



ESCOLA DE
HUMANIDADES

ESTUDOS IBERO-AMERICANOS

Estudos Ibero-Americanos, Porto Alegre, v. 52, n. 1, p. 1-15, jan.-dez. 2026
e-ISSN: 1980-864X | ISSN-L: 0101-4064

DOSSIÊ: RESPONSABILIDADE SOCIAL DA EDUCAÇÃO: ENTRE DILEMAS E POSSIBILIDADES

Higher Education: Social Responsibility and Monitoring of Graduates

Educación Superior: Responsabilidad Social y Seguimiento de Egresados

Educação Superior: Responsabilidade Social e Acompanhamento de Egressos

Vera Lucia Felicetti¹

orcid.org/0000-0001-6156-7121
verafelicetti@gmail.com

Marília Costa Morosini²

orcid.org/0000-0002-3445-1040
marilia.morosini@pucrs.br

Corbin M. Campbell³

orcid.org/0000-0002-8826-1672
campbell@american.edu

Recebido em: 30 mar. 2025.

Aprovado em: 03 jun. 2025.

Publicado em: 29 out. 2026.

Abstract: In times of sustainable development objectives, Social Responsibility in Higher Education is one of the most important and complex university functions, both in terms of its results and its application. Thus, this article, which adopts a quantitative approach, has graduates from five non-profit higher education institutions, one from each Brazilian region, as participants in the research, whose question was: How does the reality of higher education graduates from five Brazilian non-profit universities signal the social responsibility of these institutions? Based on the theoretical framework of Social Responsibility (SR), University Social Responsibility (USR) and Territorial Social Responsibility (TSR), the results show that non-profit HEIs perform SR, USR and TSR to the extent that their graduates, through the training they have received, are working in the area of training, with an increase in salary and recognition of the relevance of Higher Education for the social insertion of the graduate, for the construction of cultural capital and based on multidimensional social interaction.

Keywords: Higher Education; university social responsibility; territorial university social responsibility; graduates.

Resumen: En tiempos de objetivos de desarrollo sostenible, la responsabilidad social en la enseñanza superior es una de las funciones universitarias más importantes y complejas, tanto por sus resultados como por su aplicación. Así, este artículo, que adopta un abordaje cuantitativo, tiene como participantes de la investigación a graduados de cinco instituciones de educación superior comunitarias, una de cada región brasileña, siendo la pregunta: ¿Cómo la realidad de los graduados de educación superior de cinco universidades comunitarias brasileñas señala la responsabilidad social de estas instituciones? A partir del marco teórico de la Responsabilidad Social (RS), de la Responsabilidad Social Universitaria (RSU) y de la Responsabilidad Social Territorial (RST), los resultados muestran que las IES comunitarias cumplen la RS, la RSU y la RST en la medida en que sus graduados, gracias a la formación recibida, actúan en el área en que se formaron, con aumento de salario y reconocimiento de la relevancia de la Educación Superior para la inserción social del graduado, para la construcción de capital cultural y con base en la interacción social multidimensional.

Palabras clave: Educación Superior; responsabilidad social universitaria; responsabilidad social universitaria territorial; graduados.

Resumo: A Educação Superior em tempos de objetivos de desenvolvimento sustentável tem na Responsabilidade Social uma das funções universitárias mais importante e mais complexas, tanto no que diz respeito aos seus resultados como à sua aplicação. Assim, este artigo que adota abordagem quantitativa, tem egressos de cinco Instituições de Educação Superior comunitárias, uma de cada região brasileira, como sujeitos participantes da pesquisa que teve como questão: como a realidade de egressos da Educação Superior de cinco universidades comunitárias brasileiras sinalizam a responsabilidade social de tais



Este é um artigo de acesso aberto distribuído sob a licença [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), que permite a cópia e redistribuição do material em qualquer formato e para qualquer finalidade, desde que a autoria original e os créditos de publicação sejam mantidos.

¹ Universidade do Planalto Catarinense (Uniplac), Lages, Santa Catarina, Brasil e Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS), Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil.

² Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS), Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil.

³ American University, Washington, United States.

instituições? Fundamentados no arcabouço teórico da Responsabilidade Social (RS), Responsabilidade Social Universitária (RSU) e Responsabilidade Social Territorial (RST), os resultados apontam que as IES comunitárias desempenham a RS, RSU e RST à medida que seus egressos, mediante a formação recebida, encontram-se atuando na área de formação, com aumento na remuneração salarial e no reconhecimento da relevância da Educação Superior para a inserção social do egresso, para a construção de um capital cultural e com base na interação social multidimensional.

Palavras-chave: Educação Superior; responsabilidade social universitária; responsabilidade social universitária territorial; egressos.

1 Higher Education: Social Responsibility and Monitoring of Graduates

The physical distances between nations do not make communication between them impossible. Communication is much faster and more effective these days due to advances in technology that allow us to be connected and interconnected with people from different parts of the world at the same time. This highlights the fact that globalization is taking place and interculturality is being shared and learned, emphasizing that there is a need to develop articulated actions for the internationalization of and in education. Education plays a fundamental role in sustainable development and global citizenship. This is confirmed in Goal 4 - Quality Education, among the 17 Sustainable Development Goals published in 2017 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), which is to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all" (ODS4, 2017, p. 18). This is in line with what Irina Bokova (UNESCO, 2017, p. 7) says about the need to change the way we work "[...] how we think about the role of education in global development because it has a catalyzing effect on people's well-being and the future of our planet [...]". That being the case, "more than ever, education has a responsibility to align itself with the challenges and aspirations of the 21st century, and to promote the right kinds of values and skills that will enable sustainable and inclusive growth and peaceful coexistence".

Higher Education plays a crucial role in produc-

ing professionals for society, especially those who work in preceding educational levels. Therefore, it is essential to examine the quality of teaching, research, and service offered in Higher Education. Evaluation is a significant aspect of ensuring this guarantee. What are the indicators that assess quality? There has been a great deal of attention paid to the consequences of using different kinds of indicators (Campbell, 2015), including global, regional, territorial, and institutional indicators.

The Brazilian state is responsible for Higher Education in Brazil. To ensure the national evaluation process of Higher Education institutions, their undergraduate courses, and the academic performance of their students, the Brazilian National Higher Education Evaluation System (Sinaes) was created. Sinaes was instituted by Law No. 10.861, of April 14, 2004 (Brasil, 2004). The purpose of evaluating higher education institutions, as stated in Article 3 of Sinaes, is to identify the profile and significance of each institution's performance. This can be achieved by analyzing their activities, courses, programs, projects, sectors, and social and economic outcomes based on the 10 institutional dimensions outlined in Sinaes for evaluation. Each dimension has a set of indicators, with their respective weights considered in the evaluation. The 10 dimensions are: I. Mission and institutional development plan (has 2 indicators and the weight in the evaluation is 5); II. The policy for teaching (ungraduated and post-graduate), research, service, and the respective operational rules, including the procedures for stimulating academic production, for research grants, monitoring and other modalities (has 7 indicators and the weight is 35); III. The institution's social responsibility, especially with regard to its contribution to social inclusion, economic and social development, environmental protection, cultural memory, artistic production and cultural heritage (has 4 indicators and the weight is 5); IV. Communication with society (has 3 indicators and the weight is 5); V. Personal and career policies for teaching and teaching administrative staff, their training, professional development and working conditions (has 6 indicators and the

weight is 20). VI. Organization and management of the institution, especially de functioning and representativeness of the collegiate bodies, their independence and autonomy in relation to the sponsor, and the participation of the segments of the university community in decision-making process (has 4 indicators and the weight is 5); VII. Physical infrastructure, especially teaching ad research infrastructure, library, information and communications resources (has 5 indicators and the weight is 10); VIII. Planning and evaluation, especially teaching in relation to the process, results and effectiveness of institutional self-evaluation (has 3 indicators and the weight is 5); IX. Students care policies (has 4 indicators and the weight is 5); X. Financial sustainability, in view of the social significance of the continuity of commitments in the provision of higher education (has 3 indicators and the weight is 5).

