

<https://doi.org/10.23913/ride.v11i21.776>

Artículos científicos

La movilidad académica en la escuela normal: una estrategia para la consolidación institucional

***Academic mobility as an strategy for institutional consolidation at the Normal
school***

***Mobilidade acadêmica na escola normal: uma estratégia de consolidação
institucional***

Román Castro Miranda

Benemérita Escuela Normal Veracruzana Enrique C. Rébsamen, México

romancastrobenv@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8905-7286>

Héctor Gabriel Rangel Ramírez

Universidad Veracruzana, Instituto de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores Económicos y
Sociales, México

hrangel@uv.mx

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1507-4593>

Resumen

La internacionalización y su componente de movilidad académica representan una estrategia prioritaria en la agenda de desarrollo de las instituciones de educación superior públicas y privadas de todo el mundo. Las escuelas normales de México han vivido reformas importantes que han reivindicado su papel como instituciones clave en la formación de profesionales de la educación en nuestro país, aunque en el ámbito de la internacionalización, aún presentan más retos que realidades. El presente artículo es resultado de una investigación documental y descriptiva que pretende generar un diálogo intersaberes sobre la perspectiva que las escuelas normales en México tienen hacia la implementación de la movilidad académica en su estructura institucional, resaltando la importancia que esta enmarca en el proceso de la formación integral

y en donde compartimos algunos indicadores de desempeño que existen actualmente a nivel nacional e internacional respecto a las transformaciones organizacionales, curriculares, administrativas y financieras que se deben realizar para implementar exitosamente la dimensión internacional e intercultural en las funciones sustantivas de dichas instituciones.

Palabras clave: internacionalización, formación integral, movilidad académica, modelo educativo, planeación.

Abstract

Internationalization and its component academic mobility represents a core strategy in the development agenda of both public and private higher education institutions around the world. Teacher Training schools in Mexico, best known as ‘escuelas normales’, have experienced important reforms that have redeemed its role as key institutions in the formation of education professionals in our country, however, in the field of internationalization, they still have more challenges than realities. This document results from a detailed descriptive and documentary research which aims to unfold an interdisciplinary dialogue on the escuelas normales’ perspective towards the implementation of the academic mobility in their institutional structure, highlighting its importance within the integral formation process, sharing the main performance indicators at a national level, and identifying the organizational, curricular, administrative and financial transformations needed to successfully implement de international and intercultural dimension in the core functions of such institutions.

Keywords: Internationalization, integral formation, academic mobility, educational model, planning.

Resumo

A internacionalização e seu componente de mobilidade acadêmica representam uma estratégia prioritária na agenda de desenvolvimento das instituições de ensino superior públicas e privadas em todo o mundo. As escolas normais no México passaram por reformas importantes que têm reivindicado seu papel como instituições fundamentais na formação de profissionais da educação em nosso país, embora no campo da internacionalização ainda apresentem mais desafios do que realidades. Este artigo é o resultado de uma pesquisa documental e descritiva que visa gerar um diálogo interserviços sobre a perspectiva que as escolas normais do México têm em relação à

implementação da mobilidade acadêmica em sua estrutura institucional, destacando a importância que esta enquadra no processo de formação integral e onde partilhamos alguns indicadores de desempenho que existem atualmente a nível nacional e internacional sobre as transformações organizacionais, curriculares, administrativas e financeiras que se devem realizar para concretizar com sucesso a dimensão internacional e intercultural nas funções substantivas das referidas instituições.

Palavras-chave: internacionalização, formação integral, mobilidade acadêmica, modelo educacional, planejamento.

Fecha Recepción: Junio 2020

Fecha Aceptación: Octubre 2020

Introduction

Academic mobility in Mexico has only taken on a relevant significance in the last two decades in terms of the development of professional skills. In the university context, from its curricular references, it is a key element for the training of the student body, as well as in the training and updating of the teachers themselves.

The normal schools in our country, even when they are mandatory references in the training of teachers, are practically oblivious to the adoption of formal academic mobility actions, since only in the last seven years have the first efforts been made, which are still little recognized and supported by authorities and the teachers who serve them.

The globalization of knowledge demands the education sector, and especially the teacher training schools, to transform their institutional vision to abandon comfort zones and leave academic models that lead to unidirectional processes, closed to diversity, limited to local relevance and located in traditional contexts.

In this text, therefore, it is intended to analyze the importance of the implementation of policies and strategic actions regarding the internationalization of higher education, particularly the participation of normal schools in academic mobility schemes.

The first section describes the current context of normal schools with respect to globalization and the internationalization processes that are taking place in higher education; Subsequently, it is argued why mobility as an experiential, formative experience and with objectives at the curricular level has a high impact on the integral training process of normal school students.

Likewise, some quantitative coordinates are presented on the mobility flows that have been registered worldwide and particularly in our country, in such a way that a look can be projected that identifies the progress made by other higher education institutions in Mexico. and to know some trends related to the preferred destinations for stays, participation schemes, incoming versus outgoing mobility and the institutions that lead these activities at the national level.

Finally, feasible scenarios for the implementation of mobility in normal schools are analyzed, emphasizing in the last section on the series of economic, academic, cultural and management transformations that normal schools could carry out to ensure a viable, sustained path. and above all strategic, towards the implementation of academic mobility, as a mechanism to favor the development of its substantive functions with quality and global relevance.

The context of public normal schools in the face of internationalization

The teaching profession and the series of processes that emanate from its structure represent the basis of the training of professionals in Mexico. Normal schools, despite the constant challenges and criticisms that they have received throughout their history, must continue to be the spaces par excellence to configure and operate initial training. The profession of being a teacher has been transformed over time according to the social, economic and even political circumstances of our country; In particular, the role and relevance of teacher training in the national educational agenda continues to be debated today. In this sense, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (Unesco) (2010) affirms that teachers are the most important educational resource in all countries. For this reason, from preschool education and throughout primary and secondary education, the presence of qualified and motivated teachers is essential for effective learning (Unesco, 2010).

Although the role of the teacher is recognized worldwide, the performance, training and teaching results in our country seem to show that there are still more challenges than the consolidated scope. Many of the questions that have been made to the teachers have emanated from standardized evaluations, the results of which have shown that the level of learning of students at all levels has been below the national average, and by far at the international level. One of the most important contributions in basic education and with great weight in measuring progress in school achievement is the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA, for its acronym in English). The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)

is the body that coordinates this evaluation program, through which a comparative study is carried out between the educational systems of the member countries. The evaluation carried out by PISA is based on the competencies approach, which has had a strong impact on the redesign of educational plans and programs at different levels. To mention an example of the impact of this program —after the first administration of these evaluations in higher education— many public and private universities reconsidered their educational programs to implement the competence-based education approach (Anguas, 2013).

Since the elevation to the rank of bachelor of all normalista careers in 1984, these schools have been the subject of various programs that seek their transformation, although this has not yet been achieved. Likewise, they have faced various criticisms regarding the quality of the training they provide to their students and the quality of their own academic bodies (National Institute for the Evaluation of Education [INEE], 2016). In addition to the above, the need to rethink new strategies to diversify teacher training in current curricular reform processes is justified today more than ever.

