

# Indicator Projects on Internationalisation

-

## Approaches, Methods and Findings

A report in the context of the European project  
“**I**ndicators for **M**apping & **P**rofilng  
**I**nternationalisation” (IMPI)

**Authors:**

Eric Beerkens

Uwe Brandenburg

Nico Evers

Adinda van Gaalen

Hannah Leichsenring

Vera Zimmermann

**April 2010**

# Table of contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>A SHORT HISTORY OF MEASURING INTERNATIONALISATION .....</b>	<b>11</b>
1.1	THE CONCEPT OF INTERNATIONALISATION.....	11
1.2	THE CONCEPTS OF MAPPING, EVALUATING AND PROFILING.....	11
<b>2.</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>EXISTING INITIATIVES ON INDICATORS FOR INTERNATIONALISATION .....</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1	EXISTING INDICATOR LISTS.....	15
3.2	TYPES OF INDICATORS: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	16
3.2.1	<i>What is measured? Inputs, outputs &amp; outcomes</i> .....	16
3.2.2	<i>What is measured? Dimensions of internationalisation</i> .....	17
3.2.3	<i>Purpose of the indicator sets</i> .....	21
3.2.4	<i>Levels of assessment</i> .....	23
3.2.5	<i>Methods of indicator validation</i> .....	24
3.2.6	<i>Methods of data collection and data verification</i> .....	25
3.3	CURRENT PROJECTS .....	26
3.3.1	<i>AHELO project</i> .....	26
3.3.2	<i>Internationalisation certificate</i> .....	26
3.3.3	<i>U-map project</i> .....	27
3.3.4	<i>Erasmus Mobility Quality Tools (EMQT)</i> .....	28
<b>4.</b>	<b>EXAMPLES OF INDICATOR PROJECTS .....</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1	EXAMPLE 1: INTERNATIONAL QUALITY REVIEW PROCESS (IQRP) .....	29
4.1.1	<i>Background and actors</i> .....	29
4.1.2	<i>Philosophy of the project, political setting</i> .....	29
4.1.3	<i>Methodology</i> .....	30
4.1.4	<i>Results and application</i> .....	31
4.1.5	<i>Source</i> .....	32
4.2	EXAMPLE 2: ACE REVIEW PROCESS.....	33
4.2.1	<i>Background and actors</i> .....	33
4.2.2	<i>Philosophy of the project, political setting</i> .....	33
4.2.3	<i>Methodology</i> .....	33
4.2.4	<i>Results and application</i> .....	35
4.2.5	<i>Source</i> .....	37
4.3	EXAMPLE 3: JAPANESE STUDY TO DEVELOP EVALUATION CRITERIA TO ASSESS THE INTERNATIONALISATION OF UNIVERSITIES .....	38
4.3.1	<i>Background and actors</i> .....	38
4.3.2	<i>Philosophy of the project, political setting</i> .....	39
4.3.3	<i>Methodology</i> .....	39
4.3.4	<i>Results and application</i> .....	40
4.3.5	<i>Source</i> .....	42
4.4	EXAMPLE 4: CHE INDICATOR PROJECT.....	43
4.4.1	<i>Background and actors</i> .....	43
4.4.2	<i>Philosophy of the project, political setting</i> .....	43
4.4.3	<i>Methodology</i> .....	44
4.4.4	<i>Results and application</i> .....	45
4.4.5	<i>Source</i> .....	46
4.5	EXAMPLE 5: NUFFIC TOOL MAPPING INTERNATIONALISATION (MINT) .....	47
4.5.1	<i>Background and actors</i> .....	47
4.5.2	<i>Philosophy of the project, political setting</i> .....	47
4.5.3	<i>Methodology</i> .....	48
4.5.4	<i>Results and application</i> .....	50
4.5.5	<i>Source</i> .....	52
4.6	EXAMPLE 6: DAAD DEVELOPMENT AND COLLECTION OF PROFILE DATA .....	53
4.6.1	<i>Background</i> .....	53
4.6.2	<i>Philosophy of the project, political setting</i> .....	53
4.6.3	<i>Methodology</i> .....	53

4.6.4	<i>Application and results</i> .....	54
4.6.5	<i>Source</i> .....	56
4.7	EXAMPLE 7: "INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION: PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT AND INDICATORS" (PAIGE, 2005).....	57
4.7.1	<i>Background</i> .....	57
4.7.2	<i>Philosophy of the project, political setting</i> .....	57
4.7.3	<i>Methodology</i> .....	57
4.7.4	<i>Results</i> .....	57
4.7.5	<i>Source</i> .....	57
4.8	EXAMPLE 8: "TRENDS AND INDICATORS OF TAIWAN'S HIGHER EDUCATION INTERNATIONALIZATION" (CHIN, & CHING, 2009).....	58
4.8.1	<i>Background</i> .....	58
4.8.2	<i>Philosophy of the project, political setting</i> .....	58
4.8.3	<i>Main actors</i> .....	58
4.8.4	<i>Methodology</i> .....	58
4.8.5	<i>Results: List of indicators</i> .....	59
4.8.6	<i>Source</i> .....	59
<b>5.</b>	<b>MAIN CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	<b>61</b>
5.1	IMPORTANT CHARACTERISTICS OF CASE STUDIES.....	61
5.2	CONCLUSIONS DRAWN FROM EXAMPLES.....	62
5.3	LESSONS FOR THE IMPI TOOLBOX.....	63
	<b>REFERENCES AND LINKS</b> .....	<b>64</b>
	<b>APPENDIX 1: EXISTING TOOLS AND INDICATOR SETS</b> .....	<b>66</b>
	<b>APPENDIX 2: INDICATOR SETS AND QUESTIONNAIRES</b> .....	<b>69</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>IQRP</b> .....	<b>70</b>
	CONTEXT.....	70
1.1.1	<i>Summary of the higher education system</i> .....	70
1.1.2	<i>Summary of the institutional profile</i> .....	70
1.1.3	<i>Analysis of the (inter)national context</i> .....	70
	INTERNATIONALISATION POLICIES AND STRATEGIES.....	70
	ORGANISATIONAL AND SUPPORT STRUCTURES.....	70
1.1.4	<i>Organisation and structures</i> .....	70
1.1.5	<i>Planning and evaluation</i> .....	71
1.1.6	<i>Financial support and resource allocation</i> .....	71
1.1.7	<i>Support services and facilities</i> .....	71
	ACADEMIC PROGRAMMES AND STUDENTS.....	71
1.1.8	<i>Internationalisation of the curriculum: area and language studies, degree programmes, teaching and learning process</i> .....	71
1.1.9	<i>Domestic students</i> .....	72
1.1.10	<i>Foreign students</i> .....	72
1.1.11	<i>Study abroad and student exchange programmes</i> .....	72
	RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY COLLABORATION.....	73
	HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT.....	73
	CONTRACTS AND SERVICES.....	73
1.1.12	<i>Partnerships and networks</i> .....	74
1.1.13	<i>Out of country education programmes</i> .....	74
1.1.14	<i>Development assistance</i> .....	74
1.1.15	<i>External services and project work</i> .....	74
	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	74
<b>2.</b>	<b>ACE</b> .....	<b>75</b>
	INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT.....	75

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND STAFFING.....	75
FINANCIAL SUPPORT.....	75
FOREIGN-LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS AND OFFERINGS .....	76
INTERNATIONAL/GLOBAL COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND OFFERINGS .....	77
EDUCATION ABROAD .....	77
FACULTY POLICIES AND OPPORTUNITIES .....	78
STUDENT ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES .....	78
USE OF TECHNOLOGY FOR INTERNATIONALIZATION .....	79
DEGREE PROGRAMS OFFERED ABROAD FOR NON-U.S. STUDENTS .....	79
<b>3. JAPANESE INDICATOR LIST.....</b>	<b>80</b>
MISSION, GOALS AND PLANS OF THE UNIVERSITY .....	80
3.1.1 <i>Official statements regarding the internationalization of the university</i> .....	80
3.1.2 <i>Responsible administrative structures</i> .....	80
3.1.3 <i>Establishment of medium- and long-term plans and strategic goals</i> .....	80
STRUCTURES AND STAFF .....	80
3.1.4 <i>Decision-making structures and processes for internationalization policies</i> .....	80
3.1.5 <i>Organizational structures for operation</i> .....	80
3.1.6 <i>Professional development and performance review in the area of internationalization</i> ..	81
3.1.7 <i>Institutional accountability</i> .....	81
BUDGETING AND IMPLEMENTATION .....	81
3.1.8 <i>Budgeting structure for departments involved in international activities</i> .....	81
3.1.9 <i>Budgeting and performance</i> .....	81
INTERNATIONAL DIMENSION OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.....	81
3.1.10 <i>Achievements of research presentation</i> .....	81
3.1.11 <i>International development of research activities</i> .....	81
SUPPORT SYSTEM, INFORMATION PROVISION AND INFRASTRUCTURE (ENTRANCE EXAMINATION, EDUCATION, HOUSING, MULTILINGUAL ASPECTS AND THE ENVIRONMENT .....	82
3.1.12 <i>Support system for international researchers and students</i> .....	82
3.1.13 <i>Daily support for international students and researchers</i> .....	82
MULTIFACETED PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL AFFILIATION.....	82
3.1.14 <i>Inter-university affiliation</i> .....	82
3.1.15 <i>Overseas bases</i> .....	82
3.1.16 <i>Linkage with local community</i> .....	83
INTERNATIONALIZATION OF THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM.....	83
3.1.17 <i>Language program</i> .....	83
3.1.18 <i>General academic programs (liberal arts programs, excluding language programs)</i> .	83
3.1.19 <i>Internationalization of specialized education</i> .....	83
JOINT PROGRAMS WITH EXTERNAL ORGANIZATIONS (ACADEMIC EXCHANGES, INTERNSHIPS, AND OTHERS)	83
3.1.20 <i>General Issues regarding international programs</i> .....	83
3.1.21 <i>Educational exchange</i> .....	84
3.1.22 <i>Evaluation of joint programs with other universities</i> .....	84
DEVELOPMENT OF NEW PROGRAMS .....	84
<b>4. CHE .....</b>	<b>85</b>
OVERALL ASPECTS .....	85
4.1.1 <i>Input</i> .....	85
ACADEMIC RESEARCH.....	88
4.1.2 <i>Input</i> .....	88
4.1.3 <i>Output</i> .....	89
TEACHING AND STUDIES.....	90
4.1.4 <i>Input</i> .....	90
4.1.5 <i>Output</i> .....	92
<b>5. MINT .....</b>	<b>93</b>
GOALS.....	93

INTERNATIONALIZATION ACTIVITIES.....	94
INTERNATIONALIZATION SUPPORT SERVICES .....	98
QUALITY ASSURANCE .....	100
KEY FIGURES.....	100
<b>6. DAAD.....</b>	<b>111</b>
6.1.1 Kennzahlen zum Ausländerstudium .....	111
6.1.2 Kennzahlen zur Mobilität von Studierenden und Dozenten im Rahmen von ERASMUS 111	
6.1.3 Kennzahlen zur Mobilität von deutschen Programmstudenten außerhalb von ERASMUS 111	
6.1.4 Kennzahlen zur Beteiligung der Hochschulen an den DAAD-Programmen .....	111
6.1.5 Kennzahlen zu Internationalen Studiengängen.....	112
6.1.6 Kennzahlen zu Internationalen Kooperationen.....	112
6.1.7 Kennzahlen zu wissenschaftlichem und künstlerischem Personal mit ausländischer Staatsangehörigkeit an deutschen Hochschulen .....	112
6.1.8 Kennzahlen zu Forschungsdrittmitteln aus dem Ausland .....	112
6.1.9 Kennzahlen zu AvH-Stipendiaten und Preisträgern .....	112
6.1.10 Kennzahlen für Maßnahmen zur Förderung der Internationalität .....	112
6.1.11 Öffentlichkeitsarbeit / Marketing .....	112
6.1.12 Informations-, Beratungs- und Betreuungsangebote für Studierende und Doktoranden 113	
<b>7. TAIWANESE INDICATORLIST .....</b>	<b>114</b>
INTERNATIONALIZATION INDICATORS SUGGESTED BY LOCAL INTERNATIONALIZATION OFFICERS .....	114
INTERNATIONALIZATION INDICATORS SUGGESTED BY SCHOLARS/EXPERTS .....	114
INTERNATIONALIZATION INDICATORS SUGGESTED BY INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS.....	114
<b>8. SIU .....</b>	<b>115</b>
LEDELSE OG STRATEGI .....	115
ORGANISASJON OG FINANSIERING .....	115
INTERNASJONALE AVTALER OG INSTITUSJONELL FORANKRING .....	115
STUDENTMOBILITET UT .....	115
STUDENTMOBILITET INN .....	116
INTERNASJONALISERING GJENNOM INFORMASJON OG PROFILERING .....	116
INTERNASJONALISERING FORANKRET I FAG OG UNDERVISNING .....	116
INTERNASJONALISERING AV FORSKER- OG LÆRERSTABEN .....	117
INTERNASJONALISERING AV ADMINISTRASJON OG INFRASTRUKTUR.....	117
ANBEFALINGER.....	117
<b>9. PAIGE (2005) PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT AND INDICATORS.....</b>	<b>118</b>
UNIVERSITY LEADERSHIP FOR INTERNATIONALIZATION .....	118
9.1.1 Mission statement.....	118
9.1.2 Promotion and publicity .....	118
9.1.3 Budget.....	118
9.1.4 Leadership positions.....	118
9.1.5 Promotion and tenure .....	118
9.1.6 Student recruitment .....	118
INTERNATIONALIZATION STRATEGIC PLAN.....	118
9.1.7 Goals.....	118
9.1.8 Objectives .....	118
9.1.9 Inputs .....	118
9.1.10 Activities .....	118
9.1.11 Timelines and targets .....	119
INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION .....	119
9.1.12 Committees .....	119

9.1.13	<i>Accountability structures</i> .....	119
INFRASTRUCTURE (PROFESSIONAL UNITS AND STAFF).....		119
9.1.14	<i>International students and scholars</i> .....	119
9.1.15	<i>Study abroad</i> .....	119
9.1.16	<i>International exchanges, projects, grants, contracts</i> .....	119
INTERNATIONALIZED CURRICULUM.....		119
9.1.17	<i>International Majors</i> .....	119
9.1.18	<i>International Minors</i> .....	119
9.1.19	<i>International Courses</i> .....	119
9.1.20	<i>Languages</i> .....	120
9.1.21	<i>Scholarships and awards</i> .....	120
9.1.22	<i>Resources</i> .....	120
INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS.....		120
9.1.23	<i>International student recruitment</i> .....	120
9.1.24	<i>International student support</i> .....	120
9.1.25	<i>Integration of university students into university life</i> .....	120
STUDY ABROAD.....		120
9.1.26	<i>Academic study abroad</i> .....	120
9.1.27	<i>Work and tourism abroad</i> .....	120
9.1.28	<i>Specialized academic study abroad</i> .....	120
9.1.29	<i>Study abroad requirements</i> .....	120
9.1.30	<i>Exchange agreements</i> .....	121
9.1.31	<i>Student Support</i> .....	121
FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES.....		121
9.1.32	<i>Faculty support</i> .....	121
9.1.33	<i>Exchange agreements</i> .....	121
9.1.34	<i>International grants and contracts</i> .....	121
CAMPUS LIFE / CO-CURRICULAR PROGRAMS .....		121
9.1.35	<i>Campus life offices</i> .....	121
9.1.36	<i>Student organizations</i> .....	121
9.1.37	<i>Campus programs</i> .....	121
MONITORING THE PROCESS .....		121
9.1.38	<i>Performance assessment process</i> .....	121
9.1.39	<i>Performance indicators</i> .....	121
9.1.40	<i>Performance reviews</i> .....	122
<b>10.    CAMPUS FRANCE</b> .....		<b>123</b>
I - BEFORE DEPARTURE.....		123
10.1.1	<i>Presentation of French higher education Opportunities</i> .....	123
10.1.2	<i>Information on foreign scholar Programmes</i> .....	123
10.1.3	<i>Development of structured foreign scholar programmes</i> .....	123
10.1.4	<i>Preparations for departure</i> .....	123
II - ON ARRIVAL IN FRANCE.....		123
10.1.5	<i>Reception on arrival</i> .....	123
10.1.6	<i>Accommodation</i> .....	123
10.1.7	<i>Reception at the place of study</i> .....	123
III - DURING THE STAY.....		124
10.1.8	<i>Teaching in foreign languages</i> .....	124
10.1.9	<i>Mentoring and assimilation</i> .....	124
10.1.10	<i>Statistical and quality monitoring</i> .....	124
IV - ON RETURNING HOME.....		124
10.1.11	<i>Alumni networks</i> .....	124
10.1.12	<i>Foreign scholar follow-up</i> .....	124
10.1.13	<i>Assessment of the entire foreign scholar system</i> .....	124
<b>11.    U-MAP</b> .....		<b>125</b>



TEACHING AND LEARNING PROFILE.....	125
STUDENT PROFILE.....	125
RESEARCH INVOLVEMENT.....	125
REGIONAL ENGAGEMENT.....	125
INVOLVEMENT IN KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE.....	125
INTERNATIONAL ORIENTATION.....	125
<b>12. NVAO PROGRAMME ACCREDITATION AND INTERNATIONALISATION.....</b>	<b>126</b>
VISION OR POLICY ON INTERNATIONALISATION.....	126
LEARNING OUTCOMES.....	126
TEACHING AND LEARNING.....	126
STAFF.....	126
SERVICES.....	126
STUDENTS.....	126
<b>13. EMQT.....</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>TASK FORCE D: PERFORMANCE AND RECOGNITION.....</b>	<b>138</b>

## Summary

This document reports on the research undertaken in the 'Indicators for Mapping and Profiling Internationalisation' project in order to create a comprehensive overview of indicators for internationalisation. It describes the first steps in developing a set of indicators and creating a toolbox for a.o. institutions to apply these indicators.

Higher Education Institutions increasingly operate in an international environment which demands the development of internationalisation strategies. In recent years, a shift has taken place from the internationalisation of specific core functions of an institution to the internationalisation of the institution as a whole, including its objectives. The internationalisation of the institution is reflected by the international character of its education and research, but also by the international nature of its funding base, its quality assurance system, its staff and student population, etc.

Internationalisation refers to the process of becoming international. Whereas 'Internationality' refers to how international a university is at a certain point in time (Brandenburg & Federkeil, 2007). Both concepts are valuable.

Three important interrelated developments are causes of the increased demand for better data on internationalisation and internationality.

1. With the shift from peripheral to mainstream activity, internationalisation has become a more complicated and more comprehensive process. One is not only demanding quantitative indicators for internationalisation, but the quality of internationalisation is gaining priority.
2. The emergence of an accountability culture in higher education based on evaluations.
3. Through increased global competition and the importance of rankings and league tables in higher education, institutions need indicators to profile themselves.

Measuring can be divided into three basic items: 1. knowing where your organisation stands (mapping) in terms of internationalisation 2. examining the value of the internationalisation efforts (evaluating) and 3. setting an organisational identity (profiling), showing both internal and external stakeholders the strengths and ambitions of your organisation from an internationalisation perspective.

Although internationalisation is considered to be of the utmost importance for increasing the quality of learning outcomes, employability, and for successful research, existing sets of indicators do not yet provide useful tools to measure and map internationalisation in an international comparative manner.

This report briefly addresses the methodology used in finding, selecting and analysing possible indicators for the toolbox. An overview is given of earlier projects and studies related to indicators for internationalisation world-wide to allow for a maximum of input. An overview of over thirty existing tools has been created and for all sets the leading organisation, the country and the year of publication were identified (see appendix 1).

Many of these tools have been based on tools which had already been developed previously. Therefore, a selection of this list was used as input to set up the IMPI indicator list while others have been cross-checked for overlapping indicators. Selected were the tools

developed by CHE, Nuffic, the Flemish Bologna Experts, the IQRP, SIU and the DAAD. Inputs from Perspektywy, based on rankings, and Campus France derived from the Quality Charter for French Government Foreign Scholars have been added as well as input from the indicator set developed by ASCUN.

Other tools were studied more in depth for methodological purposes. An overview of important features of the indicator sets is given including elements (inputs, outputs & outcomes) of the internationalisation process, type of internationalisation activities-(e.g. strategy, teaching & curriculum, students, staff or research) they focus on. Second the, purpose (self evaluation, benchmarking, classification, ranking) of the indicator sets and the level (e.g. programme or institution) of assessment. Finally, the paper looks into the type of information (e.g. expert judgements and knowledge or stakeholder evaluations) that is necessary to measure the indicators and the way this data is collected (surveys, institutional data collection, peer reviews or panel visits or data collection from external databases like (inter)national statistical offices). In the end, institutions themselves are the key actors in collecting sufficient data to arrive at a thorough assessment of internationalisation activities. Experiences of core partners from earlier projects as well as current initiatives like the Feasibility Study for the International Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO), the NVAO Internationalisation certificate, the U-map research project to develop a European Classification of Higher Education Institutions and the Erasmus Mobility Quality Tools (EMQT) project were incorporated. Each of these projects has to balance comprehensiveness with usability and flexibility, which is also one of the main challenges in the IMPI project.

Experiences from earlier projects of core partners as well as current initiatives like the Feasibility Study for the International Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO), the NVAO Internationalisation certificate, the U-map research project to develop a European Classification of Higher Education Institutions and the Erasmus Mobility Quality Tools (EMQT) project were incorporated. Each of these projects have to balance comprehensiveness with usability and flexibility, which is also one of the main challenges in the IMPI project.

## 1. A Short history of measuring internationalisation

### 1.1 *The concept of internationalisation*

Universities and other higher education institutions increasingly operate in an international environment. They recruit international students; they stimulate their own students to have an international learning experience; they are part of international consortia and research networks; they emulate foreign institutions and copy good practices and new strategies. A truly national perspective on higher education institutions is clearly something of the past.

In order to operate in such an international environment, institutions are internationalising. Internationalisation was defined by Jane Knight (1994) as “the process of integrating an international or intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institutions.” Responding to the global developments in the field of internationalisation, she presented an updated definition a decade later. Here, internationalisation was defined as “the process of integrating international, intercultural or global dimensions into the objective, function and provision of higher education”. This change in definition reflects the shift from the internationalisation of specific core functions of institutions to the internationalisation of the institution as a whole, including its objectives. The internationalisation of the institution is reflected by the international character of their education and research, but also by the international nature of their funding base, their quality assurance system, their staff and student population, etc.

Internationalisation as defined by Knight clearly is a process. It reflects a set of activities or strategies that institutions formulate in order to respond to increased globalisation. Some institutions adopt and implement such internationalisation strategies more than others. In the end, this leads to more or less internationalised institutions or more or less internationalised parts of institutions. To reflect this ‘state of the art’ of internationalisation, Brandenburg & Federkeil (2007) make a distinction between ‘Internationalisation’ and ‘Internationality’, between process and status. They define ‘Internationality’ as either an institution’s current status or the status evident at the date of data acquisition with respect to international activities. Further internationalisation is thus intended to increase the level of internationality of the institution in a certain timeframe. Both concepts will be taken into account in this report.

### 1.2 *The concepts of mapping, evaluating and profiling*

Measuring internationalisation can be divided into three basic items: 1. knowing where your organisation stands (mapping) in terms of internationalisation 2. examining the value of the internationalisation efforts (evaluating) and 3. setting an

organisational identity (profiling), showing both internal and external stakeholders the strengths and ambitions of your organisation from an internationalisation perspective. The increased demand for indicators on internationalisation of higher education institutions cannot be attributed to a single factor. The concepts of mapping, evaluating and profiling can be linked to three important interrelated developments that cause for more and better data on the internationalisation process.

First of all, mapping is linked to the changing nature of internationalisation processes itself. With the shift from peripheral to mainstream activity, internationalisation has become a more complicated and more comprehensive process. It concerns activities that relate to many other processes in the university, such as quality assurance, funding, student services, etc. While internationalisation used to be an aggregation of dispersed internationalisation activities within the institution, it has evolved into a comprehensive strategy that should be approached in a holistic way. This shift has also added to the complexity of internationalisation in higher education institutions. It has created a need for more sophisticated data on these internationalisation activities. The days that the international nature of the institution was determined solely by the number of international students or the number of Erasmus exchanges are long gone. University leaders and managers now demand a much wider set of indicators.

What adds to the complexity is that one is not only demanding quantitative indicators for internationalisation, but the quality of internationalisation is gaining priority. It is not just about more internationalisation, but also about better internationalisation, and the choice of indicators and measurement methodologies need to reflect this.

A second driver of the need for indicators can be traced back to the emergence of an accountability culture in higher education based on evaluations. Reforms of higher education worldwide show tendencies towards deregulation and decentralization. In most countries institutions gain more autonomy. With this autonomy however also comes the need for accountability from institutions towards governments as well as students and other stakeholders. Institutions might have to show they are international in order to be eligible for certain funding sources or to be considered for accreditation.