It can be seen that the dimension with the greatest weight is II, which deals with "The policy for teaching (ungraduated and post-graduate), research, service, and the respective operational rules, including the procedures for stimulating academic production, for research grants, monitoring and other modalities" (SINAES, 2009, p. 143). It is true that the functions contained in dimension II are at the heart of the university; however, other dimensions with less weight give meaning to its existence, including the dimension that deals with social responsibility and student service.

The focus of this article is on dimensions III and IX, whose weights are 5 each, as it is understood that without students, there is no university, and without social responsibility, there is no reason for teaching, research, and service.

Dimension IX - Student service policies - has, among its indicators, policies for monitoring graduates and creating opportunities for continuing education, with the minimum quality reference concept being the existence of "[...] adequate mechanisms are in place to ascertain the opinion of graduates on the training they received, both curricular and ethical, to find out the rate of occupation among them, to establish a relationship between occupation and the professional training

received"; at the same time that, "the opinion of employers of graduates is used to revise the plan and programs, and there are updating and continuing training activities for graduates" (SINAES, 2009, p. 140).

Dimension III - the institution's social responsibility, considers broad indicators in relation to social inclusion, economic and social development, environmental protection, cultural memory, artistic production and cultural heritage.

Social responsibility and the monitoring of higher education graduates are dimensions that allow universities to (re)examine themselves and assume the risks of possible impacts resulting from actions and changes instituted in and by the university. This is only possible if the university equips itself with a permanent self-diagnosis, capable of measuring and signaling what can be improved and changing the habits acquired, since "what is not measured can hardly be improved" (Vallaes, 2018, p. 169). Thus, self-diagnosis is fundamental because it makes it possible to carry out good university management, increasing its commitment, listening, and accountability to all stakeholders, and helping to fight the risk of institutional misunderstanding. In this way, social responsibility assists with both accountability of higher education institutions as well as formative improvement (Campbell; Meehan, 2017). This brings us to the question that drives this article: How does the outcomes of higher education graduates from five Brazilian non-profit universities signal the social responsibility of such institutions? To accomplish this, we need to better understand what Social Responsibility, University Social Responsibility and Territorial University Social Responsibility are and how they are amplified and occur in Higher Education.

2 What is Social Responsibility?

Social Responsibility (SR) is related to a critical university function - the function of relations with society. But this apparently simple definition brings with it a complexity that surrounds the notion of the university. In the context of:

University Social Responsibility is a policy of continuous improvement through which the university effectively fulfills its social mission via four processes: ethical and environmental management of the institution; the education of responsible and socially conscious citizens; the production and dissemination of socially relevant knowledge; and social engagement in promoting more humane and sustainable development (Vallaey, 2016, p. 106).

The social responsibility shows that it is much more than philanthropic actions or ephemeral fads; they show that social responsibility must be characterized by actions based on rigorous study to better interact with society's needs, and research with graduates is an excellent evidence bases; they also show that the institution's attributions cannot be burdens, but rather a set of good practices capable of keeping up with social demands and establishing changes that promote sustainable development.

Reflections on the concept of social responsibility clearly show the existing tensions, which have been minimized but not exhausted. We can cite the relationship between organizations and society is not determined by one side alone. The process of interaction is based on ethical and social governance with lucid management. The principle and function of social responsibility must be built up gradually with the participation of different actors and seek to be permanent in the institution, thus constituting a culture present in all types of institutions.

Thus, from a relationship between the university and society, we move on to a relationship of University Social Responsibility (USR). In this case, we move on to the cycle of responsibility - "oriented towards the training of decision-makers, which contributes, through quality alliances, to underpinning and accompanying the transition from a culture marked by the power of knowledge to another, centered on the responsible care of life" (Fiorino, 2018, p. 25).

The university is based on the tripod of teaching, research, and service and without any of these elements, there is no university (Santos, 2011). Service is assigned the responsibility of connecting

the university with society, since service activity is defined as: "An interdisciplinary educational process that promotes interaction between the Higher Education institution and other sectors of society, applying scientific and technological development to external agents" (INEP, 2017, p. 50). However, referring only to service as the responsibility for connecting the university with the challenges that permeate society seems to be a rather naïve thought, given that all the actions developed in and arising from the university are directly or indirectly associated with everything that happens in society. An example of its direct influence is when it trains professionals to work in different sectors of society; indirectly, there is the influence it has on the scale of ethical values developed in these professionals. In line with this, the attributes presented in Chart 2, which define an institution's social responsibility, help us understand what University Social Responsibility (USR) is. The definition of USR considers the impacts that the university generates, both on its territory and far from it.

These impacts⁴ can be grouped into four categories according to Vallaey, Cruz and Sasia (2008): organizational, educational, cognitive and social impact. Along the same lines, Ribeiro (2007), when he was director of evaluation at the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel Foundation (CAPES), points out that the impacts of social insertion are technological, economic, educational, social and cultural.

For Vallaey, Cruz and Sasia (2008), the university, like any other institution, changes the lives of the people who work or study there because its academic and social function influences University faculty, staff, and students. A responsible university asks itself about its environmental responsibility and is aware that the way it organizes its daily work has an environmental impact.

People who go through university have their education, their values, and the way they interpret, behave and act in the world influenced by what they experience in the university (Mayhew *et al.*,

⁴ Impact is understood here as a different measure from result. Impact is the effect or consequence that the result of an action brings.

2016). This influence also affects professional ethics and their social role (Vallaey; Cruz; Sasia, 2008). Dias Sobrinho (2008) adds that social responsibility is linked to training, values, solidarity, justice, and respect for diversity. A **responsible university** asks itself about the education it offers to guarantee a socially responsible education, and is therefore concerned about the types of professionals, citizens, and people it is training (Vallaey; Cruz; Sasia, 2008).

It is the university that guides the production of knowledge, since the research it carries out defines science, truth, rationality, usefulness, teaching, learning, etc. It articulates, or should articulate, the relationship between techno-science and society, to provide direction and social appropriation of knowledge. It has a strong influence on the definition and selection of priorities on the scientific agenda. A **responsible university** asks itself about the type of knowledge it produces, its social relevance, and its recipients (Vallaey; Cruz; Sasia, 2008).