The educational model that permeates the different education subsystems in our country raises a particular vision of the training of those who teach (Díaz Barriga, 2005) and, therefore, of the strategies for their professional development. Starting from this premise, the teaching staff is considered a key element in the consolidation of educational quality, since it constitutes the axis that facilitates and guides the learning of the student body. For these reasons, the teaching profile shows three strategic knowledge in its training: the accumulation of disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge (theoretical); skills to learn autonomously (heuristic); and the arrangement of attitudes and values required to trigger student learning according to their contexts (axiological). In this way, this model places the teacher as a mediating agent (Saint-Onge, 2000), with the capacity and responsibility to build the learning environments necessary so that, in an operational way, they implement the curriculum in its extension.

This is the origin of this idea that normal schools transition to these initially administrative and vision efforts, to consistent institutions that consider professional profile aspirations with a peripheral and transversal vision.

It is worth recognizing that there are curricular changes in the study programs that have been reforming the professional profile of the normalista teacher, as is the case of the 2012 and 2017 study plans and programs, where some academic programs have been reviewed and modified, considering others pedagogical and didactic aspects. In fact, substantive elements such

as the formative path of learning English, the use of ICT and the lack of courses on didactics of multigrade schools, inclusive and intercultural education, have been strongly discussed at the national level, all as a reflection of the contextual needs. However, and in the face of the orientations that public universities were already making gradually and progressively, there is still a pending transition to the aspiration of transcending to international contexts that mobilize this learning in international contexts.

On the other hand, it should be noted that research plays an important role for the initial training of teachers, since it promotes the improvement of teaching and school reform, answering questions related to observation and reflection, experience and experimentation (Rodríguez, 2004). The recent educational reforms of 2013 in basic education, together with the constant changes in the public policy of the national educational system, have had a significant impact on the structure and academic dynamics of normal schools in the last decade. For several years now, the General Directorate of Higher Education for Education Professionals (DGESPE) - the body that dictates policies, plans and programs and in general the regulations of higher education institutions (IES) dedicated to the training of professionals in this area— has generated various initiatives to professionalize teacher training at the national level. At the end of the 1990s, through the program for the transformation of normal schools, the bachelor's degree plans in primary, preschool and secondary education were modified and physical education and special education were implemented (Mercado, 2000).

This transformation - which was strategically linked to the national agreement for the modernization of basic education generated since 1992 - implied the need to aspire to the construction of a normalist academic profile of professor-researcher, on the one hand, to satisfy the demands of the union for revaluing his profession and, on the other hand, to improve the working conditions that for several years had been led by the National Union of Education Workers (SNTE).

The new national educational policy that was emerging towards the beginning of this century began to integrate normal schools into the Teacher Improvement Program (Promep), today the Program for Teacher Professional Development (Prodep), of the Ministry of Public Education (SEP) , having as the basic cell of academic operation the academic bodies (CA), whose main objective is to balance the functions of teaching, research and management-linkage, trying to give normal schools a turn in the identity processes and in the conformation of the discipline of the academic profession (Magaña, 2000).

The incursion of normal schools to Prodep is not limited only to promoting this diversification of the teaching-research load, but to the possibility of accessing postgraduate programs of excellence at national and international level, the retention and repatriation of researchers, the generation of resources through projects and, strategically, the participation of the academy in mobility projects within the framework of the CA. The results of the educational policy that Prodep integrates are important, since they imply obtaining academic degrees, increasing the number of publications, obtaining resources for research (although most normal schools have been left out of these supports since 2014) and those items that are related to obtaining incentives and allow the academy not only to improve its salary level, but also its prestige (Romo, 2006).

The substantive transformations that have been carried out in the normal school system—and in particular the aspiration to improve the profile of the normalista teacher to adapt to a new training need in accordance with national and international trends—oblige government entities, to the networks and organisms formed from the teachers' union, to the normal schools themselves and to the normalista academy to turn their eyes towards training, cooperation and management processes related to the globalization of higher education.

The set of trends that drive the transformation of normal schools and specifically the teacher profile come largely from national approaches, but are undoubtedly complemented by those issued by international organizations through declarations, guides and far-reaching reports. The OECD, for example, although it tries to be more inclusive in the recommendations made on education policy, is not immune to the influence of economic globalization that prevails today. The three essential elements that it establishes for education are literacy, teacher training, as well as technical-professional teaching and training. At the international level, one of the most important documents that Unesco has published and that has influenced the reflection on the idea that education should continue considering the social, economic, technological and political trends of this century is the Report to the Unesco of the International Commission on Education for the XXI Century. This document is an analysis of educational philosophy as a result of the political and economic situation that distinguishes globalization, but it is also a recommendation to adapt educational systems to a dynamic of cultural, technological, economic, social and political absorption (Fernández, 2005).

Taking into account the recent milestones in the structural models of the Mexican normal school and the series of challenges that arise from the melting pot of influences at the national

and international level, it is necessary to start talking about the internationalization process in the educational model of schools. Mexican standards and, in parallel, analyze how this element may contribute to the consolidation of quality in teacher training, to the global relevance of the normalist academic profile, to the construction of cooperation networks oriented to educational research and, consequently, to strengthen the academic and professional performance of those who graduate from the normal schools in our country.

For this reason, to speak of internationalization in the field of education is to have a variety of elements that today are more relevant (González, 2007); that is, talk about study programs with global relevance, teaching-learning processes with an intercultural approach, use of foreign languages in the diversity of academic activities, research production jointly with international peers, generation of management projects and / or or links at an international level, presence of visiting students and faculty, a variety of inter-institutional agreements and, of course, the incursion of its students and academics in mobility programs.

Unfortunately, the national education system, in a generalized way, still has a long way to go in terms of the agenda and especially financing for internationalization processes. Despite the efforts made by the SEP through the Undersecretariat of Higher Education, the Ministry of Foreign Relations with its diversified offer of international cooperation programs and projects, the National Association of Universities and Institutions of Higher Education (ANUIES) and The different consortiums and independent associations that have developed strategies, documents and declarations in which they place internationalization as an unavoidable strategy for the new challenges of education in Mexico, there is still no defined and long-term policy that manages to guide the institutions higher education on the series of actions and mechanisms on which they must go to consolidate the international dimension in their models and structures.

Similarly, as in other equally important aspects in the educational field such as research, outreach and infrastructure, financing for internationalization actions in Mexican educational institutions depends, to a large extent, on financial situations that issue from intermittently the federal administrations and the efforts that the administrations of the educational institutions carry out in accordance with their capacities and directive and rectorial agendas.

Despite the lack of a clear national policy on incorporating the international dimension into the educational agenda in Mexico, individual institutions have moved at different rates. Some private universities, for example, have incorporated plans and strategies for decades that have placed them today as leaders in internationalization indicators: number of students in

mobility, double degree programs, cross-border campus, recruitment of international students, curricula in other languages, among others. To a lesser extent, but with the strength of robust and constant budgets, there are the large Mexican public universities, which thanks to their presence, tradition of teaching and research and the possibility of having management structures that enable the internationalization process, have had achievements important in many of the management and performance indicators in this area. According to Gacel-Ávila (2005), an international dimension comes from a set of conditions, such as the degree of internationalization of its curriculum, the international profile of its academics, the global competence of those who graduate and, in general, a international ethos in the institution.