A third important factor causing a demand for indicators is the reputation race in which higher education institutions are involved. Through increased global competition and the importance of rankings and league tables in higher education, institutions need indicators to profile themselves. They want to show the international impact of their research, their popularity with international students, their language courses, their joint programmes, etc., in order to show that they are internationally oriented. Here, indicators have an external function. They (selectively) inform students, academics and other stakeholders on the internationality of the institution. In these instances, internationality is seen as an intrinsic quality indicator.

However, the need to provide the public with information is not only a matter of reputation. There is also an increased call for transparency from students, governments and the labour market. Especially in areas where we observe an

increasing level of regional integration – like the European Higher Education Area – there is a need for information on the differences between institutions and their quality. Students and the general public need to have access to information on the content and quality of programmes and facilities. Internationalisation indicators are just one set of many of such indicators that can be used to inform the public.

Due to the complexity of internationalisation and the changes in the international environment of institutions, both mapping and evaluating are essential tools to stay on top of the internationalisation process and to reach institutional goals in a controlled manner. This document reports on the research undertaken in the 'Indicators for Mapping and Profiling Internationalisation' project. It describes the first steps in developing a set of indicators and creating a toolbox for a.o. institutions to apply these indicators.

The next section briefly addresses the methodology used in finding, selecting and analysing the indicators for the toolbox. Section three gives an overview of earlier projects and studies related to indicators for internationalisation. On the basis of these earlier studies and projects, a selection of indicator sets is analysed in detail in order to identify their crucial dimensions and lessons to learn for the IMPI toolbox.

## 2. Methodology

In order to create a comprehensive overview of indicators for internationalisation, a wide range of indicator sets or toolboxes have been identified and explored through desk research. On the basis of the results of this research, indicator sets were selected for further analysis. In addition to the indicators themselves, the methodologies and approaches used in the development of these sets were taken into account.

The desk research gives insights into other relevant projects world-wide to allow for a maximum of input. An overview of over thirty existing tools has been created and for all sets the leading organisation, the country and the year of publication were identified (see appendix 1). Also, specific characteristics were analysed such as (see chapter 2 for more information):

- the purpose of tool: for instance benchmarking, evaluation, ranking;
- the level: institutional level, school or faculty level, programme level;
- the type of information: quantitative or qualitative;
- the methods of data collection: for instance self evaluations or surveys.

A selection of this list has been used as input to set up the IMPI indicator list. Other tools were studied more in depth for methodological purposes. Tools to be used as input for the IMPI indicator list were selected based on:

1. the relevance of the indicators for the IMPI project,
2. year of publication and
3. scope of the project.

Selected were the tools developed by CHE, Nuffic, the Flemish Bologna Experts, the IQRP, SIU and the DAAD. Inputs from Perspektywy, based on rankings, and Campus France derived from the Quality Charter for French Government Foreign Scholars have been added as well as input from the indicator set developed by ASCUN.

### 3. Existing initiatives on indicators for internationalisation

A European-wide approach to measure internationality and internationalisation has not yet been established. Transparency and accountability needs measurability to allow students, companies, ministries and other interested groups to evaluate the quality of internationalisation in HEIs. The wider public asks for transparency, while funding agencies and governments demand accountability and the European qualification framework calls for measurable learning outcomes. Although internationalisation is considered to be of the utmost importance for increasing the quality of learning outcomes, employability, and for successful research, existing sets of indicators do not yet provide useful tools to measure and map internationalisation in an international comparative manner. Therefore, IMPI can build on the results of former indicator projects, but needs to expand the scope in order to include all aspects of internationalisation.

#### 3.1 Existing indicator lists

In the past five years we have witnessed a strong growth in the number of tools and studies which are trying to identify important indicators for internationalisation. Not surprisingly, the first sets of indicators emerged in an international setting or in those countries where internationalisation gained importance because of increasing flows of foreign students entering the country (USA, UK, Australia). One of the first international initiatives to assist institutions in evaluating and improving the quality of their internationalisation activities was the *International Quality Review Programme* (IQRP) developed by the Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE) programme of the OECD together with the Academic Cooperation Association (ACA). Other countries where sets emerged are European countries like Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Norway and Belgium. In addition to European and the mentioned English speaking countries, there is also an increasing interest in East Asia, in particular Japan and Taiwan. The full list of indicator sets or tools is given in appendix 1. A selection of these will be analysed in depth in chapter 4. Here, we will go into the background of the projects, the philosophy behind them, their methodology and the way they are applied in their real national or international settings.

In this chapter we will present an overview of important features of the indicator sets and how they are apparent (or not) in the existing sets. First it is discussed what elements of the internationalisation process the indicator sets actually want to measure and what type of internationalisation activities they focus on. Second the purpose of the indicator sets is addressed and the level on which one wants to assess the state of internationalisation within the institutions. Finally, the paper looks into the type of information that is necessary to measure the indicators and the way this data is collected.

### 3.2 *Types of indicators: review of the literature*

#### 3.2.1 What is measured? Inputs, outputs & outcomes

A first step in identifying the right indicators is an agreement on what will actually be measured. The question of what is measured does not only concern the *different aspects in the chain from goals to outcomes*. The question also concerns the *types of activities* within which the level of internationalisation can be measured. This question is very much related to the ultimate objectives of internationalisation. Do we for instance see mobility or the acceptance of foreign students as an end in itself or as a means to achieve other outputs or outcomes? And if mobility is a means, than what exactly are the ends? In order to define the right set of indicators, one first needs to clarify which type of indicators one is focussing on. Hudzik and Stohl (2009) give three categories of features that can be measured: inputs, outputs and outcomes. Each of these categories can be measured and all have their own type of indicators.

Inputs are resources available to support internationalisation efforts. These can usually be categorised under financial resources (e.g. scholarships), staff hours (e.g. for internationalising the curriculum) or specific policies (e.g. specific hiring or admission policies) which enable institutions to undertake internationalisation activities. These inputs or activities lead to certain outputs or results, for instance the number of students, the number of joint programmes, the amount of international research funding, etc. Also, the percentage e.g. of international staff can be seen as an output of an input such as international staff recruiting measures. To complicate things further, some output indicators (e.g. the number of international students) can directly be turned into input indicators (e.g. an international classroom).

Finally, the outcomes can be considered as the end results of internationalisation activities and are normally formulated at a higher level of abstraction than outputs. Outputs are direct consequences from inputs, whereas outcomes are related to overall achievements. The main distinction is that whereas outputs can be related with a clear causality to an action or an activity, outcomes usually cannot as they are linked to many actions and it is not always clear which one caused it.

In the case of proper strategic management, outcomes therefore should be linked to the strategic internationalisation goals of the institution, school or programme. Outcomes could refer to the competencies of graduates, the quality of education programmes and research, financial benefits, benefits to the wider community or increased reputation.

One of the pitfalls in using indicators is the continuous growth in the number of indicators on a certain list. This so called mushrooming leads to devaluation of the indicators by:

- \* Specifying (and specifying and specifying) definitions
- \* Using definitions that need extensive explanation

- \* Accompanying rules for measuring and calculating which have to be added
- \* A large number of exceptions to these rules as well as rules on how to deal with these

Mushrooming is mainly caused by the fact that any monitoring tool or indicator list is only able to show a limited part of reality. In the end, the word “indicator” stems from the Latin word “indicare” which means “to hint at”, i.e. indicators do not measure a result but they hint at a possible result. This however is often misunderstood and indicators are expected to reflect the reality. Mushrooming leads to a very complex indicator system which ultimately is unusable. Therefore, a useful and effective monitoring system should be allowed to have its limitations – according to the goal(s) the monitoring system serves (see below chapter 3.2.3).

### **3.2.2 What is measured? Dimensions of internationalisation**

The question of what is measured does not only concern the different aspects in the chain from goals to outcomes. The question also concerns the types of activities within which the level of internationalisation can be measured. Below, an international range of studies or projects is listed that identify different categories of activities that are to be measured.

In the IQR Programme of IMHE and ACA self-assessment focused on six categories of internationalisation indicators (in addition to one category focusing on the national context). Based on a review of existing, mainly North American literature (referring to Ellingboe, 1998; Knight and de Wit, 1999; Paige and Mestenhauser, 1999; Green and Olsen, 2003), Paige identified ten categories of indicators. Krause et al. analysed web pages of Australian institutions and categorised the indicators into five groups. Another major study was conducted at Osaka University in Japan. This study on ‘Developing Evaluation Criteria to Assess the Internationalization of Universities’ (Furushiro, 2006) identified eight main categories. A study by the German CHE (Brandenburg & Federkeil, 2007) identified three broad categories (overall, research, teaching & studies) and for the last two they made a distinction between input and output indicators. In a Dutch project, Nuffic in cooperation with Dutch higher education institutions developed the assessment and benchmarking tool MINT. This tool makes a distinction between five categories (internationalisation goals, activities, support, quality assurance and key figures). The German DAAD Profile Data Project uses ten dimensions to categorise their indicators including mobility, funding, staff and involvement in DAAD projects and several other dimensions. A final set of indicators was proposed in Taiwan by Joseph Meng-Chun Chin and Gregory S. Ching (2009). Based on interviews with local internationalisation officers, international scholars and experts as well as international students, they identified twelve categories of indicators (for an overview of all categories, see table 1).

Table 1 clearly illustrates the complexity of measuring internationalisation. Measuring the extent to which an institution is internationalised or internationalising can mean that one assesses the institutions on the basis of the international dimension of its policies or strategies, or the extent to which internationalisation is actually



institutionalised and embedded in an institution. At the same time, one can look at sheer numbers of students or at qualitative attributes of students or staff. One can focus on management and organisational issues or one can look at the international dimension of the content of the curriculum or of research projects.

**Table 1: Categories of indicators**

IMHE/ACA, 1999 (IQRP)	Paige, 2005	Krause et. al, 2005	Osaka University, 2006	CHE, 2007	Nuffic (MINT), 2009	DAAD, 2009	Chin & Ching, 2009
Policies & strategies	University leadership for internationalisation	The strategic dimension	Mission, goals and plans of the university	Overall aspects (input)	Goals	Foreign students	Institutional commitments
Organisational and support structures	Internationalisation Strategic Plan	The teaching and curriculum dimension	Structures and Staff	Academic research (input)	Activities	Mobility of staff and students in the ERASMUS framework	Strategic planning
Academic programmes and students	Institutionalisation of international education	The student dimension	Budgeting and Implementation	Academic research (output)	Support	Mobility of German students outside the ERASMUS framework	Funding
Research and scholarly collaboration	Infrastructure (professional units and staff)	The faculty dimension	International dimensions of research activities	Teaching & studies (input)	Quality Assurance	Involvement of institutions in DAAD programmes	Institutional policy & guidelines
Human resource management	Internationalized Curriculum	The research dimension	Support system, information provision and infrastructure	Teaching & studies (output)	Key figures	International programmes	Organisational infrastructure & resources
Contracts and services	International students and scholars		Multifaceted promotion of international affiliation		<i>Subcategories under activities:</i>	International collaborations	Curriculum & academic offerings
	Study abroad		Internationalization of the University Curriculum		Education in English or other foreign language	Academic staff with foreign nationality	Internet presence
	Faculty involvement in international activities		Joint programmes of external organisations		Credit mobility	Third stream research funding from abroad	Faculty & staff development

INDICATORS FOR MAPPING  
& PROFILING INTERNATIONALISATION



IMHE/ACA, 1999 (IQRP)	Paige, 2005	Krause et. al, 2005	Osaka University, 2006	CHE, 2007	Nuffic (MINT), 2009	DAAD, 2009	Chin & Ching, 2009
	<p>Campus life</p> <p>Monitoring the process</p>				<p>Recruitment of foreign students</p> <p>Internationalisation of the curriculum</p> <p>Internationalisation of staff</p> <p>International knowledge sharing</p> <p>International research activities</p>	<p>Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung Stipends</p> <p>Measures for the promotion of internationality</p> <p>Foreign students</p>	<p>International students &amp; scholars</p> <p>Study abroad program</p> <p>Campus life</p> <p>Performance evaluation and Accountability</p>

### 3.2.3 Purpose of the indicator sets

Tools and indicator sets have been developed to help institutions or programmes to gain more insight into their internationalisation efforts. In many cases, the purpose of the indicators is to help institutions in analysing their own respective situations (self-evaluation). Other tools are meant to enable comparisons to be made between parts of an institution, between entire institutions or between an institution and the average of those participating (benchmarking). Self evaluation and benchmarking have an internal function, usually aimed at improvement. Some of the tools are specifically intended to enable institutions to be ranked by external parties. In other cases they can be used to accredit institutions. Again others are only used to provide information, sometimes for the wider public, sometimes for experts and academics involved in studying internationalisation of higher education. Brief explanations of these categories are given below.

#### *Self-evaluation*

One of the most obvious and frequently used tools for mapping and assessing activities within an organisation is self-evaluation. Self-evaluations are internal exercises and serve internal purposes. Sometimes they also serve as input for subsequent external evaluations (for instance in the framework of a national quality assessment system, or for evaluations by accreditation bodies). In general, in a self-evaluation exercise the internal situation is tested against objective indicators that have been established internally (e.g., the objectives formulated in the institution's policy paper or strategic plan) or against performance targets enforced by external parties (e.g. in government directives or accreditation procedures). A self-evaluation only assesses the performance of an institution in relation to these objectives and targets. As such, the self-evaluation does not say anything about the institution's relative performance.

For that reason, self-evaluations do not serve a public purpose. They either provide the input for an external (government) assessment or serve as an initial phase in the internal quality improvement process. The internal value of a self-assessment is that it enables an institution to identify shortcomings and possible solutions. Sometimes however, an internal self-evaluation can have an external component. This can be the case when external peers are involved in the self evaluation process, for instance in the International Quality Review Programme developed by IMHE and ACA, discussed in chapter 4. Self evaluation then still is an internal assessment, but through the use of external peers, implicit comparisons with other institutions might be made.

#### *Benchmarking*

If the institution explicitly wants to know where it stands vis-à-vis its competitors, it can use benchmarking as a tool. In the past decades, benchmarking has become a popular management tool for HEIs (Birnbaum, 2000). Both self-evaluation and benchmarking are intended for internal quality improvement. The process and the targets are developed and determined within the institution. Benchmarking is an

ongoing exercise in which an institution's internal processes are measured and compared with those of other institutions.

Benchmarking can either be a one-on-one comparison between institutions or programmes. Or it can be a comparison of results of one institution to an average of a peer group.

As a tool, benchmarking brings in an external focus to internal activities. While self-evaluation uses internal and absolute targets, those used in benchmarking are external and relative.

The identification of the peer HEI(s) depends on the objectives of the benchmarking institution. The actual benchmark partner(s) to be selected could be leading institutions, either in general or within a specific area.

In many cases, the comparison with a peer institution – the benchmark – is just the first step. Results of a benchmarking are often quantitative. After having identified the institution performing best in the given indicators, the task is then to analyse the processes which allow this institution to perform best. Then each partner can try to adapt the processes to his/her own institutional setting. Benchmarking is thus not merely a self-evaluation or comparative process, but can also include the dimension of improvement by identifying and implementing good practice. Incorporation of such good practice, or learning from them, and adapting them to the HEIs particular circumstances should then bring the institution on a par with the leaders in the field.<sup>1</sup>

Reasons to engage in benchmarking are:

- to strengthen networks
- information gathering
- insight into possible areas of improvement
- accreditation or certification

### *Classification and Ranking*

While self-evaluation and benchmarking use indicators for the purpose of evaluating a single unit against objective standards or against peers with the aim of internal improvement, rankings and classifications are used to evaluate a group of institutions or other units with the goal of transparency. Standard and criteria for comparison are set outside of the institutions, often by external parties. Another important difference with benchmarks is that university rankings are not primarily intended as management tools or instruments for quality improvement, but rather aim to provide the public with information on the relative quality of institutions.

Rankings and classifications do usually not intend to reflect the state of a university's internationalisation. Rather they intend to reflect the relative quality of an institution within a larger group of institutions. In attempting to do that, they sometimes include indicators that measure the internationalisation of the institution. Considering that rankings usually only take into account a very limited number of indicators in general,

---

<sup>1</sup> For further information on higher education benchmarking see the European Benchmarking Initiative EBI under: <http://www.education-benchmarking.org>

the number of indicators that measure internationalisation or internationality is very small. Examples are the former Times Higher Education/QS rankings that used to take into account the number of international students and number of international staff. The current European classification project – U-map – that is under construction applies a set of internationalisation indicators to categorise institutions. Here the indicators are incoming exchange students, outgoing exchange students, foreign degree seeking students, non-national academic staff and the income from international sources.

#### *Applying the results*

The IMPI toolbox will provide a tool for self-evaluating and benchmarking. However, these activities are not an end in themselves. A self-evaluation or benchmark shows a limited version of reality and is meant to be analysed and interpreted. A risk of monitoring is that one is fulfilled once the results have been presented. The reality behind the figures may still be in need of further steps for instance in terms of quality assurance or sustainability of results as well as translation of the results to stakeholders. Two additional steps could therefore be applying for accreditation and including the results in information provision to stakeholders.

- Accreditation

In specific cases, internationalisation indicators might play a role in accreditation processes. If in a given accreditation framework internationalisation or internationality is part of the accreditation criteria, indicators need to be developed to measure this. In our list, only the accreditation of the Network of International Business Schools focuses explicitly on the degree to which business schools have become international. Furthermore, an example is given of a current project initiated by the Netherlands Flemish Accreditation Organisation (NVAO) in chapter 4.

- Information provision

Many of the listed tools or indicator sets have the objective to inform the public. Organisations like AUCC Canada, UKCOSA or IDP Australia publish information on internationalisation for the general public. The indicator sets can also be developed for research purposes and therewith they focus on a smaller public, mainly fellow academics and other experts. The objective here is more to start a discussion. Examples are the sets developed by Alon and McAllaster (2009), Chin & Ching (2009) and Krause, Coates and James (2005).

### **3.2.4 Levels of assessment**

Higher education is characterised by a high level of autonomy for the disciplines. Likewise, many higher education institutions are characterised by a high level of autonomy of the faculties or schools. This is also likely to result in various levels of internationalisation for different programmes or different schools or faculties. Central level policies and strategies might have more effect on a faculty or programme level in some institutions than in other. Yet, some strategies typically have to be taken on the central level while others can only be implemented at the faculty or programme level.

Depending on the purpose of the tool or indicator set, indicators can measure the level of internationalisation at different levels. One could assess the institution as a whole, focusing on central level strategies and activities, possibly complemented by assessment at lower levels. Here one could measure the level of internationalisation at lower organisational levels such as faculties, schools, departments, etc. One could also take an educational programme as the unit of analysis.

Assessment could also take place at the individual level. Most commonly, such assessments would focus on students and would in the terminology of section 2.2.1. be regarded as outcomes. Assessing the international competencies of graduates could for instance be seen as an indicator for internationalisation. Other outcomes could be foreign language proficiency or the number of students active in the international labour market. Individual assessment could also focus on academic staff. Here, one can measure the involvement in international research projects or networks, the number of internationally published journal articles, the amount of international research funding acquired, etc.

Obviously, assessments can be either comprehensive or more specialised, measuring respectively whole institutions (and their campuses) or parts thereof, focusing on central, decentral or individual levels.

### **3.2.5 Methods of indicator validation**

The indicator set can be based on a wide variety of sources. Here we can distinguish between two categories.

First, the set can be based on expert judgements and knowledge about internationalisation. In this case, indicators are established because practice and theory show that these data are important for an institutions level of internationalisation or internationality. In some cases this also leads to meta indicator sets where the indicators are based on (a selection of) indicators of other sets, tools or studies.

Second, indicator sets can be based on stakeholder involvement. In these cases, the development of the indicator set is the responsibility of the stakeholder community or the joint responsibility of the developers and the stakeholders. In measuring internationalisation, the institutions are probably the most obvious stakeholders to engage in such a consultation. Even if institutions are involved, one can discuss about whom in the university should be involved: Policy makers? Academics? Students? Another option is to involve external stakeholders in the process. Here one can think of representatives from business or from international organisations.

If stakeholders are involved in the process, one usually does not start from scratch. Involving stakeholders is often done only after a broad set of indicators has already been identified. These indicators are based on expert judgement or on meta evaluations of existing tools or indicator sets.

### **3.2.6 Methods of data collection and data verification**

A final distinctive element in the development of internationalisation indicator sets is the manner in which data is collected. Most common in this respect are surveys and institutional data collection for self-evaluation. Other ways in which institutional data could be found is through external parties, for instance through peer reviews or panel visits, or through data collection from existing databases like government data on higher education institutions or data from national or international statistical offices.

The two most used methods for data collection – surveys and institutional data collection for self-evaluation – are also the least objective. At the same time they tend to deliver the most relevant data from the perspective of the institutions or programmes. This shows that objectivity becomes more relevant once the research is done by external researchers or meant to inform external stakeholders. However in case of quality improvement goals, these data collection methods may give the most valuable information.

For external researchers self-evaluation or survey-based methods may therefore not be the only sources to consult. If indicators ask for politically sensitive data or when clear normative values are attached to the indicators, institutions might be inclined to ‘massage’ their data or even present the wrong data. One way to deal with this is to limit the indicator set to criteria that can be checked externally (e.g. numbers of foreign students) as opposed to data that is intrinsically subjective or at least very hard to make objective (e.g. the quality of programmes).

In cases where data collection is limited, relying on external, objective sources like peer reviews, panel visits or external data, might increase the validity or trustworthiness of the final assessment. In those cases however, an in-depth assessment of internationalisation activities is difficult because nearly all data are only accessible to the institutions themselves. The use of peer reviews or panel visits might take away the image of bias; it does pose the question of how detailed such an assessment can be. After all, peers or panels will always have only limited access to information on the assessed institution.

In the end, institutions themselves are the key actors in collecting sufficient data to arrive at a thorough assessment of internationalisation activities. Only by surveys or other ways of self reporting, institutions will be able to collect the information. An important norm for this way of data collection is to limit the possibility of bias by only, or at least mostly, using verifiable data. One other way to increase the quality of the collected data is to involve institutions and other stakeholders in the development of the indicators.

### **3.3 Current projects**

Apart from the tools that have been developed already (see annex 1), new tools are being developed at this very moment. Some are directly aimed at developing indicators for internationalisation, others contribute indirectly to the development of indicators or only focus partly on internationalisation. A few of the most recent projects in this area will be discussed briefly in this paragraph because of the importance they may have for the IMPI project.

#### **3.3.1 AHELO project**

The OECD is setting up a Feasibility Study for the International Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes. The initiative was taken after discussions at the 2006 OECD Ministerial Conference in Athens. The OECD countries concluded that they needed not only to make higher education more available but also of better quality. Current assessment methods were considered to be inadequate to meet these changes. An alternative had to be found and therefore the AHELO project was initiated.

The AHELO<sup>2</sup> project is aimed at assessing learning outcomes and examining which criteria influence these outcomes. The idea is that these learning outcomes are assessed on an international scale by creating measures that are valid for all cultures and languages. Higher education students in over ten different countries will take part in a feasibility study to determine the bounds of this project, possibly resulting in the creation of a full-scale AHELO.

The project is based on the idea that higher education cannot be reduced to a handful of criteria which leaves out more than it includes like rankings do. Furthermore, the project wants to fight copy cat behaviour of universities and instead stimulate diversity. The AHELO project intends to measure as many influencing factors as possible focusing on teaching and learning, the two items that rankings usually exclude.

#### **3.3.2 Internationalisation certificate**

The Dutch/Flemish accreditation organisation (NVAO) has proposed a new initiative to the ECA members: 'Towards a European Certificate for quality of internationalisation in higher education'. Assessment of internationalisation of a programme can be undertaken by the accreditation organisation possibly resulting in a certificate.

---

<sup>2</sup> [www.oecd.org/edu/ahelo](http://www.oecd.org/edu/ahelo)

The certificate is meant to:<sup>3</sup>

- stimulate the level of internationalisation
- enhance the level of internationalisation in HEIs
- deliver a tool for forming alliances between HEIs
- develop an additional information tool for students, teachers and HEIs
- give an incentive to those concerned with internationalisation
- “reward” good and excellent forms of internationalisation

The assessment will be based on the ambition level as defined by the programme management in a policy statement. The certificate will only be applicable to programme level. The programme must prove that internationalisation has an impact on the quality of the programme; more in particular, a comparison will be made between intended and achieved learning outcomes. The assessment will be undertaken by an experienced, international and authoritative panel.

The project has set standards for internationalisation in six categories 1) Vision or policy on internationalisation, 2) Learning outcomes, 3) Teaching and learning, 4) Staff, 5) Service and 6) Students.

Proof for the certificate can be demonstrated by using mapping tools like MINT, the Indicator list of the Flemish Bologna promoters and in the future possibly IMPI. A pilot project is planned for 2010.

### 3.3.3 U-map project

U-map is a research project to develop a European Classification of Higher Education Institutions.<sup>4</sup> Institutional diversity has become an important item on the political agenda especially after the development of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and the European Research Area (ERA). The classification will make this diversity more transparent. U-Map will position institutions on a number of dimensions. International orientation is one of the six items assessed.