The university's reference point is the social weight it carries and its ability to promote progress or not, to create social and cultural capital, to link its students to reality, to make knowledge accessible internally and externally to the university environment. The **responsible university** asks itself how it can keep pace with the development of society and help solve the fundamental problems it faces (Vallaey; Cruz; Sasia, 2008).

In light of this, four processes define the university's social function: its management, the training it provides, the production of knowledge and social participation. University Social Responsibility proposes transforming the university and its social territory into laboratories for learning, teaching, research and innovation. For Vallaey, Cruz and Sasia (2008), a responsible university represents an internal laboratory for the development of socially responsible research that can, in addition to contributing to the growth of science, have institutional self-assessment as a commitment by institutional leaders to outlining new paths to be taken, while at the same time presenting institutional coherence for the ethical

training of its students.

The university's ability to respond to the social needs of underrepresented groups, identified as having "initial disadvantages" whose opportunities are not the same as those present in other social groups. The university's capacity to respond to the social needs of underrepresented groups, identified as having "initial disadvantages," whose opportunities are not the same as those present in other social groups. In this sense initial disadvantages "correspond to those that exist independently of one's will, such as race, gender, age, disabilities, family, or socio-economic situation" (Felicetti; Morosini, 2009, p. 12; Roemer, 1988), must be broadened and deepened because University Social Responsibility is not limited to solidarity or the commitment to service, obscuring university management and making it difficult to take responsibility for institutional coherence and the demands of democratization, regarding opportunities for access and permanence at university for those underrepresented segments of the population who, to a large extent, are still excluded from this level of education.

University Social Responsibility allows us to know how to proceed with changes both in the management of the university-society relationship and in the university's relationship with itself. In this way, it reinforces and legitimizes the presence of service in university management, facilitating inclusion and articulation with the processes of academic training and knowledge production, associating quality, relevance and contemplating the demands of access and permanence, associated with programs that contribute to and reinforce inclusion actions at the university, thus distinguishing itself from philanthropy with little social impact and poor academic integration or occasional assistance actions.

Inclusion programs, such as the University for All Program (ProUni), achieve interaction with society naturally, through the results of training, which trigger transformative actions in the context in which they live and work while they are students and, above all, afterward as graduates, showing the impacts of University Social Respon-

sibility. Universities that serve underrepresented groups influence these students' engagement with society in various ways, indicating that certain institutions may indeed enact University Social Responsibility (Guzman; Cabrera, 2023). There is also a mutual social responsibility that exists when alumni give back to the University (Weerts; Cabrera, 2018).

In this sense, when the university meets the needs of the territory in which it is inserted, we see Territorial Social Responsibility (TSR), which, according to Fiorino (2018), includes the construction of innovative and transformative practices and logics, capable of activating multiple interactions, thus contributing to a more egalitarian economy, promoting social responsibility in organizations; contributing to a policy that is more focused on the capacities of people and communities, promoting governmental and citizen social responsibility; contributing to the development of science and technology that re-signify their efficiency and productivity in ecological harmony, promoting environmental social responsibility.

To fulfill the mission of higher education, the university needs to interact more effectively with society to better collaborate towards a more humane and sustainable development. To this end, the organizational, educational, cognitive and social impact bring to the fore interest groups or stakeholders who can affect or be affected by policies, objectives, decisions, and actions at the university and those arising from them. The interest groups are made up of staff, teaching staff, researchers, people in management positions, students, and people who provide outsourced services to the institution; graduates and employers; other higher education institutions with competitive functions; local community groups with whom the university works on programs and projects; social organizations; and public bodies such as the Department of Education and the Ministry of Education, among others.

It should be noted that the interest groups correspond to all segments of society, and the organizational, educational, cognitive and social impact that the university's responsibility is also

relational, which is evidence of the scope and University Social Responsibility for the country's development. Furthermore, as the understanding of the relationship between society and the university changes, it is possible to identify a relationship between the global and the regional. The perspective of defending the regional territory is then adopted, with the university having Territorial Social Responsibility. This, according to Noguera e Licandro (2018), has multiple responsibilities: teamwork, knowledge management, and personal responsibility in the exercise of scientific practices developed by researchers and with effects on the people who use them and how they are used. In addition, Territorial Social Responsibility is intertwined with university autonomy, which, in turn, corresponds to the "space for creation and innovation, academic freedom, and critical thinking" (Didriksson, 2018, p. 73) offering episteme and identity to people, whether they are inside HEIs or in their social territory. In this sense, this article, by presenting the results of a survey involving graduates from, shows university and Territorial Social Responsibility taking place in society. The purpose of this study was to examine the outcomes of higher education across regions in Brazil, considering the social responsibility and impact of social programs, ProUni in focus.

3 Methodology

The 1,145 graduates taking part in this survey are a representative sample of Brazil's five regions, corresponding to the participation of five Non-profit Higher Education Institutions, one in each region that participated in the project entitled Higher Education: access, trajectory and results - PHASE II. Among the respondents are those who were scholarship holders of the University for All Program - ProUni and those who were not.

The choice of analyzing the groups having been a ProUni scholarship holders and not having been one is justified by the fact that it is possible to see the results of the training provided to entrants from groups considered to be underrepresented. The federal government's University for All

Program (ProUni), which began in 2005, grants full and partial scholarships (50% of the course tuition fee) for undergraduate courses and specific training programs at private, for-profit, and non-profit higher education institutions. The program targets students without a higher education degree. By analyzing groups of scholarship and non-scholarship graduates, it is possible to make better progress in terms of monitoring graduates from and university social responsibility associated with government programs that provide for more inclusive and equitable education, as is the case with ProUni.

Regarding Non-profit Higher Education Institutions, the Article 1 of Law N°. 12.881, of November 12, 2013, defines that Non-profit Higher Education Institutions are Brazilian civil society organizations that are constituted in the form of an association or foundation, with legal personality under private law; non-profit; and fully apply their resources in the country to maintain their institutional objectives, among others.

Non-profit higher education institutions in Brazil accounted for 32.1% in 2022, according to a report prepared by Deed/Inep⁵ based on microdata from the Higher Education Census (Brasil, 2023). This percentage of Non-profit Higher Education Institutions included 5,076,790 of the overall number of places offered in undergraduate courses in 2022 (Brasil, 2023), corresponding to 22.24% of the total number of places offered in Brazilian Higher Education. Given these percentages, the role of Non-profit Higher Education Institutions in the country's development stands out, which is why this study was carried out with graduates from non-profit institutions.

The initial database was provided by the protocol of the five higher education institutions, four of which came from the project Higher Education:

access, trajectory and results - PHASE I and one of which corresponded to the project of the same title, but PHASE II. The survey questionnaire was answered between March 2018 and June 2022. This questionnaire was validated by Felicetti and Cabrera (2017a, 2017b). The questionnaires were sent by email. Each HEI created an email specifically for this research, which was monitored by a designated institutional representative with the support of the coordinator of this project.

