities that serve as centers for
promoting international research. The UK’s British Council and America’s National
Science Foundation (NSF) provide support by disseminating information about
research exchange programmes in various countries. The overseas facilities of these
organisations appear to serve as proxy overseas facilities for those universities that do
not have their own overseas facilities, assisting with the dissemination of international
information and international exchange

**Social support**

- Social support for overseas researchers can be regarded as the infrastructural
underpinning of efforts to improve researcher mobility. While there are differences of
degree, all universities provide a variety of support related to daily living, including
assistance with securing visas, finding accommodation and locating medical facilities. We provide below some examples of the type of support furnished, as garnered from information available on websites.

- Accommodation supplied by Japanese universities tends to be very standardized, but nearly all Japanese universities provide accommodation (lodging). In European and American English-speaking countries, MIT, Yale University and Stanford University have accommodation facilities for researchers. However, they are not necessarily exclusively reserved for overseas scholars.

- In non-native English-speaking countries, ETH Zurich and Peking University provide accommodation for overseas scholars.

- One noteworthy initiative by a Japanese university is Osaka University’s “Icho Japanese-language Programme.” This is designed to teach Japanese, but significantly, it is also available to researcher’s wives and other family members. In addition, the university provides a web service called GCN (Global Campus Net) using online Japanese-language teaching materials and multilingual bulletin board service (BBS) to provide support for overseas researchers. GCN is also designed to be utilized by foreigners living in the vicinity of Osaka University.

- Copenhagen University provides a Danish student to act as a mentor for overseas researchers, helping them to prepare for and adjust to daily life in Denmark. MIT and Singapore University also use local students to provide support (Singapore University refers to this as the i CARE Project).

- ETH Zurich has published a Handbook for PhD students (Survival Guide). This covers support for housing and daily living and includes advice of an academic nature, such as how to write a PhD thesis.

- Harvard University provides on-campus healthcare facilities under its HARVARD UNIVERSITY HEALTH SERVICES (HUHS) programme. For a fixed charge, it covers expensive treatment such as acute care and dental treatment.

- The University of Cambridge has a career counseling service staffed by 80 persons, which provides advice to overseas scholars on how to design a research focus and develop postgraduate career plans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance/Consortium</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
<th>Switzerland</th>
<th>Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IARU (International Alliance of Research Universities)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEAL (International Developmental Education and Learning Alliance)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL (Association of Pacific Rim Universities)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESAER</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEERI</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVROPEAN</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDER Group</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEARU (Association of East and Asian Research Universities)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN University Network (AUN)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Pacific University Network (IPUN)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compostela Group of Universities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureqa</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Universities of Global Significance</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEAL League</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tokyo</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference of Asia University Presidents (CAUP)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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