The dimensions are:

1. teaching and learning profile
2. student profile
3. research involvement
4. involvement in knowledge exchange
5. international orientation
6. regional engagement

---

<sup>3</sup> Speech delivered by Karl Dittrich at NVAO seminar on Quality Assurance and Internationalisation December 2009.

<sup>4</sup> Frans van Vught (Ed.) (2009). “Mapping the Higher Education Landscape, Towards a European Classification of Higher Education”, Springer.

The U-map project has delivered its final report in January 2010. Results of the first phase were published in 2005<sup>5</sup>. The second phase was concluded with a report in 2008<sup>6</sup>. The U-map has been developed in an interactive process including stakeholders. This resulted in a number of mapping dimensions and their indicators, an on-line classification tool and an organisational model to implement the classification.

### **3.3.4 Erasmus Mobility Quality Tools (EMQT)**

The EMQT project promotes quality of Erasmus mobility by developing monitoring and self-certification tools to support HEIs. The project aims to deliver “Guidelines for good practice in Erasmus Mobility” and a “Quality Tools’ Box”. The latter will describe key indicators and guidelines to improve positioning of HEIs as well as mechanisms/procedures. Indicators developed in this project will be considered for inclusion in the IMPI toolbox. The project works with a Balanced Scorecard approach (goal, action, indicator, possible benchmark). Due to its ongoing status, the indicator lists were not available for the public at the date of this research.

Each of the projects introduced in this paragraph have an important challenge to face. A balance of comprehensiveness with usability and flexibility has to be found, which is also one of the main challenges in the IMPI project.

---

<sup>5</sup> Institutional Profiles, towards a Typology of Higher Education Institutions in Europe

<sup>6</sup> Mapping Diversity: Developing a European Classification of Higher Education Institutions

## 4. Examples of indicator projects

In this chapter we will discuss in depth some of the most important indicator projects that were found during the desk research. A selection of indicator sets will be analysed in detail in order to identify the crucial dimensions in the different indicator sets and the lessons this analysis provides for the toolbox. The examples were selected on the basis of their relevance to the IMPI project, the year of publication and their scope.

### 4.1 *Example 1: International Quality Review Process (IQRP)*

#### 4.1.1 Background and actors

The International Quality Review Process (IQRP) has been developed by the Institutional Management in Higher Education programme (IMHE) of the OECD together with the Academic Cooperation Association and the Association of European Universities (CRE), a predecessor of the EUA. It was one of the first international initiatives to assist institutions in evaluating and improving the quality of their internationalisation activities. In 1997 not many HEIs had developed an internationalisation strategy. Even fewer HEIs had a process in place to monitor and review the implementation of such a strategy.

Yet IMHE and ACA felt it was time to start looking at the quality of internationalisation and therefore at the internationalisation process as a whole. IMHE had been active in the field of cross-country analysis of institutional level strategies for internationalisation of higher education since 1994. At a seminar held by IMHE in 1995 it was decided to set up a pilot project on quality assurance and internationalisation and to do so in cooperation with ACA. At that time ACA was already working in the field of quality in international academic cooperation, mobility and exchange.

#### 4.1.2 Philosophy of the project, political setting

The IMHE and ACA intended to set up a tool to stimulate developing, monitoring and reviewing the implementation of an internationalisation strategy within HEIs.

As internationalisation within the project was considered to be the “process of integrating an international dimension into the teaching, research and service function of the institution” the evaluation criteria were focussed explicitly on these three aspects.

The guiding principle for the design of the IQRP was that the indicators should be flexible in an individual situation by respecting any cultural value or belief. The IQRP framework and guidelines have been developed to accommodate different (cultural) contexts.

The evaluation tool is really a guideline for institutions to undertake an Internationalisation Quality Review Process. The basis for the assessment are the aims and objectives set by the institution itself. The IQRP provides them with a framework to assist HEIs in their intention to improve the quality of internationalisation. It offers them a tool to assess whether they achieved the goals they set for themselves. The self assessment should focus on assessing the quality of internationalisation rather than providing a description of all activities undertaken.

The IQRP is not a certification nor an accreditation process but merely a supporting tool for HEIs. It is not intended to set criteria, prescribe practices or advocate standardisation of internationalisation. No comparison is made between institutions. This is a notable difference compared to the tools we will discuss in the following paragraphs.

The self-evaluation should be considered a learning method for the institution involved rather than a means to produce information for the external review team. The peer review serves as a mirror to self-assessment and adds value from an outside perspective.

### **4.1.3 Methodology**

The first set of indicators was developed between 1995 and 1997 by IMHE and ACA based on workshops and discussions held at a 1994 seminar on "Institutional Strategies for Internationalization of Higher Education". Also the National Study on Internationalisation at Canadian Universities undertaken by Jane Knight was used as input. This survey reports on a 1993 survey of 89 Canadian institutions concerning their efforts toward greater internationalization.

The IQRP was then tested in three institutions in Finland, the USA and Australia. Members of the development team were part of the review team in order to assess the applicability and determine areas of improvement.

The project was also presented at several seminars to gather feedback in order to improve the tool. Feedback from experts as well as the pilot participants led to a new version of the IQRP which was then tested in a larger pilot group in 1997-1998. This time the pilot had two objectives 1. revising the original materials and 2. testing the IQRP in different types of institutions and a variety of country/cultural contexts. The indicators were on all five continents. It was applied in institutions differing both in types and in sizes.

Hans de Wit (University of Amsterdam) and Jane Knight (University of Toronto) were two of the researchers involved in the development of the tool. They would later also be involved in other tools discussed in the previous chapter. In 1999 the Association of European Universities was added to the team of ACA and IMHE to offer the IQRP as a regular service to European Universities and worldwide.

#### 4.1.4 Results and application

##### *Results*

The evaluation tool provided by IMHE/OECD and ACA is in fact a set of guidelines to undertake an International Quality Review Process (IQRP). IQRP is a quality audit programme aimed at assessing the international objectives stated by the participating institution. The tool focuses on three main elements<sup>7</sup>:

- the achievement of the institution's stated goals and objectives for internationalisation
- the integration of an international dimension into the primary functions and priorities of the institution
- the inclusion of internationalisation as a key element in the institution's overall quality assurance system

The IQR process is based on two main components: self-assessment and external review by an international review team. The review provides institutions with assistance in developing their internationalisation strategy by offering suggestions for procedures, guidelines and tools.

The self assessment report is structured in the following way:

1. Context
2. Internationalisation strategies and policies
3. Organisational and support structures
4. Academic programmes and students
5. Study abroad and student exchange programmes
6. Research and scholarly collaboration
7. Contracts and services
8. Conclusion

Reports of both the self-evaluation process and the peer review are available to the evaluated institution only. Results can only be published after consent of the institution involved.

##### *Application*

---

<sup>7</sup> Knight, J. (2008) *Higher Education in Turmoil, The changing world of internationalization*, Sense Publishers.

IMHE/OECD had the IQRP tested in institutions around the world. Institutions have used the evaluation tool to design an internationalisation plan or to support internal quality assessment and assurance procedures. The fact that the IQRP was used both for planning as well as review process points to the trend that more and more institutions have started to think about internationalisation in terms of coherent strategies rather than just individual activities.

Analysing the experiences they have identified some lessons learned:

- \* Evaluating the internationalisation process within a HEI requires a considerable investment in time and commitment from both staff and management.
- \* The objective of the review and the resource implications should therefore be clear to all involved.
- \* More time investment did not always result in a more valuable report. Review fatigue may set in or the attention for data collection overshadows the attention for the actual analysis of the data which forms a valuable part of the assessment.
- \* Recommendations resulting from the review will in turn require more time investment when the implementation phase starts.

The review process can be undertaken within the framework or related to other quality assurance procedures like accreditation, ISO certification, benchmarking etc. In recent years the European Centre for Strategic Management of Universities (ESMU) has based her benchmarking programme for internationalisation on IQRP.

#### **4.1.5 Source:**

Knight, J. (2008) *Higher Education in Turmoil, The changing world of internationalization*, Sense Publishers.

## **4.2 Example 2: ACE Review Process**

### **4.2.1 Background and actors**

In 2001 and 2003, ACE conducted two national surveys on US HEIs. These surveys were funded by the Ford Foundation. Their aim was to find out how internationalised these institutions were, i.e. if they were “highly active” or “less active” in internationalisation and which strategies they used to become more international. These surveys are the basis of four publications by Madeleine F. Green, focussing on community colleges, on liberal arts universities, on comprehensive universities and on research universities. The methodology and findings of one of the publication on research universities will be described in more detail as an example below.

### **4.2.2 Philosophy of the project, political setting**

The reason ACE undertook the 2001 and 2003 surveys on U.S. HEIs was that there were no national data available on campus internationalisation strategies. There was „proof by anecdote“ and many calls to action, but no data about the extent to which campuses were engaged in different internationalisation practices and strategies.

Our example in this case is the 2005 publication “Measuring Internationalisation at Research Universities”. This type of university comprises only 7 percent of all higher education institutions, but enrolls almost 30 percent of students. Due to its wide range of undergraduate and graduate programmes, it is able to offer a wide range of international opportunities. In addition we look at the most recent survey, conducted in 2006 and published in 2008 (Green, et al., 2008).

### **4.2.3 Methodology**

The ACE Review Process was largely based on the IQRP. However, the aim was to simplify the latter and to make it less time consuming to use and thereby easier applicable in the US situation. Furthermore the project team made a distinction between ‘highly active’ in internationalisation and ‘less active’. The definitions were based on literature review and consultation of an advisory board of international education experts. ‘Highly active’ was decided to mean: Having a high level of integration of international/global themes and content in the teaching, research and service functions of the institution.

Subsequently a survey was developed and conducted in 2001-2002 among three groups: institutions, undergraduate faculty and undergraduate students. The surveys conducted in 2001 were aimed to give insight into the state of internationalisation in US Higher Education Institutions compared to the situation in 1988. The survey was

limited to education and did not include research or development cooperation activities.

Furthermore, an internationalisation index was set up based on the series of publications to distinguish 'high activity' universities from 'less active' ones. The index was set up for each of the four types of institutions from the Carnegie Classification system in use at the time and reports were published for each of the four types. We want to take a closer look on the methodology and the findings of the study on research universities.

Of the 234 regionally accredited research universities in the nation (as defined in the Carnegie classification system in use at the time), a sample of 223 (95 percent) was drawn, of which 144, or 65 percent, responded. A literature review and the consultation of an advisory board of experts in international education resulted in approximately 30 institutional questions (see annex). These questions were mailed to the presidents of the sample institutions in September 2001. After the data had been gathered, the survey was used as the basis of an "internationalisation index". In order to assign levels of internationalisation to the institutions surveyed, the responses were coded (in different ways) as zeros and ones or in values between zero and one. A five point scale would be recoded to: 0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1.

Some questions were eliminated from the index because they could not be analysed quantitatively or because of low response rates. The questions were then grouped in six dimensions:

1. articulated commitment
2. academic offerings
3. organisational infrastructure
4. external funding
5. institutional investment in faculty
6. international students and student programmes

No dimension is weighted more than another. The dimension scores were used to calculate the overall internationalisation score.

After deriving scores for each dimension, ACE averaged the dimension scores for each institution to determine an overall score for that institution. The academic offerings dimension, being more important than the others, was adjusted to weigh 50 percent more than the others. An overall quintile ranking was achieved by assigning research institutions to quintiles based on their overall score. Thus, 20 percent of the total number of responding institutions was placed into each of the quintiles.

Therefore, of the 144 research universities in the sample, 40 percent (58 institutions) were placed in the top two quintiles (the fourth and fifth quintiles) and were labelled "highly active"; 60 percent (86 institutions) were placed in the bottom three quintiles (the first through third quintiles) and labelled "less active." The resulting overall score cut-off between the top two and bottom three quintiles was 2.30. Therefore, research universities categorized as "highly active" had an overall score greater than or equal to 2.30, and those categorized as "less active" had an overall score less than 2.30.

A correction was made for those institutions which did not fill out all questions. Averages of those questions in the same type of education were added to the results of these institutions.

For the 2006 survey, the dimensions of indicators for internationalisation were changed slightly. ACE convened an advisory group of experts who reviewed and refined the survey. They kept a majority of the 2001 survey questions, revised some questions for clarity, developed additional survey questions within the existing areas of focus, and added a new series of questions on delivering U.S. education abroad to non- U.S. students (see appendix 2 for the final survey instrument). The major dimensions used in the survey were:

1. *Institutional support* (including stated institutional commitment, organizational structure and staffing, and external funding).
2. *Academic requirements, programs, and extracurricular activities* (including foreign-language requirements and offerings, international/global course requirements, education abroad, use of technology for internationalization, joint degrees, and campus activities).
3. *Faculty policies and opportunities* (including funding for faculty opportunities and criteria for promotion, tenure, and hiring).
4. *International students* (including enrolments, recruiting targets and strategies, financial support for international students, and programs and support services).

#### **4.2.4 Results and application**

On a five-point scale (“zero,” “low,” “medium,” “medium-high,” and “high”), the majority of research universities scored “medium” (34 percent) or “medium-high” (57 percent) as a measure of their overall level of internationalisation. Only 2 percent scored “high.”

In the dimension Articulated Commitment slightly less than one-quarter of research universities scored “high”. The most common instrument of internationalisation in this dimension is to provide students with the possibility to study abroad without delaying their graduation (more than 80 percent of all the institutions use this). The highly active institutions are likely to have assessed their internationalisation strategy within the last three years (78 percent).

Nearly half the research universities scored “medium-high” on the availability of academic offerings; 16 percent scored “high.” 95 percent of all research universities offer study abroad for credits. For highly active institutions it is also common to require students to take a general education course with an international focus (66 percent).

Half of the respondents scored “medium-high” on having an infrastructure that supported international education (human resources and facilities dedicated to international education), and another one-fifth scored “high.” In this dimension, the

most prevalent strategy is to maintain an international office (97 percent). Highly active universities were likely to have a campus-wide internationalisation task force (86 percent).

Research universities registered a wide range of scores in terms of seeking and receiving funding from federal, state, and private sources. Approximately one-fourth scored either “zero” or “low” on this dimension and a similar proportion scored “high.” More than 80 percent of research universities sought external funding dedicated to internationalisation. Highly active universities were much more likely than less active institutions to receive external funding from all sources: 88 percent received private funding, 79 percent received federal funding, and 53 percent received state funding.

On the faculty level most research universities made some investment in their members’ international education: 42 percent scored “medium,” 24 percent scored “medium-high,” and 11 percent scored “high” in this dimension. Approximately 7 in 10 research universities provided funding for faculty to travel abroad to meetings or conferences, or to study or conduct research abroad. In addition to using these strategies, highly active universities were likely to provide funding for faculty to internationalise their courses (71 percent) or teach abroad (64 percent).

Concerning extracurricular activities for students, nearly 70 percent of research universities scored “medium”. None scored either “zero” or “high.” The most commonly used strategy by all institutions was providing funding for ongoing international activities on campus (87 percent). Highly active research universities were likely to provide a meeting place for students to discuss international topics (78 percent), funds for scholarships for international students (60 percent), or funds for recruitment officers to travel abroad (59 percent).

In 2006, new surveys were conducted among 2746 institutions with a response rate of 39%. The results have been published in several publications in which institutions were grouped according to the Basic Carnegie Classification in use at that time: Doctorate granting universities, Master’s Colleges and universities, Baccalaureate Colleges and Associate Colleges. Among all institutions, doctorate-granting universities were most likely to enrol undergraduate international students; however, international students remain a small proportion of the undergraduate student population. Doctorate-granting universities also committed significant resources to recruitment and support for international students. A substantial proportion of master’s colleges and universities had policies and practices that supported internationalisation. Master’s institutions have made important gains in internationalisation since 2001.

Compared to 2001, the major progress in the internationalisation of U.S. campuses in general could be observed in the proportion of institutions offering education abroad opportunities for credit had risen sharply. Also, more institutions were investing in international opportunities for faculty. Finally, institutional efforts to provide extracurricular international learning with opportunities such as buddy programs for

U.S. and international students, language partner programs, and language residence halls had increased (Green et al., 2008).

#### **4.2.5 Source**

Green, M. F., Luu, D., & Burris, B. (2008). Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: 2008 edition. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Green, Madeleine F. (2005): "Measuring Internationalization at Comprehensive Universities." American Council on Education.

Green, Madeleine F. (2005): "Measuring Internationalization at Research Universities." American Council on Education. <http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/2005FordResearch.pdf>

Green, Madeleine F. and Laura Siaya (2005): "Measuring Internationalization at Community Colleges." American Council on Education.

Green, Madeleine F. (2005): "Measuring Internationalization at Liberal Arts Colleges." American Council on Education.

### **4.3 Example 3: Japanese Study to Develop Evaluation Criteria to Assess the Internationalisation of Universities**

#### **4.3.1 Background and actors**

Osaka University set up a study to develop evaluation criteria for internationalisation for Japanese HEIs to fill a gap in evaluation techniques. So far internationalisation in Japanese universities had not been assessed university-wide, but only at the level of programmes or small units within the university. In 2003 HEIs implemented a self-monitoring and external evaluation system to “assess their international linkages and exchange activities”. The project was led by the National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE) resulted in the following evaluation categories:

- A. Incoming and outgoing faculty members
- B. Educational and student exchange
- C. Organisation of and participation in international conferences
- D. Implementation of and participation in international joint research
- E. International cooperation for assisting developing countries and others
- F. Internationalisation of local communities

Some items however seemed to favour larger universities (both in size as well as budget) over smaller ones. A similar effect was shown for full-scale universities at a higher research level. It was concluded that characteristics and sizes of HEIs needed to be taken into account to ensure objective and valid evaluation.

In 2004 the need for criteria was also stimulated by several changes in the Higher Education environment in Japan:

- National universities in Japan became independent administrative entities. This required independent decision-making and management initiatives.
- Increased competition was faced due to the decreasing demographic number of 18-year olds in Japan.
- Attention for quality assurance of education, effects of education, administrative assessment and cost awareness started to increase.

These changes were faced by the universities with new international activities, previously unknown. New forms of student exchange programmes were developed. Recruitment of foreign students has developed resulting in overseas offices for handling applications. Other overseas offices were set up to strengthen research ties. The Japanese universities realised that paradoxically surviving as an independent institution meant setting international collaborations. This would give them access to resources (both human and physical) that would otherwise not be affordable for a single institution.

In 2005 several competitive funds were introduced to stimulate internationalisation in higher education from a national view. The government called for the evaluation of the internationalisation activities undertaken under the schemes. Furthermore, increased attention was being paid to information disclosure and accountability in general. As a result of this, greater emphasis was placed on the establishment of institutional strategies for internationalisation. One of the main questions to be answered by the Japanese HE sector is how internationalisation criteria can be integrated into the regular quality assurance and accreditation systems.

#### **4.3.2 Philosophy of the project, political setting**

The list of evaluation indicators for internationalisation was set up to provide institutions with a useful tool to stimulate internationalisation of the curriculum and research activities by means of self-review.

Though internationalisation is in general terms meant to change and improve the education and research environments. The concept of internationalisation still varies considerably between stakeholders within the institutions. Evaluating internationalisation should therefore allow for this diversity. The evaluation criteria delivered by the project should be effective in different contexts of internationalisation. The study should therefore offer multiple criteria from which a selection can be made based on the purpose and form of internationalisation in a Japanese university. Internationalisation in Japan currently focuses on three themes:

- A. Mobility of students and staff
- B. Mobility and accreditation of programmes and degrees
- C. Research project activities

#### **4.3.3 Methodology**

The goal of the study was to set up a prototype based on comparative research of overseas models.

Firstly, research was undertaken on the concept of internationalisation and its diversity drawing the background and studying the theoretical scheme of internationalisation. A number of scholars including Ulrich Teichler, Hans de Wit and Jane Knight were consulted as well as the American Council on Education in order to conduct comparative studies of the internationalisation review process.

Secondly, studies were conducted on internationalisation in Europe, North America, Australia and Asia. Europe received most attention because “understanding the trend toward the internationalisation of higher education in Europe is the key to ensuring progress in this study”.

An onsite survey was undertaken among mainly Danish HEIs. Furthermore, interviews with ACA and EUA staff were held. The trend in Europe gave valuable suggestions for Japan concerning the significance of developing education systems

and frameworks required for internationalisation. Japan is involved in the UMAP network and feels the same challenge as many European countries do of determining what should be the language of instruction in higher education.

Thirdly, evaluation techniques and criteria to assess internationalisation were studied as well as two specific tools: IQRP, implemented by the OECD and IMHE, and the ACE Internationalisation Review conducted by the American Council on Education. Also quality assurance and accreditation systems in several national frameworks were studied. The fact that IQRP was not a fixed but an evolving programme was later applied to the Japanese indicator list. The Japanese evaluation set up by the National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Accreditation was also analysed.

Fourthly, criteria were developed, based on the available models that suited the Japanese situation. The background and characteristics of Japanese universities were taken into account when establishing the indicators.

The IQRP and ACE guidelines were used as a reference as well as the Internationalisation Performance indicators by Michael Paige and the Activity Category and viewpoint of the National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE). Study was done on the availability of data in public sources. These data could add value to more subjective evaluations. Furthermore, the data gave suggestion for indicators for evaluating internationalisation at university level.

Fifthly, the criteria were applied to universities and the evaluation results were analysed identifying the validity as well as the limitations of the criteria. A test of the indicators was executed among Japanese universities and feedback was given through on site surveys. The results, like the lack of generalisability and impracticality, were to be used to present a revised version of the indicator list.

Finally, a set of evaluation criteria that is flexible enough to be applicable to a broad range of universities of different sizes and backgrounds was proposed. According to the National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation the indicators should be improved continuously through feedback from case studies and the members of the research team will continue working to simplify material.

#### **4.3.4 Results and application**

##### **Results**

An “à la carte menu” of indicators was developed and published consisting of 8 major categories, 23 intermediate categories and 49 detailed categories. Indicators were split up in two themes: 1) organisations & environments and 2) curriculum.

A suitability index was added for each category showing the type of institution the indicator would be most suitable for. This however turned out to be rather arbitrary and therefore it was decided to have individual universities select indicators

themselves which would be applicable. Analysing these choices could result in knowledge of applicability for certain types of institutions. The system of classification used allows for analysis on budgets and organisational structure.

Additional results were that a network of researchers involved in the assessment of internationalisation of higher education, has been set up and that several international symposia were organised.

## Application

The indicators developed in this project can be utilised as a self-evaluation tool. The project team recommends the following steps:

1. *Clarification of Goals for internationalisation:* Using the tool for self-evaluation is preceded by setting the definition and aims of internationalisation within a specific institution. Only then it becomes possible to select the proper indicators and decide how to use them.
2. *Clarification of Evaluation objectives:* Evaluation results can be used for several purposes. Deciding on the purpose before using the indicator list is important to retrieve the information required. Possible objectives of the evaluation could be:
  - Improvement of educational programmes
  - Developing strategies and objectives based on comparison with peers
  - Increasing effectiveness and adequate use of resources
  - Accountability to financiers
3. *Choosing an evaluation model:* The indicator list can be used for:
  - Self review
  - Peer review: external experts focus on weak points as discovered during the self review.
  - Benchmarking: to set up a model to compare against. This will point out the issues in need of improvement and can facilitate goal setting.

Combinations of these evaluation models lead to frameworks. The first framework identified in this project is the self-improvement framework consisting of self review and peer review. The second framework is a benchmarking framework also consisting of self review and peer review but based on the fact that multiple universities use the same standards and that peer review at these universities is also using the same standards. Benchmarking requires small adjustments to the indicator list and its application. Some indicators are more suitable for comparison than others. Furthermore, benchmarking partners need to have agreement on the extent of information sharing.

4. In addition to the indicator list it is recommended to *make a SWOT analysis* to compare strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.

5. Consensus has to be reached within the university on the question whether evaluation results will *be made public* or not.

For the near future, the project team planned to conduct a survey on the national level, utilising the indicator list. Through international comparative analysis, benchmarking and ranking activities might be made possible according to the team. The team also planned to establish a web database on the internationalisation of HEIs. Furthermore it planned to place a stronger focus on what the actual contribution of campus internationalisation is towards learning outcome enhancement of both domestic and international students.

#### **4.3.5 Source:**

Osaka University / Norio Furushiro *Study to Develop Evaluation Criteria to Assess the Internationalization of Universities Japan 2006*

#### **4.4 Example 4: CHE Indicator project**

##### **4.4.1 Background and actors**

In Germany, internationality played a key role in nearly all HEIs in 2006 and within the overall context of higher education politics, international research cooperation was gaining more and more weight. Furthermore, graduates increasingly had to present themselves in a global job market. The proliferation of global budgets and targeted use of resources also raised the need to find ways of measuring internationality and internationalisation in a higher education context.

Demand came from three groups of stakeholders:

- HEIs trying to determine their own degree of internationality with the help of key figures
- Ranking organisations making comparisons at international level
- Ministries demanding HEIs to foster an international approach and document it appropriately. This is part of the target-settings and target agreements between HEIs and ministries.