The data was initially organized and "cleaned" in an Excel spreadsheet and then imported into Stata/IC13.1 - Statistics/Data Analysis, through which statistical and inference analyses relevant to this study were carried out according to Acock (2014). The χ^2 (chi-squared) was calculated to test the association between being ProUni or not and the variables contained in the survey instrument. The significance levels were as follows: less than 5% ($p < 0.05$) were considered significant, and between 5% and 10% (0.05 and 0.1) were considered indicative of significance, according to Bós (2004). The T-test was used to see if there was a significant difference between ProUni and non-ProUni graduates and some variables in each Brazilian region and in the regions as a whole.

The total of 1,145 responses imported into Stata/IC13.1 had values assigned to the variables according to the response format options, which for this article corresponded to which course they graduated from⁶, by academic degree: licentiate, baccalaureate, or technologist; whether the work they do is related to their degree; whether they still work in the same job as when they were students; their per-capita income when they entered higher education; their salary after graduating; and the question that identifies being the first family member to graduate from higher education. The sociodemographic questions involved

⁵ Directorate of Educational Statistics (DEED). Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira (Inep).

⁶ The graduates taking part in this survey are from the following courses: Administration, Agronomy, Systems Analysis, Architecture and Urbanism, Fine Arts, Visual Arts, Library Science, Computer Science, Aeronautical Sciences, Biological Sciences, Biological Sciences Medical Mod, Accounting Sciences, Economic Sciences, Social Sciences, Social Communication, Design, Law, Degree in Art Education, Physical Education, Nursing, Environmental Engineering, Food Engineering, Civil Engineering, Computer Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Telecommunications Engineering, Pharmacy, Degree in Philosophy, Degree in Physics, Physiotherapy, Speech Therapy, Degree in Geography, Computer Science, Journalism, Degree in History, Degree in Letters: Portuguese-English, Languages, Languages, Mathematics, Veterinary Medicine, Medicine, Nutrition, Dentistry, Pedagogy, Advertising, Psychology, Chemistry, Public Relations, International Relations, Bilingual Executive Secretary, Social Work, Information System, Theology, Occupational Therapy, Tourism, Zootechnics, Financial Management Technologist; Industrial Production Management Technologist; Logistics Technologist; Marketing Technologist.

gender⁷, age, race/ethnicity,⁸ and whether they had received a ProUni scholarship.

4 Analysis and Discussion

The total number of respondents to this survey was 1,145. The North region had the highest representation with 399 (34.9%), followed by the Southeast with 241 (21%), the Midwest with 212 (18.51%), the South with 197 (17.2%), and the North-east with the lowest representation of 96 (8.4%).

Regarding the gender of the graduates from the five regions surveyed, only in two regions were there more male graduates than female graduates: in the North region with 42 (60%) male ProUni graduates from this institution, and in the Northeast region with 41 (51.9%) male ProUni graduates from this institution. In the other regions, in both the ProUni and non-ProUni strata, the highest percentages were among women, with a total of 514 non-ProUni and 222 ProUni graduates, representing 55.8% and 59.5%, respectively, of the total of 1,145 graduates. There was no statistically significant relationship between the sexes in each region or between the regions as a whole.

Regarding the race of the respondents, only two regions had indigenous graduates, 1 non-grant holder in the South and 4 ProUni grant holders in the North, representing 0.4% of all graduates. It is noteworthy that the number of brown graduates is higher than that of white graduates in the Central-West region, corresponding to 17 (44.7%) ProUni scholarship holders in this region; in the North region, with the majority of brown respondents in both strata, 189 (57.4%) non-scholarship holders and 49 (70%) scholarship holders; in the Northeast region, the number of brown graduates was 6 (35.3%) among scholarship holders. The highest percentages of black graduates were in the Central-West region with 8 (21.1%) scholarship graduates and in the Northeast region with 24 (30.4%) non-scholarship graduates and 7 (41.2%) scholarship graduates. In the South and Southeast, the majority of respondents, scholars and non-scholars alike, are

white. In the Midwest, the majority of whites are in the non-scholarship group. In the North, the majority of both strata are brown. In the Northeast, the majority are white non-scholars. In the South, there was no statistically significant relationship between race and having received a scholarship or not. In all the other four regions, there was a greater representation of scholarship recipients in the brown and black races, showing the social relevance of ProUni, although it is known that the population of the South is predominantly white, which may explain the low number of scholarship recipients in the black or brown categories. All survey respondents answered this question.

Regarding the age at which they entered higher education, in the South, South-East, and North-East, the largest number of students, whether they were ProUni graduates, are aged 18 or over and under 25, with only the ProUni graduate stratum in the North-East not constituting a majority. In the Central-West region, the majority of both strata are 25 or older and under 35. In the North region, the majority of those who received a scholarship are aged 18 or over and under 25, and among those who did not receive a scholarship, the highest percentage are aged 25 or over and under 35. There was a statistically significant relationship between the strata of having been a scholarship recipient and not having been a scholarship recipient and age in the South and North.

In the field of study (Table 1), it can be seen that only in the North did students graduate as technologists. It is noteworthy that only in the South region, the majority of graduates, 30 (52.6%), were prounistas, while in the other regions and in both strata, the graduates were bachelor graduates. In all regions, there was no statistically significant relationship between having or not receiving a scholarship and the type of degree from which they graduated. In the South, there was an indication of significance with $p = 0.07$. The social responsibility of universities, according to the *Observatorio Regional de Responsabilidad Social para América Latina y el Caribe* (ORSALC, 2018),

⁷ We followed the division used in the Higher Education Census, which is between men and women.

⁸ We follow the same denomination used by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE).

includes among its indicators the development of skills for the world of work and mechanisms for placement and complementarity between the world of work and the world of education. Thus, Chart 01, which shows the courses from which students graduated, and Chart 02, which provides evidence of the relationship between work and training, show that the undergraduate courses of the five non-profit colleges have room for their

graduates to work in the labor market. In addition to this data, Chart 03 shows the change of job after graduation and the percentage of salary increases after graduation, aspects that show the economic and educational impact pointed out by Ribeiro (2007), as well as the social and educational projection impact of the academic training received, according to Vallaeys, Cruz and Sasia (2008).

TABLE 1 – Degree course

Region	ProUni	Bachelor	Graduation	Technologist	Total	P
South	No	86(61.4)	54(38.6)		140(71.1)	0.07
	Yes	27(47.4)	30(52.6)		57(28.9)	
Southeast	No	162(81.4)	39(19.6)		201(83.4)	0.302
	Yes	35(87.5)	5(12.5)		40(16.6)	
Midwest	No	143(82.2)	31(17.8)		174(82.1)	0.93
	Yes	31(81.6)	7(18.4)		38(17.9)	
North	No	221(67.2)	90(27.4)	18(5.5)	329(82.5)	0.14
	Yes	41(5.9)	21(3)	8(1.1)	70(17.5)	
North East	No	56(70.9)	23(29.1)		79(82.3)	0.642
	Yes	13(76.5)	4(23.5)		17(17.7)	
Total	No	668(72.5)	237(25.7)	18(2)	923(80.6)	0.107
	Yes	147(66.2)	67(30.2)	8(3.6)	222(19.4)	

Source: Author's database.

