Hans de Wit

Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe and its assessment, trends and issues

nvao
nederlands - vlaamse accreditatieorganisatie

1 ／ Introduction

1 / Introduction

Over the past 25 years, the international dimension of higher education in Europe has become more central on the agenda of European and national governments, institutions of higher education and their representative bodies, student organisations and accreditation agencies.

Stimulated in the 1980's by European programmes for cooperation and exchange in education and research, internationalisation over these years has moved from a reactive to a pro-active strategic issue, from added value to mainstream, and also has seen its focus, scope and content evolve substantially. Increasing competition in higher education and the commercialisation and cross-border delivery of higher education, have challenged the value traditionally attached to cooperation: exchanges and partnerships. At the same time, the internationalisation of the curriculum and the teaching and learning process (also referred to as 'internationalisation at home') has become as relevant as the traditional focus on mobility (both degree mobility and mobility as part of your home degree). Internationalisation has become an indicator for quality in higher education, and at the same time there is more debate about the quality of internationalisation itself.

The international dimension and the position of higher education in the global arena are given greater emphasis in international, national and institutional documents and mission statements than ever before. Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley (2009, 7) in their report to the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education note that "*Universities have always been affected by international trends and to a certain degree operated within a broader international community of academic institutions, scholars, and research. Yet, 21st century realities have magnified the importance of the global context. The rise of English as the dominant language of scientific communication is unprecedented since Latin dominated the academy in medieval Europe. Information and communications technologies have created a universal means of instantaneous contact and simplified scientific communication. At the same time, these changes have helped to concentrate ownership of publishers, databases, and other key resources in the hands of the strongest universities and some multinational companies, located almost exclusively in the developed world.*"

It would be too easy, however, to assume that everything has changed over the past ten years with regard to the internationalisation of higher education, and that this change in Europe is primarily from a more cooperative model to a more competitive model. As Van der Wende (2001, 255) writes: "*Not surprisingly most continental European countries pursue a cooperative approach to internationalisation, which in terms of international learning and experience is more compatible with the traditional values of academia.*"

In a benchmarking exercise on the internationalisation strategies of five European universities, De Wit (2005, 2) encountered clear differentiations. "*Striking is the difference between the approaches to internationalisation of three Northern European universities and two Southern European universities with respect to co-operation and competition. Where the two Southern European universities have a traditional cooperative approach, one Northern university has a strong competitive approach and the two Scandinavian universities are moving into the directions of such an approach, although all three mix it with co-operative activities, in particular in the framework of their involvement in the European programmes. These approaches give a more balanced picture to the idea of shifting paradigms for internationalisation from co-operative to competitive, as presented in current debate and study of the international dimension of higher education in Europe.*" This was confirmed in a second benchmarking exercise, which involved three other European and four Latin American universities. (De Wit, 2007)

In other words, the changing landscape of internationalisation is not developing in similar ways in higher education throughout Europe and the world as a whole. There are different accents and approaches. Internationalisation strategies are filtered and contextualised by the specific internal context of the university, by the type of university, and how they are embedded nationally. For Norway, Frolich (2008,120) comes to the conclusion that "*Internationalisation in higher education institutions (...) is a case of a match between the inherently international character of academic activities and external demands and changing environments.*"

But in a comparative study on internationalisation strategies in Europe, Frolich and Vega (2005, 169-170) observe also that "*the internationalisation of higher education is a complex, multidimensional and often fragmented process. The factors that foster or impede internationalisation activities developed at an institutional level cannot be viewed only in the national and international context. There are influences deeply rooted in the normative and cultural insights, such as history and culture; academic disciplines and subjects; the higher education institution's profiles and individual initiatives; national policies; regulatory frameworks; finance; European challenges and opportunities; and globalisation.*"

Internationalisation strategies are shaped at the programme level by the different relationship these programmes have to the market and society.

An internationalisation strategy can be substantially different for a teacher training programme than for a school of dentistry or a business school.
And as a result of the Bologna Process more and more internationalisation strategies may be different by level: PhD, master and bachelor. Joris (2009) states with reference to developing a list of measures or indicators for quality assessment of internationalisation for Flemish institutions of higher education that different institutions make different policy choices, are differently organized, are of different types and work in different contexts.

The growing importance of internationalisation in higher education on the one hand and the diversity in rationales, approaches and strategies of institutions and programmes on the other hand, call for an assessment of the quality of internationalisation at the programme and the institutional level and the realisation a system of certifications as to define the progress and status of the internationalisation at the programme and institutional level.

In this paper we propose such a system, placed within the context of meanings (what do we mean with internationalisation in higher education), rationales (why do we internationalise) and approaches (what is the focus and approach) to internationalisation, differentiations between type of programmes and institutions, different levels and different disciplines, and existing instruments for assessment and benchmarking of internationalisation.

The rationale for a system of certificates for internationalisation is described by a Flemish Working Group, which observed that too much already has been said about the why of internationalisation of Flemish higher education but too little about the how and about the quality indicators to be used. According to them important questions about visibility, transparency, focus and demonstrated quality still are not answered, and that is why they look for instruments to do so. (Joris, 2009)

Deardorff, Pysarchik and Yun (2009) state: *"with globalisation driving the demand for global-ready graduates, it becomes crucial for administrators to assess these outcomes of internationalisation to determine exactly what our students are learning through these efforts and how effective our programmes are in achieving the stated learning outcomes."*

In this paper an overview is given of the debate on quality and benchmarking of internationalisation of higher education, in the context of the initiative of the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO) to start in 2010 a pilot scheme among 21 Dutch and Flemish degree programmes to assess their level of internationalisation, a pilot that is seen as the foundation for the development of a European label 'distinctive (quality) feature for internationalisation'.