As a result of the demand for data and yet the lack thereof, four German HEIs and CHE started a project in 2006 to measure internationalisation addressing the significance of key figures as an indicator for internationality of HEIs. Attention is also paid to construction validity, objectivity and reliability of the questions.

CHE planned to include the quantitative assessment of internationality and internationalisation in its University Ranking. This is planned to happen in the next rounds of the ranking.

##### **4.4.2 Philosophy of the project, political setting**

To measure internationality and/or internationalisation, a comprehensive set of instruments of possible indicators was to be developed, which offers all German HEIs, independent from their individual target settings and profiles, a sufficient base to allow these areas to be discussed in upcoming internal and external debates.

According to CHE Consult, any HEI taking part in the working group should be able to select an individual and relevant set of indicators that help the institution visualise its own ideas of internationality and internationalisation. The set of overall indicators should be applicable as the basis of a nationwide ranking of HEIs.

The project was set up to develop useful indicators rather than indicators on the basis of availability to prevent the generation of “dead” data and offer room for innovative approaches. CHE states that their experience with rankings has shown them that there is a correlation between importance and availability of data. If the

process of internationalisation as a comparison of target and actual states or the determination of the actual state of internationality is of prime interest for the HEIs, it will be possible to acquire data which have so far not been available, because the HEIs will make them available in their own interest.

Availability of the indicators should therefore not take precedence over the question about which aspects of internationality should be measured with which indicators with reference to the individual objectives of the HEI. At the same time, the project acknowledges that in order to achieve a useful measurement it should clearly be determined in advance what can be assessed as measurable “internationality” and “internationalisation” and under which conditions this takes place.

In the CHE project indicators and key figures differ in definition: a key figure represents a value without any reference to other values (e.g. the number of international doctoral candidates), whereas an indicator describes such a key figure in relation to another figure (e.g. the proportion of international doctoral candidates in relation to the total number of doctoral candidates at an HEI).

Hidden targets such as the acquisition of indicators for the determination of budget cut options jeopardise the entire process. Open discussions and cooperation in providing data will decrease. CHE holds the view that open communication and the willingness to reach a consensus are preconditions for the success of indicator-based internationalisation processes.

Academic research plays an important role concerning internationality and internationalisation. The CHE tool is taking into account the variety in research aspects. Evaluating research findings in connection with the internationality or internationalisation of HEIs often proves difficult because a particular research performance cannot always be awarded a certain level of international significance. This makes it more important to relate them to a global standard. Furthermore, a distinctive level of internationality cannot realistically be achieved if sufficient infrastructure is lacking.

The project was also designed to provide HEIs with a set of indicators that can be used over a longer period of time. Determining internationality for evaluations and rankings had been based principally on snapshots. In contrast, indicators for internationalisation (time series) have a medium- and long-term effect and are, for example, important in the context of quality assurance processes.

#### **4.4.3 Methodology**

The focus of interest was on the internal processes in HEIs that produce the internationality or internationalisation indicators. To this end, a set of targets was developed. A heterogeneous group of HEIs was involved to assure applicability in different situations.

Indicators were developed in various joint brainstorming sessions and then

assigned to overall aspects, research or teaching and studies. Then, thematic areas were defined – such as service, new recruits or study programmes – to which individual indicators were assigned. Indicators were then differentiated to input indicators and output indicators. Input indicators were defined as factors contributing to the creation of findings (such as staff structures, curricular questions, allocation of resources) whereas output indicators represented findings at the end of academic processes (e.g. graduates or research findings).

Input indicators are used to compare a type of organisation with others, or weaknesses are linked to certain organisational aspects. Output indicators unveil possible trouble areas without pointing to input areas in need of improvement. The latter has to be undertaken in a separate process. Moreover, output indicators can document developments specified in a strategy or target agreement.

#### **4.4.4 Results and application**

##### **Results**

A total of 186 key figures and indicators was determined in the project, 170 of them can be illustrated in time series. There are 162 key figures and indicators that emerge from the areas of input and process; 24 could be determined for the output area; 69 indicators refer to “overall aspects”, 45 to „research“, and 72 to “teaching and studies“. The full indicator list is provided in appendix 2.

##### **Application**

The indicators collected can be applied to both the overall university or to smaller units. Data acquisition takes a considerable effort as does the regular update of the data stock. It is therefore necessary to concentrate on a manageable number of indicators. Users compile a mix of indicators based on their international strategy.

Before using the indicators, HEIs must therefore set themselves internationality goals and draw up a strategy of how to achieve these goals. This process consists of the following steps:

- 1 definition of the internationalisation targets,
- 2 development of a coherent internationalisation strategy,
- 3 compilation of a catalogue of short-, medium- and long-term measures ensuring the implementation and realisation of the internationalisation strategy,
- 4 development of a quality management system that:
  - effectively accompanies the implementation of the measures and adjusts the measures, if necessary.
  - documents and analyses its influence on the strategy targets.

A subject-specific assessment is recommended by this project as an overall assessment of the entire HEI blurs the differences between the individual subjects and thus the profile of the HEI. Indicators should therefore only be used for

comparative rankings if they are assigned to scientific disciplines. It is advised to select indicators that can be obtained in all universities by justifiable effort. Indicators stating the internationality or internationalisation of an HEI in total should play only a descriptive role in rankings. They are rather being used within a HEI or for comparison with other HEIs.

Three main issues related to data quality are important:

*Validity:* When using indicators, HEIs should take care to measure only what needs to be measured. Measuring a target or a measurement with more than one indicator is recommended as indicators generally focus on a certain aspect of performance, but it is usually difficult to illustrate a broad target or a complex process with an individual indicator.

*Applicability:* When repeating measurements as often as required and the basic data has not changed in the meantime, the measurements should always give the same results. As far as the time series are concerned, these have to be considered as a whole as this is the only way to recognise long-term developments. Aggregations bear the risk of minimising differences. Observations over a period of 5 to 10 years are recommended as they offer useful comparable values and set a limit to data acquisition.

*Objectiveness:* The results have to be independent from the person who carries out the measurement. The suggested key figures and indicators refer to actual values, not to target values, i.e. scholarship funds are the funds actually distributed (expended costs) and not the budgeted funds.

The indicators are said to be generally suitable for ranking. The decision on how to use these indicators for ranking is up to the interested party. However, CHE also warns that most international rankings leave the impression that it is possible to define a “world-class university“. This leads increasingly to political decisions as regards funds allocations based on rankings, and therefore to an acceptance of these assumptions as facts. An international reputation is therefore particularly difficult to measure.

#### **4.4.5 Source:**

Brandenburg, Uwe / Gero Federkeil: *How to measure internationality and internationalisation of higher education institutions! Indicators and key figures.* Germany. 2007.  
[http://www.che.de/downloads/How\\_to\\_measure\\_internationality\\_AP\\_92.pdf](http://www.che.de/downloads/How_to_measure_internationality_AP_92.pdf)

#### **4.5 Example 5: Nuffic tool Mapping Internationalisation (MINT)**

##### **4.5.1 Background and actors**

In the Netherlands in 2007 internationalisation had become an almost regular feature of higher education. The extent to which internationalisation objectives were specified however was not clear, not even to the higher education institutes themselves. Furthermore, no clear view existed on the links between those objectives and the activities undertaken to reach them. Several institutes openly wondered what the actual results of their internationalisation policy and activities were. Institutional leaders were looking for a frame of reference or a comparison.

To fill this gap, the Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education (Nuffic) decided to develop a tool, in cooperation with the HEIs. The tool, Mapping Internationalisation (MINT), aims to support HEIs and provide them with a complete overview of their internationalisation policy, activities and support. This helps individual institutes

- 1 to set an agenda for improvement,
- 2 to formulate a clear internationalisation profile and
- 3 to develop a benchmark

In addition, Nuffic's goal was to start a discussion at several levels (institutional, national, international) on quality assurance for internationalisation, also in terms of coherence between internationalisation objectives and activities.

##### **4.5.2 Philosophy of the project, political setting**

###### *Goals of the tool*

The tool was developed to support institutions as a service from the national body for internationalisation of higher education in the Netherlands. The particular wish of the higher education institutions was that MINT should combine a self-evaluation tool with a benchmarking tool. The main focus would be on self-evaluation.

In addition to providing institutional aids, MINT was designed to launch a broad discussion about making strategic choices in internationalisation, the coherence between internationalisation objectives and activities, identifying internationalisation indicators and defining standards to measure the impact of internationalisation.

To evaluate internationalisation within an institution, it was found to be essential to establish the objectives of the internationalisation process within an institution. Confusion between objectives and activities, and even results and supporting structures, often arises in this regard. Strategic alliances for instance can be reasoned not to be an end in themselves, but rather a means for institutes to improve their profiles and increase their knowledge production. A discussion and awareness phase is an important step in the further professionalisation of internationalisation.

#### *Data analysis*

In the first instance, the unit or institution itself must draw conclusions from the self-evaluation or benchmark. It is up to the users to determine the approach taken in analysing the results. It is certainly not the purpose of the tool to prompt every institution to start developing all activities referred to in the questionnaire. On the contrary, the tool allows for an institution's own profile to emerge and to choose between different objectives and activities. The quality of a self-evaluation tool's results is by definition dependent on the input provided. It is up to the institution carrying out the self-evaluation to do so in an as serious and realistic manner as possible.

Some institutes wanted to compare their current performance with their ambitions. Lack of this option in the MINT tool could potentially blur the view, especially if new objectives have been set while the old activities are continuing. In that case, the tool might point to a disconnection between the activities and the objectives, while in fact no such problem exists. Moreover, some people argue that ambitions tend to be hollow phrases, at least more often than those involved care to admit. Both of these problems are avoided when the tool is filled twice. First with data of the current year  $n$  and then with target data in the mid-term future say  $n+4$ .

#### *Data ownership*

Data are primarily for internal use and only in second instance for determining an average benchmark. Data is only visible to the individual users. Individual data from this project does not become available to third parties unless the institution or programme in question gives permission. Nuffic has access to all data and may use this information to improve the tool. In addition (blind) data on how institutions in the Netherlands are doing in the field of internationalisation may be published. This enables Nuffic to improve its services and products to support the institutes.

#### *Internationalisation process*

Internationalisation objectives can be achieved through a great variety of activities, some of which serve several objectives. International knowledge sharing could include students improving their intercultural skills, but it is usually set up as a public service while institutes hope it will also improve their reputation. Conversely, one objective may be served by several activities. Activities may reinforce each other in such a way that the objective can be more easily achieved.

A successful internationalisation process means making logical links between goals and activities and showing the expected outcomes, in other words, if the organisational structure and internationalisation efforts reflect the stated mission.

### **4.5.3 Methodology**

The MINT tool has been developed in three steps. First desk research was undertaken, secondly the questionnaires were designed and finally a pilot study was carried out.

### Phase 1 Desk research

An overview of existing evaluation tools and literature was set up. Indicators of internationalisation obtained from the literature on the subject were used to develop the questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed on the basis of existing tools like IQRP, the CHE indicator list, ACE and the EFQM excellence model.

From the literature four assumptions were extracted to design MINT:

- The project adopted the definition of internationalisation by Jane Knight: “The process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education.”<sup>8</sup>
- Education is the key topic; research is not included in this tool.
- The level of evaluation is the institution, programme or any level in between.
- A focus on active implementation of internationalisation. This means that it only includes indicators for internationalisation which were actually planned by the institute instead of being forced on it by external factors.

### Phase 2 Design

The tool was developed to support institutions. In order for it to be useful a feedback panel of higher education institutions was set up. A strong practical view on the development was provided by the feedback panel to strengthen the theoretical basis. The feedback panel was composed of experts from 15 different institutes. The group’s members determined the focus of the tool in terms of whether it should be a self-evaluation, benchmarking or ranking instrument, or possibly a combination of the three. In addition, the group provided feedback on the tool’s structure, subjects and indicators and, moreover, played a valuable role in defining the terms to be used.

The decision was made to provide the tool in digital form. After all, the staff of an institution should experience the tool as a support, not a burden. A web tool promotes:

1. dissemination
2. joint completion by several people
3. storing of data
4. reporting
5. comparison

A framework was developed from the foregoing process in which a relationship was established between internationalisation policy and activities. In the questionnaire for each group of activities, questions are asked about the objectives being pursued. Other prerequisites such as housing and visa, which are not core activities in their own right, are also included in the tool. They are considered to be essential supporting structures for internationalisation in an institute. Constituent parts of the tool are therefore:

1. Goals of internationalisation;
2. Internationalisation activities;
3. Facilities;

---

<sup>8</sup> Jane Knight, “Internationalisation remodeled: definition, approaches and rationales” 2003.

4. Quality assurance and
5. Key figures.

These five themes show the full scope of internationalisation and each consists of a wide range of items. These items are interrelated. Some have more connections than others and some connections are one way whereas others go both ways. Due to the great complexity of these interrelations and the fact that they are not universal, the toolkit does not predetermine or even suggest any relations. Furthermore, MINT does not go into full depth. It is focussed on education only excluding research and focuses on output rather than outcome.

It is up to the user to select the relevant themes and the connections between them as applicable in the specific situation being mapped. The value of an indicator and how relevant the indicator is must be defined by the context in which one uses the indicator.

### **Phase 3 Pilot**

Finally, the webtool was tested by a pilot group of almost 50 users. Pilot participants stated that it is important to recognise the different values each of the activities represent for different institutes, faculties or programmes. A Law Faculty and a Faculty of Business Economics would not attach the same importance to programmes taught in foreign languages or, for example, the number of foreign professors. This has led to the inclusion of a question on the importance attached to each of the goals, activities and services. The results of the pilot project were used to develop a new and improved version of the tool.

#### **4.5.4 Results and application**

##### **Results**

Two relatively comprehensive questionnaires have been developed one of which can be filled in by an educational programme. The other one can be filled by a unit on any higher aggregation level than an individual programme, for instance a department, faculty or institution. The questionnaires can be filled out in full or in part according to needs and priorities of the programme or unit.

The questionnaires are a combination of qualitative, quantified and a number of quantitative questions. The expectation is therefore that the answers given will indicate both individual particulars and make benchmarking possible. With regard to the latter, a number of questions relate to key figures that can serve as an institution's profile.

The new version of MINT is entirely in English. This makes it possible to perform international benchmarks at a later stage. It also enables users to make comparisons with partner institutions in both the Netherlands and abroad.

### *Webtool*

MINT consists of a digital self-evaluation form that generates an outline of various activities and goals related to internationalisation. The tool is accessible by log in ensuring confidentiality of data. The webtool contains:

1. Questionnaire module

A structure based on optional parts (building blocks) was opted for. These can be filled in as needed. Answers are only mandatory with regard to a few general questions, as they serve as the basis of a report. All other questions are optional to enable the tool to be properly attuned to the policy direction chosen by the institution. This approach also makes it possible for institutions to highlight the international elements that are important to them.

2. Reports module

- The Self-evaluation Report shows all the data a user entered in a logical format including graphs and tables. The Management Summary shows the highlights of the data entered focussing on internationalisation policy and quality assurance.
- In a Comparison Report users can compare their programme or institution/faculty to a similar programme or institution/faculty.
- Finally, a Benchmark Report compares data of one user to the average of a group of users who share certain characteristics e.g. averages of all Universities of Applied Sciences or of all Faculties of Sociology.

3. Archive module

The tool allows archiving previous reports and comparison with data from previous years.

### *Discussion*

The discussion on internationalisation objectives and activities has started, both within institutes and on a national level. The discussion generated by the pilot was also expanded through international conferences.

## **Application**

Institutions can use MINT for:

- baseline measurements
- self-evaluations including a comparison in time
- intra-institutional and inter-institutional comparisons
- benchmarking

The tool provides institutions with a view of the current state of their internationalisation policy, activities and support structures and enables them to:

- classify and profile their institution
- obtain input for a policy plan
- prepare visitations and accreditations
- monitor and guide policies and activities

### *Phases*

The use of the MINT tool is divided into the following three phases:

#### Phase 1 (September to May)

The tool is open for data inputting. All other available features can also be used. Users have access to the requested comparison and benchmark reports.

#### Phase 2 (May to June)

The tool's questionnaire will be closed, so that the comparison reports can be prepared. Users have the opportunity to apply for the comparison reports of their choice. During this phase it is not possible to enter new data or change any previously submitted data. However, users are still able to view their questionnaires, self-evaluation reports and management summaries.

#### Phase 3 (June to September)

Users are able to access the benchmark and comparison reports. During this phase it is not possible to enter new data or change any previously submitted data. However, users are still able to view their questionnaires, self-evaluation reports and management summaries.

A benchmark group will consist of at least five users to ensure data anonymity. Furthermore, benchmarking requires consensus on the minimum scores. These could only be set if the group shows sufficient similarities in terms of objectives and profile. If institutions or faculties wish to use MINT for comparison or benchmarking purposes, they will have to find comparable partners in terms of, for instance, internationalisation objectives, student numbers, programme content or region. Doing so makes comparisons between institutions/faculties more valid and therefore more valuable. Mutual agreements must subsequently be made about the organisational units to be compared, the confidentiality of data and the unit and time of measurement. Use can be made in this regard of the standard procedures formulated in the Benchmark Code of Conduct.<sup>9</sup>

#### *Users*

The tool was launched in September 2009. More than 60 programmes and over 70 other units within HEIs have been registered to use the tool. 66% (36) of all institutions in the Netherlands has been registered for at least one of the two levels of registration. Some of these institutions have indicated they will use the tool for a number of programmes or units within their organisation. Not all of the registered users have already in fact started using the tool. The webtool was originally designed for Dutch HEIs. However, due to explicit demand a small scale pilot with participants from other countries has been set up to test its international applicability. There are participants from Belgium, Sweden and Mexico.

#### **4.5.5 Source:**

Adinda van Gaalen (2009). "Developing a tool for measuring internationalisation: a case study". Measuring success in the internationalisation of higher education, EAIE Occasional Paper 22, Hans de Wit (ed.) (2009), Amsterdam, p. 77-91. [www.nuffic.nl/mint](http://www.nuffic.nl/mint)

---

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.au.dk/benchmarking/codeofconduct.pdf>

#### **4.6 Example 6: DAAD Development and collection of profile data**

##### **4.6.1 Background**

The project “Internationality at German Higher Education Institutions – Conception and Collection of Profile Data” has created a method to measure the degree of internationality of German HEIs. With the help of the empirical benchmarks that were calculated in the course of this project, each institution is now able to compare itself with other institutions of similar size and profile in order to evaluate its own level of internationality. Since the focus was not on internationalisation as a process but on internationality as a present situation, indicators concerning objectives, strategies, procedures of implementation and control of success were not used.

##### **4.6.2 Philosophy of the project, political setting**

Although globalisation is a process that has rapidly altered the society at the latest after the end of the Second World War, internationality and internationalisation have been discussed extensively in higher education politics only since the 1990s. In Europe, this discussion culminated in the Bologna process. Internationality now belongs to the core of higher education and it is an important factor in the granting of funds. But in spite of its high relevance, there is no valid and comparable data to measure and evaluate internationalisation. That is why the DAAD and its partners commissioned a study to develop and collect profile data of internationality of German HEIs.

The German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), the German Rectors’ Conference (HRK) and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (AvH) have carried out the project in cooperation with the Association for Empirical Studies (GES). They invited all German HEIs to participate of which the majority accepted. The project was founded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF).

##### **4.6.3 Methodology**

The three-step-procedure of the project consisted of the design phase, the pilot phase and the implementation phase. In the design phase, key fields of action and international activities in the sectors teaching, research and administration were identified and operationalised by a set of potential performance indicators. The pilot phase was a practical field test of these indicators resulting in the elimination of certain indicators, because the universities were not able to provide the necessary data. Only those characteristics of internationality were taken into consideration in the implementation phase that could be made available by the institutions within a certain probability.

Besides the data that was provided by the HEIs (58% responded to the survey), the relevant data of the Federal Statistical Office and the science organisations taking part in the project were used for the calculation of indicators. Clusters of HEIs were defined, in order to specify which internationalisation strategies are used in different

types of universities and other institutions of higher education. The clusters are: Technical universities, large universities (more than 20,000 students), small universities (up to 20,000 students), large Fachhochschulen (more than 5,000 students), small Fachhochschulen (up to 5,000 students) and universities for arts and music.

The original structure of the indicators, according to the type of activity and the functional areas of higher education institutions, was examined on plausibility and redundancy with the help of factor analyses. If one accepts the results of the statistical analysis, the indicators developed in the framework of the project represent seven core areas of the internationality of higher education institutions (see annex).

#### **4.6.4 Application and results**

The indicators were applied and the results evaluated for the whole of German HEIs and for the six clusters. The findings include:

In the academic year 2006, the proportion of foreigners amongst students was 9.5 percent and among graduates 7.7 percent. Within the group of scientific and artistic staff, the quote of foreign nationals was 10 percent and among professors 5.5 percent. Universities for arts and music lead, with respect to both the quote of foreign students and graduates as well as the quote of foreign scientific and artistic staff followed by Technical Universities and general Universities and with a greater distance the Fachhochschulen (core area a).

In relation to the number of students in the 5th and 6th semester, the proportion of ERASMUS students in the academic year 2007 was 8.3 percent. The ERASMUS rate is highest at Universities (large Universities 11.3% and small Universities 9.6%), while only 5 percent of students at Fachhochschulen studied abroad with the help of an ERASMUS grant. International Study Programmes with a compulsory period abroad are crystallisations of strategic decisions, of higher education institutions, to make the transfer of international competences and skills an integral part of the curriculum. Almost half of the International Study Programmes at German universities are characterised by a compulsory period abroad (44.4%). Studying and teaching are often the subjects of the international cooperation. Even without the consideration of Erasmus, about half of the mid-2008 in the higher education compass, of the HRK registered international cooperation's, were concerned with topics from the fields of study and teaching and mutual recognition of study achievements and results of examinations (core area b).

In two-thirds of the International Study Programmes offered by German higher education institutions, at least part of the lectures are taught in a foreign language, predominantly in English. These kinds of study programmes are especially for international students and are mainly trademarks of Technical Universities and general Universities. They are established with the intention of encouraging foreign students with none or limited proficiency in German language to decide in favour of studying in Germany (core area c).

Although the implementation of study and training programmes abroad has been gaining importance worldwide since the early nineties, only a few German higher education institutions are active in this area. In response to the web based survey, 37 higher education institutions reported about 69 courses and study programmes offered in another country. Large Universities are often engaged in offshore higher education (34.8%), followed by Technical Universities (28.6%) and small Universities (22,6%) (core area d).

From 2000 until 2007, the number of German ERASMUS lecturers has grown from about 2,000 to more than 2,700. In relation to the number of staff members mainly concerned with teaching, i.e. professors and lecturers, the ratio of ERASMUS lecturers in the academic year 2007 was 5.9 percent. Professors and lecturers from Fachhochschulen more frequently use an ERASMUS grant to teach at a foreign partner university, while the respective proportion at Technical Universities was lowest (core area e).

Several indicators, which represent not only internationality but also academic quality, are in a close (statistical) relationship. These include the percentage of fellows and award winners of the Humboldt Foundation, support from the DAAD and the quota of foreign students in doctoral programmes. The last figure, by definition, relates only to universities, which have the right to award doctoral degrees. Although fellows and award winners of the Humboldt Foundation, in principal, may carry out research at any type of higher education institution, they are de facto almost exclusively at Universities and Technical Universities. The DAAD and its programs reach a wider range of higher education institutions. However, the general and Technical Universities receive significantly more funding than Universities for arts and music or Fachhochschulen. While Technical Universities are the best, with respect to the proportion of foreigners among PhD graduates and the support provided by the DAAD, the large Universities are hosting more fellows and award winners of the Humboldt foundation than other types of higher education institutions (core area f).

Over 40 percent, of the partnerships in the HRK Higher Education Compass, solely or partly have the purpose to strengthen the cooperation in research. Particularly active in this field are Technical Universities (62.8% of partnerships) and smaller Universities (48.6%). Institutions which have taken part in the survey and provided details about the sources of their research funding received, in 2007, approximately 12 percent of their external funding from abroad, mostly from the research programs of the European Union: 9 percent of the total research funding, or three quarters of research funding from abroad (core area g).

Overall, large sets of data about important areas of the internationality of higher education institutions are available, which relatively easily could be converted into indicators and distributed to Universities and Fachhochschulen. Examples are the data from the Federal Statistical Office, support figures of the DAAD and the

Humboldt foundation, information on international cooperation and international courses contained by the HRK Higher Education Compass, etc.

Due to a lack of appropriate reporting systems, the collection of data at higher education institutions is more difficult. Especially at large Universities, international activities are taking place to a considerable extent in the faculties / departments. In many cases a systematic storage of data is neither available centrally nor otherwise. Consequently, complete thematic areas were considered a priori as not accessible or the validity of results of the survey is threatened by incomplete data sets. To remedy this situation, a procedure for the collection and provision of an agreed set of key information should be negotiated with (interested) higher education institutions.

