International Classroom (IC) Project (2013-2020): review of the first phase and a plan for further development and implementation

Summary

This report gives a review of the resources, expertise and networks developed in the first phase of the IC project, explains the relevance and benefits of the project given the context and ambitions for internationalisation, and presents a plan for the process of implementation and further development of the IC concept, tools and expertise in all faculties. The IC project has been based on international research and has developed a strong co-operation with internationally renowned experts. It has attracted much attention in higher education worldwide through its scholarly approach and institutionwide, multi-level character. For the next institutional accreditation and the international quality label in particular it is a key project.

CvB decisions:

- to agree with the plan for implementation and further development (page 5-7); working with the resources developed in the IC project with a focus on internationalising curricula through learning outcomes, a contextual process approach for all faculties, and a high-quality international network with additional expertise and resources
- to agree with the timeline for the project from 2016-2020, with a focus on Cequent accreditation in 2018, and 3 project calls for faculties in 2016-2017 (page 8, 9)
- to dissolve the IC project group and extend the IC expert group with advising staff from the departments of HR and staff development (ESI) and both a Dutch and an international student (page 7)
- to settle the expected €60 Euros deficit of the OBBA account for the period 2013-2015, in order to start with zero in the next phase of the project in 2016, and continue as a OBBA project (advice from Corporate Control) (page 11)

To be discussed with all other investments for next RUG strategic plan (November 2015)

- to agree with the budget plan for 2016-2020 (appendix 1, advice from Corporate Control), including a budget of €362,7 per year plus a budget of €200 on average per year for faculty plans, including 20 programmes in total, €100,0 per programme (50% match by faculties), to be financed from “universitaire beleidsruimte”.
Context

The new strategic plan of the University of Groningen (2015-2020) strongly addresses the impact of globalisation in terms of the changing labour market, increased mobility of students and staff, diversification in the classroom, the use of advanced ICT tools and, consequently, the high strategic relevance of internationalisation in higher education. The university has the strong ambition to become a “truly international university”\(^1\) with an excellent reputation and a distinctive research and teaching profile\(^2\) worldwide. In teaching, this requires internationalisation of the curriculum, implementing innovative concepts in an integrated approach, including the flipped classroom, learning communities, employability, and the international classroom. These concepts are connected through an active learning philosophy, group binding and purposeful interaction (RUG Strategic Plan, September 2015).

The IC project runs from April 2013 until 2020, following the university’s ambition to connect internationalisation with quality and innovation, and acquire an institutional quality label for internationalisation. The initial NVAO label\(^3\) has evolved into the European quality label “CeQuint” [http://ecahe.eu/home/internationalisation-platform/certification](http://ecahe.eu/home/internationalisation-platform/certification). This CeQuint methodology is the first to assess the quality of internationalisation in compliance with current international quality assurance practices. The IC project is thus focused on the relevance and quality of internationalisation in teaching and learning, and aims to develop resources and appropriate expertise for an integrated approach and systematic monitoring of the international classroom at all levels\(^4\).

Review 2013-2015

Since the start of the IC project in April 2013, the following resources, expertise and networks have been developed\(^5\).

Deliverables

- **an institutional vision on internationalisation** — a guiding framework for contextualisation and implementation at faculty and programme level (appendix 3)
- **an institutional language/culture policy** (implementation through Language/Culture project 2015-2018): focus on linguistic and intercultural competences for all staff and students
- **pilot case studies** of existing good practices with three faculties, with specific and generic

---

\(^1\) In the methodology for the European quality label “CeQuint” this means: a coherent, contextual approach in which evidence is created of the added value of internationalisation

\(^2\) This is in line with the European trend for universities to focus more on teaching and learning (EUA. Trends 2015. Learning and Teaching in European Universities)

\(^3\) NVAO stands for accreditation organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders

\(^4\) Other projects and plans relevant for the CeQuint label are for example: HR Excellence in Research Strategy and Action plan (May 2015), Internationalisation & HR policy and practice (July 2014), International Marketing plan, internationalisation plans at central and faculty levels (in process)

\(^5\) For further details, please refer to the IC project website: [www.rug.nl/internationalclassroom](http://www.rug.nl/internationalclassroom) or for internal staff: [http://myuniversity.rug.nl/infonet/medewerkers/beleid-en-strategie/onderwijsbeleid/international-classroom](http://myuniversity.rug.nl/infonet/medewerkers/beleid-en-strategie/onderwijsbeleid/international-classroom)
outcomes and illustrative examples

- an institutional conceptual framework for the International Classroom (teaching and learning), based on the RUG pilot case studies and international research (appendix 4)
- an institutional policy on graduate attributes\(^6\), with a practical programme-level approach for internationalising learning outcomes\(^7\) (appendix 5)
- an institutional conceptual framework for the International Classroom (staff and students) on how to develop and implement policies and support for the wider learning environment; implementation through institutional and faculty plans, and student organisations (appendix 6).

**Benefits**

In a global interconnected world, the possible benefits of this international classroom concept are obvious for students, staff, the institution and the wider society.

- higher quality and more innovative education
- enhancement of international reputation and networks
- facilitating inclusion of all students and staff/integration between different groups
- a more distinctive profile for programmes, faculties, the university
- higher employment for all students
- increased capacity for intercultural communication for students and staff
- increased enrolment (home and international students)
- supporting life-long learning for all staff and continuous professional development
- developing global citizens prepared to and capable of solving global problems.

**Project foundations**

The project is based on research done in Australia by Leask, Green and Whitsed (2010-2015)\(^8\), adjusted for language context by Lauridsen (2013)\(^9\). Another important point of reference is the EU project “Intl Uni” in which quality principles for teaching and learning in a multilingual and multicultural context have been developed in a wider European context\(^10\). The essential concepts are curriculum, curriculum development and Internationalisation of the Curriculum (IoC). Leask takes a broad conceptualization of IoC, foregrounding outcomes rather than inputs and outputs:

---

\(^6\)Graduate attributes are a policy for deliberate and strategic use, not only preparing for a specific profession but for global citizenship. A generally accepted definition of graduate attributes is: “generic qualities, skills and understandings a university community agrees its students should develop during their time within the institution”(Bowden et al, 2000)

\(^7\)Learning outcomes are the foundation for curriculum design; statements of what we want students to learn as the result of the learning activities they undertake during a programme. The ultimate purpose for internationalising a curriculum is to improve the learning outcomes of students (Leask, 2015: 11, 71).


“the incorporation of international, intercultural and/or global dimensions into the content of the curriculum as well as the learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods, and support services of a program of study”. The curriculum includes the formal, informal and hidden curriculum; everything that shapes the student’s learning experience (Leask, 2015).

Green and Whitsed (2015) add the perspectives from a designer, teacher, and a student/learner, describing curricula as the “specified, enacted and experienced curriculum”, referring to the layers of content, pedagogy and the actual experience. These two definitions of IoC reveal that IoC is a complex process with different elements and stakeholders, and requires personal as well as curriculum transformation.

The IC project has followed a scholarly approach, based on resources available from research done in Australia (www.ioc.global). The project has developed and used an adjusted version of the “Questionnaire for Internationalisation of the Curriculum” (Leask 2009) in the pilot case study interviews, then adjusted the “Good Practice Principles for Teaching across Cultures” (Leask 2011, adjusted by Carroll 2015) to the context of RUG, and applied the CeQuint accreditation parameters in the frameworks developed. The resources developed have thus been built on international research and methodology, have been adjusted to the RUG institutional context, and are to be used and contextualised for specific programmes.

International Classroom concept

The key characteristics found for the International Classroom for RUG are:

- starting from a vision on internationalisation
- involving students from diverse backgrounds (in culture, education, experience, etc.)
- working effectively with student and staff diversity through purposeful interaction
- starting from international and intercultural learning outcomes at programme level
- including the overall learning environment (formal, informal and hidden curriculum)
- offering appropriate support for staff and students in a multicultural and multilingual environment.

---


15. Haines, K.B.J. and F.M. van den Hende. Purposeful interaction, a working model. Referring to creation of learning value in the classroom through purposefully designed meaningful tasks, aligned with pedagogical design and skilful interpretation and implementation by the teacher(s). From The International Classroom pilot at the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences (FMNS): observations, findings and recommendations. November 2014
Communication

For internal communication and external profiling and co-operation, 5 seminars were organised (all chaired by the Rector and well-attended), approximately 20 national and international presentations were given by the project team (at invitation) at conferences and workshops, and three brochures were produced with good practices of the international classroom featuring RUG academic staff, students and support staff. A project website was developed and is currently being restructured for different target groups internally and externally. A first academic article related to the project was published in 2015\(^{16}\). The integrated institutional approach of the IC project has attracted a high interest amongst academics and policy staff in higher education worldwide, resulting in a strong international academic network and co-operation in education and research with renowned experts.

Plan for the process of implementation and further development (2016-2020)

Involvement and implementation in all faculties

Until now, all faculties have been involved in the project to a greater or lesser extent, through: participation in the IC expert group (6 faculties), regular seminars, workshops and consultancy with external experts, showcases of best practices in brochures, pilot case studies, pilots for learning outcomes, regular discussion in governance meetings between Faculty Boards and the Executive Board, and with the College of Deans. While the project aims to deliver generic resources, it builds on good practices and acknowledges specific contexts and needs. It is a mix of top down and bottom up initiatives.

In the next phase of the IC project (2016-2020), the concept of the International Classroom needs to be implemented in all faculties in a meaningful way, adding to quality and innovation in teaching and learning. For the CeQuint accreditation in 2018, every faculty needs to have at least an action plan for further development of the international classroom, based on current strengths and gaps, a vision and verifiable objectives. The process and timing can differ per faculty. The process will be guided by the specific context and stakeholders.

Tools and expertise

The resources developed through the IC project, in particular the institutional vision on internationalisation, the IC framework and the approach to internationalise learning outcomes, provide a coherent scheme for all faculties. Additionally, specific expertise and guidance will be available through the IC project team, the RUG department of staff development (ESI) and external experts to guide all faculties in their processes of implementation and further development.

Given the innovative character of the international classroom concept, expertise at RUG about internationalisation of the curriculum will need to evolve continuously. This enhancement includes both curriculum as well as personal development. A high-quality network of international renowned experts (appendix 8) has been committed to the project and is available to share their expertise, and guide and support our academic staff and educational advisors. The RUG programmes leading to university teaching qualifications (UTQ/BKO in Dutch\(^{17}\)), senior teaching qualifications (STQ/SKO in Dutch) and the Educational Leadership programme will also be used in this context. Additionally, appendix 7 gives an overview of the current expertise, methods and support related to the international classroom available at RUG central level. Depending on specific faculty needs and plans, external experts can provide (a series of) workshops, training, consultancy or other methods, in close co-operation with internal experts and support, either at programme, faculty and/or institutional level, partly on-line. Academic developers (internal and external experts) work with academic staff in the context of a single programme. Appendix 9 provides further information about resources from the Australian context.