The following topics will be addressed in this paper. What do we mean with internationalisation, in particular in the context of increasing globalisation of our societies and the development of a global knowledge economy? What rationales for and approaches of internationalisation of higher education can be identified? What experience already exists with assessment and benchmarking of quality assurance of internationalisation? What lessons can be learned from these experiences, and what are important aspects to keep in mind when implementing such a label?

2 / Meanings, rationales and approaches to internationalisation

2 / Meanings, rationales and approaches to internationalisation

The changing dynamics in internationalisation of higher education reflect themselves both in the meaning of internationalisation and globalisation, its rationales and the approaches to internationalisation by the different stakeholders.

2.1 / Meanings of internationalisation and globalisation

What do we mean by the internationalisation of higher education? First of all, we have to recognize, that there have always been many different terms used in connection to internationalisation of higher education. (De Wit, 2002,109-116; Knight, 2008, 19-22) In literature and in practice of internationalisation of higher education, it is still quite common to use terms which only address a small part of internationalisation and/or emphasize a specific rationale for internationalisation. Most of the terms used are either curriculum related: international studies, global studies, multicultural education, intercultural education, peace education, etc., or mobility related: study abroad, education abroad, academic mobility, etc.

Over the past ten years one can note a whole new group of terms emerging which were not actively present before in the debate about internationalisation of higher education. These are much more related to the cross-border delivery of education and are a consequence of the impact of globalisation of society on higher education: borderless education, education across borders, global education, offshore education and international trade of educational services.

In 2002, De Wit (2002, 14) stated that *"as the international dimension of higher education gains more attention and recognition, people tend to use it in the way that best suits their purpose."* This is even more the case now in view of this further proliferation of activities and terms.

The most commonly used definition of what we mean by internationalisation at the institutional level is the one by Jane Knight from 1994 (2008, 19) : *"a process of integrating an international and cultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution."*

Since she developed this definition in the early nineties, internationalisation of higher education has evolved. *"Internationalisation is changing the world of higher education, and globalization is changing the world of internationalisation,"* as Knight (2008,1) puts it. The debate about globalisation and internationalisation and the recent, rapid evolution of cross-border activities in higher education have strengthened the tendency to explain and define internationalisation of higher education in connection to a specific rationale or purpose. In the past 'international education' was the most frequently used term synonymous to internationalisation of education, more recently 'globalisation' has come more commonly used as a term related to or even synonym of internationalisation.

Scott (2006, 14) observes that both internationalisation and globalisation are complex phenomena with many strands, and concludes that *"the distinction between internationalisation and globalisation, although suggestive, cannot be regarded as categorical. They overlap, and are intertwined, in all kinds of ways."*

Teichler (2004, 22-23) notes that *"globalisation initially seemed to be defined as the totality of substantial changes in the context and inner life of higher education, related to growing interrelationships between different parts of the world whereby national borders are blurred or even seem to vanish."* But according to him, in recent years the term 'globalisation' is substituted for internationalisation in the public debate on higher education, resulting at the same time in a shift of meanings: *"the term tends to be used for any supra-regional phenomenon related top higher education ( ) and/or anything on a global scale related to higher education characterised by market and competition."*

Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley (2009, 7) state that *"Globalization, a key reality in the 21st century, has already profoundly influenced higher education.(...) We define globalization as the reality shaped by an increasingly integrated world economy, new information and communications technology, the emergence of an international knowledge network, the role of the English language, and other forces beyond the control of academic institutions(...). Internationalisation is defined as the variety of policies and programs that universities and governments implement to respond to globalization."*

Knight (2008, 3) acknowledges the need for constant updating of the meaning of internationalisation of higher education, as *"the international dimension of higher education has been steadily increasing in importance, scope, and complexity."* As new realities and challenges of the current environment she mentions globalisation and the emergence of the knowledge economy, regionalisation, information and communication technologies, new providers, alternate funding sources, borderless issues, lifelong learning, and the growth in the numbers and diversity of actors.

Therefore, a new definition is proposed by Knight (ibid, 21), which acknowledges both levels and the need to address the relationship and integrity between them: *"the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education."* She (ibid, 22-24) also states that you can see now basically two components evolving in the internationalisation of higher education. One is *internationalisation at home* – activities that help students to develop international understanding and intercultural skills.

So it is much more curriculum-oriented: preparing your students to be active in a much more globalised world. Activities under this at home dimension are: curriculum and programmes, teaching and learning processes, extra-curricular activities, liaison with local cultural/ethnic groups, and research and scholarly activities. And the second movement is that of *internationalisation abroad*, including all forms of education across borders: mobility of students and faculty, and mobility of projects, programs and providers. These components have not to be seen as mutual exclusive but are intertwined in the policies and programmes.

2.2 ⁄ Rationales for internationalisation

When we talk about internationalisation, it is important to distinguish the question of why we are internationalising higher education, from what we mean by internationalisation. Many documents, policy papers and books refer to internationalisation, but do not define the why. And in much literature meanings and rationales are confused, in the sense that often a rationale for internationalisation is presented as a definition of internationalisation.

Literature (De Wit, 2002, 83-102) identifies four broad categories of rationales for internationalisation: Political rationales, economic rationales, social and cultural rationales and academic rationales.

Political rationales such as foreign policy, national security, technical assistance, peace and mutual understanding, national and regional identity, have been very important, in particular after the Second World War, and in the Cold War period, when they were very dominant in the internationalisation of higher education. After 9/11/2001 national security has regained importance.

The second group, economic rationales, including growth and competitiveness, national educational demand, labour market, financial incentives, have come more to the forefront in present-day globalization of our economies.