About the degree of agreement with work being related to academic training, Table 2 shows that only in the North region, among those who were not scholarship holders, 162 (49.2%) were not the majority, and among scholarship holders, 35 (50%), but these were the highest percentages among the options selected. In all the other regions and groups, the figures represented the majority of responses. In addition, if we add up

partially and totally agree, the results are higher than 63% in both groups and all regions, which represents a total of 71.8% among those who weren't scholarship students and 78.8% among those who were. This data shows that the job market is absorbing these graduates. There was no statistically significant relationship in the regions between having been a ProUni scholar or not and work being related to training.

TABLE 2 – Work related to academic background

Region	ProUni	Totally disagree	Partially disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partially agree	Totally agree	Not working	Total	P
South	No	24(17.1)	7(5)	10(7.1)	26(18.6)	73(52.1)	15(10.7)	140(71.1)	0.75
	Yes	13(22.8)	1(1.8)	4(7)	9(15.8)	30(52.6)	3(5.3)	57(28.9)	
Southeast	No	13(6.5)	6(3)	5(2.5)	46(23.1)	119(59.8)	12(6)	201(83.4)	0.243
	Yes	1(2.5)			6(15)	28(70)	5(12.5)	40(16.6)	
Midwest	No	17(9.8)	4(2.3)	6(3.4)	30(17.2)	99(56.9)	18(10.3)	174(82.1)	0.256
	Yes	3(7.9)	1(2.6)	1(2.6)	5(13.2)	28(73.7)		38(17.9)	
North	No	28(8.5)	16(4.9)	7(2.1)	55(16.7)	162(49.2)	61(18.5)	329(82.5)	0.147
	Yes	2(2.9)	1(1.4)		18(25.7)	35(50)	14(20)	70(17.5)	

Region	ProUni	Totally disagree	Partially disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partially agree	Totally agree	Not working	Total	P
North East	No	15(19)	5(6.3)	2(2.5)	7(8.9)	45(57)	5(6.3)	79(82.3)	0.312
	Yes	1(5.9)			3(17.6)	13(76.5)		17(17.7)	
Total	No	97(43.7)	38(4.1)	30(3.3)	164(17.8)	399(43.3)	96(10.4)	923(80.6)	0.316
	Yes	20(9)	3(1.4)	5(2.3)	41(18.5)	106(47.7)	19(8.6)	222(19.4)	

Source: Author's database.

Continuing in the same job as when you were a student can be a sign of several things, including the fact that you were already working in your field of training before you graduated; another aspect may be related to your choice of course and, of course, the profession you want to pursue. On the other hand, a change of occupation is also a signal that the labor market needs professionals trained in the field. Table 3 shows the number of graduates who continued in the same job with the same salary and those who had a salary increase; it also shows those who changed jobs and continued with the same salary or had an increase; it also shows those who were not working at the time of the survey, which was 104 (11.3%) among those who had not attended ProUni

and 15 (6.8%) among those who had. The highest percentages of responses to the question about having changed jobs were found in four of the regions. In the South, 65 (46.4%) for non-ProUni students and 37 (64.9%) for ProUni students; in the Center-West, 95 (54.6%) for non-ProUni students and 32 (84.2%) for ProUni students; in the North, the percentages were 132 (40.1%) and 42 (60%) for non-ProUni and ProUni students, respectively; in the Northeast, 49 (62%) and 9 (52.9%) for ProUni and non-ProUni students, respectively. There was a statistically significant relationship in the Center-West and North regions between having received a scholarship or not and having the same job or not.

TABLE 3 – Continuing in the same job as a graduate

Region	ProUni	Yes, same salary level	Yes, with an increase	No, another salary level	No, another increase	Didn't work	Total	P
South	No	16(11.4)	15(10.7)	29(20.7)	65(46.4)	15(10.7)	140(71.1)	0.14
	Yes	7(12.3)	3(5.3)	7(12.3)	37(64.9)	3(5.3)	57(28.9)	
Southeast	No							0.016
	Yes							
Midwest	No	10(5.7)	10(5.7)	36(20.7)	95(54.6)	23(13.2)	174(82.1)	0.018
	Yes		1(2.6)	4(10.5)	32(84.2)	1(2.6)	38(17.9)	
North	No	47(14.3)	39(11.9)	50(15.2)	132(40.1)	61(18.5)	329(82.5)	0.143
	Yes	9(12.9)	2(2.9)	6(8.6)	42(60)	11(1.6)	70(17.5)	
North East	No	6(7.6)	10(12.7)	9(11.4)	49(62)	5(6.3)	79(82.3)	<0.001
	Yes		6(35.3)	2(11.8)	9(52.9)		17(17.7)	
Total	Não	79(8.6)	74(8)	124(13.5)	341(37)	104(11.3)	722(79.9)	<0.001
	Sim	16(7.2)	12(5.4)	19(8.6)	120(54.1)	15(6.8)	182(20.1)	

Source: Author's database.

Table 4 shows the per capita family income at entry. In the South, the highest percentages were

in the income bracket of up to three minimum wages⁹ for both scholarship and non-scholarship

⁹ In force until July 2022 when the data collection for this survey ends.

students, with 26 (45.6%) and 44 (31.4%), respectively; in the Southeast, the highest percentages were in the bracket of up to six minimum wages for non-scholarship students, with 99 (49.7%), and in the bracket of up to four minimum wages for scholarship students, with 20 (50%). The fact that 50% of scholarship graduates in the Southeast had an income of up to four salaries is noteworthy because one of the income criteria for receiving a full ProUni scholarship is proof of a gross monthly family income of up to 1.5 minimum salaries per person. For the partial scholarship, which covers 50% of the tuition fees, the monthly per capita income required is up to 3 minimum salaries. In the Central-West region, there are 55 (31.6%) non-scholarship holders in the range corresponding to more than six minimum wages and 18 (47.4%) scholarship holders in the

range corresponding to up to three minimum wages; in the North region, in both strata, the highest percentages are in the one minimum wage stratum with 142 (43. In the Northeast, the highest percentage of non-scholarship holders is in the more than six minimum wages' stratum with 28 (35.4%) and in the up to three minimum wages stratum for scholarship holders with 9 (52.9%). Looking at the total, it can be seen that among those who didn't receive a scholarship, there was a distribution in all income strata that was higher than 16% and lower than 23.2%, while among those who did receive a scholarship, the majority, 55.9%, were in the income stratum of up to one minimum wage. In all regions, there was a statistically significant relationship between income at entry and having a scholarship or not. All survey respondents answered this question.