**A process approach**

Faculties are advised to use the strategic process approach to internationalisation of the curriculum developed by Leask (2015)\(^{18}\) (appendix 9), starting with the “champions” and driving forces in internationalisation, and reflection on the current curriculum and teaching. In order to stimulate cross-disciplinary discussion and imagine new ways of thinking, faculties are recommended to include programme co-ordinators and staff responsible for curriculum design and development, as well as students (home and international), and stakeholders and support from outside the specific discipline, faculty or department. Overall, it will be a process in stages, creating awareness, then realising curriculum renewal and organisational change. Throughout this process, “distributed leadership”\(^{19}\) and negotiation is highly relevant, and academic staff plays a key role. It is important to have a facilitator from outside the programme\(^{20}\).

**Project structure**

The **IC project team** (1.8 fte) currently includes:

- a project manager (0.4 fte); Franka van den Hende: responsible for the overall coordination of the project, further development of the resources, alignment with the international network involved, and dissemination through publications and presentations
- an educational advisor (0.8 fte); Catherine Meissner; responsible for educational development related to the international classroom and internationalising learning outcomes in particular
- an educational advisor (0.2 fte); Kevin Haines: responsible for educational development related to the international classroom, in particular related to working with diversity (e.g. model of “purposeful interaction”)

\(^{17}\) The university teaching qualifications (BKO and SKO) are in the process of being internationalised


\(^{19}\) “Distributed leadership” stands for an informal, shared leadership role, based on collaboration, respect, and trust, enabling reflective practice and interaction across disciplines (Leask, 2015: pg. 116)

\(^{20}\) Appendix 2 gives further details for the next steps to be taken by the faculties.
➢ a project assistant (0.4 fte); Loes Kreijtz: responsible for agenda and logistic support.

To be added to the project team and to be detached with the department of staff development:

- educational advisor (0.8 fte): for further development and implementation of internationalised curricula and pedagogy with all faculties, in close co-operation with the project team, RUG staff, and external experts.

IC expert group

The IC project now has an expert group and a project group. The expert group includes academic staff from 6 faculties, the project team, and a policy advisor from Educational Policy and Quality Assurance (OSK). The project group includes the project team and supportive staff from the Language Centre (LC), Staff Development Centre (ESI), Human Resources (HR), Student Service Centre (SSC), a policy advisor from OSK, and students.

For the different roles in the next phase of the project, the proposal to CvB is to add staff members from HR and ESI to the expert group as advising members, in addition to academic staff of maximum 6 faculties, the project team, a policy advisor from OSK, and 2 students (home and international). The expert group will be chaired by the Dean of the Faculty of Spatial Sciences, Professor Oscar Couwenberg. The main role of the IC expert group in the next phase will be to advise and align with the faculty IC teams, to create platforms between the faculties, to advise CvB about the faculty plans, monitor and evaluate further processes, development and dissemination of expertise and resources, and the actual implementation.

IC project group

The second part of the proposal to CvB is to dissolve the IC project group. The involvement of LC and SSC will be continued through the Language/Culture project. The other stakeholders from the project group (HR and ESI) will be added to the IC expert group. The involvement of students will also be included in the faculty plans.

Communication and publicity

Considering the high strategic relevance of the IC project, it is essential to ensure good communication, internally and externally. Internally, the aim is to inform, involve and enrapture all staff and students, to provide a platform for questions and discussion, give an overview of resources and references, and widen the circle of active participants. It is important to explain connections with related RUG projects and the overall strategy. Externally, the project and its results can be used to enhance the university’s international reputation and international co-operation in education and research. Publications and presentations at international conferences will highly relevant for his purpose. The communication activities in the IC project so far (website, seminars, brochures) have proven to be successful, but could be extended and improved with a more integrated approach and
targeted at the different groups (academic staff, supportive staff, students, external international network). Analytics and web metrics will be applied to keep track of the use of our website.

A communication plan for the IC project will be developed for 2016-2020 for internal and external communication with an appropriate strategy (with a specific focus on social media), extended means (including more visual communication), and activities. The website, seminars and brochures will be included in this. The plan will be developed in close co-operation between the IC project team and the Department of Communication.

**Timeline project**

**2015**
- 1 November: IC project plan 2016-2020 approved by CvB
- 1 December: IC project plan 2016-2020 approved by faculties through the Deans
- Further information to all faculties and consultation with all IC faculty teams
- Distribution of 1st project proposal call to all IC faculty teams.

**2016**
- 1 April: deadline for 1st project proposal call
- assessment and possibly prioritisation of faculty plans through IC expert group and CvB
- start of first faculty plans approved by CvB (maximum 8 programmes)
- development and implementation of communication/marketing plan
- presentations, workshops, articles etc. by IC project team and possibly other staff in relevant international network
- workshops, consultancy etc. by international experts
- seminar in autumn 2016 (to showcase developments)
- 1 November: deadline for 2nd project proposal call
- annual report to CvB.

**2017**
- start of next faculty plans approved by CvB (maximum 8 programmes)
- 1 April: deadline for 3rd, last project proposal call
- continuation and evaluation of faculty plans started in 2016
- start of last faculty plans approved by CvB
- preparation for CeQuint accreditation
- presentations, workshops, articles etc. by IC project team and possibly other staff in relevant international network
- workshops, consultancy etc. by international experts
- next brochure
- seminar in autumn 2017
- annual report to CvB.
2018

- continuation and evaluation of faculty plans started in 2016 and 2017
- further preparation for CeQuint accreditation
- workshops, consultancy etc. by international experts
- presentations, workshops, articles etc. by IC project team and possibly other staff in relevant international network
- seminar in autumn 2018
- annual report to CvB
- CeQuint accreditation.

2019

- evaluation of implementation and structural embeddedness of all faculty plans
- evaluation of tools and expertise developed
- evaluation of use of international network
- evaluation of communication and marketing
- evaluation of CeQuint accreditation
- presentations, workshops, articles etc. by IC project team and possibly other staff in relevant international network
- annual report to CvB
- final seminar in autumn 2019.

2020

- project phase-out
- final brochure and/or video
- structural embedding of tools, expertise and support in the organisation at all levels and in all faculties
- presentations, workshops, articles etc. by IC project team and possibly other staff in relevant international network
- final report to CvB.
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Appendix 1: budget plan and overview

Review 2013-2015

While K€250 had been allocated for 2013-2015, it is expected that approximately K€310 will have been spent by 31 December 2015. The expected deficit of K€60 is caused by the fact that required expertise for educational development and internationalising learning outcomes in particular, as part of the central project team, had not been planned initially. On the other hand, the project team has remained small (1.8 fte), has done a lot of the work involved with the faculty pilot case studies, and works very much with the standing organisation in order to ensure structural embedding. The advice of Corporate Control to CvB is to settle the expected K€60 deficit of the IC project OBBA account, in order to start with zero in 2016 for the next phase of the project.

Overall plan 2016-2020

The IC project team remains rather small (now 1.8 fte), but needs to be extended with an educational advisor (0.8 fte) to further develop required expertise for curriculum and staff development, contribute to implementation in all faculties, and align with internal and external expertise.

For faculties 2016-2018

All faculties will be offered resources, process co-ordination, expertise and support from the central level and from the external experts, all within the scheme of the total IC project budget and the faculty plans. Extra time needed for academic staff or student teaching assistance at faculty level (beyond regular job descriptions) can be financed for 50% by the Executive Board (CvB) if approved through the faculty plan, up to a maximum of 50,000 per programme.
### Overview International Classroom

( amounts in K€)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project manager (0,4 fte scale 13 average spl K€ 88)</td>
<td>26,0</td>
<td>21,0</td>
<td>35,0</td>
<td>35,9</td>
<td>35,0</td>
<td>35,0</td>
<td>35,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project assistant (0,4 fte scale 7 average spl K€ 42)</td>
<td>12,0</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>17,0</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>16,5</td>
<td>17,0</td>
<td>11,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes (educ. Develpm.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55,4</td>
<td>22,2</td>
<td>33,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel costs for benchmarks, site visits and presentations</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>7,9</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings, guest speakers</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilots</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>35,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials for publicity</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>14,6</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total per year</strong></td>
<td>95,0</td>
<td>57,4</td>
<td>89,0</td>
<td>103,0</td>
<td>111,8</td>
<td>89,0</td>
<td>146,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>95,0</td>
<td>95,0</td>
<td>89,0</td>
<td>89,0</td>
<td>89,0</td>
<td>89,0</td>
<td>89,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37,6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-14,0</td>
<td>-22,8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-57,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve 1/1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37,6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,8</td>
<td>-12,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve 31/12</td>
<td>37,6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-12,9</td>
<td>-59,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Budget plan International Classroom 2016-2020
( amounts in K€ )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>project team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project manager: overall coordination, further development of resources and dissemination through international network</td>
<td>40,4</td>
<td>40,4</td>
<td>40,4</td>
<td>40,4</td>
<td>202,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project assistant: agenda and logistics</td>
<td>19,8</td>
<td>19,8</td>
<td>19,8</td>
<td>19,8</td>
<td>99,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and staff development (1.8 fte) incl. implementation with faculties</td>
<td>147,5</td>
<td>147,5</td>
<td>147,5</td>
<td>147,5</td>
<td>737,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>external experts</td>
<td>80,0</td>
<td>80,0</td>
<td>80,0</td>
<td>80,0</td>
<td>400,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel costs for site visits and presentations</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>200,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and publicity</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>125,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total per year</strong></td>
<td>362,7</td>
<td>362,7</td>
<td>362,7</td>
<td>362,7</td>
<td>1.813,50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

- vd Hende 0,4 fte
- student 0,4 fte
- Meissner (0,8 fte) + Haines (0,2 fte, detachment from UCG) + 0.8 fte
- vacancy related to process approach per faculty, including on-line consultancy
- to enhance expertise and profile - through IC project team and possibly IC expert group and IC faculty teams
- to showcase developments and provide platform
- strategic plan for internal and external communication

### Faculty Plans

- 400,0 for time beyond regular job descriptions, for academic staff or student assistants
- 300,0 50% match by faculties
- 1,000,000

### Total for CvB

- 762.7
- 662.7
- 662.7
- 362.7
- 2.813,50
Appendix 2: process approach; the steps for all faculties

For all faculties, the current steps to be taken are, in response to the letter from CvB of June 2015:

- Faculty Boards assign a faculty contact person for the international classroom
- Faculty Boards assign an IC team of staff in different roles, from different programmes, including staff responsible for curriculum design, preferably one Dutch student and one international student, and possibly other stakeholders (educational advisor, alumnus, potential employer)
- The IC team starts with the question “why to further internationalise curricula”.
- The IC team makes a first inventory of faculty champions and good practices, strengths and weaknesses of the international classroom in the faculty and specific needs, problems, priorities (possibly connected with innovation in education, e.g. in master profile, learning communities, flipped classroom, ICT tools and employability).