The third group of rationales are the social and cultural rationales. The cultural rationale has to do much more with the role that universities and their research and teaching can play in creating an intercultural understanding and an intercultural competence for the students and for the faculty and in their research. And the social rationale has to do with the fact that the individual, the student, and the academic, by being in an international environment, become less provincial. As mentioned before, there is concern that the role of universities in social and cultural cohesion is under pressure these days.

The last group are the academic rationales: developing an international and intercultural dimension in your research, teaching and services, extension of the academic horizon, institution building, profile and status, the improvement of the quality, and international academic standards. Among these, profile and status, as expressed in the growing importance of international rankings, seem to become more dominant.

It is clear that there are different rationales for the internationalisation of higher education. These are not mutually exclusive, may be different in importance by country and region, and can change in dominance over time. In the present time, the economic rationales are considered to be more dominant than the other three, and in connection to these, academic rationales such as strategic alliances, status and profile are also becoming more dominant.

Knight (2008, 25) speaks of emerging rationales at the national level such as human resource development, strategic alliances, income generation/commercial trade, nation building, and social/cultural development and mutual understanding; and at the institutional level: international branding and profile, quality enhancement/international standards, income generation, student and staff development, strategic alliances and knowledge production.

Several authors like Teichler (2004) mention a growing emphasis on marketisation, competition and management. Reinalda and Kulesza (2005, 99) note that *"since the end of the last century, a shift in higher education has taken place from the public to the private domain, parallel to an increase in international trade in education services (...) These developments enhance the significance of the education market as an international institution, but also contribute to changing the structure of that market. In doing so, an increase in worldwide competition is being revealed."*

Nimes and Hellsten (2005, 1) observe that internationalisation of higher education tends to have been too much identified in

the past with positive opportunities: *"Under internationalisation, the world is our oyster, or perhaps, our garden, in which we sow the seeds from the fruits of our academic labours: powerful knowledges, proven (best) practices, and established systems of scholarship, administration and inquiry."* They (ibid, 14) look "*to trouble such unproblematized notions and to provide more critical readings and explorations of the process."* They call for *"review, renewal and critical insight into current practices of internationalisation."*

All these authors have a strong inclination to call for more attention to social cohesion and to the public role of higher education as an alternative force to the growing emphasis on competition, markets and entrepreneurialism in higher education.

Brandenburg and De Wit (2010) in a provocative essay 'The end of Internationalisation' state that there is a tendency to *see "internationalization as "good" and globalization as "evil". Internationalization is claimed to be the last stand for humanistic ideas against the world of pure economic benefits allegedly represented by the term globalization. Alas, this constructed antagonism between internationalisation and globalization ignores the fact that activities that are more related to the concept of globalization (higher education as a tradable commodity) are increasingly executed under the flag of internationalisation"*

2.3 / Changing approaches

In the course of history we can identify different institutional approaches to internationalisation (De Wit, 2002, 116-118): the activity approach which describes internationalisation in terms of categories or types of activity; the rationale approach which defines internationalisation in terms of its purposes or intended outcomes; the competency approach which describes internationalisation in terms of developing new skills, attitudes, and knowledge in students, faculty, and staff; and the process approach which frames internationalisation as a process that integrates an international dimension or perspective into the major functions of the institution.

The first three approaches, in particular the activity approach, are most common to internationalisation. Given the growing importance of internationalisation in higher education one would have assumed that this would result in a development into a more process approach to internationalisation.

This appeared true for the situation in Europe, where one could observe in the late nineties a trend towards mainstreaming internationalisation, as well as initiatives in the United States of America to promote internationalisation of the campus by organisations like the American Council on Education and by NAFSA.

Also, competencies became more important factors in the discussion on internationalisation, with the increased focus on the internationalisation of the curriculum and teaching and learning process, *i.e.* the internationalisation at home movement. Rationale approaches, with economic and political rationales driving internationalisation at the (inter)national and the institutional level, can also be identified.

Rationales are different over time and by country/region, they are not mutually exclusive, and they lead to different approaches and policies. Currently, changes are taking place at a rapid pace in different parts of the world and rationales become more and more interconnected.

The changing landscape of international higher education as a consequence of the globalisation of our societies and economies is manifest in many ways: increasing competition for international students and academics, growth of cross-border delivery of programmes and emergence of international for profit providers in higher education, the changing position of countries like India and China in the world economy and in the higher education arena. They are all realities and their impact cannot be ignored.

In Europe but also elsewhere, in national and institutional strategies and approaches to internationalisation, mobility - either as part of the home degree or for a full degree abroad - has been dominant until the end of the century. In the United Kingdom this has been the case for full degree incoming mobility, in other countries like Greece and Turkey for outgoing degree mobility, and in other European countries for mobility as part of the home degree: exchanges and participation in European programmes, in particular Socrates/Erasmus. In the Communiqué of the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education, Leuven (28-29 April 2009, point 18) on the Bologna Process, there is an ongoing strong emphasis on the importance of mobility: *"in 2020, at least 20% of those graduating in the European Higher Education Area should have had a study or training abroad."*

In the past decade though a gradual shift can be observed where mobility becomes more one of the instruments and elements of internationalisation. Under the impetus of the 'internationalisation at home movement' the attention has become more focused on the internationalisation of the curriculum and the teaching and learning process: how can we prepare our students – being national or foreign – for a future

career and life in an increasingly interconnected knowledge economy and society. Mobility is in that approach no longer an objective in itself but one of the ways how to reach this; and international becomes more interconnected with intercultural, where crossing borders is no longer an absolute must but only a plus to get an international and intercultural experience.