TABLE 4 – Per capita family income when entering university

Region	ProUni	Minimum wage N (%)	Up to 3 salaries N (%)	Up to 4 salaries N (%)	Up to 6 salaries N (%)	6+ salaries N (%)	Total N (%)	P
South	No ProUni	15(10.7)	44(31.4)	33(23.6)	22(15.7)	26(18.6)	140(71.1)	<0.001
	ProUni	24(42.1)	26(45.6)	6(10.5)	1(1.8)		57(28.9)	
Southeast	No ProUni	18(9)		67(33.7)	99(49.7)	17(8.5)	201(83.4)	<0.001
	ProUni	19(47.5)		20(50)	1(2.5)		40(16.6)	
Midwest	Not ProUni	24(13.8)	45(25.9)	25(14.4)	25(14.4)	55(31.6)	174(82.1)	<0.001
	ProUni	17(44.7)	18(47.4)	1(2.6)	1(2.6)	1(2.6)	38(17.9)	
North	Not ProUni	142(43.2)	106(32.2)	30(9.1)	22(6.7)	29(8.8)	329(82.5)	<0.001
	ProUni	58(83)	10(14.3)	2(2.9)			70(17.5)	
North East	Not ProUni	7(8.9)	19(24.1)	10(12.7)	15(19)	28(35.4)	79(82.3)	0.001
	ProUni	6(35.3)	9(52.9)		2(11.8)		17(17.7)	
Total	Not ProUni	206(22.4)	214(23.2)	165(17.9)	183(19.9)	155(16.8)	923(80.6)	<0.001
	ProUni	124(55.9)	63(28.4)	29(13.1)	5(2.3)	1(0.5)	222(19.4)	

Source: Author's database.

Table 5 shows that in three regions: the Southeast, Midwest, and Northeast, the highest percentages are for those earning more than six minimum salaries per month. In the South and North, the highest percentages are for those earning up to three minimum salaries per month. There was a statistically significant relationship only in the North between salary and having received a ProUni scholarship or not. If we compare the data in Table 5 with that presented in Table 4, we can see that there has been a change in salary

income, with higher salary values presented. It should be noted that Table 4 shows per-capita income, while Table 5 shows individual income, which reinforces the change in salary of these graduates. According to Grimaldo (2018), Social Responsibility is committed to contributing to increasing the well-being of local and global society, and the individual or per-capita salary increase is a contributing factor to this well-being.

TABLE 5 – Salary after graduation

Region	ProUni	Minimum wage	Up to 3 salaries	Up to 4 salaries	Up to 6 salaries	More than 6 salaries	Not working	Total	P
South	No	26(18.6)	38(27.1)	29(20.7)	19(13.6)	28(20)	8(5.7)	140(71.1)	0.433
	Yes	12(21.1)	21(36.8)	12(21.1)	6(10.5)	6(10.5)	2(3.5)	57(28.9)	
Southeast	No	4(2)	32(16.1)	30(15.1)	27(13.6)	96(48.2)	12(6)	201(83.4)	0.495
	Yes		5(12.5)	5(12.5)	8(20)	17(42.5)	5(12.5)	40(16.6)	
Mid	No	6(3.4)	30(17.2)	25(14.4)	32(18.4)	64(36.8)	17(9.8)	174(82.1)	0.215
West	Yes	2(5.3)	3(7.9)	4(10.5)	12(31.6)	16(42.1)	1(2.6)	38(17.9)	
North	No	48(14.6)	105(31.9)	34(10.3)	49(14.9)	36(10.9)	57(17.3)	329(82.5)	<0.001
	Yes	4(5.7)	28(40)	21(30)	1(1.4)	3(4.3)	13(18.6)	70(17.5)	
North East	No	8(10.1)	13(16.5)	13(16.5)	14(17.7)	28(35.4)	3(3.8)	79(82.3)	0.54
	Yes		2(11.8)	5(29.4)	4(23.5)	6(35.3)		17(17.7)	
Total	No	92(10)	218(23.7)	131(14.2)	141(15.3)	252(27.4)	89(9.7)	923(80.6)	0.09
	Yes	18(8.1)	59(26.6)	47(21.2)	31(14)	48(21.6)	19(8.6)	222(19.4)	

Source: Author's database.

Being the first in the family to graduate from higher education is the question answered in Table 6. It shows that in all regions, among the graduates who received ProUni scholarships, the highest percentage was among those who were the first in their family to graduate, distributed as follows: 33 (57.9%) in the South, 26 (65%) in the Southeast, 19 (50%) in the Center-West, 45 (64.4%) in the North, and 10 (58.8%) in the Northeast, which represents 133 (59.9%) of the first generation of

ProUni graduates. Regarding those who were not ProUni scholarship holders, in the South 57 (40.7%) and North 135 (41%), the highest percentages were also the first to graduate, while in the Southeast 103 (51.8%), Midwest 73 (42%) and Northeast 39 (49.4%), their father or mother graduated before them. There was an indication of significance in the South region ($p = 0.061$) and a statistically significant relationship in the others.

TABLE 6 – First family member with higher education

Region	ProUni	No, cousin	No, sister/ brother	No, aunt/ uncle	No, father/ mother	Yes	Total	P
South	No	13(9.3)	36(25.7)	9(6.4)	25(17.9)	57(40.7)	140(71.1)	0.061
	Yes	3(5.3)	8(14)	7(12.3)	6(10.5)	33(57.9)	57(28.9)	
Southeast	No	8(4)	37(18.6)	5(2.5)	103(51.8)	48(24.1)	201(83.4)	<0.001
	Yes	2(5)	4(10)	3(7.5)	5(12.5)	26(65)	40(16.6)	
Midwest	No	7(4)	41(23.6)	9(5.2)	73(42)	44(25.3)	174(82.1)	0.04
	Yes	2(5.3)	5(13.2)	2(5.3)	10(26.3)	19(50)	38(17.9)	
North	No	16(4.9)	84(25.5)	31(9.4)	63(19.1)	135(41)	329(82.5)	0.008
	Yes	3(4.3)	12(17.1)	5(7.1)	5(7.1)	45(64.4)	70(17.5)	
North East	No	5(6.3)	10(12.7)	6(7.6)	39(49.4)	19(24.1)	79(82.3)	0.012
	Yes		2(11.8)	3(17.6)	2(11.8)	10(58.8)	17(17.7)	
Total	No	49(5.3)	208(22.6)	60(6.5)	303(32.9)	303(32.9)	923(80.6)	<0.001
	Yes	10(4.5)	31(14)	20(9)	28(12.6)	133(59.9)	222(19.4)	

Source: Author's database.

Social responsibility is directly linked to people and society, since it is inserted in a space, in a territory in which social life, life with other people, grows and develops (Grimaldo, 2018). In this

sense, being the first in the family to graduate from higher education represents a movement in the family and social territory, it gradually represents a growth in cultural capital (Bourdieu,

2007).

5 Final Considerations

Considering the analyses presented, the evaluation indicators set out by SINAES and the evidence that permeates University Social Responsibility, it is possible to consider that knowing about graduates means maintaining an institutional self-assessment, which allows the institution to better identify the results of the training it provides. It means having evidence to be able to maintain an internal dialogue within the HEI to make improvements, changes, or create new proposals in the dynamics of institutional management so that the HEI achieves its mission more effectively; it means maintaining an external dialogue with interested parties, such as employers, companies, government agencies, and others; it means evaluating affirmative action programs (in this article, the ProUni; but, above all, it means reflecting on CSR and its impacts on society.