After approval of this overall IC project plan for 2016-2020 by the Executive Board (CvB), the next phase will include:

- In total 3 project calls in 2016 and 2017 (1 April and 1 November 2016, 1 April 2017)
- The faculty selects at least one programme, maximum 2 programmes (Bachelor or Master) (based on CeQuint criteria, a first quick scan of learning outcomes and student and staff evaluations and feedback) to start with the implementation and further development of the international classroom and explains the selection
- The faculty team makes a first analysis of the stakeholders and expertise involved, what needs to be done, and what kind of support and expertise is required from outside the faculty (guidance available through IC project team and staff development department)
- The faculty submits a project plan to the IC expert group (either with the 1st, 2nd or 3rd project call in 2016 or 2017)
- The IC expert group assesses the faculty project plans together with Corporate Control and gives an advice to the Executive Board of the University (CvB). If necessary, the IC expert group will prioritise the faculty project plans to ensure a good spreading with sufficient support
- CvB gives a final assessment of the faculty project plans and assigns reserved budget
- The faculty starts up the process in close co-operation with the staff development department, the IC project team and external experts
- After 1 year, each faculty will submit a first evaluation of the results of their project plans to the IC expert group.
Conditions faculty plans

- The plan describes how the resources developed and available through the IC project will be applied in the selected programme; vision, IC framework, and learning outcomes approach
- The plan matches the faculty strategy for education and internationalisation
- The plan includes a SWOT analysis and verifiable objectives
- The plan is SMART
- The plan is relevant for other programmes in the faculty, so that results and expertise can be shared, developed and embedded in a structural way faculty-wide
- The plan describes the activities involved (in a process approach, related to reflection, mapping, reviewing and revising curricula and staff development)
- The plan ensures that the results will be relevant and made visible to a high number of students and staff within the faculty
- The plan describes the required expertise, roles and capacity available within the faculty
- The plan describes what kind of expertise/support is required from the central level or from external experts involved in the IC project
- The plan includes an evaluation after 1 or maximum 2 years
- The plan includes a sound budget plan.
Appendix 3: institutional vision on internationalisation\(^{21}\)

**Overall mission RUG**
The University of Groningen offers research-driven education in a wide range of disciplines. We generate and share knowledge, contributing to the innovative development of society and to “grand societal challenges”, while preparing students for a life and career in a globalized world.

**Values**
Building on our traditional foundations, we highly value our cross-disciplinary and entrepreneurial character, producing work that contributes to international developments. We work in a context of academic excellence, autonomous thinking and integrity, and embrace diversity.

**Vision on internationalisation\(^{22}\)\(^{23}\)**
RUG strives to be a truly international university and a major global player. This is reflected in:
- an inclusive environment with equal rights and access for all staff and students
- an international perspective throughout research disciplines and degree programmes
- an international perspective at the institutional level, reflected in all policies and regulations
- a continuous development process for staff and students (life-long learning)
- engagement with society in local, regional, national and international contexts.

This is accomplished by:
- attracting a diverse and talented staff and student population in terms of background, culture, gender, age, and education
- including international and intercultural competences in learning outcomes
- encouraging international mobility for staff and students
- cooperating with international partners worldwide in international networks and projects
- building an organization/environment in line with recognized international standards
- using the diversity of staff and students as a resource.

**Concepts and terms**

**Rationales for 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.

**Globalisation and internationalisation**
Philip Altbach, Liz Reisberg and Laura Rumbley (2009, 7) state:

“*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*

---

\(^{21}\) Policy documented adopted by CvB, March 2014.

\(^{22}\) Internationalisation is not a static phenomenon, but a constantly evolving process. Our vision and definitions of internationalisation might thus need to be adjusted from time to time

\(^{23}\) A vision on internationalisation should be clear and shared and supported by all stakeholders, and linked to the quality of education. For internationalisation of the curriculum, start with a vision at programme level ” (CeQuint, 2015)
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 globalisation.”

**From a management/institutional perspective**

**Internationalisation**: “Internationalisation of the institutional level is the process of integrating an international, intercultural, global dimension into the purpose, functions, and delivery of higher education at the institutional and national levels” (Knight 2008; p. 21).

In 2014 this definition was further elaborated by de Wit, Hunter, and Coelen in a study on Internationalisation of Higher Education for the European Parliament:

“The **intentional** process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society”

This new definition has some additional elements to Knight’s definition of 2008:

- IoHE is a deliberate (intentional) change of how an institution behaves;
- IoHE is a quality enhancement of education and research for all students and staff;
- IoHE is less elitist and is for all students – this will drive IaH more strongly
- IoHE makes a meaningful contribution to society.

**From a student/staff life-long learning perspective:**

For students:
Internationalisation is an important aspect of students' education. It broadens their mind, not only in their academic but also in their personal development. In addition to this, it adds to their employability. It broadens their labour market potential and increases their attractiveness to potential national and international employers.

For staff:
Internationalisation makes the university a more interesting place to study and work. Students and staff are exposed to a larger and more diverse pool of people and ideas. It strengthens knowledge creation, which is the primary aim of any academic venue.

“**Internationalisation of the curriculum** is the incorporation of an intercultural and international dimension into the content of the curriculum, as well as the teaching and learning processes and support services of a programme of study. An internationalised university will engage students with internationally informed research and cultural and linguistic diversity. It will purposefully develop their international and intercultural perspectives as global professionals and citizens” (Leask 2009; p. 209).

“**Internationalisation at home** is Internationalisation at Home is the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students within domestic learning environments (Beelen & Jones, 2015, p. 76)

“**Internationalisation at home** is including activities that help students to develop an international awareness and intercultural skills, preparing them to be active in a globalised world” (Knight, 2008; p. 22-24)

**Curriculum** (formal, informal and hidden): everything that shapes the students’ learning experience (Leask).
Appendix 4: Institutional conceptual framework for International Classroom: Teaching and learning

Instruction for programme coordinators, programme designers, lecturers and students (June 2015).

International Classroom at RUG24:

- Working from a vision on internationalisation
- Involving students from diverse backgrounds (in culture, education, experience)
- Working effectively with student and staff diversity through purposeful interaction25
- Including the overall learning environment (formal, informal and hidden curriculum)26
- Offering appropriate support for staff and students in a multicultural and multilingual environment.

Preamble

This IC framework for programme coordinators, programme designers and teachers with the parameters of learning outcomes, teaching and learning, assessment and evaluation is part of a wider IC framework (including vision, staff, students and monitoring - for policy makers and support staff) (appendix 4). The IC framework has been developed in the IC project27 based on international research and local pilot case studies at RUG. The objective is to develop an integrated, systematic approach of internationalisation and the international classroom and to connect internationalisation with quality and innovation. The framework follows accreditation parameters. An overall objective is to acquire the European quality label for internationalisation28. Please note that the IC framework cannot be used as a “check-list”. The particular approach in developing and implementing the international classroom will be guided by the specific context and the stakeholders. It is recommended to include stakeholders and support from outside the specific discipline, faculty or department in order to stimulate cross-disciplinary discussion and imagine new ways of thinking. Expertise and guidance will be available through the IC project and relevant RUG departments.

---

24 Based on results from pilot case studies at RUG in three different faculties
25 A model by Haines and van den Hende (2014), referring to creation of learning value in the classroom through purposefully designed meaningful tasks, aligned with pedagogical design and skillful interpretation and implementation by the teacher(s)
26 Leask 2012
27 www.rug.nl/internationalclassroom
28 CeQuint, a guide to assessing internationalisation in higher education (Aerden, 2014).
Conceptual foundations

This IC framework is based on international research, in particular the “Questionnaire for Internationalisation of the Curriculum”, the “Principles for Teaching across Cultures”29 and the “Principles for Quality Teaching and Learning” developed in the EU project “Intl Uni”30. Through the pilot case studies at RUG, these principles have been adjusted for the specific context of RUG. All seven principles are reflected in the IC framework as underlying principles.

---

**Good Practice Principles of Teaching across Cultures – adjusted for RUG**

- to be aware of the impact of the existing culture(s) - local, disciplinary and academic
- to use diversity as a resource
- to extend specific context into an international context
- to enable purposeful interaction in the formal and informal curriculum
- to provide appropriate language and support for intercultural competences for this purpose
- to find a balance between being explicit about norms, values and standards, and being flexible and reflective about current practices
- to align learning outcomes with global and intercultural competences.

---

**IC framework: learning outcomes, teaching and learning, assessment and evaluation**

This framework presupposes constructive alignment of teaching, learning, learning outcomes, and assessment at all levels and involves a process of co-construction/negotiation between individual students and between students and their teachers.

1. The **learning outcomes** are a clear reflection of the programme vision on internationalisation and need to include intercultural and international learning outcomes explicitly where appropriate.

---


30 Intl Uni is a EU project about quality teaching and learning in the multilingual and multicultural learning space, running from 2012-2015. RUG is one of the 38 European universities participating.
At the programme level:
- base learning outcomes on international standards (in specific field)
- allow for transition and development in the thinking and capability of students
- focus on development of intercultural, linguistic and global competences
- link with employability and career perspectives; ensure ‘double valorisation’ from academic science and professional practice
- ensure alignment of (internationalised) learning outcomes at all levels.

At the course level:
- address the diverse learning needs of students
- explicitly use and value the diversity of staff and students
- extend the context beyond the immediate Dutch experience
- focus on the use of examples beyond the European perspective.

Illustrative examples

“We need to consider how to adjust our learning outcomes for students who will work in international companies. In this process, academic writing and communicative skills are important related skills” (Computing Science).

“The moment you cross the border of not thinking only in terms of the Netherlands, you start to get new experiences” (Medicine).

“I really liked the whole integration of culture along with the really real medical issue. It’s the end of life, how are you supposed to treat people, etcetera. But I kind of felt for the first time that I was really in an international group. Especially with the discussion later in the coach group meeting with all the different opinions, you really do realize, it’s true I am in a really international group right now” (Medicine).

2. Teaching and learning (didactics, learning arrangements, content and context): the need to enable the achievement of the learning outcomes at both programme and course level for all students, regardless of their diverse language, cultural and previous educational background.

At programme \(^{31}\) level
- be explicit about the concept and added value of the ‘international classroom’ (raise awareness)
- be explicit about specifics of Dutch culture and RUG academic and organisational culture
- create opportunities to reflect on teaching styles and negotiate learning processes
- raise and develop intercultural sensitivity, skills and an international attitude in both teachers and students. Where appropriate, assess these aspects and align with international learning outcomes
- facilitate interactive learning and community building \(^{32}\) through suitable learning arrangements, regular feedback, reflection, and peer review
- locate opportunities where the informal curriculum/networks can be used or encouraged to better support programme level learning
- be aware of the international agenda and trends for research as well as the specific local, Dutch context and find an appropriate balance

\(^{31}\) A programme denotes a collection of learning units leading to a named award (Carroll, 2013)

\(^{32}\) Refer to RUG learning communities approach (2014).
allow for some flexibility (while ensuring consistency), and adaptation time (e.g. in assignment/research topics) and monitor the transition and progress of individual students.

Illustrative examples

“We only started to realize the Dutchness of our rules when international students came to Groningen” (Environmental and Infrastructure Planning).

“Dealing with intercultural differences starts with awareness and respect from all involved” (Mathematics and Natural Sciences).

“We have a number of community-building activities inside and outside the classroom. Structured interaction is required, also outside formal gatherings” (Environmental and Infrastructure Planning).

At course level

- adjust learning materials and literature to include international examples (not only European/Western)
- include issues of context in tasks for assessment
- create purposeful interaction, regulated by both the learning outcomes and skilful pedagogical design and delivery
- create tasks that are meaningful, taking into account the composition of the student group
- encourage students to participate in discussions, develop critical thinking, and encourage and create chances for students to use their background and experiences as examples
- for assignments and group work; think about group formation, have a rationale for how you set groups, and ensure composition fits the goals and purpose of the assessment task
- create an open, safe and supportive environment: communicate standards, teaching methods and expectations, get to know each other, value other perspectives. Intervene to manage interactions that are disrespectful or exclusive, and treat such events as opportunities for learning.

