

Serial number	<u>0273</u>
Title	<u>Internationalisation at home: approaches and tools for review and development</u>
Submitter	<u>Prof. Sue Robson, Prof. Jan Van Maele, Dr. Claudia Borghetti, Dr. Alina Schartner, Dr. Rosa Pugliese, Dr. Joana Almeida, Dr. Annelies Messelink, Mrs. Greata Zanoni</u>

This paper draws on an Erasmus+ Strategic Partnerships project, involving a consortium from three European universities. It aims to bring interdisciplinary perspectives to a critical review and development of 'internationalisation at home' (IaH) as both a theoretical and practical concept. The rationale behind the project is that the benefits of an internationalised university experience should not be limited to the internationally-mobile minority. The current political climate, which has created 'waves of uncertainty in higher education regarding international cooperation and the free movement of students, academics, scientific knowledge, and ideas' (van der Wende, 2017) suggests that the project is both timely and policy-relevant. Dialogue around IaH has gathered momentum as the values and purposes of HE internationalisation are being re-examined (Weimer, 2016; Marantz-Gal, 2016; de Wit et al., 2015). IaH as a means to internationalise the experiences and mind-sets of the non-mobile majority of students is an important dimension of the European Commission's education policy - European Higher Education in the World and the Europe 2020 Growth Strategy.

The importance of IaH, broadly defined as other forms of internationally related activity in addition to outbound student and staff mobility, has been recognised for more than a decade (Wachter, 2000). For universities seeking to graduate interculturally competent global citizens, a more recent definition focuses on prioritising the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students (Beelen and Jones, 2015), including the non-mobile majority. The paper explores the perspectives of policy makers, students, and academic and professional services staff on IaH and considers the implications for institutional policy- and decision-making and practice development.

The expected outcomes include practical tools to advance the understanding and operationalisation of IaH at institutions that wish to review and develop their policies and practices.

Methodology

The paper focuses on phase one of the ATIAH project. This phase of the project involved three strands:

- (1) a baseline audit to establish the extent of existing IaH practices at Newcastle University, University of Bologna and University of Leuven; the audit data helped to identify issues to explore further with
 - (2) focus groups for students and staff at the partner institutions, and
 - (3) an online survey
- to explore perspectives on current IaH practices in higher education in Europe, and to identify innovative ideas or effective practices to be shared

The paper focuses on the qualitative data from the audit and focus groups, which were used to inform the survey design. Data analysis was comparative, identifying commonalities and differences across the three contexts. The analysis of the data will inform the development of three practical outputs: an audit tool, curriculum framework, and evidence framework for HE institutions to support the review and development of existing policies and practices for IaH.

Findings

The audit comprised of individual interviews with key personnel across the three contexts. In total 11 interviews with senior management; 6 interviews with directors of learning & teaching; and 9 interviews with student services personnel were conducted. Focus groups were conducted with students at each institution, with 29 students involved in total. Staff focus groups were also conducted at each institution, drawing on the views of 21 staff in total.

Preliminary analysis of the data suggests that IaH initiatives are scattered, and that there is no clear central strategy on IaH at the partner institutions (although initiatives were evident at faculty level). The term IaH was not always familiar, or experienced as useful for mobilizing people and leveraging internal change. Some participants preferred to use the term 'intercultural competence'. Inclusivity, integration and intercultural competency development were considered to be at the heart of IaH.