That experience can also be reached by an international/intercultural classroom setting, in an international company or organisation and/or an intercultural social environment (for instance a internationally/ culturally diverse neighbourhood). Brandenburg and de Wit (2010) phrase it as follows: "*Gradually, the why and what have been taken over by the how and instruments of internationalization have become the main objective: more exchange, more degree mobility, and more recruitment.*"

In this context also the recent initiative by the American Council on Education to bridge the current divide between internationalisation and multicultural education is important. While they are distinct, Christa Olson et all ACE, 2007) wrote that *"one should not be subsumed into the other (...) the two areas have much they can substantively contribute to each other. Indeed, neither area is complete without consideration of what the other brings to bear in terms of understanding and living effectively with difference."*

3/Assessment of internationalisation strategies, an overview of existing instruments and issues

3/ Assessment of internationalisation strategies, an overview of existing instruments and issues

In 1999, the OECD published a book edited by Jane Knight and Hans de Wit with the title *Quality and Internationalisation in Higher Education*, where an instrument and guidelines were provided for assessing internationalisation strategies based on a number of pilot reviews in institutions in different parts of the world. Two issues were considered at that time relevant: the question of the added value that internationalisation contributes to higher education, and the quality of the internationalisation strategies itself. (see also Knight, 2008, 40).

Ten years later, in 2009, EAIE publishes an Occasional Paper edited by De Wit with contributions around the theme: *Measuring the success of what we do*. In the introduction, it is stated that this is becoming an increasingly urgent item on the agenda as professionals in internationalisation. The international ranking of higher education institutions is a widely debated example of how measurement has started to influence our profession in a way that differs from the past. The call for accountability by students, faculty, deans, the management of higher education institutions and national governments, as well as the call for quality assurance, is an important issue on the agenda of higher education, in general, and this includes the internationalisation process, programmes and projects. Accreditation, ranking, certification, auditing, and benchmarking have become key items on the international higher education agenda.

Some important questions that are relevant in addressing the issue of assessment of internationalisation are:

- How do we measure what we do?
- What do we measure?
- What indicators do we use for assessment?
- Do we assess processes or activities?
- Do we carry out assessments with a view to improving the quality of our own process and activities or do we assess the contribution made by internationalisation to the improvement of the overall quality of higher education?
- Do we use a quantitative and/or a qualitative approach to measurement?
- Which instruments do we use, *ex post* or *ex ante* measurements, indicators, benchmarking, best practices, quality review, accreditation, certification, audits or rankings?
- Are we focussing on inputs, outputs and/or outcomes?

Several initiatives to develop tools and instruments for measuring internationalisation have been taken in different countries over the past years, following the 'Internationalisation Quality Review Process' of 1999, as the following overview of initiatives shows (an updated version of de Wit, 2009).

Outside of Europe

1. The Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU) ran The ACU University Management Benchmarking Programme for the first time in 1996, primarily, but not exclusively, for Commonwealth universities. Both in 1998 and 2008, internationalisation has been one of the themes of ACU's benchmarking exercise. The ACU Benchmarking Programme helps to identify areas for change and assists in setting targets for improvement and identifying techniques for managing change. The Programme focuses on the effectiveness of university-wide processes and policies rather than narrow departmental functions. It enables members to learn from each other's experience of difficulties and successes across international boundaries. For a more detailed description of the ACU Benchmarking Programme and the methodology used, see www.acu.ac.uk under benchmarking.

2. Another initiative is the project set up by the American Council on Education, known as "Internationalizing the Campus". Its *User's Guide* was published in 2003. http://www.acenet.edu

3. The Association of International Educators NAFSA has a project entitled "Accessing Best Practices in Internationalisation" (ABPI). NAFSA has published an annual report entitled *Internationalizing the Campus: Profiles of Success at Colleges and Universities* since 2003. Each year, this publication profiles colleges and universities, highlighting best practices in various aspects of internationalisation. www.nafsa.org/knowledge_community_network.sec/itc_matrix

4. The Forum on Education Abroad published *A Guide to Outcomes Assessment in Education Abroad* in 2007, edited by Mell C. Bolen.

5. Also in Japan, the discussion on assessing the internationalisation of Japanese universities is under way, as part of national initiatives to enhance the internationalisation of Japanese higher education. See, for instance, Furushiro, N. (Project Leader) (2006) Developing Evaluation Criteria to Assess the Internationalisation of Universities. Final Report Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research, Japan: Osaka University.

6. The Forum Euro-LatinoAmericano di Torino has established a Universities Benchmarking Club, to support each university's continued efforts towards improvement through systematic comparisons of various key aspects among participating universities. It includes internationalisation of human resources as one theme, and is considering to expand to other internationalisation themes as well. http://www.forumtorino.org/index.php?IDpage=638&lang=eng. The Columbus Programme has established a web-based benchmarking instrument in connection with this project, focussing among other son the internationalisation of the curriculum and implementation of internationalisation strategies.

In Europe, the following ones can be identified.

7. The European Centre for Strategic Management of Universities (ESMU), together with CHE and UNESCO/CEPES and the Universidade de Aveiro, has started a European Benchmarking Initiative in Higher Education, sponsored by the European Commission, which also includes internationalisation. See www.education-benchmarking.org. ESMU has been carrying out a benchmarking exercise for its member institutions, based on ACU's model, since 1999. In 2005, internationalisation was one of the themes.

8. The Spanish Agencia Nacional de Evaluación de la Calidad y Acreditación (ANECA) conducted a pilot project in 2005-2006 with the aim of assessing the international relations of universities which involved five Spanish universities. Based on this pilot project, the European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) recently gave the quality mark "Committed to Excellence" to Universidad Pontificia de Comillas in Madrid for its international relations. The evaluation tool developed by ANECA for the self-assessment of the international relations offices can be found at http://www.aneca.es/active/active_serv_rrii.asp.