Illustrative examples

“Whenever I learn anything about myself or about my friends, it is never when we are agreeing on subjects or when we share the same experience. You always learn about other cultures and other perspectives when you discuss it from different angles” (Global Health).

“In my lecture I had a few very silent students, not easily asking questions. I asked them to write information about themselves and discuss this with their neighbours. This is how I try to create a group feeling and make them feel part of the program” (Computing Science).

3.) Assessment: including feedback, formative and summative assessment

- make sure students understand what is expected through discussion and interaction
- add time and support for adjustment [to assessment]

---

33 A course refers to an assessed unit of learning (Carroll, 2013)
34 Assessment defines the curriculum, drives student behaviour and can, but will not necessarily enhance learning (Leask 2015, page 86).
- use entry tests and formative diagnostic testing to provide lecturers with information on skills, gaps and on progress\(^\text{35}\)
- reflect on methodologies to be used with more heterogeneous groups
- follow international standards
- base the plans, delivery and grading of assessments on RUG assessment policy (2014).

**Illustrative examples**

“We have a standard explanation on examinations on the beginning of every year” (Environmental and Infrastructure Planning).

“Here I like it because there is someone looking after what you are doing. So you have got assessment throughout the course, so it is not that your grade depends only on your last exam. We have a gradual assessment” (Industrial Engineering & Management).

“I would like to challenge these students with short answer questions or maybe essay questions, to let them explain why they chose a certain answer. It’s really interesting to see how they came to a certain answer, and you can really see who understood” (Global Health).

**4.) Evaluation**

- monitor all students (vary the approach in line with their specific learning needs)
- involve students closely in making sense of evaluations, taking action as a result, etc.
- include feedback from different stakeholders (e.g. alumni and professional field)
- gather evidence of good practices
- include informal evaluation
- review institutional goals.

At programme and course level.

\(^{35}\) (e.g. Maths Medal project).
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Appendix 5: institutional approach to internationalising learning outcomes

This appendix describes a systematic, planned approach to add quality and innovation to education through internationalisation (together with other concepts).

The objectives are:
- to provide a framework for internationalising learning outcomes and implications for teaching, learning and assessment (at programme and course level)
- to connect the global context and intercultural competences with the educational strategy and employability – at different levels
- to develop a distinctive profile for RUG graduates of international programmes.

Next steps:
In IC project:
- to focus on global citizenship and intercultural competences to internationalise curricula and teaching and learning
- to facilitate the next steps in this process through more examples and process descriptions at programme level.

For Cequint, in a wider group:
- to adopt graduate attributes as an institutional policy and framework for further internationalisation and to add quality and innovation in education – process at the institutional level.

Context

Within Europe, internationalisation is of growing strategic importance in higher education, along with a stronger focus on entrepreneurship and innovation, rankings and institutional positioning, and rapid ICT developments. However, there is still a gap between institutional policies and realities, and it is often difficult to involve academic staff in the internationalisation of curricula, teaching and learning. Despite of an increased focus on the quality of teaching and learning, not many tools have yet been implemented to monitor and assess the added value of internationalisation in higher education\(^{36}\).

At RUG, our new strategic plan (2015-2020) strongly addresses the impact of globalisation in terms of the changing labor market, increased mobility of students and staff, diversification in the classroom and the use of advanced ICT tools. The University of Groningen has the ambition to become a “truly international university”\(^{37}\) with an excellent reputation and a distinctive research and teaching profile. In teaching, this requires internationalisation of the curriculum, implementing innovative concepts like the international classroom, in an integrated way with flipped classroom, and learning communities (RUG strategic plan 2015-2020, page 2).

---

\(^{36}\) EUA. Trends 2015. Learning and Teaching in European Universities.

\(^{37}\) In CeQuint methodology this means: a coherent, contextual approach in which evidence is created of the added value of internationalisation
The IC project runs from April 2013 until 2020, following the ambition to acquire an institutional quality label for internationalisation. The initial NVAO label has evolved into the European quality label CeQuint (http://ecahe.eu/home/internationalisation-platform/about/). This CeQuint methodology is the first to assess the quality of internationalisation in compliance with current international quality assurance practices. The IC project is focused on the relevance and quality of internationalisation in teaching and learning, and aims to develop tools and appropriate expertise for an integrated approach and systematic monitoring of the added value of the international classroom.

This policy of graduate attributes is one of the policies being developed or adjusted through the IC project. It includes a practical framework for internationalising learning outcomes at programme and course level. This combined policy and framework will provide guidance how to integrate a global and intercultural component into curricula. For the overall RUG strategy, it can contribute to a distinctive profile of RUG graduates and their employability in a rapidly globalising world.

The concept of graduate attributes

A generally accepted definition of graduate attributes is:
“generic qualities, skills and understandings a university community agrees its students should develop during their time with the institution”38. A common categorisation of graduate attributes is: knowledge, communication skills, problem-solving skills, global perspective and social responsibility. There is a strong focus on interdisciplinary and transferrable skills.

In Australia and the UK, the concept of graduate attributes has been well established. Implementation has been perceived as beneficial for the planning, implementation and evaluation of curricula, the specific character and profile of education at a specific university, student retention rates and employability. Please refer to some examples from UK and Australian universities including policies, guidelines, action plans and resources in the appendices.

Framework for RUG

The RUG graduate attributes intend to be a tool to further internationalise the whole institution, in line with the university’s vision on internationalisation39. The specific attributes of “intercultural competence” and “global citizenship” are generally accepted to be the most appropriate concepts to internationalise curricula, and define the required skills for RUG graduates in an increasingly globalised world.

*Intercultural competence* refers to the ability to interact effectively and appropriately in a variety of cultural contexts. It includes skills and attitudes that address cultural (self-) awareness and intercultural communication.40 41

*Global citizenship* refers to learning in an increasing globalised world and focuses on social, economic, and political responsibilities. Based on acceptance of personal responsibilities, students

38 Bowden et al, 2000: Generic capabilities of Australian Technology Network (ATN) university graduates

39 RUG vision on internationalisation (March 2014)

40 Perry and Southwell, 2011. Developing intercultural understanding and skills: models and approaches. Intercultural education 22, no.6: 453-466

are to become deeply committed to solving the world’s problems and find solutions to complex problems in both local and global contexts. It includes knowledge, skills and attitude such as global awareness and ethical integrity.

Based on the concepts of intercultural competence and global citizenship and the RUG vision on internationalisation, the table below shows the RUG-specific graduate attributes, and the implication of these attributes at the programme level. The alignment between generic attributes at the institutional level and learning outcomes at programme and course level offers good opportunities for monitoring and evaluation of the internationalisation process and creating evidence of the added value of internationalisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate attributes of the RUG at the Institutional Level</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Implications for International Learning Outcomes at Programme Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A graduate of an international RUG programme is open-minded and tolerant for knowledge exchange and new learning strategies within the international academic community. | Intercultural competence | Cultural (self-) awareness | • Critical self-reflection on own cultural background  
• Identify others’ word views and taking others’ perspectives  
• Analyse the impact of culture |
| A graduate of an international RUG programme is able to communicate and function in intercultural settings and contexts | Intercultural communication | | • Communicate, act and function in an intercultural setting  
• Development in skills and attitudes: empathy, curiosity, openness, tolerance, listening, observing, withholding judgement |
| A graduate of an international RUG programme is able to acknowledge cultural and global differences and their consequences | Global citizenship | Global awareness | • Global history (of profession)  
• Being aware of global consequences resulting from acting on a local, institutional and societal level |
| A graduate of an international RUG programme is able to engage in society by taking responsibility and be aware of (global) ethical issues | Ethical integrity | | • Being aware of ethical issues of profession  
• Commitment to professional responsibility/ integrate ethical knowledge in decision making/ able to convey decisions |

---

**Examples of international RUG programmes**

These RUG graduate attributes have been developed through a process of continuous application to educational practice. The graduate attributes are used to align international learning outcomes of programmes to the overarching attributes at the institutional level. This way, graduate attributes give direction in the way existing learning outcomes can be adjusted in order to be more international.

**Example Medical Science**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional level</th>
<th>Programme level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Attribute</td>
<td>specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A graduate of a international programme is able to communicate and function in intercultural settings and contexts.</td>
<td>Intercultural competence-Intercultural communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example Computing Science**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional level</th>
<th>Programme level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Attribute</td>
<td>specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A graduate of a international programme is able to engage in society by taking responsibility and be aware of (global) ethical issues</td>
<td>Global citizenship-Ethics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: IC framework for policy advisors, support staff and students (staff and student related)

Instruction for policy makers, support staff, and students (June 2015).

Key characteristics of International Classroom at RUG43:

- Working from a vision on internationalisation
- Involving students from diverse backgrounds (in culture, education, experience, etc.)
- Working effectively with student and staff diversity through purposeful interaction
- Including the overall learning environment (formal, informal and hidden curriculum)
- Offering appropriate support for staff and students in a multicultural and multilingual environment.

Preamble

This IC framework for policy makers, support staff and students with the parameters of vision, staff, students and evaluation (monitoring) is part of a wider IC framework (including learning outcomes, teaching and learning, assessment - for programme co-ordinators, programme designers and teachers) (appendix 2). The IC framework has been developed in the IC project based on international research and local pilot case studies at RUG. The objective is to develop an integrated, systematic approach of internationalisation and the international classroom and to connect internationalisation with quality and innovation. An overall objective is to acquire the European quality label “CeQuint” for internationalisation44. The framework follows the “CeQuint” accreditation parameters. Implementation requires close collaboration between units and faculties.

IC framework: vision, staff, students, evaluation (monitoring)

This framework presupposes constructive alignment of vision, staff, students and evaluation (monitoring) at all levels and requires close collaboration between units and faculties.

1. A vision is matching ambitions in internationalisation and related to quality and innovation in education. Start with a vision on internationalisation at faculty level (related to RUG vision on internationalisation, 2014), then translate to programmes

43 Based on results from pilot case studies in 3 different faculties
44 European quality label CeQuint (Aerden, 2014).
- clarify why internationalisation is important to the faculty, address international driving forces

- make an integrated vision (attuning education, research, and valorisation)

- think beyond dominant paradigms (‘renewable thinking’)

- include diversity as a central value and potential resource

- address added value of internationalisation: a richer variety of solutions, broader scope and understanding, resulting in a higher quality of argumentation and higher educational standards

- combine top-down and bottom-up approach

- make use of appropriate RUG policies and resources (e.g. language/culture policy, learning communities, e-learning, flipped classroom).

**Action plan**

- A RUG internationalisation plan will be written (Autumn 2015) and presented and discussed with all faculties in December 2015

- Each faculty and department will write an internationalisation plan (possibly as part of a wider faculty plan) based on an overall vision and specific (measurable) objectives (January – March 2016). Indicators for a format will be provided (through OSK) to enable monitoring and assessment and comparison between faculties.