Talking about institutional evaluation, more specifically self-evaluation, means bearing in mind that the university has social responsibility at its core, with emphasis on territorial social responsibility, since this corresponds to the territory in which the university operates, in the context where the achievements and results of academic work, training, learning and cognitive construction are located; it is the territory where the relationship between the university and society takes place, "where concepts and hypotheses, experiments and proposals for transformation and innovation, change and solution of problems and phenomena of society and nature can be verified" (Didriksson, 2018, p. 74).

In this sense, the results of the research presented here show the role of the five non-profit HEIs, one in each Brazilian region, regarding University Social Responsibility and Territorial Social Responsibility, since each one meets, in its social territory, the specificities that pass through them, without forgetting the global since they contemplate Social Responsibility indicators prescribed by the *Observatorio Regional de Responsabilidad*

Social para América Latina y el Caribe (ORSALC, 2018). Therefore, the data about work being related to academic training, whether they continue in the same job upon graduation or not and whether there has been a salary increase, the comparison between family per capita income and current salary remuneration, and whether they are the first family member to graduate from Higher Education answers the research question: How does the outcomes of Higher Education graduates from five Brazilian non-profit universities signal the social responsibility of such institutions?

The results presented here provide similar conclusions to previous research in other national (Felicetti; Cabrera, 2017a, 2017b) or international settings. For example, in the United States, research comparing graduates of higher education to those without degrees demonstrates greater economic, health and civic outcomes (Baun; Kurose; Ma, 2013).

Future research in Brazilian higher education institutions may consider the health and civic outcomes of graduates in addition to employment. It is hoped that the evidence presented in this article can contribute to other research and to higher education institutions.

References

- ACOCK, A. *A gentle introduction to Stata*. College Station: StataCorp LP, 2014.
- BAUN, S.; KUROSE, C.; MA, J. *How College Shapes Lives: Understanding the Issues*. Trends in Higher Education Series. New York: College Board, 2013.
- BÓS, Â. J. G. *EpilInfo sem mistérios: um manual prático*. Porto Alegre: EdiPUCRS, 2004.
- BOURDIEU, P. Os três estados do capital cultural. In: NOGUEIRA, M. A; CATANI, A. (org.). *Escritos de educação*. 9. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2007. Cap. IV, 71-80.
- BRASIL. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais (Inep). *Censo da Educação Superior*. Brasília, DF, 2023. Disponível em: <https://www.gov.br/inep/pt-br/areas-de-atuacao/pesquisas-estatisticas-eindicadores/censo-da-educacao-superior>. Acesso em: 12 mar. 2024.
- BRASIL. *Lei nº 10.861, de 14 de abril de 2004*. Institui o Sistema Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior – SINAES. Brasília: INEP, 2004.

CAMPBELL, C. M. Serving A Different Master: Assessing College Educational Quality for the Public. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, New York, n. 30, p. 525-579, 2015.

CAMPBELL, C. M.; MEEHAN, M. Leading the Call for Improving Student Learning Goals and Outcomes. In: ANTONY, J. S.; CAUCE, A. M.; SHALALA, D. E. (ed.). *Challenges in Higher Education Leadership*. New York: Routledge Press, 2017.

DIAS SOBRINHO, J. Avaliação educativa: produção de sentidos com valor de formação. *Revista Avaliação da Educação Superior*, Campinas, v. 13, n. 1, p. 193-207, 2008.

DIDRIKSSON, A. Responsabilidad social territorial: nuevos desafíos para la autonomia universitaria. In: UNESCO – IESALC. *Tendencias de la educación superior en América Latina y el Caribe*. Córdoba: Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, 2018. p. 73-94.

FELICETTI, V. L.; CABRERA, A. F. Resultados da Educação Superior: o ProUni em Foco. Avaliação. *Revista da Avaliação da Educação Superior*, Campinas, v. 22, n. 3, 2017a.

FELICETTI, V. L.; CABRERA, A. F. Percurso na Educação Superior: o ProUni em Foco. *Ensaio: Avaliação e Políticas Públicas em Educação*, Campinas, v. 25, n. 95, 2017b.

FELICETTI, V. L.; MOROSINI, M. C. Equidade e iniquidade no ensino superior: uma reflexão. *Ensaio*, Rio de Janeiro, n. 17, p. 9-24, 2009. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/ensaio/a/Gq8c9dWsgVskC3LDcnV8jgH/abstract/?lang=pt>. Acesso em: 20 abr. 2024.

FIORINO, V. M. Calidad y responsabilidad social em la educación superior. In: UNESCO – IESALC. *Tendencias de la educación superior en América Latina y el Caribe*. Córdoba: Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, 2018. p. 17-34. Disponível em: <https://bibliotecadigital.cin.edu.ar/bitstream/123456789/2273/1/Tendencias.pdf>. Acesso em: 15 mar. 2024.

GRIMALDO, H. Tendencias RST, calidad y lugar social de la educación superior desde una visión sistémica. In: UNESCO – IESALC. *Tendencias de la educación superior en América Latina y el Caribe*. Córdoba: Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, 2018. p. 171-188. Disponível em: <https://bibliotecadigital.cin.edu.ar/bitstream/123456789/2273/1/Tendencias.pdf>. Acesso em: 20 mar. 2024.

GUZMAN, A.; CABRERA, A. F. Uncovering Typologies of Civically Engaged Latina/o College Graduates at 4-Year Institutions of Higher Education. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, San Bernardino, v. 22, n. 5, p. 1800-1814, 2023.

INSTITUTO NACIONAL DE ESTUDOS E PESQUISAS EDUCACIONAIS – INEP. *Instrumento de Avaliação de cursos de graduação Presencial e a distância* – Autorização. Brasília: Inep/MEC, 2017.

MAYHEW, M. J.; ROCKENBACH, A. N.; BOWMAN, N. A.; SEIFERT, T. A.; WOLNIAK, G. C. *How college affects students: 21st century evidence that higher education works*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, v. 1, 2016.

NOGUERA, J. M.; LICANDRO, O. El bien común como meta: retos para las Instituciones de educación superior en América Latina. In: UNESCO – IESALC. *Tendencias de la educación superior en América Latina y el Caribe*. Córdoba: Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, 2018. p. 95-114. Disponível em: <https://bibliotecadigital.cin.edu.ar/bitstream/123456789/2273/1/Tendencias.pdf>. Acesso em: 10 de abril de 2024.

OBJETIVOS DE DESENVOLVIMENTO SUSTENTÁVEL – ODS4. Nova York: 2017. Disponível em: <https://www.ipea.gov.br/ods/ods4.html>. Acesso em: 10 de abril de 2024.

OBSERVATORIO REGIONAL DE RESPONSABILIDAD SOCIAL PARA AMÉRICA LATINA Y EL CARIBE – ORSALC. Colômbia, 2018.

RIBEIRO, R. J. *Inserção social*. Brasília: CAPES, 2007. Disponível em: https://www.gov.br/capes/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/Artigo_23_08_07.pdf. Acesso em: 17 mar. 2024.

ROEMER, J. E. *Equalizing opportunities (in one country) for human development*. Davis: University of California, 1988. Disponível em: <http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=1441472>. Acesso em: 15 mar. 2024.