9. The Centre for Higher Education Development (CHE) in cooperation with a group of German institutions of higher education developed a list of indicators, "*How to measure internationality and internationalisation of higher education institutions! Indicators and key figures.*" http://www.che.de/. See also Brandenburg et all, 2009.

10. The Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education (Nuffic) in collaboration with a group of Dutch institutions, developed an instrument, MINT (Mapping Internationalisation) to help institutions and their programmes to assess their internationalisation. It is defined as an instrument to reach the intended internationalisation objectives; a way to profile and identify the own institution; and an instrument to support audits, and a method to make benchmarking with other institutions and programmes more easy. http://www.nuffic.nl/nederlandse-organisaties/services/kwaliteitszorg-en-internationalisering/internationalisering-in-kaart-inkt/literatuur.

11. Flemish institutions of higher education are developing indicators to assess the quality of institutional strategies for internationalisation. (Michaël Joris, 2008)

12. There is the Bologna Process Stocktaking exercise, which includes indicators for the degree system, quality assurance and recognition.

13. And very recently the project Indicators for Measuring and Profiling Internationalisation (IMPI), based on the CHE project, MINT, and the ESMU project, which starts in October 2009 with EU-funding and includes the following partners: CHE, Nuffic, Campus France, SIU, ACA and Perspektywy. Associate partners are DAAD, VLHORA, 15 individual universities and up to 15 individual HEIs from the Coimbra group.

The IMPI-project is at present the most relevant activity in line with this paper. The rationale for and content of the project is described as follows: "*Bologna and Lisbon call for increased competitiveness and globalisation in higher education is developing rapidly, but so far no European-wide approach has been made to measure internationalisation. Transparency and accountability in internationalisation are not in place yet.*
To this end, a set of indicators will be developed with relevance to all European HEIs. It provides options for comparison on the one hand but also offers opportunities for HEIs to choose their individual profile of internationalisation. Such a set of indicators will be co-developed by national and supranational entities together with a broad set of individual HEIs as well as the Coimbra Group and the DAAD as associate partners to ensure both relevance and acceptance in the community.
The project aims at providing HEIs with insight into their performance and means for improvement. The goal is to increase the OVERALL performance of European HEIs in internationalisation. The milestones of the project will be a set of key indicators, a toolbox for HEIs to profile their internationalisation as well as a number of dissemination instruments (workshops, symposium, website) which will bring together stakeholders from different levels to discuss the results and start implementation.
A two-step benchmarking initiative will ensure that the practicability of the suggestions will be tested. The establishment of

some kind of association of HEIs focusing on the advancement of accountability and transparency in internationalisation is envisioned. The project will lead to a considerable improvement in accountability and transparency of internationalisation and through new tools an improvement process on internationality will finally help to enhance the competitiveness of European HEIS."

In addition to these instruments, there are also developed several *Codes of Practice* for internationalisation.

14. The 'Code of Practice for Educational Institutions and Overseas Students' by the United Kingdom Council for Overseas Student Affairs (UKCOSA) in the mid-1980s

15. The 'Code of Ethical Practice in International Education' by the Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE) of 1996

16. The 'Principles for Transnational Education' of the Global Alliance for Transnational Education (GATE) of 1997.

17. The 'Code of Ethical Practice in the Provision of Education to International Students' by Australian Universities of the Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee (AVCC) of 1998.

The last four are taken from Knight (2008, 52-56), who also mentions the ISO 9000 Set of Standards and their possible use for quality assessment of internationalisation and makes reference to the Guidelines for Quality Cross-border Provision of UNESCO/OECD of 2005. (ibid, 127).

There are probably more interesting examples to be found and, although they all seem to have some common bases (in particular the IQR guidelines of the OECD's Programme on Institutional Management of Higher Education (IMHE) of 1999), there are also striking differences based on national contexts and institutional cultures.

All of them measure inputs and/or outputs, and not outcomes. According to Hudzik and Stohl (2009), outcomes are *"usually most closely associated with measuring goal achievement and the missions of institutions (...) and are the really important measures."* However, the German indicators project state that only input and output indicators are developed, as outcomes would have required large-scale, in-depth surveys of samples, which was beyond the scope of the project. The Dutch MINT tool also stays clear of outcomes. Deardorff, Pysarchik and Yun (2009), however, state that the assessment of outcomes is possible and that workable frameworks are available.

Instruments dealing with Intercultural Competences are more oriented to outcomes and several tools exist, primarily in the USA, such as Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI); Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI); Intercultural Conflict Styles Inventory; Languages Strategies Survey; Strategies Inventory for Culture Learning; Beliefs Events, Values Inventory (BEVI); Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI); Assessment of Intercultural Competence; and many more.

Quality assurance in general terms refers to the policies, attitudes, actions, and procedures necessary to ensure that quality is being maintained and enhanced. (Woodhouse, 1999). Woodhouse identifies four different approaches: general accreditation, specialised or profession accreditation, audit or review, and quality assessment. Most of the instruments described above fall in the category of audits and reviews and focus on 'How good are you at achieving your stated objectives'. Most combine self-assessment with external peer review and some have an award incentive attached to it.

Benchmarking is another instrument that is used in assessing the quality of internationalisation. In the list of instruments presented above, several are using benchmarking. Comparison and identification of best practices are two additional elements that form key aspects of benchmarking exercises, and the exercise itself is also focused on improvement. Also for benchmarking one needs a list of measures or indicators.