**Overall coordination by Department of International Relations.**

2. **Staff (group composition, international experience and competences, academic and social services provided)**

- reward international work experience, language and cross-cultural communication skills, in recruitment and promotion procedures – HR department and faculties

- provide teaching staff with appropriate didactic training, instruction and support to use diversity as a resource - ESI, HR and faculties

- integrate internationalisation in University Teaching Qualification (ESI, HR and faculties)

- stimulate and facilitate international staff mobility – HR + International Relations (IR) + faculties

- take active steps to increase participation of international staff in boards and governance through transparent procedures, diverse selection committees and possibly quota – HR and faculties

- develop and value diversity of staff – through pro-active HR policy and faculty policies
- implement RUG language/culture policy ensuring tailor-made support for all staff in didactics, language and intercultural skills – HR, ESI, LC, faculties - through specific Language/Culture project with additional resources.

These staff related issues will be included in the institutional and faculty plans.

Illustrative examples

“Many teaching staff are from abroad, the research topics are not only technical and not only restricted to the Netherlands ... With the international staff involved, the students can experience a lot in international education” (Industrial Engineering & Management).

“The international staff and staff with international experience feel comfortable in addressing the international classroom and use terminology that is accessible for all” (Mathematics & Natural Sciences).

3. Students (group composition, international experience, academic and social services provided)

- value and use diversity of students as a potential resource in marketing and selection – Communications/Marketing departments + faculties

- stimulate and facilitate study and internships abroad - IR + faculties

- take active steps to increase participation of international students in boards and student associations – faculties, student associations

- in admissions, focus on motivation and (potential) capacity alongside knowledge, set appropriate pre-requisites – exam committees, admissions officers

- provide appropriate academic and social support for all students – Student Service Centre, faculties

- provide virtual and other digital learning spaces that allow students to make wider connections – CIT, faculties

- implement RUG language/culture policy ensuring tailor-made support for all students in English, Dutch, intercultural communication and academic writing and presenting – O&S/SSC, LC, separate project.

These student related issues will be part of the institutional and faculty plans.

Illustrative examples

“It’s not about how many passports of international students you can get within one classroom. It’s about how you bring this transnational dimension to the discussion” (Arts faculty).
“A more heterogeneous group of students needs extra attention, including outside-class activities to accommodate them - beyond the introduction” (Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences).

“International students also need to make an effort. You cannot just come to a foreign country and not adapt. You need to try methods for making things work” (Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences).

“Some students do not have the basic knowledge, for example in mathematics, we need to cope with that in the beginning of the program, we might have to offer mathematics courses at different levels. This is about missing topics; it is not a question of capability” (Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences).

4.) Evaluation (monitoring)

- monitor all students (vary the approach in line with their specific learning needs)
- involve students closely in making sense of evaluations, taking action as a result, etc.
- include feedback from different stakeholders (e.g. alumni and professional field)
- gather evidence of good practices
- include informal evaluation
- review institutional goals.

At institutional level.

Overall coordination by Department of Education Policy and Quality Assurance (OSK).

Illustrative examples

“Direct contact with students is very interesting, you get the info that you would not get otherwise” (Computing Science).

“It is good to see the efforts and thoughts that are put in this new initiative. We do a lot of feedback questionnaires and it feels like somebody will read it” (Industrial Engineering & Management).

References


- Haines, K.B.J. and F.M. van den Hende. Purposeful interaction, a working model. From The International Classroom pilot at the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences (FMNS): observations, findings and recommendations. November 2014.


RUG internal documents

- RUG assessment policy (June 2014)
- RUG language/culture policy (March 2014)
- RUG vision on internationalisation (March 2014)
- RUG learning communities (2014)
Appendix 7: Internal expertise and support (central level): overview of expertise, training, workshops etc.

Approach and support

Please note that training and support to develop linguistic and intercultural competences will be provided through the Language/Culture project.

For the IC project, the central department of Educational Support and Innovation (ESI)/ staff development will work closely together with the IC project team, the HR department and international renowned experts in this specific field. For each faculty, a specific process approach will be developed based upon faculty plans and specific needs, using the tools and expertise developed through the IC project and staff development department. Additionally, specific workshops as described below can be followed by individual lecturers and programme co-ordinators, either in a discipline-specific or interdisciplinary setting.

The ESI staff development section enables current lecturers and other university staff to improve their professional skills via workshops, courses, open days and tailored activities. Target groups include lecturers, PhD students, student-assistants, faculties and departments. ESI staff development will support the IC project in training and facilitating lecturers and senior staff in applying the concept of the international classroom in their programmes and in their courses. Furthermore, ESI will guide the processes for new lecturers to obtain their University Teaching Qualification (UTQ) and for senior lecturers to obtain the Senior Teaching Qualification (STQ), possibly focused on the international classroom.

Workshops related to International Classroom

1. “how to internationalise your curriculum using the IC framework” (for programme co-ordinators)
   In this workshop the international classroom will be discussed in connection with the IC framework and the institutional vision on internationalisation developed through the IC project. These tools intend to provide a systematic, integrated approach, to be interpreted and contextualised for specific contexts. The participants are required to read some background materials at home in order to become familiar with the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum (IoC) and international research related to IoC and principles of Teaching across Cultures (e.g. Leask, Carroll). The workshop includes a critical reflection of the RUG IC framework and how it could be applied in the participants’ specific context. Participants will be required to work out an action plan based on the IC framework in order to further develop the international classroom for their programme.

2. “International Learning outcomes (ILO’s)”
   During this workshop the approach of internationalising learning outcomes in connection with institutional graduate attributes, developed through the IC project, will be discussed. The participants are required to read some background materials at home in order to become familiar with the concepts of graduate attributes and learning outcomes (cf. day 1).
   Further, the participants will reflect on their own (international) course objectives (and the assessment) at course or programme level. Some questions that will be tackled are: (how) is
internationalisation relevant for your course or programme? To what extent are the objectives explicitly global or intercultural? How to adjust current learning outcomes into international learning outcomes? What are the tips and tricks for writing ILO’s? What is the impact of adjusting learning outcomes on teaching and learning? How can global or intercultural competences be assessed?

3. **“Good practices in the international classroom”**

Most lecturers at the University of Groningen have a reasonable amount of experience in teaching in the international classroom. This workshop is a knowledge sharing opportunity for lecturers to get an impression of what their colleagues are already doing when they are teaching in the (international) classroom.

Prior to the training, participants will be requested to send in concrete examples of situations they encountered during their teaching in the international classroom. The cases will be discussed during the first half-day and collaboratively hands-on solutions on how to deal with the international classroom will be explored. The focus of the first half-day will strongly be on the connectedness between participatory approaches (active involvement of the learner) to teaching and dealing with international students. The lecturers’ experiences and knowledge will be essential for discussions and reflections. At the end of the first day, the participants will receive some documents/checklists, which they have to read and prepare before starting the second part of the training. This workshop will use the pilot case studies and brochures with good practices (teachers, students and support staff) developed through the IC project.

4. **“Bridging academic cultural differences”**

The five main areas that differ the most between academic cultures - and therefore can lead to misunderstanding, miscommunication and frustration - are:

1. the relationship between staff and students
2. teaching and learning methods
3. assessment
4. academic writing
5. academic / critical reading

Being explicit about the hidden curriculum and the expectations of the institution can resolve most of the issues. This workshop can help lecturers to become aware of the necessity of being explicit, their own academic culture and bias.

5. **“Engaging teaching and learning activities”**

Active learning is perceived as very important at the University of Groningen (and in other Anglo-western higher education institutions): “Understanding happens through interaction”. However, active learning theories do not have this prestige position worldwide. This workshop will make lecturers aware of the influence of their active learning theory point of view on their teaching and learning activities and accordingly on the learning process of their (international) students. With a specific focus on how to work with diversity as a resource through constructive alignment.
Other related programmes

**STQ (SKO) programme : International Classroom and Learning Communities**

This fourth **Senior Teaching Qualification** program (STQ/SKO) is a so called “special”, inspired by the strategic priorities and International Classroom and (International) Learning Communities. This programme is meant for staff with responsibility for the internationalisation of undergraduate and/or graduate programmes. The participants will be invited on the recommendation of the Faculty Board. It is meant for lecturers with "cross-curricular" teaching responsibility for innovation and coordination. The SKO programme aims to inspire participants who will be the leaders in educational innovation. The programme is characterised by substantive meetings on strategic educational issues, interaction with experts inside and outside the university, peer meetings on their own improvement projects and the possibility of a study trip. The program has six sessions (four days and two half days). In a total of 40 hours over a period of nine months. **Improvement projects** play a central role in the programme and in the assessment of the RUG STQ. The STQ program schedules time to pay regularly attention to the project’s progress. The **studytrip abroad (EU / US)** lasts one week and is planned to promote the external orientation of the participants

**U4 International Perspectives in Teaching & Learning (IPT&L)**

The IPT&L programme is part of the activities within the U4-network. U4 represents the close cooperation between the universities of Groningen, Göttingen, Ghent, and Uppsala in teaching, research and university management. The IPT&L network is a framework for the internationalisation of teaching and research. Twice a year twenty participants (five from each university) are invited to join one of the four identical workshops of this programme; each conducted at one of the U4-universities. The workshops are led by experienced course leaders of the partner universities. The concept of the programme is based on identified needs and an important feature is to share ideas, experiences and best practices. A first cycle of the IPT&L-programme has been realised between 2012 and 2014. In total, 80 staff member of the four universities have been working together in IPT&L-workshops and gained new ideas for their field of work.

**Educational Leadership programme (with University of Utrecht and University of Twente).**
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Please note that the specific contributions of the international experts mentioned below will be based on faculty needs and plans approved on the one hand, and availability and interest of the international experts on the other hand. All will be discussed and co-ordinated through the IC project manager.

Jos Beelen is researcher and consultant on internationalisation of the curriculum at the Centre for Applied Research into Economics and Management at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences. He is chair of the Special Interest Group Internationalisation at Home of the European Association for International Education (EAIE) and a visiting fellow at Leeds Metropolitan University’s Centre for Academic Practice and Research in Internationalisation (CAPRI). Jos is a certified senior trainer for EAIE and has facilitated training sessions and workshops in a range of European countries, Latin America, South Africa, Asia and Australia. He has coached academic staff in internationalising academic programmes at universities in The Netherlands, Belgium, Austria, Colombia, Brazil and Australia. For the Columbus Network, he has facilitated on line training courses. He was the editor EAIE’s ‘toolkit’ Implementing Internationalisation at Home (2007) and has since written a range of articles on the same topic, often co-authored with researchers from Europe and Australia. He acts as reviewer for the Journal of Studies in International Education. Jos is currently doing research into the internationalisation of learning outcomes in academic programmes. One of the issues he focuses on is developing the skills of academic staff that enable them to assume ownership of curriculum internationalisation.

