The SWB *Experience,* held on June 10, 2015, in Curitiba, at the PUCPR Campus, aimed to create a space for sharing the experiences of CSF *graduação sanduíche* fellows (students given a scholarship to study abroad), who have returned from abroad.

31 students who completed the exchange program in the following countries participated in the event:

Destination country	Total
Germany	3
Australia	7
Canada	6
South Korea	1
Spain	1
United States	4
France	2
Hungary	1
United Kingdom	6
Total	31

In the first part of the event, the PUCPR CsF program coordinator, Prof. Cleybe Vieira presented the design of the event and the information about the program at the University. The Dean of PUCPR, prof. Waldemiro Gremski, welcomed the students and ex-CsF fellows and talked not only about the importance of participation in the program for the personal and professional training of each student, but especially about the importance of the Program for the country, from the contribution of all the students to the society. Next, prof. Fernando Bittencourt Luciano, gave the lecture "*Travel to Lead, does this make sense*?" a spoken testimony of his own experience that was quite provocative and inspiring for the second part of the event.

After this lecture, students were divided into six groups according to the country of destination, the countries with few students having been regrouped.

For 1 hour the groups were given the task of discussing relevant points to make contributions to PUCPR, for management of the CSF Program (for CNPq and CAPES) and the partners of the destination countries, which are responsible for the allocation of students in Universities.

The last part of the event was reserved for the presentation of future opportunities for the PhD program.

Below, we list the suggestions made for each of the recipients:

1) Suggestions for PUCPR

1.1. <u>Library</u>

    a. Library with a better framework for studies and research. For example, more outlets, better internet;

    b. Boost the library by areas of knowledge and the return of books per demand. Statistics for book loans: Different deadlines for more commonly used books;

    c. More inviting libraries: different study areas, areas for discussions.

    d. Partnerships with article databases. The University of Dundee had a fairly complete articles database that helped students;

    e. Availability of textbooks. Assist students with materials for lessons, books, classes, videos, library with longer hours;

    f. 24-hour Library.

1.2. <u>Study rooms and laboratory</u>

    a. Study islands in the blocks;

    B. latest equipment and in adequate numbers for all students in the class to use.

1.3. <u>Academic curriculum x higher education methodology</u>

    a. Greater flexibility in the grids, facilitating the selection of subjects;

    b. Better interaction between students and teachers, such as more dynamic classes;

    c. Provide lessons recorded in the classroom on the PUCPR website. Insertion of video-classes, and recorded lectures;

    d. Inclusion of handbooks: guides for the subjects;

    e. Feedback from professors. PUC does not give much feedback to students;

    f. We lose a lot of time with evaluations. Outside, we had one test per semester, which is few tests, but many activities;

    g. When there are similar tests in different courses, they are given for everyone on the same day. Provide previous tests;

    h. Create an exam week;

    i. Electives from other courses that are not yours. Freedom for students to choose other subjects - multidisciplinary;

    j. Create an entire course in another language. If I, as a Brazilian, want to do my entire course in English, or have an entire semester of my course in another language;

    k. Provide materials in other languages;

    l. Encourage students to study more on their own, with less time in the classroom;

    m. Promote ongoing evaluations, after all, a student acquires various skills during the semester and not all can be evaluated through a single test.

1.4. Reception

a. Greater interaction with the exchange students that PUC receives;

b. More activities between Brazilian students and exchange students;

c. The PUC exchange sector could promote more events for the exchange students, which would be an opportunity for them to get to know each other, as well as get to know the Brazilian students;

d. Events to encourage the presentation of the culture of many countries (food, dances, songs), these events work great at universities in Australia.

1.5. Office hours and attending to the students

   a. Issue documents in other languages.
   b. Facilitate communication with PUCPR during the exchange period (do not block eureka for example).

1.6. Infrastructure and meals

   a. Provide locations to fill up water bottles (advise PUCPR to distribute squeeze bottles) and microwaves to heat up food/snacks;
   b. Encourage the use of water bottles (squeeze bottles) for drinking water, with specific supply areas to facilitate filling up the bottle;
   c. Eating area with microwave for students who bring their own lunches.;
   d. 24-hour Research Laboratory;
   e. 24-hour architecture and design workshops at the end of semesters;
   f. Provide better infrastructure for bicycle use;
   g. Encourage the use of bicycles by the students and PUCPR employees.