Knight (2008, 43) concludes from the Internationalisation Quality Review Process, and this can be extended to the other instruments as well, *"that institutions need a way to monitor internationalisation and collect information on an ongoing basis. Institutions often spend too much time describing in very vague terms the status of the internationalisation. More precise, relevant measures of explicit objectives and targets will help provide the information necessary to analyze strengths and areas of improvements. With the information collected from the tracking measures, institutions can proceed to the more important step of analyzing how to maintain areas of strength, improve areas of weakness, and ensure that internationalisation goals and objectives are met. This is, in turn a precursor to analyzing the results and outcomes of internationalisation endeavors."*

Knight (ibid, 48-49) uses the term 'tracking measure' as opposed to 'performance measure' or 'indicator' as it expresses progress rather than output. Both quantitative and qualitative measures should be used. To identify these measures, she states, is a challenge. *"They need to be relevant, clear, reliable, consistent, accessible, and easy to use.(...) Institutions need to be vigilant about their choice (...) Such meas-*

ures need to be pertinent to the desired objective and limited to the most relevant (...) (and they) need to stand the test of time, as they should be used over a period to get a true picture of progress toward reaching the objective and whether there is any improvement." On the use of the terms 'performance indicators' or 'indicators' in the context of internationalisation, Knight (ibid, 58) observes that there is not a lot of work on them as there is also no consensus on their use yet and that given their quantitative approach and the high level of diversity within institutions they *"operate best at the program level within individual institutions. It has been suggested that the higher the level of their aggregation, the less useful quality indicators become.*"

As principle guidelines, the 'Internationalisation Quality Review Process' has learned that the following are crucial:

- Focused on two aspects: progress (measured by quantitative and qualitative measures) and quality (measured by opinion of those who do the assessment)
- Measured according to the objectives and targets set by the institution
- Focused on both organisational and programme strategies
- More oriented to evaluating the process than the outcomes or impact
- Pointed to where improvement is desirable and necessary
- Accepting that there is no ideal or optimal measurement profile
- Focused on how the different elements work together in an integrated and strategic manner
- Need to take place on a regular basis and over a period of time as to reinforce the process. (Knight, ibid, 44-45)

One can add to that list also that the quality review of internationalisation requires a commitment and involvement at all levels: leadership, faculty, students and administrative staff.

Brandenburg et all (2009) make in the context of assessment an interesting distinction between internationalisation (a process with a focus on improvement) and internationality (a description of the present state of internationalisation).

Last but not least, the diversity of the context is most relevant. As mentioned before, there are different types of institutions; different disciplines within one institution; different levels of education; and different institutional, local, national and regional cultures and environments. Instruments for assessment have to recognise this differences and to be able to contextualise the internationalisation process. The key questions of assessment of internationalisation are: why are you doing it, how do you do it, and what do you want to reach with it, and these questions have to be placed in their specific context.

4 / Lists of measures or indicators

4 / Lists of measures or indicators

At the beginning of the paper we have stressed the importance of the notion of diversity in higher education: by type of institution, by discipline, by programme, by level and by the different approach the institution takes. This has to be taken into account when a list of measures or indicators is developed.
As Joris (2008) states, on the one hand the material must be sufficiently relevant to design an instrument that can be used for all kind of different purposes, on the other hand it has to serve as a self-assessment instrument to make results visible and measurable, and to serve as benchmarks and allow benchmarking.
He observes that the notion of context is important, as one has to be aware that one should not compare things that are different. The value of an indicator and how relevant the indicator is must be defined by the context in which one uses the indicator. It is because of those reasons, most instruments, following the example of the 'Internationalisation Quality Review Process', use the term 'Guidelines' or 'Outline', from where the institution or the programme can select those measures which are relevant in their context.

Most instruments refer to a list of categories, for instance the one used by the ACE:

1. Articulated commitment
2. Academic offerings
3. Organisational infrastructure
4. External funding
5. Institutional investment in faculty
6. International students and student programs.

NAFSA uses criteria:

1. The campus has been widely internationalized across schools, divisions, departments and disciplines.
2. There is evidence of genuine administrative or even board-level support for internationalisation.
3. The campus-wide internationalisation has had demonstrative results for the students.
4. The institution's mission or planning documents contain an explicit or implicit statement regarding international education
5. The institution's commitment to internationalisation is reflected in the curriculum
6. The campus-wide internationalisation has had demonstrative results within the faculty
7. There is an international dimension in off-campus programs and outreach
8. There is internationalisation in research and/or faculty exchange
9. The institution supports education abroad as well as its international faculty, scholars and students.

Nuffic uses the term 'dimensions':

1. Internationalisation objectives
2. Internationalisation activities
3. Facilities
4. Embededness in the organisation

CHE uses the term indicators and gives the following list:

Overall aspects

- Input
- Management in general
- Professors
- Young researchers
- Administrative staff/non-academic staff
- Resources
- International networking

Academic research

- Input
- Professors
- International networking in research
- Resources
- International research projects
- Output
- Research findings
- Young researchers

Teaching and studies

- Input
- Lecturers
- Students (Bachelor/Master handled separately
- Service and administration
- International networks for teaching and studies
- Resources
- Study programmes/Curricula
- Output
- Graduates (Bachelor/Master/doctoral candidates to be
- handled separately
- International reputation

Joris (2008) makes reference to Mestenhauser's seven domains:

1. Specialised academic disciplines such as International Relations, Area Studies
2. Foreign language teaching

3. Academic disciplines which (must) have inherent international componentens, such as social and political sciences, journalism, economics, pedagogy, psychology, communications, management, anthropology
4. Courses which are international oriented in other disciplines which are primarily focused on the labour market
5. Exchange of students, teachers and other staff
6. The administration around internationalisation such as management of bilateral contracts and agreements, recruitment of international students, etc.
7. Policy development around internationalisation, governance.