Jude Carroll was a Principal Lecturer and worked in a variety of roles at Oxford Brookes from 1990 to 2011, including Deputy Director of the ASKe Centre for Excellence in assessment standards (2005-8), and Brookes Teaching Fellow (2005-7). In 2008/9, she worked on secondment at the Royal Technical University in Stockholm Sweden as an educational developer. Jude’s interests include projects linked to deterring plagiarism, and to effective strategies for teaching International Students. She writes, runs workshops and addresses conferences on these topics, within Brookes, across the UK and internationally. As part of her work with international students, Jude collaborated with Dr Janette Ryan on the Teaching International Students (TIS) project (2009-11), funded under PMI2 and hosted at the Higher Education Academy. One TIS outcome was the Teaching International Students Lifecycle resource which brings together research, good practice and teachers’ experiences. Jude is the author of The Handbook for Deterring Plagiarism in Higher Education (2nd ed 2007, Oxford Brookes University) and with Dr Ryan, she co-edited the text Teaching International Students: improving learning for all (2005, Routledge). In 2009, Jude was awarded a National Teaching Fellowship and she used the funding in 20011-12 to travel in Australia, New Zealand and India, where she investigated teaching practices and shared expertise with tertiary and secondary school colleagues.
Robert Coelen is Professor of Internationalisation of Higher Education at Stenden University of Applied Sciences in the Netherlands. He has worked for about 19 years in the field of international education. He returned to work in Europe after an absence of 30 years, mainly in Australia. He was a researcher and academic for most of that time and finally as Director International at two universities in Queensland. In 2004 he became Vice-President International at Leiden University. Robert is a member of Club33, a global think tank on internationalisation, a member of the International Ranking Experts Group, which produced the Berlin Principles on Ranking in Higher Education. He was a member of the Executive Steering Committee and the Editorial Committee of the European Association of International Education. He was a member of Advisory Boards on the EU Network of European Promotors and Transnational Education Projects within the context of the Erasmus Mundus Global Promotion. He was the founding President of Euroscholars, a Foundation of 12 leading research intensive universities in Europe that promotes opportunities for undergraduate research in study abroad. Robert is an editor for the Journal of Studies in International Education (SAGE) and for the Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education (Emerald). He is a member of an audit panel for FINeec in Finland. Robert is a regular speaker at international and national conferences on internationalisation of higher education. He was also chair of the Leiden University Global Ranking Symposium Series. Robert is committed to the ideals of an internationalised higher education as a result of first-hand experience as a student, followed by observing the development of his international students in undergraduate programs, as well as his international PhD students. Specialties: international positioning, institutional strategy, ranking, international marketing, intercultural competence development.

Nick Cooling is the Director of Electives & Internationalisation & Senior Lecturer in Medical Practice at the School of Medicine, University of Tasmania. He has worked in medical education for over 15 yrs, including as Director of Training of the GP Training Program in Tasmania for 8 yrs. His work career has included pharmacology research (metabolism of drugs by the cytochrome P450 system), clinical dietetics, general practice in both international, rural and urban settings. His research interests include allergy, global health, internationalisation of the curriculum, student mobility, academic detailing, clinical reasoning, behaviour change for doctors and their patients, intercultural communication and consulting skills. Nick is currently a part time general practitioner specialising in allergy in Hobart and full time academic at the University of Tasmania.

Rick Cummings is Senior Research fellow in the Centre for University Teaching and Learning at Murdoch University. Rick moved to this position in 2015 after more than 15 years as Director of Teaching and Learning at Murdoch. During Rick’s 20 years at Murdoch he has chaired or been a member of university committees addressing a wide range of learning and teaching policies including assessment, work integrated learning, academic integrity, internationalisation, and educational technology. Rick chaired the university committee which developed in the 1990s the first set of graduate attributes for Murdoch and subsequently chaired the committee which developed the policy on course level learning outcomes for all Murdoch degree programs in 2012. He was one of 12 commissioners on the Murdoch University Curriculum Commission, which redesigned the undergraduate and postgraduate course curriculum for Murdoch in 2012-2013. Rick’s research interests in teaching and learning are curriculum development, graduate attributes and teaching
standards. He has led several national collaborative research projects in these areas with the latest being the development of a national framework for university teaching standards and criteria (http://uniteachingcriteria.edu.au).

Rick is also an experienced programme evaluator and has worked as a consultant in this area for nearly 30 years. He has led evaluation studies for the World Bank in Papua New Guinea, in the area of crime prevention for the national government, and in the areas of education and training, homelessness, crime prevention, and youth policy for the state government. He currently teaches Policy Research and Evaluation in the Sir Walter Murdoch Graduate School of Public Policy and International Affairs. Rick was elected to the Board of the Australian Evaluation Society in 2001 and President for the period 2005-8. He was awarded the ET&S Award for outstanding contribution to evaluation in 2010 and made a Fellow of the Society in 2013.

**Darla K. Deardorff** is currently executive director of the Association of International Education Administrators, a national professional organization based at Duke University (US), where she is also a Research Scholar in Education. In addition, she is an adjunct professor at North Carolina State University, Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey and is on faculty of Harvard University’s Future of Learning Institute as well as the Summer Institute of Intercultural Communication in Portland, Oregon. Additionally, she is a Research Associate at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University in South Africa, a Research Scholar at Meiji University in Japan, and a Visiting Professor at Shanghai International Studies University and Huazhong University of Science and Technology in China. She has also held adjunct appointments at Leeds Beckett University in the UK and at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. She receives numerous invitations from around the world to speak on her research on intercultural competence development and assessment (including in Europe, Latin America, Africa, Australia and Asia) and is a noted expert on these topics. Darla has published widely on topics in international education and intercultural learning/assessment and is editor of The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence (Sage, 2009) as well as lead editor of The SAGE Handbook of International Education (Sage, 2012) with Hans de Wit, John Heyl and Tony Adams; co-author of Building Cultural Competence (Stylus, 2012) with Kate Berardo and most recently, author of Demystifying Outcomes Assessment for International Educators: A Practical Approach (Stylus, 2015). She is also the co-author of an ESL textbook entitled Beneath the Tip of the Iceberg: Improving English and Understanding US Cultural Patterns (University of Michigan Press, 2011).

Darla has worked in the international education field for over fifteen years and previously held positions at North Carolina State University and the University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill where she has had experience in study abroad, international student services, cultural programming, and ESL teaching/teacher training. She is also an ESL instructor and teacher trainer with over twelve years of experience and has lived, taught and worked in Germany, Japan, and Switzerland. Darla is an experienced cross-cultural trainer and coach and conducts training for non-profits, corporations and educational institutions, including as a trainer for the European Association of International Educators (EAIE). She is a consultant for numerous universities and organizations around the world on topics related to intercultural competence development/assessment, global leadership and
internationalization issues. One of her recent consultant projects was for UNESCO on comparative perspectives on intercultural competence which resulted in an invitation to speak at the first UN World Forum on Intercultural Dialogue, held in Baku, Azerbaijan as well as a UN-related event in Doha, Qatar. She has been an advisor for Council of Europe, US Department of Education, and PISA (under the OECD).

Wendy Green is a Senior Lecturer in Higher Education at the Tasmanian Institute of Learning and Teaching (TILT), University of Tasmania. Her teaching and research concern the internationalisation of higher education; culture, learning and teaching; graduate attributes; student and academic mobility; and academic development within the context of internationalisation. She has extensive teaching experience, with coursework and research students, and with academics through her teaching in formal, accredited Graduate Certificate, University Teaching programs and informal discipline-specific workshops and communities of practice, nationally and internationally. She has won university and national Awards for teaching and curriculum development. Wendy is currently co-leading an Australian Office of Learning and Teaching (OLT) Extension Grant, Bringing the Learning Home: Programs to enhance study abroad outcomes in Australian universities. She contributed to Prof Betty Leask’s national Teaching Fellowship, Internationalisation of the curriculum in Action, and with Craig Whitset, she co-led the OLT Extension Grant, Embedding the “IoC in Action” Framework in two universities in 2013 to extend Leask’s work. She has also been a team member in two other National Learning and Teaching Grants: TKNe: A transnational knowledge network in education that facilitates internationalisation and A fair go in the field: Making field education inclusive for international students. She has also led numerous institutionally funded strategic grants concerning both internationalisation and curriculum development. She has published extensively on a range of issues relating to the internationalisation of higher education. Her most recent publication, with Craig Whitset, is the edited book, Critical perspectives on internationalising the curriculum in disciplines: Reflective narrative accounts from Business, Education and Health (2015, Sense Publishers, Netherlands). She also contributes regularly to the IEAA’s publication, Vista and to University World News. She belongs the College of Reviewers for Higher Education Research & Development and reviews for several other journals, including the Journal of Studies in International Education. She is Convenor of the International Education Association of Australia (IEAA) Special Interest Group for Internationalisation of the Curriculum and is a Visiting Fellow at the Centre for Academic Practice & Research in Internationalisation, UK. In 2013, she was the Tony Adams Visiting Scholar at the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore Milan.

Elspeth Jones is Emerita Professor of the Internationalisation of Higher Education, Leeds Beckett University and Honorary Visiting Fellow, Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, (CHEI) Milan. Her specialisms include personal, professional and employability outcomes from international mobility, strategic leadership, internationalisation of the curriculum at home and abroad, global citizenship and intercultural competence development. She has published widely and is series editor for the Routledge book series, Internationalization in Higher Education. Elspeth’s recent published research includes employability skills development in transnational education and student learning outcomes from international mobility. She is a member of the Scientific Committee of CHEI, Milan and the Editorial Board of the Journal of Studies in International Education. She is
Visiting Professor at several European universities. In September 2014 Elspeth received the European Association for International Education’s Tony Adams Award for Excellence in Research.

Karen M. Lauridsen is an Associate Professor, at the Centre for Teaching and Learning @ School of Business and Social Sciences at Aarhus University, Denmark. With a background in languages (English and German) and the experience of 4 years as Dean and 8 years as Vice-Rector with special responsibility for international affairs at the then Aarhus School of Business, she now works at Aarhus University, Centre for Teaching and Learning (CUL). She focuses on issues related to teaching and learning through the medium of English in the multilingual and multicultural learning space and to language policy in both her research and in-service training and professional development programmes. Karen is the coordinator of the Erasmus Academic Network IntUni – The Challenges of the Multilingual and Multicultural Learning Space in the International University (2012-15) – www.intuni.eu. Aarhus University was instrumental in establishing the European Language Council, and Karen has served on the Board of the ELC since the association was launched in 1997. For more information, please see here:

Betty Leask is an internationally respected leader in internationalization of the curriculum, an area in which she has researched and published extensively since 2001. She is currently Professor of Internationalization and Pro Vice-Chancellor Teaching and Learning at La Trobe University, Melbourne where she leads curriculum innovation and change across the institution. Her national teaching fellowship on Internationalization of the Curriculum in Action (2010) engaged academic staff in different disciplines in internationalization of the curriculum (www.ioc.global). This work resulted in the development of a conceptual framework of internationalization of the curriculum of relevance to university and disciplinary leaders, scholars, curriculum designers and teachers and a number of related publications, including two books. Professor Leask is Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of Studies in International Education and Honorary Visiting Researcher at the Centre for Higher Education Internationalization, Università Cattolica del Sacre Cuore in Milan
http://www.latrobe.edu.au/ltlt/about/staff-profiles/profile?uname=BLeask

Craig Whitshed is Senior Lecturer in the Centre for University Teaching and Learning at Murdoch University in Perth. Craig taught in the Japanese university sector for 10 years and has been at Murdoch University since 2006. He is an elected member of the University’s Academic Council and has been a member of the University’s Learning and Teaching Committee and chaired the working party that wrote Murdoch’s Internationalisation policy. He was awarded a Murdoch University Vice Chancellor’s Citation for Enhancing Learning (2011) for his work in internationalisation. In his role, Craig works with academic staff to support them in the area of curriculum development. In addition to his role at Murdoch, Craig reviews for and is on the Editorial Board of the Journal of Studies in International Education and convened the International Education Association of Australia Special
Interest Group Internationalisation of the Curriculum. Craig's areas of expertise are internationalisation of the curriculum, internationalisation, Japanese higher education, and professional development for academic staff. He has received invitations to present on his work nationally and internationally and presented papers at national and international conferences on internationalisation of the curriculum http://profiles.murdoch.edu.au/myprofile/craig-whitsed/?section=publications#block-publications
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Internationalisation of the curriculum, an essential component of the broader concept of internationalisation in higher education, is variously interpreted and enacted. In part, this can be explained by the different ways of thinking and approaching issues that are associated with different disciplines, but other factors are also important. These other factors include the relative importance ascribed by academic staff to the different contexts within which they work. The layers of context and their possible impact on the way academics think about internationalisation and the curriculum are represented visually in the conceptual framework presented below. Each layer of context directly and indirectly interacts with and influences the others, creating a complex set of conditions influencing curriculum design. In these circumstances the wide divergence in the understandings of internationalisation observed in universities across the world is not surprising.