Services of higher education institutions aiming to support internationality are difficult to quantify. Thus, the pre-condition for the establishment of indicators is missing, which would allow on the one hand a grading between institutions and on the other hand the analysis of the relationship between the extent of service, e.g. marketing efforts or assistance and advice for foreign students, and the level of internationality. Therefore, it would be desirable that at least data on the personnel and financial resources to this area would be made available.

Internationality of research could not only conceptually be improved but also with respect to the available base of information. In recent years, the internationalisation of teaching and learning were foremost the centre of attention. Thus, the knowledge about this area is well developed by numerous research projects and studies. In comparison, the capture of the international dimension of research at higher education institutions was rather a peripheral issue.

To better classify the degree of internationalisation at the national level and to set policy benchmarks, international comparative figures would be desirable. The project has provided a wealth of interesting results, which might not only be of interest for individual higher education institutions but also for decision makers concerned with the internationalisation of higher education at the federal and state level. To ensure that the figures are fruitful, also in a longer perspective and could be applied to the monitoring of internationalisation strategies, a regular update should be undertaken, which would also allow the formation of time series.

#### **4.6.5 Source**

German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) (2010): „Internationalität an deutschen Hochschulen – Konzeption und Erhebung von Profildaten“. PDF available under: [http://www.daad.de/imperia/md/content/portrait/publikationen/dok\\_und\\_mat\\_band\\_65.pdf](http://www.daad.de/imperia/md/content/portrait/publikationen/dok_und_mat_band_65.pdf) (retrieved 23.03.2010).

#### **4.7 Example 7: “Internationalization of Higher Education: Performance Assessment and Indicators” (Paige, 2005)**

##### **4.7.1 Background**

The article “Internationalization of Higher Education: Performance Assessment and Indicators” has been published in the Nagoya Journal of Higher Education by R. Michael Paige, Professor at the College of Education and Human Development, University of Minnesota. The Center for the Studies of Higher Education (CSHE) at Nagoya University has been involved in studying this issue in the Japanese university context and has identified performance indicators that can be used as tools for assessing a university's overall performance. Paige's paper builds on the work done by CSHE by examining performance assessment and performance indicators specifically as they relate to the internationalisation of higher education.

##### **4.7.2 Philosophy of the project, political setting**

The author starts his paper by stating that “there is pressure on universities to become more international in character.” Thus, Paige discusses what internationalisation means and how it can be assessed by taking a closer look at performance assessment and performance indicators that have been found by CSHE as well as other researchers and projects. The paper results in a list of key performance indicators regarding internationalisation.

##### **4.7.3 Methodology**

At first, Paige provides definitions for the terms “globalization” and “internationalization”, as well as an overview of the concept of performance assessment and of the concept of performance indicators. In a second step, he presents a review of the literature on internationalisation from which he draws ten key performance categories as a third step. These ten categories consist of a varying number of performance indicators.

##### **4.7.4 Results**

Paige arrives at a list of over 80 indicators in ten categories (see appendix 2). The author explains that the indicators can be used in several ways. They can be used by way of assessment, assessing whether certain realities of internationalisation are present or not. The indicators might also be used as a benchmark, assessing progress in internationalisation over time. A third functionality of the list might be that it can invoke a discussion on what characteristics make an institution – or parts thereof – international in nature.

##### **4.7.5 Source**

Paige, Michael R. (2005): “Internationalization of Higher Education: Performance Assessment and Indicators”. Nagoya Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 5, p. 99-122. PDF available under: <http://www.cshe.nagoya-u.ac.jp/publications/journal/no5/08.pdf> (retrieved 10.03.2010).

#### **4.8 Example 8: “Trends and Indicators of Taiwan’s Higher Education Internationalization” (Chin, & Ching, 2009)**

##### **4.8.1 Background**

Higher education in Taiwan has undergone a far-reaching transformation, changing from centralised to decentralised and becoming market-oriented. For example, the state owned HEIs were transferred into independent legal entities, which reduced the control of the Ministry of Education over these HEIs. Universities were also forced to seek funds and private HEIs were founded. The number of HEIs increased from 7 in 1950 to 164 in 2008.

##### **4.8.2 Philosophy of the project, political setting**

Taiwan’s government has realised the importance of internationalisation for its universities relatively late and the global competition is just now becoming more and more evident. That is why Chin and Ching discuss the current local trends with regard to internationalisation and introduce a set of performance indicators for the evaluation of Taiwan’s HEIs.

##### **4.8.3 Main actors**

Joseph Meng-Chun Chin, Professor, Department of Education, National Chengchi University, Taiwan and Gregory S. Ching, Lunghwa University of Science and Technology, Taiwan.

##### **4.8.4 Methodology**

A qualitative and descriptive research, consisting of questionnaires, individual and focus group interviews, as well as a literature review has been conducted. The authors analysed all HEIs websites and then sent a formal letter to all of the local international offices and officers. From the 164 HEIs, a total of 22 international officers responded. Core questions on the factors and strategies involved in the internationalisation of Taiwan’s HEIs were asked and discussed. After the interview, insights from the respondents were coded and categorized into major trends by seeking common key words and phrases. The result is a list of internationalisation indicators suggested by international officers. In a second phase, interviews with international scholars were conducted during the summer of 2008. 12 international experts were invited, three of them replied. The interviews were analysed as in phase one. Phase three consisted of individual and focus group interviews with international students coming from two well-known HEIs situated in Taipei City, Taiwan. Posters were used to announce the interview sessions. A total of 35 interviewees coming from 20 countries participated in the sessions. The interviews were then transcribed, noting their patterns into themes, and clustering items into categories.

During the following literature review, previous foreign and local studies on internationalisation were analysed. The authors then compared the indicators they had found by asking local international officers, internationalisation experts and international students with the indicators that were the results of previous studies. The comparison of those sets of indicators led to a total of 12 performance indicators to measure the internationalisation in Taiwan's HEIs.

#### **4.8.5 Results: List of indicators**

On the basis of this study three lists of indicators were established. One based on the views of internationalisation officers of Taiwanese universities, one based on the views of international experts and scholars and one based on opinions of international students. The list of the internationalisation officers was most comprehensive, followed by the experts and then the students.

#### **4.8.6 Source**

Chin, Joseph Meng-Chun/ Ching, Gregory S. (2009): "Trends and Indicators of Taiwan's Higher Education Internationalization". *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, Vol 18, No 2 (2009), pp. 185-203. PDF available under: <http://www.philjol.info/index.php/TAPER/article/viewArticle/1322> retrieved 10.03.2010).



The evaluation tools discussed in the previous chapter have shown a range of characteristics which are summarised in the table beneath.

**Table 2 Characteristics of indicators sets**

	<b>IQRP (IMHE/ACA)</b>	<b>ACE</b>	<b>Osaka University</b>	<b>CHE</b>	<b>MINT (Nuffic)</b>	<b>DAAD</b>
<b>Type of data</b>	<i>Input, output</i>	<i>Input, output</i>	<i>Input, output</i>	<i>Input, output</i>	<i>Input, output and quality assurance</i>	<i>Input, output</i>
<b>Dimensions</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Context</li> <li>2. Internationalisation strategies and policies</li> <li>3. Organisational and support structures</li> <li>4. Academic programmes and students</li> <li>5. Study abroad and student exchange programs</li> <li>6. Research and scholarly collaboration</li> <li>7. Contracts and services</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Institutional support</li> <li>2. Academic requirements, programmes and extracurricular activities</li> <li>3. Faculty policies and opportunities</li> <li>4. International students</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mission, goals and plans of the university</li> <li>2. Structures and staff</li> <li>3. Budgeting and implementation</li> <li>4. International dimensions of research activities</li> <li>5. Support system information provision and infrastructure</li> <li>6. Multifaceted promotion of international affiliation</li> <li>7. Internationalisation of the university curriculum</li> </ol> <p>Joint programmes of external organisations</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overall aspects (input)</li> <li>2. Academic research (input)</li> <li>3. Academic research (output)</li> <li>4. Teaching and studies (input)</li> <li>5. Teaching and studies (output)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Goals</li> <li>2. Activities <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Education in a foreign language</li> <li>b. Credit mobility</li> <li>c. Recruitment of foreign students</li> <li>d. Internationalisation of the curriculum</li> <li>e. Internationalisation of staff</li> <li>f. International knowledge sharing</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Support</li> <li>4. Quality assurance</li> <li>5. Key figures</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Foreign students</li> <li>2. Mobility of staff and students in the ERASMUS framework</li> <li>3. Mobility of German students outside the ERASMUS framework</li> <li>4. Involvement of institutions in DAAD programmes</li> <li>5. International programmes</li> <li>6. International collaborations</li> <li>7. Academic staff with foreign nationality</li> <li>8. Third stream research funding from abroad</li> <li>9. Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung Stipends</li> <li>10. Measures for the promotion of internationality</li> <li>11. Foreign students</li> </ol>
<b>Purpose</b>	Self evaluation	Self evaluation and information provision	Self evaluation	Information provision and ranking	Self evaluation and benchmarking	Self evaluation and benchmarking
<b>Level of assessment</b>	Institution	Institution	Institution	Institution and smaller units	Programme, institution and intermediate levels	Institution
<b>Methods of data collection</b>	Institutional data collection and peer review	Survey	Institutional data collection and peer review	Institutional data collection	Institutional data collection	Survey and statistical data (from Federal Statistics Office)

## 5. Main Conclusions

Due to the increased complexity of internationalisation, mapping and profiling indicators are required. In recent years a shift has taken place from the internationalisation of specific core functions of institutions to the internationalisation of the institution as a whole, including its objectives. The complexity of internationalisation in higher education institutions has created a need for more sophisticated data on these internationalisation activities. University leaders and managers now demand a much wider set of indicators.

Both 'Internationalisation' as well as 'Internationality' are valuable concepts for the IMPI project. Internationalisation refers to the process of becoming international. Whereas 'Internationality' refers to how international a university is at a certain point in time (Brandenburg & Federkeil, 2007).

Measuring can be divided into three basic items: 1. knowing where your organisation stands (mapping) in terms of internationalisation 2. examining the value of the internationalisation efforts (evaluating) and 3. setting an organisational identity (profiling), showing both internal and external stakeholders the strengths and ambitions of your organisation from an internationalisation perspective.

From the desk research we learned how important it is to get answers to the following questions:

- What will be the level on which mapping is taking place: programme, faculty, institution, etc.?
- Which items are important?
- What is a logical categorisation of items?
- How do you map a theme like Third mission?
- What indicators are useful in terms of practice, culture and law?

Only a few tools presented in chapter 3 measure outcome rather than input or output. Tools which do look at outcome are usually focussed strictly on intercultural competences of students. The methodology they use is usually based on self assessment by students which cannot be expected to deliver very objective results.

### 5.1 *Important characteristics of case studies*

The straight forward structure presented in Chapter 3 on self-evaluation, benchmarking and classification or ranking tools does not completely reflect reality. Some tools offer the option of both self evaluation and benchmarking (as does MINT developed by Nuffic). Other tools additionally offer the option of ranking (CHE tool). Finally benchmarking instruments can be used to classify as does the Network of International Business Schools (NIBS) by only allowing those institutions into their network which live up to a set benchmark. Some accreditation organisations use

benchmarking to grant special labels to programmes which are proven to be more successful or more special than their peers.

Benchmarking models for internationalisation have been developed, for instance, within the context of the Network of International Business Schools (NIBS) and the European Benchmarking Programme (by ESMU). The NIBS model is a combination of benchmarking and ranking. In the near future, benchmarking will be used to determine whether potential new member institutes can be allowed to join the network. Some accreditation organisations use benchmarking to grant special labels to programmes which are proven to be more successful or more special than their peers. Both self-evaluation and benchmarking are intended for internal quality improvement.

Audits by internal or external (peer) committees that were presented in the IQRP and Osaka University cases are still a rare phenomenon though it does happen here and there, especially when the focus is on processes (of an IO for instance) rather than outcomes.

## **5.2 Conclusions drawn from examples**

There are no universal standards (yet) for evaluating internationalisation and its quality. However, a few interesting tools have been developed over the past few years. Many of these tools have been based on already existing tools, so for the purpose of composing the IMPI indicator list it is useful to focus on the most recently developed tools like those of the Flemish Bologna Experts (not described in detail in this report), CHE and Nuffic. As the indicator list of the Flemish Bologna Experts is available in Dutch only and has been partly based on the Dutch MINT webtool this set of indicators will not be discussed in detail.

One of the most prominent characteristics is the purpose of the indicator list. Is it about gaining insight in order to improve its own quality (self-evaluation and benchmarking) or to set a profile to distinguish oneself within a group of institutions (benchmarking)? Finally it could be about the relative value attached to the HEI by stakeholders (ranking). Some of the self-evaluation tools mentioned earlier like the MINT tool offer the additional feature of benchmarking.

Key to setting up evaluations is determining beforehand what one wants to measure. One of the contributions from the CHE project is the conscious distinction between internationalisation and internationality. The project was designed to provide HEIs with both a set of indicators to make a snapshot showing internationality and to make a time series evaluation including a medium and long term effect of internationalisation. The latter would for example be important in the context of quality assurance processes. Another option is to compare current performance with ambitions.

The CHE project also points out that any attempt to find categories to fit all indicators and yet not to overlap each other will probably fail. As an example international

doctoral training courses or graduate schools are in the cross-over area between teaching and research and input and output.

As only a few tools measure outcome rather than input or output the IMPI project cannot base this part of the toolbox on a large range of previous tools. However, indicators to map impact have been identified by stakeholders as highly important and will therefore need special attention during the development of the toolbox. After all, when all is said and done internationalisation is about the results it delivers, not in terms of foreign student numbers but in terms of their impact on budgets and the quality of education.

If stakeholders are involved in the development process of a tool, one usually does not start from scratch. Involving stakeholders is often done only after a broad set of indicators has already been identified. These indicators are based on expert judgement or on meta evaluations of existing tools or indicator sets.

It can be argued that some activities are in fact support structures for others. Examples include the internationalisation of staff and the provision of programmes taught in other languages. These activities are especially useful to support the internationalisation of the curriculum and student mobility. In that sense, it is possible to create a virtuous circle: offering programmes in English will make it easier to organise staff exchange, which will stimulate the internationalisation of the curriculum.

### **5.3 Lessons for the IMPI toolbox**

In the past five years we have witnessed a strong growth in the number of tools and studies which are trying to identify important indicators for internationalisation. IMPI can build on the results of former indicator projects, but needs to expand the scope in order to include all aspects of internationalisation.

From literature and cases we have learned that a design for a toolbox to measure internationalisation should at least address 1. the purpose of the toolbox, 2. the type of indicators to be measured, 3. the dimensions to be measured, 4. the structure to be used and 5. the method of indicator validation.

## References and Links

Birnbaum, R. (2000) *Management Fads in Higher Education: Where They Come From, what They Do, why They Fail*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bowden, R. (2000). Fantasy higher education: University and college league tables. In: *Quality in Higher Education*, 6(1), 41–60.

Brandenburg, U. and G. Federkeil (2007), *How to measure internationality and internationalisation of higher education institutions! Indicators and key figures*. Working paper No. 92, CHE Centrum für Hochschulentwicklung.

Dill, D.D. and M. Soo (2005) Academic quality, league tables, and public policy: A cross-national analysis of university ranking systems. *Higher Education*, 49: 495–533.

Espeland, W.N. and M. Sauder (2007) *Rankings and Reactivity: How Public Measures Recreate Social Worlds*. In: *American Journal of Sociology*, 113: 1-40.

Furushiro, N. (2006) *Developing Evaluation Criteria to Assess the Internationalization of Universities*, Osaka University

Galen, van A. (2009) “Developing a tool for measuring internationalisation: a case study”. *Measuring success in the internationalisation of higher education*, EAIE Occasional Paper 22, Hans de Wit (ed.) , Amsterdam, p. 77-91.

Green, M., D. Luu and B. Burris (2008) *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses*  
*American Council on Education*, Centre for International Initiatives.

Hofmann, S. (2005) *Lessons learned from the Institutional Evaluation Programme*, EUA <http://www.eua.be/press-corner/press-releases/euas-institutional-evaluation-programme-iep/>

Hudzik, J. and M. Stohl (2009) “Modelling assessment of the outcomes and impacts of internationalisation” *Measuring success in the internationalisation of higher education*, EAIE Occasional Paper 22, Hans de Wit (ed.) , Amsterdam, p. 9-21.

Knight, J. (1994). *Internationalization: elements and checkpoints*. CBIE Research, no. 7. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.

Knight, J. (2004) *Internationalization remodeled: definition, approaches and rationales*, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 5-31.

Knight, J. (2008) *Higher Education in Turmoil, The changing world of internationalization*, Sense Publishers.

Teekens, H. (2006) *Archetypes of internationalisation*, Workshop offered by Nuffic.

Vught, van F. (Ed.) (2009) *Mapping the Higher Education Landscape, Towards a European Classification of Higher Education*, Springer.

ACA/IMHE (1996) Internationalization Quality Review (IQR). Publications which resulted from this review:

- *Quality and Internationalisation in Higher Education* (1999)

[http://www.aca-secretariat.be/02projects/Quality\\_Review.htm](http://www.aca-secretariat.be/02projects/Quality_Review.htm)

- *IAU: Internationalization Survey*

[http://www.unesco.org/iau/internationalization/i\\_survey2.html](http://www.unesco.org/iau/internationalization/i_survey2.html)

EFQM Excellence Model, European Foundation for Quality Management

<http://ww1.efqm.org/en/>

Benchmarking code of conduct

<http://www.au.dk/benchmarking/codeofconduct.pdf>

French Quality Charter for French Government Foreign Scholars

[http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/IMG/pdf/Version\\_anglaise\\_Charte2008.pdf](http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/IMG/pdf/Version_anglaise_Charte2008.pdf)

## Appendix 1: Existing tools and indicator sets

1. SIU / Margrete Sovik *Internationalisation of Norwegian higher education. Suggestion for indicators.*  
Norway 2009
2. DAAD / Simone Burkhardt *Profile data project*  
Germany 2009
3. Hochschul Rektoren Konferenz / Gabriele Hufschmidt, *Internationalising German Higher Education Institutions*  
Germany 2009
4. Nuffic / Adinda van Gaalen & Nico Evers: *Mapping Internationalisation (MINT)*  
The Netherlands 2009 [www.nuffic.nl/mint](http://www.nuffic.nl/mint)
5. INHolland UAS / Sandra Reeb-Gruber: *Checklists Programme Internationalisation*  
The Netherlands 2009
6. Ilan Alon, and Craig M. McAllaster. *Measuring the global footprint of an MBA*  
USA 2009
7. Chin, J.M. & Ching, G. *Trends and Indicators of Taiwan's Higher Education Internationalization*  
Taiwan 2009
8. IAU / Jane Knight *Global Survey/ Internationalization survey*  
2003, 2005 and 2009
9. Swedish National Agency for Higher Education / Gunnar Enequist: *The internationalisation of Higher Education in Sweden*  
Sweden 2005 and 2008
10. Association of Commonwealth Universities / Jay Kubler *ACU Benchmarking Programme*  
1998 and 2008
11. Flemish Bologna experts / H el ene Vanbrabant, Rosette S'Jeegers Micha el Joris and Jan Geens *Indicatoren Kwaliteitszorg Internationalisering*  
Belgium 2008
12. EUA *IEP (Institutional Evaluation Programme)*  
Europe, 2008

13. Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada / Jane Knight  
*Progress and promise*  
Canada 2007
14. Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada *Internationalizing Canadian campuses*  
Canada 2007
15. CHE / Uwe Brandenburg and Gero Federkeil *How to measure internationality and internationalisation of higher education institutions! Indicators and key figures*  
Germany 2007
16. Network of International Business Schools / Ian Charles *NIBS International Accreditation*  
2007
17. EFMD *Internationalisation Survey*  
2007
18. NAFSA *Assessing best practices in internationalisation (ABPI)*  
2007
19. UKCOSA *Benchmarking the provision of services for international students in higher education institutions*  
UK 2007
20. Forum of Education Abroad *Quality Improvement Program (QUIP) for Education Abroad*  
USA 2007
21. National Agency Leonardo da Vinci The Netherlands *Quality of Mobility Projects, Quality and Impact Scan*  
The Netherlands 2007
22. Osaka University / Norio Furushiro *Study to Develop Evaluation Criteria to Assess the Internationalization of Universities*  
Japan 2006
23. New Zealand Ministry of Education / Craig McInnis, Roger Peacock and Vince Catherwood *Internationalisation in New Zealand Tertiary Education Organisations*  
New Zealand 2006
24. Wendy Woon-Yin Chan *The Internationalising of Universities: a comparative case study*  
UK and Hong Kong 2006

25. ANECA/EFMD *ANECA/EFMD indicator set*  
Spain 2006
26. Newcastle University Business School / John Leopold *Curriculum internationalisation*  
UK 2006
27. Nottingham Trent University / Simon Mercado *DOMI amd AOPi frameworks*  
UK 2006
28. Kerri-Lee Krause, Hamish Coates and Richard James *Monitoring the Internationalisation of Higher education: Are there useful quantitative performance Indicators?*  
Australia 2005
29. ESMU / Hans de Wit *European Benchmarking Programme on University Management*  
Europe 2005
30. ACE / Madeleine F. Green *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses*  
USA 2001 and 2006
31. ASCUN / Claudia Aponte *Hacia un modelo de evaluacion de la internacionalizacion para las universidades en Colombia*  
Colombia 2004
32. IDP Education / Ken Back, Dorothy Davis and Alan Olsen *Internationalisation and Higher Education: Goals and Strategies*  
Australia 1996
33. IMHE/ACA/EUA *IQRP (Internationalisation Quality Review programme)*  
1996

## Appendix 2: Indicator Sets and Questionnaires

1.	IQRP .....	70
2.	ACE .....	75
3.	JAPANESE INDICATOR LIST .....	80
4.	CHE .....	85
5.	MINT .....	93
6.	DAAD .....	111
7.	TAIWANESE INDICATORLIST .....	114
8.	SIU .....	115
9.	PAIGE (2005) PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT AND INDICATORS .....	118
10.	CAMPUS FRANCE .....	123
11.	U-MAP .....	125
12.	NVAO PROGRAMME ACCREDITATION AND INTERNATIONALISATION .....	126
13.	EMQT .....	127
	TASK FORCE D: PERFORMANCE AND RECOGNITION .....	138

## 1. IQRP

OECD, 1999

### **Context**

#### **1.1.1 Summary of the higher education system**

- 1) Provide a brief description of the higher education system in the country and indicate
- 2) the position of the institution in the system.

#### **1.1.2 Summary of the institutional profile**

- 3) Age of the institution.
- 4) Student enrolment (undergraduate/graduate).
- 5) Number of faculty and staff.
- 6) Faculties and departments.
- 7) The mission of the institution.
- 8) The history of internationalisation efforts in your institution.

#### **1.1.3 Analysis of the (inter)national context**

- 9) Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis of the (inter)national context for internationalisation of the institution.
- 10) Make reference to national and regional policies and programmes of relevance for the institution's international dimension.

### ***Internationalisation policies and strategies***

- 11) Why is internationalisation important to your institution (rationales)?
- 12) What is the institution's stated policy (goals and objectives) and implementation strategy for internationalisation? Attach existing policy documents, if available.
- 13) What is the relationship between the internationalisation strategy and the institution's overall strategic plan, and what links exist with other relevant policy areas?
- 14) How is internationalisation valued with respect to the institution's overall strategic plan by the different actors in the institution: administration, faculty, students?
- 15) How has the decision-making process for internationalisation policy been structured?
- 16) What is recommended to improve the policies and strategies for internationalisation?
- 17) How can the support and involvement be improved of both leadership, administration, faculty and students to the internationalisation policies and strategies of the institution?

### ***Organisational and support structures***

(Address those issues which are relevant to your institution and undertake a SWOT analysis on the organisational and support structures for internationalisation of the institution.)

#### **1.1.4 Organisation and structures**

- 18) What office/unit/position has the overall and ultimate policy-level responsibility for the internationalisation of the institution?
- 19) Which unit(s) have direct operational responsibility for international activities?

- 20) What is the reporting structure, liaison and communication system (both formally and informally) between the various offices/units/persons involved in internationalisation?
- 21) Provide an organigram, if possible.
- 22) How effective are the existing support structures in relation to the strategic plan for internationalisation?
- 23) What improvements are recommended to make the organisation and support structures more effective in relation to the existing strategies and policies?

### **1.1.5 Planning and evaluation**

- 24) How is internationalisation integrated into institution-wide and department level planning processes and is it effective?
- 25) What system is in place for the evaluation of internationalisation efforts? What impact does it have on these efforts?
- 26) Does the overall quality assurance system (internal/external) include reference to internationalisation? If so, what is its impact?
- 27) What proposals for improvement in the planning and evaluation processes for internationalisation are recommended?

### **1.1.6 Financial support and resource allocation**

- 28) What internal and external sources of support exist for internationalisation? How effective are these funds for the realisation of the objectives and goals for internationalisation?
- 29) What is the mechanism for the allocation of resources (at both central and departmental level) for internationalisation? How effective are these mechanisms?
- 30) What is the institution's process for seeking, securing and maintaining internal and external funding for internationalisation? Are these processes effective?
- 31) What proposals for improvement in the fund allocation and fund-raising for the realisation of the internationalisation of the institution are made?