He also makes reference to Elinboe's six characteristics of internationalisation practices:

1. Internationalisation in and of policy
2. Involvement of staff in international activities
3. International curriculum
4. International study opportunities for students
5. Integration of international students and staff
6. International co-curricular units and activities.

The guidelines of the Internationalisation Quality Review Process, also described as the Outline for the Self-Assessment Process, include the following categories:

- Context
- Internationalisation strategies and policies
- Organizational and support services
- Academic programmes and students
- Study abroad and student exchange programmes
- Research and scholarly collaboration
- Contracts and services
- Conclusions.

If you take a close look at them, the overarching conclusion is that these lists include more or less the same categories,. What they also have in common is that they are more directed to the assessment of institutional strategies than to programmes.

This is also the case with the recent publication '*Internationalisation and Quality Assurance*', edited by Adinda van Gaalen which addresses as central question "how can we assure the quality of internationalisation of an institution." (2010, iv)

As rationale they all have primarily what is cited above for the IMPI project: "*The project aims at providing HEIs with insight into their performance and means for improvement.*"

5／Concluding remarks: towards a European Programme Label for internationalisation?

5 / Concluding remarks: towards a European Programme Label for internationalisation?

From the present overview, some issues come clearly to the forefront:

- There appears a need for quality assessment of internationalisation strategies in higher education
- Around the world, in particular in the USA and Europe, several instruments have been developed over the past 15 years to assess that quality
- They use more or less the same programmatic and organizational categories for assessment
- They are focusing on input and output assessment
- They are mainly taking place at the institutional level
- They address the state of the art and/or the process for improvement
- With preference some form of benchmarking as to create comparison and best practice is appreciated .

At the same time, one can observe that:

- Institutions are reluctant to ongoing assessment of internationalisation strategies, as this is a time consuming process
- In the present world of branding and ranking, an instrument without some kind of certification is not considered a high priority
- Assessment of institutional strategies denies the diversity of strategies for disciplines and programmes and the different levels within them
- Increasingly, institutions and programmes distinguish between a minimum requirement of internationalisation, applicable to all students and all programmes, and a maximum requirement, applicable to programmes and students with a high international and intercultural focus
- Internationalisation is becoming more mainstream in het higher education agenda, as in the present global knowledge economy internationalisation is strongly linked to innovation, interdisciplinarity and interculturality, and
- Increasingly a link has to be made to learning outcomes for students.

Based on these observations, it appears advisable to develop a system of certification of internationalisation at the programme level. This certification should be able to distinguish programmes for the quality of their internationalisation. The following characteristics should be taken into consideration:

- The use of different assessment levels in order to indicate the state of internationalisation (what has been achieved so far) and to provide incentives for improvement (where is it heading to or what is attainable)
- The certification is available at least at the level of the programme or a combination of programmes (bachelor and/or master; schools/faculties)
- The assessment procedure is not focused on a specific activity but is comprehensive towards internationalisation (the why, how and what of internationalisation)
- It should focus on how internationalisation contributes to the overall quality by focusing on qualitative indicators (vision, content, provisional elements and outcomes) while using quantitative indicators (e.g. staff mobility figures) as supporting elements
- It should be with preference a regional (European) or international certificate, as the purpose is to position it in a comparative international context
- The assessment should be done by a team which combines expertise on the subject, on quality assurance and on internationalisation, and should include international expertise and the student perspective
- Given the global knowledge economy and the diverse society we live in, both intercultural and international competencies should be addressed
- As much as possible, the assessment should be combined with existing assessment of the programme, as to avoid extra workload and costs.

6 ／References

6 / References

Altbach, Phillip. 2006. "Globalization and the University: Realities in an Unequal World." In *International Handbook of Higher Education,* ed. P. G. Altbach and J. J .F. Forest. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Atlbach, Philip, Reisberg, Liz, and Rumbley, Laura. 2009. *Trends in Global Higher Education, Tracking an Academic Revolution.* Boston, Center for International Higher Education, Boston College.

American Council on Education. 2003. *Internationalizing the Campus. A User's Guide.* ACE, Washington.

AVCC. 1998. *Code of Ethical Practice in the Provision of Education to International Students.* Australian Universities of the Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee.

Brandenburg, Uwe, Ermel, Harald, Federkeil, Gero, Fuchs, Stephan, Gross, Martin, and Menn, Andrea. 2009. How to Measure internationality and internationalisation of higher education institutions! Indicators and Key Figures. In Hans de Wit (Ed.), *Measuring the Success of the Internationalisation of Higher Education*. EAIE Occasional Paper 22. European Association for International Education, Amsterdam.

Brandenburg, Uwe, and De Wit, Hans. (2010). The end of internationalisation. In *International Higher Education*. Winter 2010. Center for International Higher Education, Boston College.

CBIE. 1996. *Code of Ethical Practice in International Education.* Canadian Bureau for International Education, Canada.

Communiqué of the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education on the Bologna Process (28-29 April 2009), Leuven.

De Wit, Hans. 2002. *Internationalisation of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe: A Historical, Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

_____. 2005. *"Report on Internationalisation (E21)."* Report for the European Benchmarking Programme on University Management, Brussels.

_____. 2007. Planificación estratégica y mecanismos de aseguramiento de la calidad para la internacionalización. In PIHE, *Prácticas y tendencias para la internacionalización y la cooperación entre universidades de América Latina y Unión Europea*. Universidad de Alicante, Alicante.

_____. (Ed.). 2009. *Measuring the Success of the Internationalisation of Higher Education.* EAIE Occasional Paper 22. European Association for International Education, Amsterdam.