Bottom-up and top-down approaches can complement each other, and it was considered that a more coordinated approach would help to optimise financial resources and communication regarding IaH. Formal and non-formal curricular activities were seen as key IaH activities, and more dedicated resources were considered necessary to develop IaH initiatives. The importance of involving all stakeholders e.g. teaching staff, administrators, alumni, and students in working groups and other fora was considered crucial for creating change. Top down approaches should also ensure that staff have support and development opportunities to enhance their intercultural competence, to adapt teaching methodologies for diverse student cohorts, and to ensure a strong international dimension in learning opportunities. In terms of the student learning experience, the European dimension was considered important, but further actions were considered necessary to facilitate multilingualism, i.e. learning English, or English as a Medium of Instruction, was not considered to be sufficient. Learning and using other foreign languages is important to gain transnational perspectives; and promote interculturality e.g. through fostering contacts between international/mobile and local students. It was also considered important that there is recognition for teacher competences and successful initiatives and practices e.g. in promotion procedures. Internationalisation of curricula in international, joint, and double/multiple degrees was cited as an example of effective practice.

Reflections

Surprisingly, concerns related to the current political factors threatening HE, international cooperation and free movement (Van der Wende, 2017) were not specifically voiced, although findings confirm the existence of two discourses about internationalisation: internationalisation as a means to promote economic growth and competitiveness; and internationalisation as a means to foster students' international and intercultural mind-sets.

The key challenges identified related to finding ways to operationalize more integrated and comprehensive approaches to IaH, rather than actions that depend on the initiative of individual members of staff; and to facilitate contact between home and international students (in- and outside the classroom) to optimise intercultural learning and exchange.

In proposing a framework to assist HE institutions to review and improve IaH practices we sought to directly address Key Priority Area 2 of the European Commission's Communication on European Higher Education in the World: 'Promoting internationalisation at home' (COM/2013/499). Further research, review and development is clearly needed in order that IaH, or an alternative term that resonates more strongly within the sector, can be embedded and enacted within HE policies and practices to promote wider engagement in international and intercultural learning communities.

Refs (no word limit)

- Beelen J. and Jones, E. 2015 redefining Internationalisation at Home in A. Curaj et al. (eds.), The European Higher Education Area. DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0_5
- de Wit, H., Hunter, F., Howard, L., Egron-Polak, E. 2015 Internationalisation of higher education. Report for the European Parliament <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/studies>
- EACEA 2016 Key Action 2 Erasmus+ Capacity Building in the field of Higher Education http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/home/erasmus-plus/actions/key-action-2-cooperation-for-innovation-and-exchange-good-practices/capacity-0_en
- EAIE, 2016 Spring Forum: Internationalisation in a Conflicted World. <http://www.eaie.org/eaie-resources/library/publication/Forum-Magazine/2016-spring-forum>
- European Parliament 19 Jan 2016 The role of intercultural dialogue, cultural diversity and education in promoting EU fundamental values http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/repository/education/library/publications/2016/communication-preventing-radicalisation_en.pdf
- Hénard, F., Diamond, L., Roseveare, D. 2012. Approaches to Internationalisation and Their Implications for Strategic Management and Institutional Practice. A Guide for Higher Education Institutions. Institutional Management in Higher Education. OECD, 2012.
- Inan, A., Wick, D., van Liempd, H.G., Fastner, M. 2014. Internationalisation with Integrity: modelling a new approach. European Association for International Education, 25 July 2014. <http://www.eaie.org/blog/internationalisation-with-integrity/>
- Katsarova, I. 2015 Higher Education in the EU: Approaches, issues and trends. March European Parliament 2015 — PE 554.169
- Marantz-Gal, A., 2016 Not just teaching, but peace-ing. Spring Forum 2016 Internationalisation in a conflicted world <http://www.eaie.org/eaie-resources/library/publication/Forum-Magazine/2016-spring-forum>

Seeber, M., Cattaneo, M., Huisman, J., Paleari, S. 2016 Why do higher education institutions internationalize? An investigation of the multilevel determinants of internationalization rationales. Higher Education, 2016, 72:685–702 DOI 10.1007/s10734-015-9971-x

van der Wende, M. 2017 Reframing Global Engagement. International Higher Education, 90, Summer 2019, 10-12. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9807>

Weimer, L. International Higher Education in 2016: the year in review. 21 Dec. 2016 <http://www.eaie.org/blog/international-higher-education-2016-year-review/>