On the other hand, the majority of educational institutions that are not in the aforementioned privileged segments have had very limited progress in internationalization, a process to which they have arrived late and without a structured plan of action, for which they have eminently implemented inertial actions and based on the experience of other institutions. As with other transformation and strengthening processes, in the case of normal schools, internationalization is incorporated late (2009), in an exercise of imposing universalized ideas, models and conceptions (Noriega-Chávez, 2014).

Academic mobility in comprehensive training

As we have already pointed out, it is the globalization of the economy, the mobilization of information and the opening of trade barriers that are the main factors that triggered the emergence of the knowledge society. As Martín-Barbero (2003) points out, this knowledge circulates in these societies with greater freedom, since it is handled as information, and the production and legitimation of knowledge is not limited to a rigidly determined social circle, a situation that results in the transformation of society and the school space at all levels.

The increase in international cooperation and student flows worldwide coincides with the advent of greater mobility of information and knowledge that is supported and in many cases is based on the use of information and communication technologies, which have made possible the formation of communication and contact channels with various cultural expressions, ways of life and academic work that allowed the creation of alternative and innovative work, research and joint development scenarios (García, 2013).

To speak of academic mobility, we must analyze the conceptual framework from which it emerges. Much is currently said about mobility programs and the benefits that this produces

in the academic performance of both students and teachers, but very seldom is it conceived as part of a macro-process called internationalization of higher education. Internationalization is commonly confused with globalization (Altbach, 2004). The results of globalization in the field of education include the integration of applied research, the use of English as a lingua franca in scientific communication, the growth of the labor market for academics and scientists, the growth of companies and multinationals offering technology and services to publish academic products and the use of information technologies (Altbach and Knight, 2007). On the other hand, internationalization - although it obeys various factors and needs that result from political, economic, sociocultural and academic aspects (De Witt, 2002) - offers an approach that is more attached to the substantive adaptations that the substantive functions of any institution must have educational before the inexorable trend of the globalization of knowledge. In this way, we can say that, in accordance with the academic orientation of internationalization, this can be defined as the development of international and intercultural dimensions in research, teaching and services for the improvement of quality and quality. international academic standards (Zaman y Mohsin, 2014).

Academic mobility implies in general terms the physical movement of a person to carry out academic activities in a different higher education institution, which can happen in a regional, national and international context. On many occasions, even when the differences between mobility and the internationalization process are constantly emphasized, the former is still seen as the basis or the operational version of the latter, which is a misconception and very limited.

In order to conceive mobility, it is necessary to first highlight the implications of an academic stay. In the words of Ruiz (2011), it is an educational strategy of a curricular nature that allows the student a training process to professionally join the various productive sectors of goods and services, through the development of a defined project of professional work, with which that it is sought that the student body is faced with situations that possibly exceed their level of knowledge; In this way, they will be forced to develop their analytical and drive capacity to investigate on their own, demand further explanations and interact with the teaching staff. In other words, it is to take students through the academic stay to an in situ process of analytical complexity and problem solving in diverse and multifactorial contexts as a strategic way to promote comprehensive training.

Aspiring to this type of training, according to Díaz and Quiroz (2013) implies the social and individual preparation of people, both scientifically, ideologically and spiritually, valid for

a historical time where every training process seeks in the student body from the different disciplines to link the contents of the teaching with their cultural, ethical and aesthetic significance, seeking to strengthen the human capacity for communication.

The academic mobility stays properly have more specific purposes and with greater educational depth, among which the most important are helping students - through an academic experience with great intercultural, inter-ethnic and social diversity - so that they can promote independent thinking, the ability to adaptation to cultural diversity, to eliminate communication barriers, to expand professional vision and, among many other things, to generate the foundations of global citizenship.

In short, academic mobility refers to the movement of researchers, teachers and students between national and foreign educational institutions with the aim of participating in training programs and particular research projects. Academic mobility is usually located within an inter-institutional, national or international work scheme, although it is possible that the flow of people develops from the initiative of the subjects themselves or as part of specific projects that do not necessarily involve work with various institutions or research centers (García, 2013).

Paraphrasing Fresán (2009), academic mobility is a training strategy whose objective goes beyond the strictly academic sphere and refers mainly to comprehensive training. It is desirable that the experience be enriching in many different areas, because in addition to the challenges that its incorporation into a different university environment represents, with a different culture and other teaching-learning models, there are also those of taking charge of oneself as an individual , both with regard to their personal care and caution in the use of economic resources and the need to live with other people outside the university environment. Therefore, a substantive action that we must not go unnoticed in the training of students is, in addition to academic training, their personal and socio-emotional independence, which in these times is increasingly demanded of us.

Many higher education institutions in the world have implemented student exchange and mobility programs in order to help young university students develop skills that improve their professional profile and help them interact more effectively in the globalized environment in which we live. These programs are based on the possibility that the student may temporarily join an institution other than their own, taking courses for the transfer of academic credits to carry out research activities or to carry out special summer programs to learn languages or certain competencies at the level. discipline. Academic mobility constitutes, then, one of the tools that

many universities and institutions around the world use strategically to raise educational quality, since it allows students to develop differentiated skills that respond to the social demands of the local, regional environment and also global.

The mobility of academics and students from normal schools represents an alternative to raise academic quality and competitiveness among its entire educational community (students, teachers and researchers), promoting stay in other higher education institutions in Mexico or from abroad in order to complete full semesters, carry out professional practices, participate in research projects and / or receive advice for the conclusion of their degree work. These programs favor professional training, increase the country's academic and student cohesion, contribute to raising the level of academic excellence and improve communication among those who research, in addition to encouraging the participation of students in multidisciplinary projects.

In addition to the educational benefits that the inclusion of academic mobility in normal schools represents, it is necessary to highlight that this internationalization strategy has a direct impact on the construction of an intercultural profile of the future professional in education. According to Deardorff and Hunter (2006), the core of the mission statements of higher education institutions today is based on preparing “globally ready” graduates, who must be able to deal with global challenges. However, our inefficient institutions are doing little in this regard (Bok, 2006). This brings intercultural competence and diversity to the main stage of the need to address internationalization and mobility as fundamental axes of the acquisition of educational models with a global approach.

For these and other academic-social reasons, it is assumed that there is no doubt that internationalization and particularly student mobility have transformed the landscape of higher education in recent decades. This mobilization of people with academic objectives has brought various benefits to students, institutions, communities, and the countries as a whole. (Knight, 2012).

Indicators on student mobility

The number of foreign students participating in higher education programs around the world has exploded in a single generation, increasing from 0.8 million in the late 1970s to 4.6 million (that is, 45 years later). In 2015 alone, there were 3.3 million students who traveled the world for educational purposes (OECD, 2018).

Mobile student groups and flows remain highly concentrated; Furthermore, mobility routes are deeply rooted in historical patterns and determined by proximity factors. The top five OECD destination countries receive almost 70% of the student body in mobility within the OECD area, while the top five countries of origin (worldwide) account for just under 40% of total migration towards that area. The main recipient countries have advanced economies and are English-speaking: the United States (30% of all international students in the OECD area), the United Kingdom (14%) and Australia (10%). However, Germany, the Russian Federation and France also attract a considerable number of students. Most of the student body in mobility within the OECD countries come from China (20%), followed by India (7%), Germany (4%), Korea, France and Saudi Arabia (which stand at 2% and 3%). (OECD, 2018).

In Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) mobility (mainly at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels that carry out full studies) is an activity that HEIs have supported to some extent. The most numerous flows of outgoing Latin American students go to educational spaces located in the United States and later in Spain, Germany, France and Great Britain. An outstanding trend in the current decade is the retour en force of the United States as the main magnet for students in the region. Their number went from 65,632 in 2009-2010 to 86,378 in 2014-2015 (increased by 31.6% in the period) (Didou, 2017). LAC's participation rate in total incoming mobility to the United States was 8.9% in 2014-2015. Brazil (in sixth position) and Mexico (in tenth rank) are among the ten countries that send students the most to that country (Didou, 2017), followed by Venezuela and Colombia.

In Mexico, there are 3.8 million students enrolled in about 3,500 IES, of which only 10% reported in the 911 database having had at least one student participating in a mobility program abroad during the 2015/2016 school year (SEP, 2017). The data are even more discouraging when observing the total number of mobility students, which depending on the source consulted - the PATLANI survey or the SEP 911 base - was between 23,000 and 30,000. In Mexico, only between 0.6% and 0.8 % of upper-level students have the opportunity to carry out temporary activities of an academic nature abroad.

The National Survey of International Student Mobility PATLANI has established itself as a valuable and reliable source of information for national and international organizations, researchers, professors and higher education institutions interested in the development of student mobility as a fundamental part of internationalization, a transcendental axis of the development

of higher education in our country. Table 1 presents the mobility flows that our country has had in the period between 2011 and 2016.

Tabla 1. Resumen de la Encuesta Nacional de Movilidad Internacional Estudiantil, PATLANI

CICLO ESCOLAR	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2015/2016
MOVILIDAD SALIENTE	17,689	15,941	20,599	24,900	29,401
MOVILIDAD ENTRANTE	8,795	18,125	16,685	15,608	20,116

Fuente: Castiello, Cortes y Bustos (2018)

The results of international student mobility in Mexico obtained in PATLANI (in the 911 formats, mainly) and in other additional sources of information in relation to two periods (2014/2015 and 2015/2016) are the following:

Number of mobility students: In the period 2014-2015 there were 24,900 students in outgoing mobility and 15,608 in incoming mobility. For the period 2015-2016, 29,401 students were reported in outgoing mobility and 20,322 in incoming mobility. On the other hand, the 911 formats report in 2014-2015, 16 182 outgoing mobility students and 7201 incoming (2014-2015), a figure that increases to 22 988 outgoing mobility and 8492 incoming mobility in the following cycle (2015-2016). From these data it can be deduced that student mobility has grown throughout the editions of PATLANI and the records of the 911 formats (despite their disparities in numbers).

Proportions of mobility in relation to general enrollment: Taking as a reference the general enrollment of the HEIs that reported to PATLANI, on average 1% corresponds to outgoing mobility in either of the two periods. The same goes for inbound mobility. In the same proportion, but taking the 911 formats as a source of information, the results are more pessimistic: incoming mobility corresponds to 0.2% in either of the two periods, while outgoing mobility is 0.4% in 2014-2015 and 0.5 % in 2015-2016.

Mobility by type of institution (public or private): In the 2014-2015 cycle, most of the incoming and outgoing mobility occurred in private HEIs. For 2015-2016, most of the mobility occurs in public HEIs. This trend is observed both in PATLANI and in the information of the 911 formats.

Main Mexican HEIs: In outgoing mobility, the Monterrey Institute of Technology and Higher Studies (ITESM) was the institution that presented the highest mobility in both periods. Regarding incoming mobility, in 2014-2015, the main institution was again the ITESM; However, for 2015-2016, greater mobility was reported at the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM). An issue that is evident in this report is the lack of comparability that exists between the first twenty HEIs that report mobility in PATLANI and those included in the 911 base. There is some coincidence in the important mobility that exists in the ITESM, but there is a strong disparity with respect to the rest of the institutions between the two sources of information.

Main training fields: As has happened in all PATLANI editions, the most important training field in both reported periods and for incoming and outgoing mobility is that of social sciences, administration and law.

Student mobility in North America: There were 6,832 outbound mobility students in this region in 2014-2015, a figure that decreased to 6,701 students in 2015-2016. With this, it is confirmed as the second most important region after Europe. In the incoming mobility period 2014-2015, 3,681 students were reported, a figure that increased to 4,510 students in 2015-2016. In the analysis, unequal relations are detected between the student mobility of Mexico with the countries of this region: Mexico sends more students than it receives, while the type of mobility they carry out is different between these countries. The ratio indicates that for every 6 Mexican students who go to Canada, one Canadian student travels to Mexico; while for every American student who comes to Mexico, 1.4 students travel to the United States.

Student mobility in Europe: It is the most important region in terms of student mobility for Mexico. In 2014-2015, 12,901 Mexican students left, and this number increased to 17,763 in 2015-2016. In the incoming mobility (2014-2015), 5099 students were reported to Mexican HEIs, which in the following period amounted to 6280. In this region, asymmetric student mobility is also observed in its majority, especially with Spain (for every 6 Mexicans who one comes to Spain), the United Kingdom (for every two students who go to the United Kingdom, one comes to Mexico) and Italy (for every 4 Mexican students who go to Italy, one Italian comes to Mexico). In the case of Germany and France, the relationship is a bit more even. The foregoing poses challenges to Mexican HEIs for implementing long-term strategies that allow more bilateral student mobility.

Student mobility in Latin America and the Caribbean: Of the three regions analyzed, this is the one with the least influx of student mobility. For 2014-2015, outbound mobility was 4278 students, increasing to 5911 in 2015-2016. In the incoming mobility 2014-2015, 5456 students were registered, a figure that increases to 7063 in 2015-2016. This region constitutes an area of greater balance in terms of sending and receiving students with Mexican HEIs. However, the main influx of mobility takes place within certain countries. For example: for every 2 Colombians who come to Mexico, a Mexican goes there; For every two Mexicans who go to Argentina, one Argentine comes to Mexico, and for every five Mexicans who go to Chile, one Chilean comes to Mexico, mainly.

Mobility scenarios for normal schools

It is undeniable the progress that internationalization and student mobility has had over the last decades in the life of higher education institutions, including in the Latin American region, where we know of the existence of a significant lag in terms of access, infrastructure, financing and public policy in education.

As we see in the statistics described in the previous section, Mexico shows some progress in the participation of students in mobility, however, it is clear that the distance to be covered is wide, especially when the scope of internationalization as a whole is still to be consolidated in our country.

Normal schools have not escaped this trend of moving students and opening up towards cooperation schemes that contribute to increasing their educational quality. Although the number of normal schools that systematically participate in mobility programs is small, the demand for and interest in this type of training tools continues to grow. Normalist institutions in the states of Puebla, Jalisco, Durango, State of Mexico, Veracruz, Baja California Sur, Michoacán and Tlaxcala, among others, have achieved that a limited number of students and academics have access to some opportunity to carry out a mobility stay within or outside of Mexico, although currently it is not possible to know for sure the exact flow of outgoing and incoming mobility by institution or by state, as well as the main destinations and the mechanisms by which each student is making said stays.