### **1.1.7 Support services and facilities**

- 32) What specific services and infrastructure exist to support and develop international activities and how effective are they?
- 33) What level of support is available from institution-wide service departments? What is their impact?
- 34) To what degree do the facilities (*e.g.* libraries) and the extra-curricular activities on campus include an international or cross-cultural dimension? What is their impact?
- 35) What recommendations are made to improve the support services and facilities to bring them in line with the internationalisation strategies and policies of the institution?

### ***Academic programmes and students***

(Address those issues which are relevant to your institution and undertake a SWOT analysis on the international dimension of the academic programmes and student policies of the institution.)

### **1.1.8 Internationalisation of the curriculum: area and language studies, degree programmes, teaching and learning process**

- 36) Are there programmes which include options for area and language studies (including courses in intercultural communication and culture studies?) What is their impact?
- 37) How has the international dimension been integrated into the courses/units in the various disciplines? How effective have the integration efforts been?
- 38) What joint or double degree programmes are offered by the institution in partnership with foreign institutions? What is their impact on the curriculum and the students?

- 39) Does teaching include the use of examples, case studies, research, literature, etc., drawn from different countries, regions and cultures? To what effect?
- 40) To what extent is the “international classroom setting” applied, *i.e.* are students encouraged to study together and to interact with foreign students?
- 41) To what extent is instruction given in languages other than the primary language(s) of instruction of the institution?
- 42) What recommendations are made with respect to the future place of area and language studies in the institutional strategies and policies for internationalisation?
- 43) What measures are recommended to improve the international dimension in the curriculum?
- 44) What recommendations are made to improve the internationalisation of the teaching and learning process?

### 1.1.9 Domestic students

- 45) What are the quantitative goals (if any) for the number of students studying abroad annually? Are they being met and how effective are the mechanisms to achieve them?
- 46) Do students participate in international research projects and international networks. How? What is the impact?
- 47) What policies and support services are in place to encourage and support students to participate in international activities? How effective are they?
- 48) Are students being informed and advised about international work/study/research opportunities? Are the mechanisms effective?
- 49) How are students being prepared for international academic experiences (including language and cultural preparation)? Is the preparation effective and what is the impact?
- 50) What recommendations are made to improve the opportunities for students to add an international dimension to their study?

### 1.1.10 Foreign students

- 51) What are the quantitative goals (if any) for the number of foreign students (both fee paying students and exchange students)? How effective are the measures taken to reach these goals?
- 52) What strategies does the institution have to attract, recruit and select foreign fee paying students? What are the objectives behind these strategies and how effective are these strategies?
- 53) What strategies does the institution have to attract and select (bilateral and multilateral programme) exchange students? How effective are they?
- 54) How is the level of academic success of foreign students monitored? How effective is it? How is the integration (educational and social) of foreign students with domestic students and with their local environment monitored? How effective is it?
- 55) How is social guidance and academic counselling for foreign students organised?
- 56) Does a difference exist in objectives, impact and attention between the strategies for foreign fee paying students and exchange students?
- 57) What measures should be taken to improve the strategies for recruitment, selection and integration of foreign fee paying and/or exchange students?

### 1.1.11 Study abroad and student exchange programmes

- 58) What is the range of programmes available for study abroad and student exchange?
- 59) How effective are these programmes?
- 60) How effectively are study abroad periods integrated into the curriculum? Has the transfer and recognition of credits been arranged in an adequate manner?
- 61) To what extent have international work experience or internships been incorporated into the curriculum? What is the impact of these arrangements?
- 62) How are study abroad and student exchange programmes evaluated? In what way have the results of these evaluations been taken into account in the further delivery of these programmes?
- 63) What measures are recommended to improve the quality of the study abroad and student exchange programmes in the overall context of the internationalisation strategies and policies of the institution?

### ***Research and scholarly collaboration***

(Address those issues which are relevant to your institution and undertake a SWOT analysis on the international dimension of research and scholarly collaboration of the institution.)

- 64) Which collaborative agreements exist with foreign institutions/research centres/private companies for research? How effective are these?
- 65) What international/regional research and graduate centres belong to or are sponsored by the institution? What role do they play in the internationalisation strategies and policies of the institution?
- 66) To what degree is the institution involved in international research projects? How successful is it?
- 67) How actively involved is the institution in the production of internationally published scientific articles? What mechanisms are in place to stimulate the involvement?
- 68) What mechanisms are in place to stimulate the institution's performance in organising and benefiting from international conferences and seminars? How effective are these?
- 69) What support (internal and external) structures are in place for international collaborative research? How effective are these?
- 70) What mechanisms exist to guarantee that international research (and its outputs) is linked to internationalisation of teaching? What is the effect?
- 71) What opportunities and resources are made available to stimulate the international dimension in research? Are they effective?
- 72) What recommendations are made to improve the international dimension of research, as part of the strategies and policies of the institution?

### ***Human resources management***

(Address those issues which are relevant to your institution and undertake a SWOT analysis on the international dimension of human resources management of the institution.)

- 73) What mechanisms are in place to involve academic and administrative staff in international activities (at home and abroad)? Please distinguish between research, teaching, publications and development assistance. How effective are these mechanisms?
- 74) What mechanisms are in place to stimulate the presence of foreign academic and administrative staff members on campus (temporary/permanent)? How effective are they?
- 75) How are teaching and research of visiting staff being organised? How effectively are they integrated into the curriculum?
- 76) Do appointment procedures seek for staff from abroad? How effective are they?
- 77) How is selection and recruitment of new staff (academic and administrative) targeted at personnel who are internationally experienced/active? How effective is that policy?
- 78) Are there procedures for selecting staff for international education assignments (*e.g.* for teaching international programmes/to international groups/teaching in other languages)? How effective are they?
- 79) What mechanisms are in place to guarantee and stimulate that staff members possess the knowledge and skills required for teaching in international programmes and for other international assignments? How effective are they?
- 80) Are there mechanisms in place to guarantee that international teaching/research/development assistance experience counts toward promotion and tenure? If so, how effective are they?
- 81) What recommendations are made to improve the international dimension of the human resource management of the institution as part of its internationalisation strategies and policies?

### ***Contracts and services***

(Address those issues which are relevant to your institution and undertake a SWOT analysis on the international dimension of contracts and services of the institution.)

### 1.1.12 Partnerships and networks

- 82) What is the range of bilateral and multilateral collaborative agreements with foreign partner institutions for education? How active/functional are these?
- 83) What procedures exist for the establishment, management and periodic evaluation of partnerships and linkages? How well do these procedures function?
- 84) What is the relation between the policies and strategies at the faculty level and those at the central level? How effective is that relationship?
- 85) What measures are recommended to improve the partnerships and networks the institutions takes part in and their relation to the strategies and policies of the institution?

### 1.1.13 Out of country education programmes

- 86) Does the institution deliver educational programmes to students located in other countries.
- 87) If so, what methods are used to deliver these courses (*i.e.* correspondence, partner institutions, www, satellite campus, franchise partners or brokers, etc.)? What are the rationales for such programmes?
- 88) Is there a process (internal/external) of the institution for the evaluation of such programmes, if provided? If so, what is the impact of these evaluations?
- 89) What are the institution's strategies to attract, recruit and select students and staff for such programmes and courses? How effective are these strategies?
- 90) What measures are recommended to improve these programmes and their relationship to the institution's overall internationalisation strategy?

### 1.1.14 Development assistance

- 91) What is the institution's involvement (as a contractor or partner) in development projects, how are they perceived by the faculty? What is their impact on the teaching and research functions of the institution?
- 92) What is the link between development assistance projects and other internationalisation activities of the institution?
- 93) What policies and procedures exist for the design, management and evaluation of development projects, and what is the effect of these procedures on the projects and on the institutions strategy for internationalisation?
- 94) What measures are recommended to improve the quality of the role of the institution in these activities and of the integration of these projects in the overall internationalization strategy of the institution?

### 1.1.15 External services and project work

- 95) How active is the institution in external services (*e.g.* contract education, training, consultancy), and to what extent do these services include an international or cross-cultural dimension?
- 96) What is the impact of these services on the internationalisation strategy of the institution?
- 97) What measures are recommended to improve the quality of these services and their relationship to the internationalisation strategy of the institution?

## Conclusions and recommendations

- 98) What are the main conclusions from the self-assessment on internationalisation?
- 99) What are the main concerns and challenges for the institution with regard to the further development of internationalisation?
- 100) What are the main recommendations to the institution for the further improvement of its international dimension?
- 101) Are the goals and objectives for internationalisation of the institution clearly formulated?
- 102) Are these goals and objectives translated into the institution's curriculum, research and public service functions and does the institution provide the necessary support and infrastructure for successful internationalisation?
- 103) How does the institution monitor its internationalisation efforts?
- 104) What specific topics or questions would you like to bring to the attention of the peer review team?

## 2. ACE

ACE, 2006

### ***Institutional Commitment***

- 1) Does your institution's mission statement specifically refer to international or global education
- 2) Is international or global education listed as one of the top five priorities in your institution's current strategic plan?
- 3) Does your institution have a separate written plan that addresses institution-wide internationalization
- 4) Does your institution have a campus-wide committee or task force that works solely on advancing internationalization efforts on campus
- 5) Has your institution formally assessed the impact or progress of its internationalization efforts in the last five years?
- 6) Has your institution developed specific international or global student learning outcomes? (Select one.)
- 7) Does your institution's student recruitment literature highlight international or global education programs, activities, and opportunities?

### ***Organizational Structure and Staffing***

- 8) Please select the response that most closely resembles the administrative structure of the internationalization activities and programs at your institution.
- 9) Does your institution have one or more professional staff or faculty members dedicated at least half time to any of the following aspects of internationalization?
  - international student recruitment/admissions
  - international student services
  - international scholar services
  - English as a Second language (ESI)
  - Education/Study abroad
  - international/global campus programming
  - internationalisation of the curriculum
  - languages Across the Curriculum (IAC, IxC)
  - development and monitoring of international partnerships
  - other
- 10) Does your institution have a full-time administrator who oversees or coordinates multiple internationalization activities or programs?
- 11) If you responded "yes" to question 10, to whom does the individual report?
  - Chief academic officer
  - Other administrator in academic affairs
  - Chief student affairs officer
  - Other administrator in student affairs
  - President
  - Other

### ***Financial Support***

- 12) Has your institution received external funding specifically earmarked for internationalization programs or activities from any of the following sources in the last three years (2003–2006)?
  - Federal government
  - State government
  - Alumni

- Private donors other than alumni
  - Foundations
  - Corporations
  - Other
  - No specific external funding received
- 13) Did your institution provide specific funding for any of the following activities to promote recruitment of full-time, degree-seeking international students at the undergraduate level last year (2005–06)?
- Travel for recruitment officers
  - Scholarships for international students
  - Other
  - No specific institutional funding provided
  - American Council on Education
- 14) Did your institution provide specific funding for any of the following activities to promote recruitment of full-time, degree-seeking international students at the graduate level last year (2005–06)?
- Travel for recruitment officers
  - Stipends/Fellowships
  - Other
  - No specific institutional funding provided
- 15) Did your institution provide specific funding for any of the following internationalization programs or activities last year (2005–06)?
- Faculty leading students on study abroad programs
  - Faculty teaching at institutions abroad
  - Faculty travel to meetings or conferences abroad
  - Faculty studying or conducting research abroad
  - Faculty development seminars abroad
  - Hosting visiting international faculty
  - Internationalisation of courses
  - Other
  - No specific funding provided
- 16) Can undergraduate students use their institutionally awarded financial aid to participate in study abroad opportunities administered by other institutions? Note: For the purposes of this survey, “administer” means that the institution has control over and runs the daily operation of the program.
- No
  - Yes, for approved opportunities administered by institutions within a consortium or state system
  - Yes, for approved opportunities administered by any institution
- 17) Does your institution, or do any schools or departments within your institution, provide specific institutional funds for student education abroad, in addition to all other sources of financial aid?
- No
  - Yes, for undergraduate students only
  - Yes, for graduate students only
  - Yes, for both undergraduate and graduate students

### ***Foreign-Language Requirements and Offerings***

- 18) Does your institution have a foreign-language admissions requirement for incoming undergraduates?
- No
  - Yes, for some bachelor’s/associate degree students
  - Yes, for all bachelor’s/associate degree students
- 19) Does your institution have a foreign-language graduation requirement for undergraduates?
- No . Please skip to question 22.
  - Yes, for some bachelor’s/associate degree students

- Yes, for all bachelor's/associate degree students
- 20) If you responded "yes" to question 19, what is the foreign-language requirement for graduation at your institution?
  - One semester or equivalent
  - One year or equivalent
  - More than one year, but less than two years
  - Two years or equivalent
  - More than two years or equivalent
- 21) If you responded "Yes" to question 19, can undergraduate students satisfy their foreign-language requirement for graduation by passing a proficiency test?
- 22) Please select all foreign languages that were taught at the undergraduate level during the 2005–06 academic year. Do not count English as a Second Language (ESL) or American Sign Language (ASL).

### ***International/Global Course Requirements and Offerings***

- 23) To satisfy a general education requirement, are undergraduates required to take courses that primarily feature perspectives, issues, or events from specific countries or areas outside the United States? Note: Do not include foreign-language courses.
  - No . Please skip to question 26.
  - Yes . Please continue to question 24.
- 24) If you responded "yes" to question 23, how many courses that primarily feature perspectives, issues, or events from specific countries or areas outside the United States are undergraduates required to complete to satisfy their general education requirement?
  - One course
  - Two courses
  - Three or more courses
- 25) Are students required to complete courses that primarily feature countries or geographic areas other than Canada, Australia, or Western Europe?
- 26) To satisfy a general education requirement, are undergraduates required to take courses that feature global trends or issues (e.g., global health issues, global environmental issues, peace studies, etc.)?
- 27) Does your institution offer international/global tracks, concentrations, or certificate options for undergraduate students in any of the following fields:
  - International/global certificate available to all students, regardless of major
  - Business/Management
  - Education
  - Health/Medicine
  - Humanities
  - Social/Behavioral Sciences/Economics
  - Science/technology/Engineering/Mathematics (StEM)
  - Technical/professional
  - Tourism/Hotel Management
  - Other
- 28) Does your institution offer any joint degree programs with institutions in other countries?

### ***Education Abroad***

- 29) Did your institution administer for credit any of the following undergraduate education abroad programs last year (2005–06)?
  - Study abroad
  - International internships
  - International service opportunities
  - Field study abroad

- Research abroad
  - Work abroad
- 30) If your institution administers education abroad programs for credit, does it have guidelines to ensure that undergraduate students can participate in approved education abroad programs without delaying graduation?
- 31) Please estimate the percentage of undergraduate students at your institution who graduated in 2005 and who engaged in education abroad for credit at some point during their academic career.
- None
  - Less than 5 percent
  - 5 percent to 10 percent
  - 11 percent to 20 percent
  - 21 percent to 30 percent
  - 31 percent to 50 percent
  - More than 50 percent

### ***Faculty Policies and Opportunities***

- 32) 32. Does your institution have guidelines that specify international work or experience as a consideration in faculty promotion and tenure decisions?
- No
  - Yes, for faculty in some schools, departments, or programs
  - Yes, for all faculty
- 33) Did your institution offer any of the following opportunities to faculty members in the last three years (2003–2006)?
- Workshops on internationalising
  - Workshops that include a focus on how to use technology to enhance the international dimension of their courses
  - Workshops that include a focus on assessing international or global learning
  - opportunities to increase their foreign-language skills
  - Recognition awards specifically for international activity
- 34) When hiring faculty in fields that are not explicitly international/global, does your institution give preference to candidates with international background, experience, or interests?
- No
  - Yes, rarely
  - Yes, frequently

### ***Student Activities and Services***

- 35) What percentage of full-time undergraduate students at your institution are international students?
- none
  - less than 5 percent
  - 5 percent to 9 percent
  - 10 percent to 25 percent
  - More than 25 percent
- 36) Does your institution have a strategic international student recruitment plan that includes specific targets for undergraduate students? Does your institution have a strategic international student recruitment plan that includes specific targets for graduate students?
- 37) Does your institution offer any of the following programs or support services for international students
- Individualized academic support services
  - Orientation to the United States and the local community
  - Orientation to the institution and/or the U.S. classroom
  - Assistance in finding housing
  - institutional advisory committee of international students

- International alumni services and/or chapters
  - Support services for dependents of international students
  - Host-family program for international students
  - English as a Second language (ESI) program
- 38) Did your institution offer any of the following programs or activities for undergraduate students last year (2005–06)?
- Buddy program that pairs U.S. and international students to help integrate students socially
  - Language partner program that pairs U.S. and international students
  - Residence hall where a particular foreign language is designated to be spoken (i.e., language house)
  - Meeting place for students interested in international topics
  - Regular and ongoing international festivals or events on campus
  - International residence hall open to all, or a roommate program to integrate U.S. and international students
  - Programs to link study abroad returnees or international students with students in K–12 schools
  - Other

### ***Use of Technology for Internationalization***

- 39) Does your institution use technology in any of the following ways to enhance internationalization?
- Courses conducted in collaboration with higher education institutions in other countries using web-based technology
  - guest lectures using video conferencing
  - Institutionally sponsored study abroad student blogs
  - Video- or web-based research conferences
  - A direct link from your institution's home page to international programs and events
  - Other

### ***Degree Programs Offered Abroad for Non-U.S. Students***

Note: The questions in this section apply to both undergraduate and graduate programs.

- 40) Does your institution offer programs outside the United States for non-U.S. students leading to a degree from your institution only, and delivered entirely or in part through face-to-face instruction? Note: Please do not include joint degree programs.
- No . You have completed the survey. Please go to the last page of the survey to complete the institutional contact information.
  - No, but our institution is currently working on developing such programs. (You have completed the survey. Please go to the last page of the survey to complete the institutional contact information)
  - Yes . Please continue to question 41.
- 41) If you responded "Yes" to question 40, please indicate in what countries or regions your institution offers such programs, and whether you have partner higher education institutions in those countries or regions
- 42) If you responded "yes" to question 40, please select all the fields in which you offer undergraduate and/or graduate degree programs for non-U.S. students outside the United States
- 43) If you responded "Yes" to question 40, please indicate whether you are receiving direct and/or indirect financial support from the host country government for your institution's
- 44) If you responded "Yes" to question 40, has your institution established a branch campus in another country for any of the degree programs you have indicated

### 3. Japanese indicator list

#### *Mission, goals and plans of the university*

##### **3.1.1 Official statements regarding the internationalization of the university**

- 1) Determine whether “internationalization” policies are articulated as part of the basic policies declared by the university and whether the mission and its presentation are consistent.

##### **3.1.2 Responsible administrative structures**

- 2) To what extent does the highest ranked person in charge of international exchange activities act independently from the President and/or Administrative Director? Assess the level of his/her authority.

##### **3.1.3 Establishment of medium- and long-term plans and strategic goals**

- 3) Does “internationalization” pursued by the university appear together with concrete goals in the major publications issued by the university? Assess the levels of articulation and concreteness.
- 4) To what extent are the goals recognized or shared (by people concerned in and outside the university)? To what extent do responsible persons in major departments including accounting and instruction departments agree with concrete proposals for establishing goals and plans? Express the level of consensus numerically.
- 5) Evaluate whether the contents and items of the medium- and long-term plans are consistent with the university's general administrative policies and plans.
- 6) Evaluate whether the implementation body (responsible department) is clarified for each of the plans.
- 7) Determine to what extent the staff members of the relevant departments understand the implementation processes for achieving the goals.

#### *Structures and Staff*

##### **3.1.4 Decision-making structures and processes for internationalization policies**

- 8) Determine the frequency of decision opportunities (decision meetings) and time required for processing an agenda.
- 9) To what extent are the purposes, roles and responsibility sharing of the committees organized within the university clarified? Assess the levels.
- 10) Evaluate whether the members of the committees of the university are well balanced in terms of background and discipline.
- 11) Comprehensive assessment the frequency and response rate of an awareness survey on students, the frequency, size and other points of an opinion exchange meeting between students and the person in charge of international exchange activities comprehensively.

##### **3.1.5 Organizational structures for operation**

- 12) Assess whether the goals of the international department and their relevant action plans are clearly indicated.
- 13) Ratio of the number of international service staff to the size of the university (total number of faculty members)
- 14) Personnel allocation plan to meet the goals and current rate of filled vacancy
- 15) Are eligible persons with required expertise allocated? The assessment is carried out based on mutual evaluation among staff.
- 16) Measure whether the job descriptions/responsibility sharing descriptions clearly identify the duties.
- 17) Rate of regular and full-time staff
- 18) Language skills required in conducting business (how many languages) and actual command of languages by the staff

- 19) Proportion of the international students who are involved in international services (interpretation, public relations activities regarding entrance examination) using their language skills and knowledge on their nations (ratio of the students undertaking on-campus jobs to the entire international students)
- 20) Proportion of the international students who are involved in campus jobs including Tas and Ras (ratio to the domestic students)
- 21) Rates and increases/decreases of faculty members who have studied abroad and participated in overseas researches
- 22) Rates and increases/decreases of international faculty members
- 23) State of opportunity announcement for recruiting international faculty members
- 24) Number of international clerical staff members
- 25) Number of graduates from and degree holders of foreign universities

### **3.1.6 Professional development and performance review in the area of internationalization**

- 26) Implementation progress of training programs (FD) for faculty members in response to internationalization (frequency and number of participants)
- 27) Implementation progress of training programs (SD) for administrators in response to internationalization (frequency and number of participants)
- 28) To what extent are international activities taken into consideration during the performance review? Assess the proportion to the entire evaluation.

### **3.1.7 Institutional accountability**

- 29) Measure how the institutional risk management system works for international activities such as overseas training (insurance, preparedness to respond to an accident and others).

### ***Budgeting and implementation***

#### **3.1.8 Budgeting structure for departments involved in international activities**

- 30) Measure whether budget accounts and amounts for respective goals are articulated in the budget materials.
- 31) Application for competitive funds associated with internationalization and results

#### **3.1.9 Budgeting and performance**

- 32) Evaluate whether the ratio of the budget international projects to the total budget as well as breakdowns is checked for each fiscal year to assess the consistency between the size of the budget and the progress of the relevant international project

### ***International dimension of research activities***

#### **3.1.10 Achievements of research presentation**

- 33) Number of presentation in international conferences per faculty member per year
- 34) Number of articles for international journals per faculty member per year

#### **3.1.11 International development of research activities**

- 35) Number of accepted international researchers per year and duration of stay
- 36) Number of organized international meetings and participants from other countries
- 37) Number of international joint research projects (international collaborative projects are separately outlined)
- 38) Number of research funds from other counties (number of funds and amount)

## ***Support system, information provision and infrastructure (entrance examination, education, housing, multilingual aspects and the environment)***

### **3.1.12 Support system for international researchers and students**

- 39) Determine whether enquiry contact for those who wish to join the university from overseas on a section basis is clearly specified.
- 40) Actual number of cases of correspondences, period of time and contents of the correspondences
- 41) Information provision through English
- 42) website: whether necessary information is provided (evaluation of navigation as well as search function)
- 43) Determine whether the university has established a system to directly accept international students to degree programs.
- 44) Has a system for verifying the authenticity of diplomas from institutions in other countries, qualifications, academic transcripts, qualifications been developed? Are the procedures documented in a manual?
- 45) Does the university accept transfer students and have the system (recognition of credit) applicable to them?
- 46) Support for improving Japanese language skills of international students and researchers. Evaluate whether they are provided with Japanese language classes or personal tutorials for the purpose of acquiring Japanese language skills required to writing academic papers and Japanese technical words.
- 47) Is information of relevant departments (instruction department, student department, libraries, information processing center and others) needed for researches and Study clarified and easily accessed? The levels of clarification and accessibility are assessed using a rating scale.

### **3.1.13 Daily support for international students and researchers**

- 48) Are the housing accommodations provided by the university and public agencies sufficient to satisfy the needs?
- 49) How much of housing information is provided? Is necessary information to find housing provided? To what extent is housing support is provided? The level of housing support is assessed using a rating scale.
- 50) Determine whether everyday conversations are taught in Japanese language classes or personal tutorials.
- 51) Support system for families (Japanese language training, assistance for childbirth and child rearing and others) is assessed using a rating scale.
- 52) Does the university provide with lectures to promote understanding on frictions arising from differences in cultures and customs? Does it offer an orientation program? (frequency and participants)
- 53) What vehicles and processes are used for providing information on campus? How many pieces of information are provided through booklets, website and others?
- 54) Career support to international students (employment and higher education) and frequency of seminars

## ***Multifaceted promotion of international affiliation***

### **3.1.14 Inter-university affiliation**

- 55) Comprehensive evaluation is made based on exchange programs, achievements, sizes, level of mutual satisfaction and others.
- 56) Participation in international university consortiums and alliances (what types of organizations does the university belong to?)
- 57) Purpose, objective, concrete content (summary), duration, state of implementation (number of participants and type) of each program or activity

### **3.1.15 Overseas bases**

- 58) Number and locations of overseas offices (country and city)
- 59) Are the purposes of establishment of the overseas offices articulated? Are they consistent with actual performances?
- 60) Are the overseas offices undertaking activities befitting the purposes of establishment such as recruitment of international students, public relation, liaising and networking of graduates?