A conceptual framework of internationalisation of the curriculum

Knowledge in and across disciplines

Knowledge in and across disciplines is at the centre of the framework.
Dominant and emerging paradigms

The process of curriculum design involves a series of choices about whose knowledge will be included and what skills and attitudes will be developed.

Requirements of professional practice and citizenship

What international and intercultural knowledge skills and attitudes will be required of graduates as professionals and citizens?

Assessment of student learning

How and when will progress and achievement be measured? What feedback will students get along the way?

Systematic development across the program

Where and how will all students develop the identified knowledge, skills and attitudes across the degree program?

Institutional context

What mission, ethos, policies and priorities? What services, opportunities for experience and extension beyond the formal curriculum?

Local context

How does global interconnectivity and interdependence influence local conditions for professionals and citizens and vice versa?

National and regional context

What culture of internationalisation, past, present and future?

Global context

What kind of world do we live in? What kind of world do we want?

The framework explained

Knowledge in and across disciplines

Knowledge in and across disciplines is at the centre of the framework. The disciplines are the foundation of knowledge, but the complexity of problems faced by the world and its communities requires ‘problem-defining and solving perspectives that cross disciplinary and cultural boundaries’ (Hudzik 2004,1).
Dominant and emerging paradigms

The process of curriculum design involves a series of choices about whose knowledge will be included and what skills and attitudes will be developed. This is often decided, by default, according to dominant paradigms, with little if any consideration being given to alternative models and ways of practising a profession or viewing the world. An important part of the process of internationalisation of the curriculum is to think beyond dominant paradigms, to explore emerging paradigms and imagine new possibilities and new ways of thinking and doing. This is a challenging task for academic staff. They have been socialised into their discipline. Through that process they have developed a sense of identity and personal commitment to the shared values and associated ways of doing, thinking and being embedded within dominant paradigms of their discipline communities (Kuhn 1996). Thus, academic staff are themselves culturally bound by their own disciplinary training and thinking (Becher & Trowler 2002).

Requirements of professional practice and citizenship (local, national and global)

The requirements of professional practice are important considerations when decisions are being made about what and what not to include in a curriculum, especially when the program is accredited by an external professional body. But a university education is not just about training for demands of professional practice in a globalised world. The moral responsibilities that come with local, national and global citizenship are also important considerations when planning an internationalised curriculum.

Assessment of student learning

An important consideration in curriculum design is what you would expect students to be able to do at the end of a program and as graduates. This can then be used to plan assessments tasks and learning experiences in different courses at different levels in the program, ensuring that students are provided with regular feedback on how they are performing and progressing. In an internationalised curriculum it is important to specifically provide feedback on and assess student achievement of clearly articulated international and intercultural learning goals.

Systematic development across the program in all students

The development of international and intercultural knowledge, skills and attitudes in an internationalised curriculum requires careful planning, collaboration with colleagues and coordination across a program of study. The development of skills such as language capability and intercultural competence may need to be embedded in a number of courses at different levels. Given that not all students will enter the program with the same capabilities, a range of strategies to assist all students to achieve desired learning outcomes by the end of the program are likely to be required. Finding ways in which student services and the informal curriculum can support the work undertaken in the formal curriculum is an important part of curriculum design. Mapping where desired knowledge, skills and attitudes will be developed and assessed in the formal curriculum is a good starting point.

Process

The core work involved in internationalisation of the curriculum (IoC) must be done by academic staff in disciplinary teams.
Ideally IoC is undertaken as a project for a whole program of study or a major within a program. However the same process can be applied to the review and development of a single course within a program.

The process of IoC

The core work involved in IoC must be done by academic staff in disciplinary teams.

It is critical to approach the task of internationalisation of the curriculum in a scholarly way, as an action research process. This is best done in a program team consisting of those staff responsible for designing and teaching a program of study. This makes it possible to harness the combined resources and perspectives of the team to ensure coherence across the program and the systematic identification and development of appropriate knowledge, skills and attitudes in all students.

Action research is a reflective and cyclical process of problem solving. When applied to internationalisation of the curriculum the process involves the program team as a community of practice. The purpose of the action research process is one of continuous quality improvement. Changes may occur whilst research is being conducted. When applied to internationalisation of the curriculum team members are actively engaged in reviewing rationales for internationalisation of the curriculum, related goals and performance and making changes which are then evaluated and further changes made. The cycle is repetitive and may be undertaken as part of the normal review process, or outside of that process.

The five stages of the process of IoC emerged during extensive work with teams of academic staff across Australia from 2010-2012. Possible focus questions and key activities associated with each stage were developed. The process can be lead by an internal and/or an external facilitator. Most teams, in working through this process, have enlisted the support of an external facilitator in the early stages.
Questionnaire on Internationalisation of the Curriculum (QIC)

A Stimulus for Reflection and Discussion

The purpose of this questionnaire is to stimulate reflection and discussion amongst teams of teaching staff about internationalisation of the curriculum in their PROGRAM. It is intended as an aid to identifying what is already happening and, where appropriate, what action might be taken to further internationalise the PROGRAM.

Internationalisation of the curriculum is ‘the incorporation of an international and intercultural dimension into the content of the curriculum as well as the TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS and support services of a program of study’. This definition implies that an internationalised curriculum will:

- Engage students with internationally informed research and cultural and linguistic diversity,
- Purposefully develop students’ international and intercultural perspectives - the knowledge, skills and self awareness they need to participate effectively as citizens and professionals in a global society characterised by rapid change and increasing diversity,
- Move beyond traditional boundaries and dominant paradigms and prepare students to deal with uncertainty by opening their minds and developing their ability to think both creatively and critically,
- Be supported by services focussed on the development of intercultural competence and international perspectives

The questionnaire looks at the context in which the PROGRAM is taught, as well as individual elements of the curriculum such as content, assessment and TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS. Respondents are asked to locate different aspects of their PROGRAM on a continuum, like the one below, using the descriptors provided as a guide. At the end of the questionnaire respondents are asked to locate the PROGRAM as a whole on the continuum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A localised curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>An internationalised curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: It is not necessarily desirable or appropriate for all aspects of all COURSES in a PROGRAM to be located at the same place on this continuum. One of the purposes of the follow-up discussion is to identify future goals in relation to internationalisation of the curriculum for the PROGRAM and develop a plan to achieve them, given what is already happening in individual COURSES across the PROGRAM.

---
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46 Throughout this document expressions in upper case refer to common higher education concepts that often have different names in different universities. Please refer to the glossary at the end of this document for clarification.

It is important that all program team members involved in the discussion have completed the questionnaire prior to the team meeting where the individual and collective responses will be discussed.

Completing the Questionnaire

Program name ............................................................

There are 15 main questions in the questionnaire. There are also some questions ‘For further consideration’ related to each of the main questions. These questions will be discussed when the team comes together to share their individual responses to the main questions. However, you may want to think about your responses to the ‘For further consideration’ questions prior to that meeting. It should you between 30 minutes and one hour to complete the questionnaire, depending on the amount of detail you choose to include in explaining your answers.

In answering the questions, consider which is the most appropriate response for your COURSE or PROGRAM, as far as you know, at this time. If you think that your COURSE or PROGRAM best fits somewhere between two numbers indicate that on the scale.

On the continuum, 4 indicates a higher level of internationalisation than 1.

In the comments section associated with each question you should:
- make a note of why you have placed the item at the point you have on the continuum
- highlight any issues that have influenced your answer
- describe any changing circumstances
- list questions for further discussion around the item.

These comments will be important when you have the discussion with your colleagues in Step 3.

Before you start the questionnaire please take a few minutes to record your thinking on relation to the following question:

**BACKGROUND**

How important is internationalization of the curriculum in this PROGRAM?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not important at all</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Essential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?
Rationale

1. How clearly is the rationale for internationalisation of the curriculum in this PROGRAM understood by members of the PROGRAM team?

1.1 Reasons for internationalisation of the curriculum in this PROGRAM are never discussed
1.2 Reasons for internationalisation of the curriculum in this PROGRAM are sometimes discussed but we never seem to reach agreement and so nothing happens
1.3 The rationale for internationalisation of the curriculum in this PROGRAM is frequently discussed and debated by members of the PROGRAM team
1.4 The reasons for internationalisation of the curriculum in this PROGRAM are understood and agreed by the PROGRAM team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A localised curriculum
internationalised curriculum

Comments:

For further consideration

What, for you, is the most compelling reason to internationalise the curriculum in this PROGRAM?
COURSE Level – Learning Outcomes

2. In the COURSE for which you are responsible, how clearly defined and articulated are any international/intercultural learning goals, aims and outcomes?

2.1 No COURSE specific international/intercultural goals, aims and learning outcomes are defined
2.2 There are some desirable and intended international/intercultural goals, aims and learning outcomes but they are not explicitly described in the COURSE information.
2.3 The COURSE has clearly defined and articulated learning outcomes related to the development of international/intercultural perspectives and these are communicated to students and staff
2.4 The COURSE has clearly defined and articulated learning outcomes related to the development of international/intercultural perspectives within the context of the discipline and these are systematically developed and assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A localised curriculum</td>
<td>An internationalised curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

If you located your COURSE at or between point 3 or point 4 on the continuum, describe the relevant outcomes.

For further consideration

How do the international/intercultural learning goals, aims and outcomes of this COURSE relate to those of other COURSES in the PROGRAM?
COURSE Level – TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS

3. In the COURSE for which you are responsible, to what extent do the TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS support students to work effectively in cross-cultural groups and teams?

3.1 The TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS do not support students to work in cross-cultural groups
3.2 The TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS encourage students to work in cross-cultural groups
3.3 Students are taught how to work in cross-cultural groups and how to reflect on and learn from their experiences in more than one COURSE in this PROGRAM
3.4 Students are given extensive training and support so that by the time they graduate they will be able to work effectively in a variety of cross-cultural group work situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A localised curriculum</td>
<td>An internationalised curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

For further consideration

To what extent do the TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS across the PROGRAM support students to work effectively in cross-cultural groups and teams?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is this appropriate? Why? Why not?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. In the COURSE for which you are responsible, to what extent do the TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS encourage intercultural interaction?