At present, we can account for several programs and calls for eminently federal funds that promote the mobility of students and teachers of normal schools, so we can highlight the following:

- Interjom Program (exchange for young teachers).
- Academic training program for students and teachers who are members of the governing body of normal schools in France (SEP-CRFDIES).
- Scholarship in the Training Program for Students and teachers of Public Normal Schools (DGESPE-CNBES)
- International Academic Mobility Project Paulo Freire in Ibero-American Countries aimed at students of Public Normal Schools of Mexico.
- SEP-SRE Student Training Program Project 100 000.
- Grant Program for the development of linguistic and communicative competences of English, promoted by the SEP, and DGESPE.
- Call for Elisa Acuña scholarships, National Student Mobility for normal schools.
- National Mobility Program Normal Schools and Public Universities SEP.
- Comprehensive Institutional Strengthening Program (PIFI).
- Program for teacher professional development (Prodep).

These programs, along with most of the initiatives that governments and organizations offer to Mexican students and particularly those of normal schools, are based on the modality of temporary mobility for credits, which is the most common way of conceiving and promote mobility in the country and in our region. However, there are currently various ways of operating and organizing student mobility. On the contrary, in countries such as the United States or those on the European continent, when talking about student mobility, they usually refer to those students who are completing higher education studies in a country other than the country of origin, and to a lesser extent to students who they do semester stays, commonly called Study Abroad programs.

The truth is that mobility does not only imply a stay that involves academic credits, regardless of its duration. Mobility has gradually diversified into actions that involve field practices, laboratory stays, double degree programs and recently virtual mobility activities. There are six categories to organize student mobility that require going beyond the concepts of semester stay or complete studies abroad (Knight, 2012):

Tabla 2. Categorías de la movilidad estudiantil

Categoría	Descripción	Tipo de reconocimiento
<p>Programa de estudios completos en el extranjero.</p>	<p>Estudiantes que se mueven a otro país para matricularse y obtener un título en la institución anfitriona. Son comúnmente conocidos como estudiantes internacionales o estudiantes extranjeros.</p>	<p>El título lo expide la institución en la cual cursan el grado académico.</p>
<p>Experiencia de intercambio temporal como parte del programa educativo de la universidad de origen.</p>	<p>Estudiantes que realizan una estancia académica temporal (seis meses o un año) en un país extranjero a través de algún convenio de colaboración o en una institución que forma parte de alguna red de universidades.</p>	<p>El grado académico lo otorga la institución de origen y los créditos realizados en la institución extranjera son comúnmente acreditados.</p>
<p>Programas conjuntos de educación transfronteriza entre dos o más instituciones.</p>	<p>Los estudiantes se matriculan en programas ofrecidos conjuntamente por dos o más instituciones. Las opciones son:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Programas <i>twining</i> en la institución de origen - Programa franquicia en la institución de origen -Programa de titulación conjunta - Programas de doble o múltiple titulación - Programas <i>sándwich</i> en la institución anfitriona 	<p>El grado académico se otorga de diferentes formas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Un título por cada universidad -Un título por cada universidad - Un título conjunto entre las universidades socias. - Dos o más títulos son expedidos - Un título se expide por la universidad anfitriona.

Investigación y trabajo de campo	Estancia de investigación o trabajo de campo como requisito para la titulación en la institución de origen.	La institución de origen emite el título cumpliendo el requisito de la estancia.
Internados y prácticas profesionales	Estancia como practicante, internado o servicio comunitario como requisito para obtener el título en la institución de origen.	La institución de origen emite el título cumpliendo el requisito de la estancia.
Viajes de estudios o asistencia a talleres.	Estancias opcionales y en ocasiones requisitos dentro del plan de estudios. Pueden ser estancias de verano, programas culturales o cursos de lengua.	Normalmente no generan créditos académicos.

Fuente: Six categories of student mobility experiences (Knight, 2012)

In this way, we can warn that another challenge facing our Mexican educational system is precisely to diversify the forms and modalities in which we manage and promote academic mobility.

There are already successful experiences in various public and private universities in Mexico, where less traditional mobility programs have been practiced for some years, such as twining programs (Academic twinning program, where students can transfer their credits from an institution to another and have the possibility of graduating from one or both institutions), dual degree programs or franchise programs. The National Autonomous University of Mexico, with branches and affiliate programs in the United States, Spain, Germany, France, China, Canada, South Africa and the United Kingdom, or the ITESM, with about 14 representative offices in different parts of the world, in addition to the Numerous programs that offer double degree programs taught in a foreign language and with a high presence of international students are undoubtedly the leading universities in establishing franchise programs and cross-border education in our country. In the same way, there are other Mexican universities that have bet on the diversification of the modalities of academic mobility, promoting joint programs, double degrees, affiliate programs with foreign universities, careers or franchise-type educational programs in Mexico, in addition to an immense offer of short-term programs, such as academic summers, research stays, international professional practices or language courses. The

institutions that we can distinguish in this area in an enunciative way, but not limited to, are the University of Guadalajara, the University of Monterrey, the Autonomous University of Ciudad Juárez, the University of Guanajuato, the Veracruzana University, the University of the Valley of Mexico, the Universidad Anáhuac, the Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, the Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, among many other higher education institutions.

The Mexican normal schools have, based on the experience of other educational institutions in our country, an excellent opportunity to enter not only in the field of academic mobility in a comprehensive way, but also to begin to lay the foundations of the internationalization process as a whole and positively permeate its educational models, its structures and therefore its students and academics in the coming decades. To achieve this end, normal schools need to rethink their long-term institutional plans, integrating perspectives of an academic (curricular), structural (management) and financial (funds) order.

But before establishing courses of action and making proposals to support the incorporation of normal schools into the spectrum of internationalization and particularly student mobility, a series of questions arise about the elements that guide and trigger the need to internationalize an institution, as well as the motivations for integrating mobility in higher education (De Witt, 2002). Let's describe some scenarios that will serve to generate proposals later:

Triggers to incorporate mobility in the substantive functions of normal schools. We have already analyzed to a large extent the series of impacts that mobility brings to comprehensive training processes, the way in which it contributes to the construction of an intercultural profile, differentiated and with added value to students and academia, as well as the contribution it has to the development of personal skills in those who wish to move to other social, academic and cultural contexts. But what leads the institution to decide to transform its ethos and invest diverse resources in mobility?

In a study carried out at three Spanish universities, Grasset (2013) concludes that there are six main motivations that guide the search for a more international perspective and particularly promote academic mobility efforts: 1) the development of professional skills of students and academics; 2) generate strategic alliances (networks); 3) obtain international recognition: international branding (refers to the generation of the concept of institutional “brand”, as a way to promote the sale of educational services internationally); 4) increase

educational quality; 5) generate income through international programs and 6) develop social responsibility in students.

Normal schools should carry out an in-depth analysis of the reasons why they want and / or should implement academic mobility actions, since said input will be key to the establishment of a realistic strategic scope that determines specific goals and actions, the definition of programs, preparation stages, and sustained financing schemes.

Scope and beneficiaries of mobility in normal schools. In this work we have referred specifically to the term academic mobility, although the common connotation in our country and in many others in Latin America refers to the mobility that students do and not necessarily the academics or the people in charge of functions of Institutional management. It will be necessary to identify if the programmatic action proposals for mobility will be only for students, for academics or for both, while establishing target populations with very realistic and specific goals that allow us to measure results and obtain them gradually.

On this point, it would be worth asking ourselves the following question: why do we insist that student mobility is a priority and we do not institutionally promote the mobility of teachers?