### **3.1.16 Linkage with local community**

- 61) Number of affiliated local organizations and programs, purposes of programs and activities, and state of implementation (number of participants)
- 62) Number of articles of the programs and activities, which appear in public relations magazines of local communities and newspapers

### ***Internationalization of the university curriculum***

#### **3.1.17 Language program**

- 63) Comprehensively assess ratio of lessons by native speakers, degree of participation in overseas language programs, communicative approach in lessons, the degree to which standard tests in language education are being used, etc. (Has the student acquired a high level of communicative ability in the foreign language by the time of graduation?)
- 64) Comprehensively assess the setting of language education goals (results of the curriculum, participation in overseas study programs, standard test score required for graduation or promotion, etc.) and results.

#### **3.1.18 General academic programs (liberal arts programs, excluding language programs)**

- 65) Among general education subjects (subjects taken that are not related to student's specific academic concentration), review the syllabus of the 5 or 10 subjects having the largest number of students, and analyze the amount of international perspective (introduce overseas precedents, case studies).
- 66) With regards to the general education curriculum, compare the number of students and ratio of those studying subjects related to the adaptation to foreign cultures and the understanding of foreign cultures with those in other curricula.

#### **3.1.19 Internationalization of specialized education**

- 67) With regards to programs in which it is possible to obtain a degree in languages other than Japanese, make a comparison and comprehensively evaluate the recruitment and selection process, program management, diversity of course selection, standard of program content and the like, focusing on the quality of education in comparison to courses taught in Japanese.
- 68) In regard to the management of curriculum and short-term overseas study programs that can be studied in languages other than Japanese, conduct a comparison between these courses and courses taught in Japanese, focusing on quality and diversity of education.
- 69) Select 5 to 10 subjects from the academic concentration areas that are taught at the university and that are believed to provide the greatest international perspective, and assess how this is taught and its effectiveness.
- 70) Assess whether university is responding appropriately to recommendations offered by accreditation bodies, in terms of international academic standards.

### ***Joint programs with external organizations (academic exchanges, internships, and others)***

#### **3.1.20 General Issues regarding international programs**

- 71) What percentage of total credits are earned through exchange studies, short-term training, overseas internships, overseas fieldwork and the like.
- 72) Analyze how self-review and student evaluations are being integrated into the improvement process of international programs.

### **3.1.21 Educational exchange**

- 73) What percentage of students participate in exchange programs, and percentage of credits earned through exchange programs.
- 74) Evaluate how courses attended by exchange students at the university are recognized back at the students' home institutions.
- 75) What percentage of students participate in short-term overseas training, and percentage of credits earned through short-term overseas training.
- 76) Comprehensively evaluate the content of materials used for guidance and orientation, pre and post guidance, number of times orientation implemented, participation ratio, and guidance content (partner school administration, risk management response, etc.).

### **3.1.22 Evaluation of joint programs with other universities**

- 77) If such courses exist, comprehensively assess the proportion of students who are attending these courses, the proportion of faculty members who are taking part, and the impact of these courses on other courses.
- 78) If such programs exist, comprehensively assess the proportion of students expected to earn an international joint degree, the proportion of faculty members involved in the joint degree programs, and the impact of these programs on other degree programs.
- 79) If such consortium activities exist, comprehensively assess how many and what kinds of classes are offered through the consortium, actual achievement of students, proportion of faculty members participating, and impact on other programs.

### ***Development of new programs***

- 80) Comprehensively assess how many students are participating in university-designed overseas programs, such as internships and field work, and assess data on number of earned credits.

## 4. CHE

Uwe Brandenburg & Gero Federkeil, 2007

### *Overall aspects*

#### 4.1.1 Input

##### *Management in general*

- 1) Degree of anchorage in the management of the HEI (how many of the questions 1 to 4 have been answered with "Yes"? All answers = "Yes" corresponds to 100%)
- 2) Is the person responsible for international relations directly subordinate to the management of the HEI or does he report directly to it?
- 3) Is there a member of the management of the HEI responsible for international relations?
- 4) Is internationality/internationalisation regularly a topic in management conferences?
- 5) Is internationality/internationalisation regularly an agenda item in management conferences?
- 6) Does the vice-chancellor/president regularly attend international representational events (visits of delegations, visits at partner universities)?
- 7) Does an internationalisation strategy including a defined catalogue of measures exist?
- 8) Is internationality/ internationalisation incorporated into the strategy of the HEI and does it produce measures?
- 9) Is internationality/ internationalisation incorporated into target agreements with the provider, the higher education council and other bodies responsible for target agreements?
- 10) If 8 and/or 9 have been answered with „Yes“: To what extend is it linked to funding and human resources?

##### *Professors*

##### Internationality of professors

- 11) Number of professors who have spent at least 1 semester abroad in the last x years
- 12) Proportion of professors who have spent at least 1 semester abroad relative to the total number of professors
- 13) Number of international business trips per annum of professors in relation to the total number of professors
- 14) Number of professors who gained their doctoral degree abroad
- 15) Proportion of professors who gained their doctoral degree abroad relative to the total number of professors
- 16) Number of professors with international professional experience outside the HEI
- 17) Proportion of professors with international professional experience outside the HEI relative to the total number of professors

##### International recruitment of professors

- 18) Number of professors appointed from abroad
- 19) Number of professors who have been appointed from abroad relative to the total number of professors
- 20) Number of non-German professors or professors with a migrant background
- 21) Proportion of professors of non-German nationality or from a migrant background relative to the total number of professors

- 22) Number of international visiting researchers (minimum duration 1 week)
- 23) Number of international visiting researchers (minimum duration 1 week) in relation to the total number of professors
- 24) Total number of all days of stay of all international visiting researchers (minimum duration 1 week) per annum

### *Young researchers*

#### Internationality of young researchers

- 25) Number of young researchers who gained their degree abroad (without doctorate)
- 26) Present proportion of young researchers who gained their degree abroad (without doctorate) relative to the total number of young researchers
- 27) Number of young researchers who gained their doctoral degree abroad
- 28) Proportion of young researchers who gained their doctoral degree abroad relative to the total number of young researchers
- 29) Number of young researchers with post-doctoral research periods (minimum duration?) abroad
- 30) Proportion of young researchers with post-doctoral research periods abroad relative to the total number of young researchers
- 31) Total number of young researchers who have gained at least one university degree abroad (Bachelor, Master, PhD)
- 32) Proportion of young researchers who gained at least one university degree abroad (Bachelor, Master, PhD) relative to the total number of young researchers
- 33) Number of participations of young researchers in international conferences (with qualified contribution)

#### International recruitment of young researchers

- 34) Number of young researchers recruited from abroad (doctoral candidates, post-doctoral researchers)
- 35) Proportion of young researchers recruited from abroad (doctoral candidates, post-doctoral researchers) relative to the total number of young researchers
- 36) Number of international doctoral candidates (international students with a non-German education)
- 37) Proportion of international doctoral candidates (international students with a non-German education) relative to the total number of doctoral candidates
- 38) Number of international post-doctoral researchers (international students with a non-German education)
- 39) Proportion of international post-doctoral researchers (international students with a non-German education) relative to the total number of post-doctoral researchers
- 40) Total number of international young researchers (doctoral candidates, post-doctoral researchers)
- 41) Proportion of international young researchers (doctoral candidates, post-doctoral researchers) relative to the total number of young researchers
- 42) Number of doctoral candidates in double doctoral degree study programmes
- 43) Proportion of doctoral candidates in double doctoral degree study programmes relative to the total number of doctoral candidates

### *Administrative staff/non-academic staff*

### General administrative staff/non-academic staff

- 44) Number of non-academic staff/ administrative staff with foreign language skills as a precondition for employment (including secretaries)
- 45) Proportion of non-academic staff/ administrative staff with foreign language skills as a precondition for employment (including secretaries) relative to the total number of administrative staff
- 46) Number of non-academic staff/ administrative staff who have taken part in international administration exchange programmes
- 47) Proportion of non-academic staff/ administrative staff who have taken part in international administration exchange programmes relative to the total number of administrative staff
- 48) Number of non-academic staff/ administrative staff who have taken part in internationally-oriented further training programmes
- 49) Proportion of non-academic staff/ administrative staff who have taken part in internationally-oriented further training programmes relative to the total number of non-academic staff/ administrative staff

### International office and equivalent institutions

- 50) Number of posts (full time equivalent=FTE) in the international core business (international strategy and basic questions, scientific cooperation, counselling and tutoring of students, alumni, admission)
- 51) Number of posts (full time equivalent=FTE) in the international core business (international strategy and basic questions, scientific cooperation, counselling and tutoring of students, alumni, admission) in relation to the total number of administrative posts
- 52) Number of posts (full time equivalent=FTE) in the international areas of counselling and tutoring of students and admission in relation to the total number of students
- 53) Number of posts (full time equivalent=FTE) in relation to the degree of coordination
- 54) Number of employees with foreign language skills as a precondition for employment
- 55) Proportion of employees with foreign language skills as a precondition for employment relative to the total number of administrative staff
- 56) Proportion of FTEs with international experience as employment criterion relative to the total number of FTEs
- 57) Number of employees with international experience (minimum 3 months)
- 58) Proportion of employees with international experience (minimum 3 months) relative to the total number of international office administrative staff
- 59) Number of employees of international office who have taken part in international administration exchange programmes
- 60) Level of coordination: Reciprocal value of the number of organisational units performing international core business tasks (international strategy and basic questions, scientific cooperation, counselling and tutoring of students, alumni, admission) (1/n)

### *Resources*

- 61) University budget for international cooperation
- 62) Proportion of the budget for international cooperation in relation to the total budget
- 63) Number of posts (full time equivalent=FTE) for counselling on international applications (e.g. EU projects, double degrees etc.)
- 64) Proportion of posts (full time equivalent=FTE) for counselling on international applications (e.g. EU projects, double degrees, etc.) relative to the total number of posts for administrative staff
- 65) Special service offers for international researchers (descriptive)

### *International networking*

- 66) Participation in international networks (COIMBRA, EUA, LERU, etc.)
- 67) Membership in international benchmarking initiatives/clubs
- 68) Active partnerships: Number of partnerships in which at least one mobility has taken place
- 69) Active SOKRATES-ERASMUS partnerships: Number of SOKRATES-ERASMUS partnerships in which at least one mobility has taken place

## **Academic research**

### **4.1.2 Input**

#### *Professors*

##### Internationality of professors

- 70) Number of Professors having spent at least 1 study semester abroad
- 71) Proportion of professors having spent at least 1 study semester abroad relative to the total number of professors
- 72) Number of business trips professors have taken abroad relative to the total number of professors
- 73) Number of professors who have acquired a doctoral degree abroad
- 74) Proportion of professors who have acquired a doctoral degree abroad relative to the total number of professors
- 75) Number of professors with professional experience abroad
- 76) Proportion of professors with professional experience abroad relative to the total number of professors

##### International recruitment of professors

- 77) Number of professors appointed from abroad
- 78) Proportion of professors appointed from abroad relative to the total number of professors
- 79) Number of non-German professors or professors with a migrant background
- 80) Proportion of professors of non-German nationality or from a migrant background relative to the total number of professors
- 81) Number of international visiting researchers per annum
- 82) Number of international visiting researchers per annum in relation to the total number of professors
- 83) Total number of all days of stay of all international visiting researchers per annum

#### *International networking in research*

- 84) Procured third-party funding from international sponsors per annum
- 85) Amount of procured third-party funding from international sponsors in relation to the total sum of third-party funds per annum
- 86) Third-party funding for international projects with international cooperation partners per annum
- 87) Amount of third-party funding for international projects with international cooperation partners in relation to the total amount of third-party funding per annum
- 88) Amount of third-party funding for international projects with international cooperation partners in relation to the total university budget per annum
- 89) Number of committee activities in international professional associations
- 90) Number of co-editorships in international trade journals

- 91) Number of international doctoral training courses/International graduate schools (To define these, criteria that, for example, have been developed by the DFG-German Research Foundation or DAAD – German Academic Exchange Service may be used.)

### *Resources*

- 92) Budget for international research cooperation (initiation, carrying out) and scholarship funds for international doctoral candidates
- 93) Proportion of budget for international research cooperation (initiation, carrying out) and scholarship funds for international doctoral candidates relative to the total budget
- 94) Number of available scholarships from university funds for international doctoral candidates (international students with non-German education)
- 95) Number of available scholarships from university funds for international post-doctoral researchers

### *International research projects*

- 96) Number of international research projects with international cooperation partners
- 97) Number of researchers who are involved in international research projects with international cooperation partners
- 98) Number of internationally funded (e.g. EU and other) research projects
- 99) Proportion of internationally funded (e.g. EU and other) research projects relative to the total number of research projects
- 100) Third-party funding procured in international research projects with international cooperation partners
- 101) Third-party funding procured in internationally funded (e.g. EU and other) research projects

## **4.1.3 Output**

### Research findings

- 102) Number of international publications per researcher
- 103) Number of international citations per paper CPP
- 104) Number of international publications per researcher and number of international citations, measured by global standard according to CWTS
- 105) Number of Highly Cited Authors (HiCi) according to Thomson11
- 106) Proportion of HiCis relative to the total number of researchers
- 107) Number of international conference contributions per professor/researcher
- 108) Number of international patents per professors/researcher

### Young researchers

- 109) Number of completed doctoral degrees by young researchers from abroad or of those with a university degree from abroad
- 110) Proportion of completed doctoral degrees by young scientist from abroad or of those with a university degree from abroad relative to the total number of doctoral degrees
- 111) Number of double doctoral degrees
- 112) Number of international double doctoral degrees in relation to the total number of doctoral degrees
- 113) Number of doctoral degrees in international research cooperation projects

114) Proportion of doctoral degrees in international research cooperation projects relative to the total number of doctoral degrees

## ***Teaching and studies***

### **4.1.4 Input**

#### *Lecturers*

##### Internationality of professors/ lecturers

- 115) Proportion of lecturers who teach technical disciplines in a foreign language (e.g. engineering taught in English) relative to the total number of lecturers
- 116) Number of lecturers who have spent at least 1 semester abroad
- 117) Proportion of lecturers who have spent at least 1 semester abroad relative to the total number of lecturers
- 118) Number of lecturers who have held a visiting lectureship abroad
- 119) Proportion of lecturers who have held a visiting lectureship abroad relative to the total number of lecturers
- 120) Number of lectureship stays abroad in relation to the total number of lecturers
- 121) Number of lecturers who gained their doctoral degree abroad
- 122) Proportion of lecturers who gained their doctoral degree abroad relative to the total number of lecturers
- 123) Number of lecturers with international work experience
- 124) Proportion of lecturers with international work experience relative to the total number of lecturers

##### International recruitment of lecturers

- 125) Number of lecturers appointed from abroad
- 126) Proportion of lecturers appointed from abroad relative to the total number of lecturers
- 127) Number of non-German lecturers of nationality or lecturers from migrant background
- 128) Proportion of non-German lecturers of nationality or lecturers from migrant background relative to the total number of lecturers
- 129) Number of international visiting lecturers
- 130) Number of international visiting lecturers in relation to the total number of professors
- 131) Total number of days of stay of all international visiting lecturers in relation to the total number of visiting lecturers

#### *Students (Bachelor/Master handled separately)*

- 132) Number of international students with non-German education
- 133) Proportion of international students with non-German education relative to the total number of students
- 134) Number of incoming international exchange students
- 135) Proportion of incoming international exchange students relative to the total number of students
- 136) Number of outgoing exchange students
- 137) Proportion of outgoing exchange students relative to the total number of students
- 138) Number of students in joint or double/multiple degree programmes
- 139) Proportion of students in joint or double/multiple degree programme relative to the total number of students
- 140) Number of students in study programmes with an obligatory stay abroad of a minimum duration of 3 months (ERASMUS standard)

- 141) Proportion of students in study programmes with obligatory stay abroad of a minimum duration of 3 months (ERASMUS standard) relative to the total number of students
- 142) Number of students with an international internship
- 143) Proportion of students with an international internship relative to the total number of students
- 144) Number of outgoing exchange students (136) and of students with an international internship (142)
- 145) Proportion of outgoing exchange students and of students with an international internship relative to the total number of students

### *Service and administration*

- 146) Administrative posts in the faculty for mentoring international students, doctoral candidates and visiting lecturers in relation to the total number of students (per faculty)
- 147) Internationally-oriented Career Center
- 148) Proportion of staff with foreign nationality of the non-academic staff relative to the faculty/institute
- 149) Number of international professional qualification offers with or without credit points in relation to the total number of students
- 150) Lectures on intercultural learning
- 151) Information on countries/cultures/societies

### *International networks for teaching and studies*

- 152) Number of incoming international exchange students in relation to the number of partnership agreements (ERASMUS and others)
- 153) Number of outgoing exchange students in relation to the number of partnership agreements (ERASMUS and others)
- 154) Number of incoming international exchange students in relation to the number of partnership agreements (ERASMUS and others) for the 10 partnerships with the highest exchange rate
- 155) Number of outgoing exchange students in relation to the number of partnership agreements (ERASMUS and others) for the 10 partnerships with the highest exchange rate
- 156) Number of students enrolled on special academic courses at the summer university and its proportion relative to the total number of students
- 157) Active membership in international specialised networks and associations (e.g. BWL: AACSB, AMBA, EQUIS)

### *Resources*

- 158) Total sum of scholarship funds for stays abroad in relation to the total number of students (own funds of the HEI)
- 159) Total sum of scholarship funds for stays abroad in relation to the total number of students (externally procured funding)
- 160) Total sum of scholarship funds for stays abroad in relation to the total number of students (3.1.5.1. and 3.1.5.2. aggregate)
- 161) Budget for international higher education marketing in relation to the total budget
- 162) Proportion of the HEI's own funds for international visiting lecturers in relation to the total budget for academic staff
- 163) Funds for supporting self-organised stays abroad in relation to the total number of students

### *Study programmes/Curricula*

#### Course offers

- 164) Proportion of courses taught in a foreign language in relation to the total course offers

- 165) Proportion of courses taught in a foreign language that are institutionalised in the respective curriculum in relation to the total course offers
- 166) Proportion of credit points for foreign language courses in relation to the total number of credit points (compulsory or optional)
- 167) Number of foreign languages offered at the HEI
- 168) Number of foreign language teaching hours per week (all languages) in relation to the total number of students
- 169) Mobility windows incorporated into the respective curriculum
- 170) Number of lecture stays abroad of university teachers (Teaching Staff (TS) Mobilities) in relation to the total number of lecturers (Outgoing=Incoming)
- 171) Number of places in study programmes exclusively set aside for international students (Master) in relation to the total number of students
- 172) Proportion of credits acquired abroad and recognised by the HEI in relation to the total number of credit points

#### Measures for international professional qualification

- 173) Number of places offered in programmes for intercultural learning in relation to the total number of students
- 174) Number of places offered in programmes for international application training in relation to the total number of students
- 175) Number of places offered in programmes providing information about countries/cultures/societies in relation to the total number of students

#### 4.1.5 Output

##### *Graduates (Bachelor/Master/doctoral candidates to be handled separately)*

- 176) Number of graduates with joint or double/multiple degrees
- 177) Proportion of graduates with joint or double/multiple degrees relative to the total number of graduates
- 178) Number of graduates of foreign nationality (international graduates with a non-German education)
- 179) Proportion of graduates of foreign nationality (international graduates with a non-German education) in relation to the total number of graduates
- 180) Ratio between international first-year students (international graduates with a non-German education) and graduates of a given starting year of studies
- 181) What percent of graduates of foreign nationality (international graduates with a non-German education) are tutored/included in the alumni paper after 3 years?
- 182) Is there information about the whereabouts and professional development of the graduates?

##### *International reputation*

- 183) Number of international applications for study programmes (incl. doctoral programmes) in relation to the total number of applications
- 184) Number of international applications for special academic courses in summer universities (absolute number is here valid, as no capacity regulation (in Germany called Kapazitätsverordnung or KapVO) is applicable)
- 185) Number of international applications for special academic courses in summer universities in relation to the number of available places
- 186) Number of international applications for special academic courses in summer universities in relation to the number of courses offered

## 5. MINT

### Goals

- 1) Have internationalisation goals been set for the unit?
- 2) Who is responsible for the internationalisation policy?
- 3) Does the person who is responsible for internationalisation report directly to the Executive Board?
- 4) Is internationalisation a regular item on the agenda during Executive Board meetings?
- 5) In which international networks and/or consortia does the unit (institution, faculty, department, school, programme) participate?
- 6) Which of the following possible goals of internationalisation are actively pursued by the unit?

International and intercultural competencies for students  
Improving quality of education  
Continuity  
Service to the community  
Reputation enhancement  
Improving quality of research  
Other, please specify:

How important are these goals to the unit on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = not important at all and 5 = extremely important)?

- 7) International and intercultural competencies for students
  - 8) Improving quality of education
  - 9) Continuity
  - 10) Service to the community
  - 11) Reputation enhancement
  - 12) Improving quality of research
  - 13) Other, please specify:
- 14) How is achievement of the goal International and intercultural competencies for students monitored?

This goal is an explicit element in a policy plan  
Key indicators have been set for this goal  
The level of achievement of this goal is evaluated in a structured process  
Evaluation results are used as input to improve policies.

- 15) How is achievement of the goal Improving quality of education monitored?

This goal is an explicit element in a policy plan  
Key indicators have been set for this goal  
The level of achievement of this goal is evaluated in a structured process  
Evaluation results are used as input to improve policies.

- 16) How is achievement of the goal Continuity monitored?

This goal is an explicit element in a policy plan  
Key indicators have been set for this goal  
The level of achievement of this goal is evaluated in a structured process  
Evaluation results are used as input to improve policies.

- 17) How is achievement of the goal Service to the community monitored?

This goal is an explicit element in a policy plan  
Key indicators have been set for this goal

The level of achievement of this goal is evaluated in a structured process  
Evaluation results are used as input to improve policies.

18) How is achievement of the goal Reputation enhancement monitored?

This goal is an explicit element in a policy plan  
Key indicators have been set for this goal  
The level of achievement of this goal is evaluated in a structured process  
Evaluation results are used as input to improve policies.

19) How is achievement of the goal Improving quality of research monitored?

This goal is an explicit element in a policy plan  
Key indicators have been set for this goal  
The level of achievement of this goal is evaluated in a structured process  
Evaluation results are used as input to improve policies.

20) How is achievement of the goal 'other' monitored?

This goal is an explicit element in a policy plan  
Key indicators have been set for this goal  
The level of achievement of this goal is evaluated in a structured process  
Evaluation results are used as input to improve policies.

### ***Internationalization Activities***

21) Please indicate below which activity clusters are organized by the unit:

- Education in English or another foreign language
- Student mobility/Credit mobility
- Recruitment of foreign students
- Internationalisation of the curriculum
- Internationalisation of staff
- International knowledge sharing
- International research activities
- Other, please specify:

How important are these activity clusters on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = not important at all and 5 = extremely important)?

- 22) Education in English or another foreign language
- 23) Student mobility/Credit mobility
- 24) Recruitment of foreign students
- 25) Internationalisation of the curriculum
- 26) Internationalisation of staff
- 27) International knowledge sharing
- 28) International research activities
- 29) Other, please specify:

You have indicated one or more internationalisation goals and activity clusters. Please indicate below which activity cluster is used to reach which goal.

30) Goal: International and intercultural competencies for students

- Education in English or another foreign language
- Student mobility/Credit mobility
- Recruitment of foreign students
- Internationalization of the curriculum
- Internationalization of staff
- International knowledge sharing
- International research activities
- Other, please specify:

31) Goal: Improving quality of education

- Education in English or another foreign language
- Student mobility/Credit mobility
- Recruitment of foreign students
- Internationalization of the curriculum
- Internationalization of staff
- International knowledge sharing
- International research activities
- Other, please specify:

32) Goal: Continuity

- Education in English or another foreign language
- Student mobility/Credit mobility
- Recruitment of foreign students
- Internationalization of the curriculum
- Internationalization of staff
- International knowledge sharing
- International research activities
- Other, please specify

33) Goal: Service to the community

- Education in English or another foreign language
- Student mobility/Credit mobility
- Recruitment of foreign students
- Internationalization of the curriculum
- Internationalization of staff
- International knowledge sharing
- International research activities
- Other, please specify

34) Goal: Reputation enhancement

- Education in English or another foreign language
- Student mobility/Credit mobility
- Recruitment of foreign students
- Internationalization of the curriculum
- Internationalization of staff
- International knowledge sharing
- International research activities

- Other, please specify

35) Goal: Improving quality of research

- Education in English or another foreign language
- Student mobility/Credit mobility
- Recruitment of foreign students
- Internationalization of the curriculum
- Internationalization of staff
- International knowledge sharing
- International research activities
- Other, please specify

36) Goal: 'other'

- Education in English or another foreign language
- Student mobility/Credit mobility
- Recruitment of foreign students
- Internationalization of the curriculum
- Internationalization of staff
- International knowledge sharing
- International research activities
- Other, please specify

Indicate per activity cluster which activities the unit carries out.