Deardorff, Darla, Thorndike Pysarchik, Dawn and Yun, Zee-Sun. 2009.Towards Effective International Learning Assessment: Principles, Design and Implementation. In Hans de Wit (Ed.), *Measuring the Success of the Internationalisation of Higher Education*. EAIE Occasional Paper 22. European Association for International Education, Amsterdam.

Frolich, Nicoline, and Amelia Veiga. 2005. "Competition, Cooperation, Consequences and Choices in Selected European Countries." In *Internationalisation in Higher Education: European Responses to the Global Perspective,* ed. B. Khem and H. de Wit. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education and the European Higher Education Society (EAIR).

Frolich, Nicoline. 2008. Justifications and Drivers. In Ase Gornitzka and Liv Langfedlt (Eds.), *Borderless Knowledge, Understanding the "New" Internationalisation of Research and Higher Education in Norway.* Higher Education Dynamics 22. Springer.

Furushiro, N. (Project Leader). 2006. *Developing Evaluation Criteria to Assess the Internationalisation of Universities.* Final Report Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research, Japan: Osaka University.

GATE. 1997. *Principles for Transnational Education.* Global Alliance for Transnational Education, USA.

Hudzik, John K. and Stohl, Michael. 2009. Modelling Assessment of Outcomes and Impacts from Internationalisation. In Hans de Wit (Ed.), *Measuring the Success of the Internationalisation of Higher Education*. EAIE Occasional Paper 22. European Association for International Education, Amsterdam.

Joris, Michaël. 2008. *Hoe en waarom van de indicatorenlijst.* Unpublished document. Belgium.

Knight, Jane. 2008. *Higher Education in Turmoil. The Changing World of Internationalisation.* Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Knight, Jane, and de Wit, Hans (Eds.). 1999. *Quality and Internationalisation of Higher Education.* OECD, Paris.

NAFSA. 2003. *Internationalizing the Campus: Profiles of*

Success at Colleges and Universities. Each year, this publication profiles colleges and universities, highlighting best practices in various aspects of internationalisation. www.nafsa.org/knowledge_community_network.sec/itc_matrix

Naidoo, Rajani, and Ian Jamieson. 2005. "Knowledge in the Marketplace: The Global Commodification of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education." In *Internationalizing Higher Education, Critical Explorations of Pedagogy and Policy*, ed. P. Ninnes and M. Hellsten. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, the University of Hong Kong/Springer.

Olson, Christa, Evans, Rhodri, and Shoenberg, Robert E. 2007. *At Home in the World. Bridging the Gap.* American Council on Education (ACE), Washington.

Reinalda, Bob, and Ewa Kulesza. 2005. *The Bologna Process--Harmonizing Europe's Higher Education.* Opladen, Germany, and Bloomfield Hills, MI: Barbara Budrich Publishers.

Scott, Peter. 2005. "The Global Dimension: Internationalising Higher Education." In *Internationalisation in Higher Education: European Responses to the Global Perspective,* ed. B. Khem and H. de Wit. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education and the European Higher Education Society (EAIR).

Teichler, Ulrich. 2004. "The Changing Debate on Internationalisation of Higher Education." *Higher Education*, 48: 5-26.

UKCOSA. *The 'Code of Practice for Educational Institutions and Overseas Students'.* United Kingdom Council for Overseas Student Affairs, UK.

UNESCO. 2009. World Conference on Higher Education: The New Dynamics of Higher Education and Research For Societal Change and Development, 5 – 8 July 2009. COMMUNIQUE (8 July 2009), Paris.

Van der Wende, Marijk C. 2001. "Internationalisation Policies: About New Trends and Contrasting Paradigms." *Higher Education Policy* 14 (3): 249-259.

Van Gaalen, Adinda. 2010. *Internationalisation and Quality Assurance.* EAIE Professional Development Series for International Educators. EAIE, Amsterdam.

Woodhouse, David. 1999. Quality and Quality Assurance. In Jane Knight and Hansde Wit (Eds.). 1999. *Quality and Internationalisation of Higher Education.* OECD, Paris.

Hans de Wit is Professor (lector) of Internationalisation of Higher Education at the School of Economics and Management of the Hogeschool van Amsterdam, University of Applied Sciences, since August 2009.

He is the Co-Editor of the *'Journal of Studies in International Education'* (Association for Studies in International Education/ SAGE publishers). He has (co)written several other books and articles on international education and is actively involved in assessment and consultancy in international education, for organisations like the European Commission, UNESCO, World Bank, IMHE/OECD, Salzburg Seminar, NVAO and ESMU.

His latest books are Hans de Wit (2009). (Ed.), *Measuring Success in Internationalisation of Higher Education*, EAIE Occasional Paper, Amsterdam; and Hans de Wit, Pawan Agarwal, Mohsen Elmahdy Said, Molatlhegi Sehoole and Muhammad Sirozi, (Eds.). (2008). *The Dynamics of International Student Circulation in a Global Context*. SensePublishers, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

In 2005-2006 he was a New Century Scholar of the *Fulbright Program* Higher Education in the 21st Century, in 1995 and 2006 a visiting scholar in the USA (Center for International Higher Education, Boston College) and in 2002 in Australia. He has been among others Vice-President for International Affairs and Senior Advisor International at the University of Amsterdam, in the period 1986-2005, and director of international relations at Tilburg University in 1981-1985. He has a bachelor, master and PhD from the University of Amsterdam. Hans de Wit is founding member and past president of the *European Association for International Education* (EAIE).

Colophon

December, 2010
This publication was written commissioned by the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders

NVAO
Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie

Parkstraat 28 / 2514 JK Den Haag
Postbus 85498 / 2508 CD Den Haag
Nederland

T +31 (0)70 312 23 00
F +31 (0)70 312 23 01
E info@nvao.net
www.nvao.net