It is well known that the academy or teachers have always had the disposition and the will to carry out stays inside and outside the country. There are many examples of those who have carried out various international cooperation actions, either because they have completed postgraduate studies, participate in international networks or projects, participate in academic events, take specialized courses or develop a research protocol in conjunction with a foreign partner. . However, these actions are mainly the result of individual effort, or of an academic body, rather than a policy or program of the affiliated institutions. The mobility of academics and scientists is self-organized, motivated by the need to increase prestige and credibility, in addition to being the product of the process of extending individual social space, that is, it is stimulated by the desire for professional socialization (Mahroum, 2000).

Under this perspective, it will be prudent to promote in Mexican normal schools the balance of institutional efforts to motivate both students and the academy not only to participate in the options they have for mobility, but also to seek profiles, economic resources, administrative mechanisms and curricular planning so that mobility is feasible and desirable in a transversal way. The promotion of student mobility will be more complex if the academic staff does not have international experience, and for this it is necessary to begin to create sensitivity

and awareness about the importance of carrying out academic stays outside the institution, on an individual level, but on all at the institutional level.

Planning and institutional empowerment for mobility in normal schools

Once we have reiterated the importance, necessity and relevance of the implementation of academic mobility processes (of students and teachers) in the institutional life of normal schools, we will talk about an aspect that has been little addressed in the literature related to the internationalization and that has great relevance in the success or failure of efforts to institutionalize mobility, that is, we will address the implications of academic mobility management.

Developing a policy and a sustained plan on internationalization and specifically on academic mobility is not a matter exclusively of wills, but of long and consistent processes of institutional empowerment that includes administrative, academic, financial, cultural and even political factors, since as we have In other words, the history of normal schools has been marked by the constant changes in the political order that have moved the national educational system in recent decades.

In order to provide a basis on the strategic management that normal schools can implement and identify their opportunities in the field of academic mobility and channel their efforts in a comprehensive manner, four key factors are presented that must be developed in parallel: structure , planning, curriculum and financing.

Management structure for mobility and internationalization. Although the operation and monitoring of mobility processes in an institution can be carried out individually (as is the case with many students and academics today), an institutional figure (entity) is required to support academic, administrative and financially to those involved in mobility activities. There are different ways and types in which this support structure can be organized, but the predominant organizational cell worldwide is the office of international relations, or better known to many as the ORI. These offices arise from the need of educational institutions not only to operate internationalization efforts regardless of their complexity, but to organize, plan and develop the institution's national and international cooperation policy in the long term. An ORI goes beyond the mere international relations of a university (linked to more formal and protocol aspects of inter-institutional relations), since it is positioned as a tool that can enhance the international bond of the institution, and also as an instrument for consolidate an internationalization model

through the transversality of this process to all the actors, academic units and secretariats of the university (Gacel-Ávila, 2009).

The first step that normal schools should analyze in favor of the incursion of academic mobility is to decide on the management structure that should be in charge of the planning, operation and monitoring of all efforts in the matter. It is understandable that the financial and even legal conditions of these institutions limit the administrations or directorates to create or integrate an office as such, which would obviously have significant operating expenses for institutional finances, but it must be understood that the need for a management office does not necessarily implies investment in infrastructure, payroll and furniture, but rather the creation of a work team (surely existing) that spends part of its time, at least in the initial stage, to organize mobility actions through processes and mechanisms that are endorsed by the senior management of the institution.

The area, office, team, department or agency that is designated as responsible for mobility or internationalization in a normal school must have a high degree of legitimacy from the general direction of the institution, since without this the efforts they could be diluted and this structure would run the risk of being considered more adjective than substantive. The scope of an ORI is transversal in nature, so its interaction with the legal, financial, academic, school services and research areas are essential and necessary.

Policies and planning of academic mobility. The mere existence of a space dedicated to international links does not guarantee the development of the internationalization of a university. To achieve this objective, it is sought to have a more general vision of the management process, which includes the various dimensions of this process traversed by the following selected variables: strategic planning, program and project management, evaluation and monitoring processes, political decision of the university authorities, the training of the staff working at the ORI and, finally, the linking of research in management processes (Abba, 2015).

Normal schools must equip themselves with an internationalization and academic mobility plan in order to harmonize this ambition with the series of challenges established in their strategic objectives, in such a way that clear policies, objectives, goals and actions are established that enable the academic community the identification of the path that the institution traces in the matter. Knowing what to do, about what, where and with whom is essential for the internationalization process to be fruitful and not limited to a passive response to the demands that come from outside the institutions (Larrea and Astur, 2011).

On the other hand, it will be important that normal schools include in the institutional planning documents (mission, vision, educational model, institutional development plan, among others) the importance of internationalization and mobility as development strategies, and not simply are conceived as temporary projects that are the result of the initiative of a person or of a period of institutional management.

Transformations to the educational model (curriculum). Regarding the internationalization of the curriculum, Knight (2008) and Beelem (2011) define two components: a) internationalization at home, where the curriculum prepares students to act in a global world, therefore, activities This dimension involves designing curricula with an international focus, adapting teaching programs, learning processes, extracurricular activities, liaising with local culture or ethnic groups, and academic research activities; b) The second component is internationalization abroad (also known as cross-border internationalization), including all forms of education that cross borders, that is, student and teacher mobility, as well as mobility projects, programs and services educational.

In this area, the normal school requires the implementation of a series of changes at the level of the curricular structure of its programs, in such a way that the educational model responds congruently to the integration of the international dimension and therefore of academic mobility. Some strategies that we can highlight are the following:

- Updating of study plans, incorporating pedagogical approaches, graduation profiles and networks of educational experiences, harmonized or standardized by international educational organizations.
- Incorporation into the study plans, subjects with an international and intercultural focus.
- Construction of a system or an exercise of equivalence of educational credits, in accordance with other international transfer systems and parameters.
- Inclusion of international bibliography (physical and virtual) in languages other than Spanish.
- Offer of courses and educational experiences in languages other than Spanish.
- Incorporation of ICT and virtual methodology for the development of subjects, research and other educational training processes.
- Develop programs in conjunction with international universities for joint courses, double degrees, internships, internships and exchanges.
- Execution of research projects with foreign researchers and professionals.

- Obtaining educational certification and international accreditation of academic quality, both from the IES and its academic programs.

The insertion of a set of strategies that aim towards curricular innovation with an international focus will be key to the successful implementation of mobility in normal schools. Some disciplines tend to perpetuate a relatively narrow focus on the lack of intercultural and international perspectives, conceptualizations, and data, precisely at a historical moment when the need for an international and intercultural perspective becomes a broad need rather than an option (Bartell, 2003).

Financing for mobility. Financing higher education is and has been a crucial aspect in the development of educational policy at the international level. Internationalization and specifically academic mobility not only do not escape this reality, but they have historically been activities that represent a considerable economic impact at the personal (students), institutional and public levels (scholarships from governments and agencies).

The participation of normal schools in mobility actions and the possibility that these are financed will largely depend on the way in which the institution itself adheres to agreements, associations and programs that promote this mechanism. Sebastián (2004) highlights that the mobility programs in which the institution participates can be classified into two aspects: on the one hand, those that are part of the cooperation and internationalization offer of international agencies and organizations, and on the other, the programs of the institution on cooperation and internationalization.