1.7. Cultural and linguistic activities

   a. Support the creation of clubs such as drama club, poetry club, music club;
   b. Creation of clubs for all interests (photography, video games, dancing, etc.);
   c. Free time for students: improving the students' quality of life with SOCIETIES (common interest groups like sports, extracurricular activities);
   d. Tandem - educational language exchange, two people meet to teach languages to each other, regardless if it is between Brazilians or Brazilians with foreigners, which, in some universities, is part of the curriculum;
   e. University incentive for creation of clubs for various interests. (Chess, mathematics, astronomy, soccer, etc ...);

f. Open up language courses for the community where students returning from exchange teach classes for beginners.

1.8. Information Technology

a. Intranet to assist teachers in the delivery of work, identifying plagiarism in papers, feedback. Software;

b. Printer interlinked to computers and a membership card at PUCPR;

c. Institutional application for submitting projects and plagiarism control: turnitin.com

1.9. Innovation, incubator and entrepreneurship

a. When students create a new product or service, the university is the proper environment for testing and applying ideas;

b. Innovation battery, where people spend all day for one week at the university to develop an idea that will be presented to the municipality or the university itself for implementation;

c. Junior company creation.

2) Suggestions for CNPq and CAPES

2.1. Performance monitoring, monitoring of students and selection

a. Greater oversight of academic performance of fellows and also of spending transferred to universities abroad;

b. Audit the scholarships better and have a "collection" so that students can repay the company for what he or she received during the program;

c. Best way of assessing people. There were people who the students identified that did not deserve to take part in the program. Suggestion: interview with the applicants; demand for higher averages at the university;

d. Greater control over students' grades;

e. More effective follow-up to have a better return;

f. Require a minimum academic performance, through credits;

g. Minimum standard of 4 semesters in the course completed in Brazil. Students with little time in the course often perform better than students who have studied for longer;

h. Improve the selection criteria with an interview done by the university to see if the student meets the profile that the program demands, because sometimes the grade does not truly represent the student's profile, sometimes he or she gets a relatively low grade, but is creative and interested in research.

2.2. Payment of scholarships and needs

    a. Monitor the fellow better, not only the payment of scholarships but know what the needs of each student are.

    b. Students lost money with highly valued currencies. Deposit money in the actual currency.

    c. Science without borders scholarship was not enough for *accommodation* in London. The university placed the student in a building that was very far away.

    d. The scholarship for students could be higher.

2.3. Communication with the institution and information

    a. improve communication: quality of responses via email, via the website;

    b. Provide clearer information for the university abroad: rules for internships, etc;

    c. When I went, the IIE only sent emails stating that the scholarships could be delayed, we want more "humane" treatment;

    d. Fellows require a quicker solution to the problems faced when the response is delayed, the student is usually very stressed and anxious about the whole situation.

2.4. Access to other institutions

    a. Facilitate entry and access to existing research at the university;

    b. CAPES/CNPQ should respond more for the students before the foreign university.

2.5. Research

    a. Place more emphasis on research in the Program;

    b. Demand more access to research at the universities;

    c. Demand more access to research for students approved in the CSF notices;

    d. Destination Universities were not prepared to coordinate internships and research;

    e. CAPES/CNPQ could try to make an arrangement with the foreign institutions to facilitate research abroad.

3) Suggestions for the partner (allocations)

    3.1. Partner and coordination information

        a. Greater clarity of information on how the program works;

        b. Guide students with courses for the student to know what he or she is going to study;

        c. Provide the curriculum grid, especially for courses like medicine and healthcare areas. Make it available on the website;

      d. Students end up not working in the main area during the internship and research because it is not well coordinated.

3.2. Reception

      a. Better preparation of the university abroad to receive the CSF students;

      b. Have greater proximity with the students, hold meetings like the ones universities hold for freshman.

3.3. Housing

      a. Separate Brazilians so that they do not live together in the same flat. This makes the students speak the local language more.

3.4. The campus in France has greater interaction with the students

3.5. CRUP: Improve the physical structure of the universities