4.1 The TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS do not encourage intercultural interaction

4.2 The TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS provide opportunities for students to participate in intercultural interaction but it is up to them whether they do or they don’t take these up

4.3 The TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS actively encourage all students to participate in intercultural interaction

4.4 The TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS actively encourage and reward student engagement in intercultural interaction

1 2 3 4

A localised curriculum An internationalised curriculum

Comments:

For further consideration

To what extent do the TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS across the PROGRAM encourage student engagement in intercultural interaction and international experience?

1 2 3 4

Is this appropriate? Why? Why not?
5. In the COURSE for which you are responsible, to what extent do the TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS assist all students to develop international and intercultural skills and knowledge?

5.1 The TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS do not include any activities designed to assist students to develop international or intercultural skills and knowledge

5.2 The TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS include some activities designed to assist students to develop international or intercultural skills and knowledge but no constructive feedback is provided

5.3 The TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS include a range of activities designed to assist students to develop international and/or intercultural skills and knowledge and constructive feedback is provided

5.4 The TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS include a range of activities designed to assist students to develop international and intercultural skills and knowledge, these are integrated into the COURSE and constructive feedback is provided on their development

---

A localised curriculum
An internationalised curriculum

Comments:

---

For further consideration

To what extent do the TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS across the PROGRAM assist all students to develop international and intercultural skills and knowledge?

Is this appropriate? Why? Why not?
COURSE Level – Assessment Tasks

6. In the COURSE for which you are responsible, to what extent do assessment tasks require students to consider issues from a variety of cultural perspectives?

6.1 Students in this COURSE are never required to consider issues from more than one cultural perspective in an assessment task

6.2 Sometimes students in this COURSE are given the option to consider issues from more than one cultural perspective in an assessment task

6.3 Students in this COURSE are sometimes required to consider issues from more than one cultural perspective in an assessment task

6.4 Students in this COURSE are always required to consider issues from more than one cultural perspective in an assessment task

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A localised curriculum
internationalised curriculum

Comments:

If you located your COURSE at point 4 on the continuum, explain how you do this or give an example.

For further consideration

To what extent do assessment tasks across the PROGRAM require students to consider issues from a variety of cultural perspectives?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is this appropriate? Why? Why not?
7. In the COURSE for which you are responsible, to what extent do assessment tasks require students to recognize intercultural issues relevant to their discipline and/or professional practice?

7.1 Students in this COURSE are never assessed on their ability to recognize or discuss intercultural issues relevant to their discipline and/or professional practice

7.2 Sometimes students in this COURSE are given the option to discuss intercultural issues relevant to their discipline and/or professional practice as part of an assessment task

7.3 Students in this COURSE are sometimes required to discuss intercultural issues relevant to their discipline and/or professional practice as part of an assessment task

7.4 Students in this COURSE are always required to discuss and analyse intercultural issues relevant to their discipline and/or professional practice as part of an assessment task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A localised curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internationalised curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

If you located your COURSE at point 4 on the continuum, explain how you do this or give an example.

For further consideration

To what extent do assessment tasks across the PROGRAM require students to recognize intercultural issues relevant to their discipline and/or professional practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Is this appropriate? Why? Why not?
8. In the COURSE for which you are responsible, to what extent are assessment tasks culturally sensitive?

8.1 Patterns of assessment task completions and results are never analysed for signs of any difficulties for particular groups of students
8.2 Patterns of assessment task completions and results are rarely analysed for signs of any difficulties for particular groups of students
8.3 Patterns of assessment task completions and results are sometimes analysed by some staff for signs of any difficulties for particular groups of students
8.4 Patterns of assessment task completions and results are systematically analysed for signs of any difficulties for particular groups of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A localised curriculum</td>
<td>An internationalised curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

If you located your COURSE at point 4 on the continuum, explain how you do this.

For further consideration

To what extent are assessment tasks across the PROGRAM culturally inclusive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Is this appropriate? Why? Why not?
PROGRAM Level – Learning Outcomes

9. How clearly defined and articulated are the international/intercultural learning goals, aims and outcomes of this PROGRAM?

9.1 No PROGRAM specific international/intercultural goals, aims and learning outcomes or graduate attributes are defined for this PROGRAM

9.2 There are PROGRAM specific international/intercultural goals, aims and learning outcomes and/or graduate attributes but no COURSES specifically focus on their development and assessment

9.3 The PROGRAM has clearly defined and articulated learning outcomes and/or graduate attributes related to the development of international/intercultural perspectives within the context of the discipline and these are communicated to students and staff

9.4 The PROGRAM has clearly defined and articulated learning outcomes and/or graduate attributes related to the development of international/intercultural perspectives within the context of the discipline and these are systematically developed and assessed across the PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A localised curriculum</td>
<td>An internationalised curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

If you located your PROGRAM at point 4 on the continuum, explain how you do this in relation to at least one PROGRAM learning outcome.

For further consideration

What international, intercultural or global perspectives do graduates of this PROGRAM need? Why?
What are the 2-3 most important international/intercultural learning outcomes for graduates of this PROGRAM?

PROGRAM Level - Curriculum

10. To what extent is the content of this PROGRAM internationalised?

NOTE: When considering ‘content’ you should think not only about the nature of the subjects or topics covered in text books and readings but also about the substantive information contained in your lecture slides and notes, PROGRAM and COURSE information booklets etc.

10.1 The content of the PROGRAM is only informed by research and practice from within the national or regional context, and only dominant viewpoints and commonly accepted ways of thinking in the discipline are presented, invited and rewarded

10.2 The content of the PROGRAM is predominantly informed by research and practice from an international context, and only dominant viewpoints and commonly accepted ways of thinking in the discipline are presented, invited and rewarded

10.3 The content of the PROGRAM is predominantly informed by research and practice from an international context, and dominant viewpoints and ways of thinking in the discipline are the main focus, but the presence of non-dominant viewpoints is acknowledged

10.4 The content of the PROGRAM is predominantly informed by research and practice from an international context, and a broad range of dominant and non-dominant viewpoints and ways of thinking in the discipline are presented, invited and rewarded

1 2 3 4

A localised curriculum An internationalised curriculum

Comments:

For further consideration

What are the main blockers to internationalisation of the content in this PROGRAM?
11. To what extent are students required to apply knowledge and skills in different national and cultural contexts?

11.1 The PROGRAM focuses only on the application of knowledge and skills within local contexts in ways that do not require engagement with the perspectives of those from other national and/or cultural backgrounds.

11.2 The PROGRAM focuses mainly on the application of knowledge and skills within local contexts, but some COURSES within the PROGRAM give students the option to engage with the perspectives of those from other national and/or cultural backgrounds.

11.3 The PROGRAM focuses mainly on the application of knowledge and skills within local contexts, but some COURSES within the PROGRAM require students to engage with the perspectives of those from other national and/or cultural backgrounds.

11.4 The PROGRAM focuses on the application of knowledge and skills within a range of different national and cultural contexts and requires students to engage with multiple perspectives and points of view.

A localised curriculum

internationalised curriculum

Comments:

For further consideration

What is the appropriate balance in this PROGRAM between the application of knowledge and skills within different national and cultural contexts? Why?
PROGRAM Level – Teaching Team

12. To what extent do COURSE COORDINATORS understand the cultural foundations of knowledge and practice in the discipline and related professions?

12.1 COURSE COORDINATORS are not required or encouraged understand the cultural foundations of knowledge and practice in the discipline and related professions

12.2 COURSE COORDINATORS are encouraged to develop their understanding of the cultural foundations of knowledge and practice in the discipline and related professions

12.3 COURSE COORDINATORS are expected to have a good understanding of the cultural foundations of knowledge and practice in the discipline and related professions

12.4 COURSE COORDINATORS are expected to have a good understanding the cultural foundations of knowledge and practice in the discipline and related professions and to ensure this is reflected in the course in some way

1 2 3 4

A localised curriculum An internationalised curriculum

Comments:

For further consideration

What mechanisms would you expect to see in place in a PROGRAM at point 4 on the continuum?
13. To what extent are teaching staff in this PROGRAM expected to understand the international context of the discipline and related professions?

13.1 Teaching staff are not encouraged or required to have a good understanding of the discipline and related professions internationally.

13.2 Some teaching staff are encouraged to have a good understanding of the discipline and related professions internationally.

13.3 Some teaching staff are required to have a good understanding of the discipline and related professions internationally.

13.4 All teaching staff are encouraged and required to continually develop their understanding of the discipline and related professions internationally.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A localised curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>An internationalised curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

For further consideration

What types of support and assistance are most effective in developing the understanding of teaching staff of the international context of the discipline and related professions?

How should/are teaching staff rewarded for continually developing their understanding of the international context of the discipline and related professions?
14. To what extent are teaching staff in this PROGRAM expected to employ teaching strategies that engage students from diverse cultural backgrounds?

14.1 Teaching staff are *not encouraged or assisted in or rewarded* for employing teaching strategies that will engage students from diverse cultural backgrounds.

14.2 Teaching staff are *encouraged* to develop teaching strategies that will engage students from diverse cultural backgrounds.

14.3 Teaching staff are *assisted &/or supported* to develop teaching strategies that will engage students from diverse cultural backgrounds.

14.4 Teaching staff are *encouraged, assisted and supported* in the employment of teaching strategies that engage students from diverse cultural backgrounds.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A localised curriculum</td>
<td>An internationalised curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:*

**For further consideration**

*What types of support are most likely to be effective in assisting teaching staff to develop strategies that engage students from diverse cultural backgrounds?*

*What types of reward and recognition are (or could be) provided to teaching staff who do this effectively?*
Overall Rating for this PROGRAM

15. Considering the above, overall where would you locate the curriculum of your PROGRAM on this scale?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A localised curriculum

An internationalised curriculum

Comments:

Other related questions and issues

Are there any other questions, issues, considerations or discussion topics related to internationalisation of the curriculum that you would like to raise?
Step 4: Developing the Action Plan

This plan should be developed by the PROGRAM Director in consultation with the nominated team after the QIC has been completed and the responses discussed by the team. The focus of this step is to consider, given the individual responses of the team to the QIC and the resulting team discussion, what should be done, why, by whom and by when? Additional resources to support the development and implementation of the Action Plan are available from [www.ioc.net.au](http://www.ioc.net.au).

**Internationalisation of the Curriculum Action Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What needs to be done?</th>
<th>Why does this need to be done?</th>
<th>Who will do this?</th>
<th>By when?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary of terms used in the QIC

PROGRAM = a course of study leading to a qualification offered by the university, e.g. Bachelor of Nursing. In some universities the terminology used is ‘course’.

COURSE = the components of a PROGRAM, e.g. Nursing 1, Anatomy and Physiology 1. In some universities the terminology used is ‘subject’ or ‘unit’.

COURSE COORDINATOR = the academic position with administrative and academic leadership of the COURSE, often the lecturer

GRADUATE ATTRIBUTES = formal statement of generic competencies of a university graduate, usually associated with a formal process of ensuring the PROGRAM curriculum contributes towards the development of these competencies

SCHOOL = the second level of subdivision of the academic function of the university, e.g. Faculty of Business, School of Management

TEACHING AND LEARNING ARRANGEMENTS = the combination of face-to-face and online delivery of content and development of skills including for example use of lectures and tutorials and opportunities within those for group work and discussion; the use of online tools such as discussion groups and simulations; opportunities for practical experience

ACADEMIC MAJOR = the primary focus of a degree; the sequence of COURSES embodying that focus