In this sense, it will be vital for normal schools to promote a variety of agreements and memberships in key organizations that contribute to the increase of students and teachers participating in academic stays at the national and international level, since many of these governments, organizations, consortiums and agencies They have the ability to offer scholarships that partially or totally support the mobility objectives that higher education institutions currently demand.

Regardless of the diversity of agreements that a normal school has to promote its academic mobility, an aspiration that has been little exploited by Mexican educational institutions is the procurement of international funds through foundations, donors and non-profit civil associations, in where there is a very wide universe of possibilities to finance not only academic mobility actions, but also a very wide range of academic activities related to research, outreach and social service. These universities or educational institutions have been considered

in other spaces as "entrepreneurial" institutions. The entrepreneurial university is a place that diversifies its funds in such a way that it does not depend essentially on the whims of politicians and bureaucrats, nor on corporations, nor on the payment of tuition by the student body. Funding in them comes from a diverse set of agencies, alumni, previous grant interests, and other sources. Due to this diversification of their sources of financing, entrepreneurial universities do not depend on either the State or the market, but on the self-determination of the university in accordance with policies developed by it (Clark, 2005).

The incursion of normal schools in the world of fundraising is viable as long as there is training for project-based academic work, in addition to a transformation of a more flexible, expeditious administrative and academic management with high visibility of results.

Discussion

It is evident that derived from the analysis presented, academic and student mobility is a topic on the educational research agenda in Mexico, especially in Mexican normal schools. This article aimed to address, based on a documentary and descriptive analysis, the position that normal schools currently hold in relation to internationalization, mobility and the mechanisms in which this subsystem faces the global reality of its educational work, which without doubt, at least in Mexico, it warns of serious challenges that must be attacked from the curricular point of view, but especially from the field of public policy.

The reflection on the necessary and unpostponable adherence of normal schools to the current of internationalization opens the door to many other perspectives of a more pragmatic nature of the academy and institutional management: is it necessary to create a guideline on internationalization from the top of the national educational system so that normal schools take actions accordingly? Can or should it be the responsibility of each institution to address the challenge towards the global? Why have normal schools not yet established the foundations for their academic communities to benefit? of the international dimension through mobility?

Undoubtedly, it can be seen that the priorities of structural change touch the normative, financial, curricular and organizational aspects within the normal ones that will have to be resolved in a medium and long term spectrum; However, there are other areas of opportunity that can be addressed immediately and promote in these institutions the conditions that allow them to build programs and projects that, in the next decade, trigger the active participation of students and teachers in academic collaboration actions. At national and international level. Among these

pending are, to mention a few, the incorporation of the components of interculturality and internationalization in the competences approach, the establishment of agreements and collaboration agreements based on individual experiences, the promotion of foreign language learning, the bibliographic update towards global content or the establishment of elementary procedures and rules for eventual mobility activities.

These questions and remarks will surely trigger other research gaps that contribute to a deep approach to an incipient issue for these institutions, encouraging not only researchers belonging to normal schools, but also the growing number of academics from all higher education institutions that They are aware of the urgency of implementing internationalization processes in Mexico and Latin America.

Conclusions

Thinking about leaving the classrooms and everyday spaces are the determining factors for the achievement of the graduation profile of the future educator of the public normal schools of the country, which would lead to breaking intellectual, epistemological boundaries and repetitive professional practices.

A large number of national and international HEIs are curricularly and academically convinced that the achievement of their educational purposes and the construction of differentiated competencies in graduate profiles can be consolidated through academic mobility, since it represents a tool that allows integration knowledge and doings, both personal and of the academic community itself, which permanently contribute to the integral formation that combines theoretical knowledge acquired in school, with practical aspects of the work and professional reality.

Regardless of the institutional conditions, budget and / or curricular conditions that normal schools currently have, it will be transcendental to move towards the implementation of internationalization processes where mobility is inserted in a strategic way, but not temporary.

There are many challenges posed by this change in the structural and curricular paradigm in normal schools, since it is necessary to make a deep reflection on the transformations necessary to carry out a relevant and coherent transition with the long-term academic objectives. In the first place, it is necessary to define the motivations to establish mobility as an academic strategy, in such a way that policies, plans, programs, goals and actions can be conceived to guide efforts in an orderly, progressive and sustainable manner; secondly, it is essential to carry

out a series of transformations at the curricular level: updating curricula, enabling the profile of students and teachers for mobility (intercultural approach, languages, research, among others), programmatic content with international scope and creating systems that allow the transfer and recognition of academic credits from other countries; and thirdly, it is vital to adapt the administrative apparatus of the normal school (have an area or office, create processes, regulations and formalize agreements) coupled with a strategy that contributes to the access of the academic community to financing options for mobility and internationalization in general.

Normal schools, as key institutions in the training of education professionals in Mexico and Latin America, have the great challenge of adapting to the trends of internationalization of higher education, without eagerness to adopt prefabricated models and structures, but using these processes to consolidate its educational quality and to open itself towards a real inter-institutional cooperation scheme that strengthens its formative essence.

References

- Abba, M. (2015). Las oficinas de relaciones internacionales en el proceso de internacionalización de la educación superior. Un análisis a través de variables de gestión. *Revista Gestão Universitária na América Latina-GUAL*, 8(4), 20-37. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.5007/1983-4535.2015v8n4p20>
- Altbach, P. G. (2004). *Globalization and the University: Myths and Realities in an Unequal World*. In National Education Association, The NEA 2005 Almanac of Higher Education. Washington, D.C: National Education Association.
- Altbach, P. G. and Knight, J. (2007). Thecastiellodeardofdíaz e Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 290-305. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303542>
- Anguas, M. B. M. (2013). Los organismos internacionales y las políticas de formación docente. En Ducoing, P. *La escuela normal. Una mirada desde el otro*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la Universidad y la Educación, Centro Cultural Universitario, Ciudad Universitaria, Coyoacán, 4510.
- Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of Universities: A University Culture-Based Framework. *Higher Education*, 45(1), 43-70.

- Beelem, J. (2011). Internationalisation at Home in a Global Perspective: A Critical Survey of the 3rd Global Survey Report of IAU. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 8(2), 249-264.
- Bok, D. (2006). *Our underachieving colleges: A candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Castiello, S., Cortes, C. y Bustos, M. (2018). *¿Qué sabemos de movilidad estudiantil en México? Logros y retos derivados del reporte Patlani*. Recuperado de <https://educacion.nexos.com.mx/?p=1086>
- Clark, B. (2005). The character of the entrepreneurial university. *International Higher Education*, (38), 2-3. Retrieved from <https://ejournals.bc.edu/index.php/ihe/article/view/7456/6652>
- De Witt, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CT: Information Age Pub Inc.
- Deardorff, D. and Hunter, W. (2006). Educating global ready graduates. *International Educator*, 72-83.
- Díaz Barriga, F. (2005) Enseñanza situada. Vínculo entre la escuela y la vida. México: Mc Graw Hill.
- Díaz, A. y Quiroz, R. (2013). La formación integral: una aproximación desde la investigación. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, 18(3), 17-29. Recuperado de <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/2550/255030038002.pdf>
- Didou, A. S. (2017) La internacionalización de la educación superior en América Latina: transitar de lo exógeno a lo endógeno. México: UDUAL.
- Fernández, J. (2005). Matriz de competencias del docente de educación básica. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, 36(2), 1-14. Recuperado de <https://rieoei.org/historico/investigacion/939Fernandez.PDF>
- Fresán, M. (2009). Impacto del programa de movilidad académica en la formación integral de los alumnos. *Revista de la Educación Superior*, 38(151) 141-160. Recuperado de http://publicaciones.anuies.mx/pdfs/revista/Revista151_S4A1ES.pdf
- Gacel-Ávila, J. (2005). La internacionalización de la educación superior en América Latina: el caso de México. *Cuaderno de Investigación en la Educación*, (20), 1-14. Recuperado de <https://www.uco.edu.co/ova/OVA%20Internacionalizacion/ova%20internacionalizaci%>