SANTOS, B. de S. *A universidade no século XXI: para uma reforma democrática e emancipatória da Universidade*. 3. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011. (Coleção questões da nossa época; v. 11).

SISTEMA NACIONAL DE AVALIAÇÃO DA EDUCAÇÃO SUPERIOR – SINAES. Brasília: Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira, 2009.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO). *Education for Sustainable Development Goals: learning objectives*. Paris: UNESCO, 2017.

VALLAEYS, F. *Introducción a la responsabilidad social universitaria*. Barraquilla: Ediciones universidad Simón Bolívar, 2016.

VALLAEYS, F. Responsabilidade social universitária: uma definição prudente e responsável. *Colóquio – Revista do Desenvolvimento Regional – Faccat*, Taquara, v. 14, n. 2, 2018.

VALLAEYS, F.; CRUZ, C.; SASIA, P. M. *Responsabilidad social universitaria: manual de primeros pasos*. México, D.F.: McGraw-Hill Interamericana Editores, S.A. de C.V. Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo, 2008.

WEERTS, D. J.; CABRERA, A. F. Alumni giving as civic expression. *Philanthropy & Education*, New York, v. 2, n. 1, p. 1-24, 2018.

Vera Lucia Felicetti

Realizou estudos de Pós-doutorado na Faculdade de Educação da University of Maryland – College Park/EU (2015) e na American University (2023) com bolsa do Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico – CNPq. Fez doutorado no Programa de Pós-Graduação na PUC/RS. Ganhadora da MENÇÃO

HONROSA pela Tese de Doutorado na Área da Educação para as melhores teses defendidas no país em 2011, dada pela Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior CAPES Portaria nº 160 Edição 2012. Participou dois semestres letivos do Curso de Doutorado no College of Education na Universidade do Texas em Austin - Estados Unidos, no âmbito do Programa de Cooperação Internacional Brasil - EU, com bolsa CAPES como J1 Research Scholar. Possui graduação em licenciatura Plena-Habilitação em Matemática pela Faculdade Porto-Alegrense de Educação Ciências e Letras (1991) e Mestrado em Educação em Ciências e Matemática pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (2007). Atualmente professora no curso de Pós-Graduação em Educação na Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul e no Programa de Pós-graduação em Educação da Universidade do Planalto Catarinense. Tem experiência na Educação Básica, Educação Superior e Pós-Graduação. Interesse de pesquisa: Formação docente, Estudante, Educação Superior, egressos, egressos e estudantes ProUni, processos de ensino e de aprendizagem, comprometimento do estudante, métodos e práticas de ensino.

Marília Costa Morosini

Possui licenciatura e bacharelado em Ciências Sociais, mestrado em Sociologia Educacional, doutorado em Educação pela UFRGS e pós-doutorado no LILLAS/ Universidade do Texas (2002/2003). Bolsista produtividade 1A do CNPq. scholar da New Castle University, School of Education, Communication and Linguistic Sciences. Coordenadora do CEES - Centro de Estudos em Educação Superior - PUCRS; da RIES (Rede Sulbrasileira de Investigadores da Educação Superior) Coordenadora Centro Internacional de Educação Brasil Austrália (2020 -2023); Coord. do Observatório de Educação Qualidade do Ensino Superior (CAPES/ INEP) e da Rede UNIVERSITAS ligada ao GT Política de Educação Superior/ANPED (1996 2012); Coord. do programa conjunto de pesquisa CAPES/UTEXAS/ CEES (2006 - 2012) Qualidade na Educação Superior; e coord. a da Rede CEES/PUCRS - School of Education /Newcastle University/CAPES-PrInt. Coord. e membro do Comite#770; Assessor da Cooperação Internacional FAPERGS (2008 - 2012) e membro CA Educação e Psicologia (2004-2019). Membro da AIDU (Associação Ibero-americana de docência Universitária) e vice-presidente do XCIDU; da LASA Latin American Studies Association. Membro representante da área de Ciências Humanas da CTAA/ INEP/ MEC (2006-2012); integra o CA - Ad Hoc de Educação da CAPES. Coordenadora de projeto CAPES/PRINT com USA e UK. Participa (ou) de projetos nacionais INEP/CNE e internacionais IAU/ UNESCO/CNPq/CAPES/UTexas; CPLP: INNOVACESAL (UE), ACRO; Alfa-Guia (UE); Newcastle (British Council); NEIES/Mercosul. Professora aposentada do IFCH/ UFRGS. Professora titular da PUCRS. Foi diretora da Faculdade de Educação da PUCRS e Coordenadora do PPGEDu (2011 - 2012). Tem experiência na área de Fundamentos da Educação, atuando em: educação superior, qualidade da educação superior, formação de professores, internacionalização da Educação Superior, diversidade e equidade na Educação Superior

Corbin M. Campbell

Professor in the School of Education. Her research, funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Spencer Foundation, and the National Academy of Education, examines three interrelated streams: college teaching in diverse institutional contexts, assessments of higher education quality, and the organizational environments that support faculty in thriving in their careers. Dr. Campbell Served as Associate Dean and Acting Co-Dean of SOE from 2019-2024. Prior to coming to American, Dr. Campbell was Associate Professor in the Higher and Postsecondary Education Program at Teachers College, Columbia University. Dr. Campbell's research has been published in several top-tier journals, such as the Journal of Higher Education, Research in Higher Education, Review of Higher Education, and Teachers College Record. Her work has been highlighted in news venues, such as Inside Higher Education, the Wall Street Journal, NPR, and the New York Times. Dr. Campbell has served on several editorial boards including Review of Higher Education and Review of Educational Research. In 2015, Dr. Campbell was awarded the National Academy of Education/Spencer Postdoctoral Fellowship. She also served on a committee of the National Academies to assess interpersonal and intrapersonal competencies in college and a committee of the National Center for Education Statistics, revising the national postsecondary sample surveys. Dr. Campbell received her Ph.D. in Education Policy from the University of Maryland, her M.A. in Higher Education and Student Affairs from The Ohio State University, and her B.A. in Psychology from the University of Virginia.

Endereço para correspondência

VERA LUCIA FELICETTI

Av. Mal. Castelo Branco, 170 – PPGE - Universitário, 88509-900

Lages, Santa Catarina, Brasil

Av. Mãe Apolinária Matias Batista, nº 360 sobrado 56, 91450-510

Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do sul, Brasil.

MARÍLIA COSTA MOROSINI

Cel bordini 1307/1202. Cep 90 440 003. Auxiliadora

Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil

CORBIN M. CAMPBELL

4801 Massachusetts Avenue NW 453

Washington – DC – United States of America

Como citar este artigo

Felicetti, V. L., Morosini, M. C., & Campbell, C. Educação Superior: Responsabilidade Social e Acompanhamento de Egressos. Estudos Ibero-Americanos, e47757. <https://doi.org/10.15448/1980-864X.2026.1.47757>

Os textos deste artigo foram normatizados por Araceli Pimentel Godinho e submetidos para validação dos autores antes da publicação.