C3%B3n/g)%20Gacel-%C3%81vila,%20J-
%20Cuaderno%20de%20Investigaci%C3%B3n%20en%20la%20Educati%C3%B3n%
202005.pdf

Gacel-Ávila, J. (2009). Marco teórico: modelo de oficinas de relaciones internacionales. En *Red SAFIRO II: casos prácticos para la gestión de la internacionalización en universidades* (pp. 6-32). Alicante: Oficina de Gestión de Proyectos Internacionales de la Universidad de Alicante.

García, J. (2013). Movilidad estudiantil internacional y cooperación educativa en el nivel superior de educación. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, (61), 59-76.

González, J. (2007). Internacionalización de la educación superior. *Universidades*, (33), 3-10, 3-10. Recuperado de <http://ucsj.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=37303302>

Grasset, C. (2013). *Internationalization rationales, obstacles and drivers: A multiple case study of Spanish higher education institutions*. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. Retrieved from https://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/handle/11299/150715/GRASSET_umn_0130E_13608.pdf?sequence=1

Instituto Nacional para la Evaluación de la Educación [INEE] (2016). *Panorama educativo de México 2015. Indicadores del sistema educativo nacional. Educación básica y media superior*. México. Recuperado de <https://www.inee.edu.mx/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/P1B115.pdf>

Knight, J. (2008). *Higher Education in Turmoil. The Changing World of Internationalization*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Knight, J. (2012). Student Mobility and Internationalization: Trends and Tribulations. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 7(1), 20-33. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.2304/rcie.2012.7.1.20>

Larrea, M. y Astur, A. (2011). *Políticas de internacionalización de la educación superior y cooperación internacional universitaria*. Recuperado de <http://portales.educacion.gov.ar/spu/files/2011/12/Artículo-Políticas-de-internacionalización>

- Magaña, M. (2000). *Mejoramiento del desempeño docente en la Universidad de Colima a través de la formación de cuerpos académicos* (tesis de maestría). Universidad de Colima, Colima.
- Mahroum, S. (2000). Highly skilled globetrotters: mapping the international migration of human capital. *R&D Management*, 30(1), 23–31.
- Martín-Barbero, J. (2003). La globalización en clave cultural: una mirada latinoamericana. *Renglones, revista del ITESO*, (53), 18-33. Recuperado de https://rei.iteso.mx/bitstream/handle/11117/357/53_02_globalizacion.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y
- Mercado, R. (2000). *La incapacidad del plan 1997 de licenciatura en educación primaria. Un estudio sobre el primer semestre* (reporte de investigación: temas prioritarios). México, Dirección General de Investigación Educativa SEByN-sep.
- Noriega-Chávez, M. (2014) México en la internacionalización. Las escuelas normales. En Navarrete-Cazales, Z. y Navarro-Leal, M. A. (eds.), *Internacionalización y educación superior* (pp. 301-334). Estados Unidos de América: Palibrio/SOMECE.
- Organización para la Cooperación y el Desarrollo Económico [OECD] (2018). *Panorama de la educación 2017: indicadores de la OCDE*. Madrid: Fundación Santillana. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1787/eag-2017-es>
- Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura (UNESCO) (2010). *Informe de seguimiento de la educación para todos en el mundo 2010: llegar a los marginados*, Francia.
- PATLANI (2012). *Encuesta nacional de movilidad estudiantil internacional de México*. Recuperado de http://www.sin Cree.sep.gob.mx/work/models/sin Cree/Resource/archivo_pdf/movilidad.pdf
- PATLANI (s. f.). *Encuesta mexicana de movilidad internacional estudiantil 2014/2015 y 2015/2016*. Recuperado de http://patlani.anuies.mx/archivos/documentos/PATLANI2017_web_optimizado.pdf
- Rodríguez, H. (2004). Investigación en la escuela normal superior. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, (47), 1-14. Recuperado de <https://revistas.pedagogica.edu.co/index.php/RCE/article/view/5518/4545>

- Romo, R. (2006). Políticas públicas, académicos e interdisciplina. *Revista de Educación y Desarrollo*, (5), 13-20. Recuperado de http://www.cucs.udg.mx/revistas/edu_desarrollo/anteriores/5/005_Romo.pdf
- Ruiz, L. (2011). Formación integral: desarrollo intelectual, emocional, social y ético de los estudiantes. *Revista Universidad de Sonora*, (19), 11-13. Recuperado de <http://www.revistauniversidad.uson.mx/revistas/19-19articulo%204.pdf>
- Saint-Onge, M. (2000) Yo explico, pero ELLOS... ¿Aprenden?. México: SEP.
- Sebastián, J. (2004). *Cooperación e internacionalización de las universidades*. Buenos Aires: Biblos.
- Secretaría de Educación Pública [SEP] (2017). *Sistema educativo de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos: principales cifras 2016-2017*. Ciudad de México: Autor.
- Zaman, K. and Mohsin, A. (2014). Internationalization of Universities: Emerging Trends, Challenges and Opportunities. *Journal of Economic Info*, (3), 1-9. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.31580/jei.v1i1.100>

Rol de Contribución	Autor (es)
Conceptualización	Román Castro Miranda (Igual) Héctor Gabriel Rangel Ramírez (igual)
Metodología	Román Castro Miranda (Principal) Héctor Gabriel Rangel Ramírez (Apoyo)
Software	Román Castro Miranda (Igual) Héctor Gabriel Rangel Ramírez (igual)
Validación	Román Castro Miranda (Igual) Héctor Gabriel Rangel Ramírez (igual)
Análisis Formal	Román Castro Miranda (Igual) Héctor Gabriel Rangel Ramírez (igual)
Investigación	Román Castro Miranda (Igual) Héctor Gabriel Rangel Ramírez (igual)
Recursos	Román Castro Miranda (Igual) Héctor Gabriel Rangel Ramírez (igual)
Curación de datos	Román Castro Miranda (Igual) Héctor Gabriel Rangel Ramírez (igual)
Escritura - Preparación del borrador original	Román Castro Miranda (Igual) Héctor Gabriel Rangel Ramírez (igual)
Escritura - Revisión y edición	Román Castro Miranda (Igual) Héctor Gabriel Rangel Ramírez (igual)
Visualización	Román Castro Miranda (Igual) Héctor Gabriel Rangel Ramírez (igual)
Supervisión	Román Castro Miranda (principal) Héctor Gabriel Rangel Ramírez (Apoyo)
Administración de Proyectos	Román Castro Miranda (principal) Héctor Gabriel Rangel Ramírez (Apoyo)
Adquisición de fondos	Román Castro Miranda (Apoyo) Héctor Gabriel Rangel Ramírez (principal)