37) In the activity cluster Education in English or another foreign language the unit carries out

- Programme elements entirely in English
- Programme elements in another foreign language
- Programme elements organised abroad
- Preparatory school
- Summer school
- Double or joint degree programmes
- Tailor-made courses
- Non-degree courses
- Refresher courses
- E-learning
- Other, please specify:

38) In the activity cluster Student mobility/Credit mobility the unit carries out

- Study abroad
- Work placement
- International project
- Graduation project
- Research
- Other, please specify:

39) In the activity cluster Recruitment of foreign students the unit carries out

- Participation in fairs abroad
- Alumni helping out with recruitment
- Partner institutions helping out with recruitment
- Agents
- International visitors to the website
- Ads placed in international media
- International school visits
- Other, please specify:

40) In the activity cluster Internationalization of the curriculum the unit carries out

### CONTENT

- Courses in Intercultural skills
- English language courses for students
- Dutch language courses for foreign students
- Other foreign language courses for students
- Programme elements aimed at the study of an international subject such as European Social Legislation
- Programme elements that include the international comparison of a subject such as International Comparative Education.
- Programme elements focused on a particular country or region.
- Other, please specify:

### STYLE

- Virtual mobility
- International (research) project
- Using foreign literature
- Joint/double/multiple degree programmes
- Cases in an international context
- Local knowledge of (foreign) students is used explicitly
- Other, please specify:

41) In the activity cluster Internationalization of staff the unit carries out

- Members of staff recruited with international experience
- Members of staff recruited on the international job market
- Foreign visiting professors
- Members of staff taking intercultural skills training
- Professors taking 'Didactics in the International Classroom' training
- Members of staff taking English language training
- Members of staff with permanent residence abroad
- Members of staff with structural contacts with foreign colleagues
- Other, please specify:

42) In the activity cluster International knowledge sharing the unit carries out

- Capacity building (development cooperation) projects
- International consulting assignments
- International conferences organized by the unit
- Training programmes for staff of partner institutes abroad
- Shared supervisions or co-tutelles

- Other, please specify:

- 43) In the activity cluster International research activities the unit carries out
- Research centres focused on an explicitly international research topic
  - Researchers with a foreign nationality
  - Researchers with a foreign higher education degree
  - Scientific (peer-reviewed) publications published in English or another foreign language
  - Professional publications published in English or another foreign language
  - Patents filed outside the country
  - Other, please specify:

How is the quality monitored in the following activity clusters. For questions 31-38 Indicate whether:

- Activities in this cluster are an explicit element of an operational plan
- Activities in this activity cluster are carried out as planned
- The performance of activities in this cluster is evaluated in a structured process
- Evaluation results are used as input to improve policies

- 44) How is the quality monitored of activities in activity cluster education in English or another foreign language?  
45) How is the quality monitored of activities in activity cluster credit mobility?  
46) How is the quality monitored of activities in activity cluster recruitment of foreign students?  
47) How is the quality monitored of activities in activity cluster internationalization of the curriculum?  
48) How is the quality monitored of activities in activity cluster internationalization of staff?  
49) How is the quality monitored of activities in activity cluster international knowledge sharing?  
50) How is the quality monitored of activities in activity cluster international research activities?  
51) How is the quality monitored of activities in activity cluster 'other'?

### ***Internationalization Support Services***

- 52) Which of the following services are available to support the unit's international activities?

#### ***Practical Services***

- Accommodation
- Visa/residence/work permit application service
- Information
- Multilingual communication
- Organization of travel

#### ***Academic Services***

- Advice
- Information
- Preparation programme

#### ***Financial Services***

- Scholarships
- Subsidies
- Advice on/help with application

*Social Services*

- Guidance
- Activities
- Crisis team/procedure
- Re-entry programme

How important are these services on a scale of 1 to 5 (1=not important at all and 5=extremely important)?

*Practical Services*

- 53) Accommodation
- 54) Visa/residence/work permit application service
- 55) Information
- 56) Multilingual communication
- 57) Organization of travel

*Academic Services*

- 58) Advice
- 59) Information
- 60) Preparation programme

*Financial Services*

- 61) Scholarships
- 62) Subsidies
- 63) Advice on/help with application

*Social Services*

- 64) Guidance
- 65) Activities
- 66) Crisis team/procedure
- 67) Re-entry programme

For which target groups are the services-primarily offered?

- Degree seeking foreign students?
- Incoming credit mobile students?
- Outgoing credit mobile students?
- Permanent foreign staff-Incoming foreign staff?
- Outgoing staff?

*Practical Services*

- 68) Accommodation
- 69) Visa/residence/work permit application service
- 70) Information
- 71) Multilingual communication
- 72) Organization of travel

*Academic Services*

- 73) Advice
- 74) Information
- 75) Preparation programme

### *Financial Services*

- 76) Scholarships
- 77) Subsidies
- 78) Advice on/help with application

### *Social Services*

- 79) Guidance
- 80) Activities
- 81) Crisis team/procedure
- 82) Re-entry programme

- 83) Does the unit have a partner network?
- 84) How important is the partner network on a scale of 1 to 5
- 85) For which activity clusters does the unit use its partnerships?
  - Education in English or another foreign language
  - Student mobility/Credit mobility
  - Recruitment of foreign students
  - Internationalization of the curriculum
  - Internationalization of staff
  - International knowledge sharing
  - International research activities
  - Other, please specify

### **Quality Assurance**

For the services below, indicate in what way the quality is assured:

- The services are an explicit element of a policy plan
- The availability of services is according to plan
- The services are evaluated in a structured process
- Evaluation results are used as input for the improvement of services

- 86) How is the quality of the practical services assured?
- 87) How is the quality of the academic services assured?
- 88) How is the quality of the financial services assured?
- 89) How is the quality of the social services assured?
- 90) How is the quality of the partner network assured?

### **Key figures**

*What are the unit's core key figures for the*

### Bachelor's phase

- 91) Number of FTEs
- 92) Number of students
- 93) Number of programmes

### Master's phase

- 94) Number of FTEs
- 95) Number of students
- 96) Number of programmes

### PhD phase

- 97) Number of FTEs
- 98) Number of students
- 99) Number of programmes

### Total

- 100) Number of FTEs
- 101) Number of students
- 102) Number of programmes

103) How many Bachelor programmes does the unit offer in a foreign language?

- In English
- In other languages

104) How many Masters programmes does the unit offer in a foreign language?

- In English
- In other languages

105) How many PhD programmes does the unit offer in a foreign language?

- In English
- In other languages

106) How many of the following programmes or elements does the unit offer and what is the total number of European credits offered?

- Programme elements taught in a foreign language
- Preparatory schools
- Summer schools
- Double or joint programmes
- Programmes organized abroad
- Tailor-made programmes
- Non-degree programmes
- Refresher courses/programmes
- E-learning programmes

107) Which percentage of all programme elements, within a programme taught in the national language, is in English or in another foreign language?

108) How many programmes taught in the national language explicitly include internationalization in their educational objectives?

- Number of Bachelor programmes
- Number of Master programmes
- Number of PhD programmes
- Total

What is the number of students registered for the following degree programmes?

109) Bachelor programmes taught in English

- National students
- Foreign degree seeking students
- Incoming exchange students
- Total number of students

110) Master programmes taught in English

- National students
- Foreign degree seeking students
- Incoming exchange students
- Total number of students

111) PhD programmes taught in English

- National students
- Foreign degree seeking students
- Incoming exchange students
- Total number of students

112) Bachelor programmes taught in another foreign language

- National students
- Foreign degree seeking students
- Incoming exchange students
- Total number of students

113) Master programmes taught in another foreign language

- National students
- Foreign degree seeking students
- Incoming exchange students
- Total number of students

114) PhD programmes taught in another foreign language

- National students
- Foreign degree seeking students
- Incoming exchange students
- Total number of students

115) Total

- National students
- Foreign degree seeking students
- Incoming exchange students
- Total number of students

*What is the number of students (including any double degree students) registered for the following types of education?*

116) Programme elements taught in a foreign language

- Number of National students
- Number of Foreign students

117) Preparatory schools

- Number of National students
- Number of Foreign students

118) Summer schools

- Number of National students
- Number of Foreign students

119) Double or joint degree programmes

- Number of National students
- Number of Foreign students

120) Programmes organized abroad

- Number of National students
- Number of Foreign students

121) Tailor-made programmes

- Number of National students
- Number of Foreign students

122) Non-degree programmes

- Number of National students
- Number of Foreign students

123) Refresher courses/programmes

- Number of National students
- Number of Foreign students

124) E-learning programmes

- Number of National students
- Number of Foreign students

*What is the number of credit mobile students?*

125) Study abroad

- Number of outgoing students
- Percentage of outgoing students
- Number of incoming students
- Percentage of incoming students

126) Work placement

- Number of outgoing students
- Percentage of outgoing students
- Number of incoming students
- Percentage of incoming students

127) International project

- Number of outgoing students
- Percentage of outgoing students
- Number of incoming students
- Percentage of incoming students

128) Graduation project

- Number of outgoing students
- Percentage of outgoing students
- Number of incoming students
- Percentage of incoming students

129) Research

- Number of outgoing students
- Percentage of outgoing students
- Number of incoming students
- Percentage of incoming students

130) In the past academic year, what was at the central level, the number of...

- Participations in fairs abroad
- Alumni helping out with recruitment
- Partner institutions helping out with recruitment
- Agents recruiting foreign students for the unit
- International visitors to website
- Ads placed in international media

International school visits

131) Which positions related to internationalization (filled or not) are available at unit level?

- International Officer
- Policy Advisor for Internationalization
- Head of International Office
- Foreign Alumni coordinator
- International Marketeer
- Visa application officer
- Study abroad advisor
- Mentor/dean for social guidance to foreign students

132) In the past academic year, what was the number of...

- members of staff with international experience
- members of staff recruited on the international job market
- foreign visiting professors
- members of staff taking intercultural skills training
- professors taking 'Didactics in the International Classroom' training
- members of staff taking English language training
- members of staff with permanent residence abroad
- members of staff with structural contacts with foreign colleagues

*In the past academic year, what was the number of...*

Capacity building (development cooperation) projects

133) Number

134) Number of staff involved

135) Number of students involved

International consulting assignments

136) Number

137) Number of staff involved

138) Number of students involved

International conferences organized by the unit

139) Number

140) Number of staff involved

141) Number of students involved

Articles published internationally

142) Number

143) Number of staff involved

144) Number of students involved

Training programmes for staff of partner institutes abroad

145) Number

146) Number of staff involved

147) Number of students involved

Shared supervisions or co-tutelles

148) Number

149) Number of staff involved

150) Number of students involved

*In the past academic year, what was the number and percentage of...*

151) research centres focused on an explicitly international research topic

- Number
- 0-25%
- 25-50%
- 50-75%
- 75-100%

152) researchers with a foreign nationality

- Number
- 0-25%
- 25-50%
- 50-75%
- 75-100%

153) researchers with a foreign higher education degree

- Number
- 0-25%
- 25-50%
- 50-75%
- 75-100%

154) scientific (peer-reviewed) publications published in English or another foreign language

- Number
- 0-25%
- 25-50%
- 50-75%
- 75-100%

155) professional publications published in English or another foreign language

- Number
- 0-25%
- 25-50%

- 50-75%
- 75-100%

156) Patents filed outside the country

- Number
- 0-25%
- 25-50%
- 50-75%
- 75-100%

157) What budget is available (excluding personnel costs) for internationalisation?

158) How many research fellowships does the unit offer specifically for foreign researchers or PhD **students**?

159) What is the total amount of these research fellowships in euro's?

*How many students and staff have used the following services in the past academic year?*

### *Practical Services*

#### Accommodation

- 160) Degree seeking foreign students
- 161) Incoming credit mobile students
- 162) Outgoing credit mobile students
- 163) Permanent foreign staff
- 164) Incoming foreign staff
- 165) Outgoing staff

#### Visa/residence/work permit application service

- 166) Degree seeking foreign students
- 167) Incoming credit mobile students
- 168) Outgoing credit mobile students
- 169) Permanent foreign staff
- 170) Incoming foreign staff
- 171) Outgoing staff

#### Information

- 172) Degree seeking foreign students
- 173) Incoming credit mobile students
- 174) Outgoing credit mobile students
- 175) Permanent foreign staff
- 176) Incoming foreign staff
- 177) Outgoing staff

### Multilingual communication

- 178) Degree seeking foreign students
- 179) Incoming credit mobile students
- 180) Outgoing credit mobile students
- 181) Permanent foreign staff
- 182) Incoming foreign staff
- 183) Outgoing staff

### Organisation of travel

- 184) Degree seeking foreign students
- 185) Incoming credit mobile students
- 186) Outgoing credit mobile students
- 187) Permanent foreign staff
- 188) Incoming foreign staff
- 189) Outgoing staff

### *Academic Services*

#### Advice

- 190) Degree seeking foreign students
- 191) Incoming credit mobile students
- 192) Outgoing credit mobile students
- 193) Permanent foreign staff
- 194) Incoming foreign staff
- 195) Outgoing staff

#### Information

- 196) Degree seeking foreign students
- 197) Incoming credit mobile students
- 198) Outgoing credit mobile students
- 199) Permanent foreign staff
- 200) Incoming foreign staff
- 201) Outgoing staff

#### Preparation programme

- 202) Degree seeking foreign students
- 203) Incoming credit mobile students
- 204) Outgoing credit mobile students

- 205) Permanent foreign staff
- 206) Incoming foreign staff
- 207) Outgoing staff

### *Financial Services*

#### Scholarships

- 208) Degree seeking foreign students
- 209) Incoming credit mobile students
- 210) Outgoing credit mobile students
- 211) Permanent foreign staff
- 212) Incoming foreign staff
- 213) Outgoing staff

#### Subsidies

- 214) Degree seeking foreign students
- 215) Incoming credit mobile students
- 216) Outgoing credit mobile students
- 217) Permanent foreign staff
- 218) Incoming foreign staff
- 219) Outgoing staff

#### Advice on/help with application

- 220) Degree seeking foreign students
- 221) Incoming credit mobile students
- 222) Outgoing credit mobile students
- 223) Permanent foreign staff
- 224) Incoming foreign staff
- 225) Outgoing staff

### *Social Services*

#### Guidance

- 226) Degree seeking foreign students
- 227) Incoming credit mobile students
- 228) Outgoing credit mobile students
- 229) Permanent foreign staff
- 230) Incoming foreign staff
- 231) Outgoing staff

### Activities

- 232) Degree seeking foreign students
- 233) Incoming credit mobile students
- 234) Outgoing credit mobile students
- 235) Permanent foreign staff
- 236) Incoming foreign staff
- 237) Outgoing staff

### Crisis team/procedure

- 238) Degree seeking foreign students
- 239) Incoming credit mobile students
- 240) Outgoing credit mobile students
- 241) Permanent foreign staff
- 242) Incoming foreign staff
- 243) Outgoing staff

### Re-entry programme

- 244) Degree seeking foreign students
- 245) Incoming credit mobile students
- 246) Outgoing credit mobile students
- 247) Permanent foreign staff
- 248) Incoming foreign staff
- 249) Outgoing staff

### **How many partner institutes does the unit have in each region of the world?**

- 250) European Union
- 251) Europe outside EU
- 252) Africa
- 253) Asia
- 254) North America
- 255) South America
- 256) Pacific
- 257) Total

## 6. DAAD

### DAAD, 2009 (in German as all the indicator set is in German)

#### 6.1.1 Kennzahlen zum Ausländerstudium

- 1) Quote der Studierenden mit ausländischer Staatsangehörigkeit gemessen an den Studierenden insgesamt (in Prozent)
- 2) Quote der Bildungsausländer gemessen an den Studierenden insgesamt (in Prozent)
- 3) Quote der Bildungsinländer gemessen an den Studierenden insgesamt (in Prozent)
- 4) Quote der Bildungsausländer im ersten Hochschulsesemester gemessen an den Studienanfängern insgesamt (in Prozent)
- 5) Quote der Bildungsausländer-Absolventen gemessen an den Hochschulabsolventen insgesamt (in Prozent)
- 6) Quote der Bildungsausländer im Erststudium gemessen an den Studierenden/Absolventen im Erststudium insgesamt (in Prozent)
- 7) Quote der Bildungsausländer im Promotionsstudium gemessen an den Studierenden/Absolventen im Promotionsstudium insgesamt (in Prozent)
- 8) Quote der Bildungsausländer in sonstigen Studienarten gemessen an den Studierenden/Absolventen in sonstigen Studienarten insgesamt (in Prozent)
- 9) Verteilung der Bildungsausländer nach Herkunftsregionen (in Prozent)
- 10) Verteilung der Bildungsausländer nach Fachgruppen (in Prozent)

#### 6.1.2 Kennzahlen zur Mobilität von Studierenden und Dozenten im Rahmen von ERASMUS

- 11) Quote der Outgoing-Studierenden gemessen an der Zahl der Studierenden im 5./6. Hochschulsesemester (in Prozent)
- 12) Quote der Incoming-Studierenden gemessen an der Zahl der Studierenden im 5./6. Hochschulsesemester (in Prozent)
- 13) Verhältnis der Outgoing-Studierenden zu Incoming-Studierenden (Verhältniszahl). Bei einem Wert größer 1 gehen mehr deutsche Studierende mithilfe von ERASMUS ins Ausland als im Gegenzug ausländische Studierende nach Deutschland kommen und vice versa.
- 14) Quote der Outgoing-Dozenten gemessen an der Zahl der Professoren, Dozenten und Assistenten (in Prozent)
- 15) Quote der Incoming-Dozenten gemessen an der Zahl der Professoren, Dozenten und Assistenten (in Prozent)
- 16) Verhältnis der Outgoing-Dozenten zu Incoming-Dozenten (Verhältniszahl)
- 17) Verteilung der ERASMUS-Studierenden und Dozenten nach Gast- und Herkunftsländer (in Prozent)
- 18) Verteilung der ERASMUS-Studierenden und Dozenten innerhalb einer Hochschule nach Fachgruppen (in Prozent)

#### 6.1.3 Kennzahlen zur Mobilität von deutschen Programmstudenten außerhalb von ERASMUS

- 19) Quote der deutschen Programmstudenten außerhalb von ERASMUS gemessen an der Zahl der Studierenden im 5./6. Hochschulsesemester (in Prozent)

#### 6.1.4 Kennzahlen zur Beteiligung der Hochschulen an den DAAD-Programmen

- 20) Quote der Individualstipendiaten gemessen an der Zahl der Studierenden im 5./6. Hochschulsesemester (in Prozent)
- 21) Quote der deutschen Individualstipendiaten gemessen an der Zahl der Studierenden im 5./6. Hochschulsesemester (in Prozent)
- 22) Quote der ausländischen Individualstipendiaten gemessen an der Zahl der Studierenden im 5./6. Hochschulsesemester (in Prozent)
- 23) Förderbetrag insgesamt pro Studierende im 5./6. Hochschulsesemester (Mittelwert in Euro)
- 24) Förderbetrag für Individualförderung pro Studierende im 5./6. Hochschulsesemester (Mittelwert in Euro)
- 25) Förderbetrag für Projekte und Programme pro Studierende im 5./6. Hochschulsesemester (Mittelwert in Euro)

- 26) Förderbetrag für Projekte und Programme ohne EU-Mittel pro Studierende im 5./6. Hochschulsesemester (Mittelwert in Euro)
- 27) Förderbetrag aus EU-Mitteln pro Studierende im 5./6. Hochschulsesemester (Mittelwert in Euro)

### **6.1.5 Kennzahlen zu Internationalen Studiengängen**

- 28) Quote der Internationalen Studiengänge gemessen an der Gesamtzahl der Studiengänge (in Prozent)
- 29) Quote der Studierenden, die in Internationalen Studiengängen eingeschrieben sind, gemessen an der Gesamtzahl der Studierenden (in Prozent)
- 30) Quote der Bildungsausländer, die in Internationalen Studiengängen eingeschrieben sind, gemessen an der Gesamtzahl der Bildungsausländer (in Prozent)
- 31) Quote der Internationalen Studiengänge mit einem gemeinsamen Curriculum (in Prozent)
- 32) Quote der Internationalen Studiengänge mit der Möglichkeit zum Erwerb eines Doppelabschlusses/Gemeinsamen Abschlusses (in Prozent)
- 33) Quote der Internationalen Studiengänge mit obligatorischer Auslandsphase (in Prozent)
- 34) Quote der Internationalen Studiengänge, in denen Lehrveranstaltungen ganz oder teilweise in Englisch stattfinden (in Prozent)

### **6.1.6 Kennzahlen zu Internationalen Kooperationen**

- 35) Durchschnittliche Zahl an Internationalen Kooperationen pro Professor (Mittelwert)
- 36) Quote der Kooperationen in diesem Bereich (in Prozent)
- 37) Quote der Kooperationen in diesem Bereich (in Prozent)
- 38) Quote der Kooperationen in diesem Bereich (in Prozent)
- 39) Quote der Kooperationen in diesem Bereich (in Prozent)
- 40) Quote der Kooperationen in diesem Bereich (in Prozent)
- 41) Quote der Kooperationen in diesem Bereich (in Prozent)
- 42) Verteilung der Partnerschaften nach Zielregionen (in Prozent)

### **6.1.7 Kennzahlen zu wissenschaftlichem und künstlerischem Personal mit ausländischer Staatsangehörigkeit an deutschen Hochschulen**

- 43) Quote des Personals mit ausländischer Staatsangehörigkeit gemessen am Personal insgesamt (in Prozent)
- 44) Quote der Professoren mit ausländischer Staatsangehörigkeit gemessen an der Gesamtzahl der Professoren (in %)
- 45) Verteilung des Personals mit ausländischer Staatsangehörigkeit nach Herkunftsregionen (in Prozent)
- 46) Verteilung des Personals mit ausländischer Staatsangehörigkeit innerhalb einer Hochschule nach Fachgruppen (in Prozent)

### **6.1.8 Kennzahlen zu Forschungsdrittmitteln aus dem Ausland**

- 47) Quote der Forschungsdrittmittel aus dem Ausland gemessen an den Forschungsdrittmitteln insgesamt (in Prozent)
- 48) Quote der Drittmittel aus EU-Programmen gemessen an den Forschungsdrittmitteln insgesamt (in Prozent)

### **6.1.9 Kennzahlen zu AvH-Stipendiaten und Preisträgern**

- 49) Quote der AvH-Stipendiaten und Preisträger gemessen an der Zahl der Professoren an deutschen Hochschulen (in Prozent)
- 50) Verteilung der AvH-Stipendiaten und Preisträger nach Herkunftsregionen (in Prozent)
- 51) Verteilung der AvH-Stipendiaten und Preisträger nach Fachgruppen (in Prozent)

### **6.1.10 Kennzahlen für Maßnahmen zur Förderung der Internationalität**

#### **6.1.11 Öffentlichkeitsarbeit / Marketing**

- 52) Die Webseiten der Hochschule sind überwiegend auch in englischer Sprache abrufbar

- 53) Die Webseiten der Hochschule sind nicht nur in Englisch sondern zumindest teilweise auch in einer oder mehreren anderen Fremdsprachen abrufbar
- 54) Teilnahme an Bildungsmessen etc. im Ausland
- 55) Durchführung von Promotion Touren im Ausland
- 56) Teilnahme an GATE
- 57) Unterhaltung eines oder mehrerer Auslandsbüros

### **6.1.12 Informations-, Beratungs- und Betreuungsangebote für Studierende und Doktoranden**

#### *Angebote für ausländische Studierende/Doktoranden:*

- 58) Allgemeine Beratung
- 59) Bereitstellung von speziellen, studiengangsbezogenen Informationen
- 60) Deutschkurse
- 61) Tutorien
- 62) Hilfe bei der Wohnungsvermittlung
- 63) Betreuungspakete, z.B. die Bereitstellung einer Wohnung, Studienberatung, Mensa-Essen etc.

#### *Angebote für deutsche Studierende/Doktoranden:*

- 64) Allgemeine Beratung über Möglichkeiten des Auslandsstudiums und über Stipendien
- 65) Angebote zur sprachlichen Vorbereitung von "outgoing students"
- 66) Angebote zur fachlichen Vorbereitung von "outgoing students"
- 67) Angebote zur kulturellen Vorbereitung von "outgoing students"
- 68) Nachbereitungskurse für "outgoing students"

#### *Informations- und Beratungsangebote für deutsche und ausländische Wissenschaftler*

- 69) Spezielle Informations- und Beratungsangebote über Förderungsmöglichkeiten für Auslandsaufenthalte
- 70) Information/Beratung/Unterstützung von Wissenschaftlern bei der Antragstellung für internationale Projekte, z.B. EU-Projekte
- 71) Spezielle Beratungsangebote für ausländische Gastwissenschaftler
- 72) Gästehaus der Hochschule zur Unterbringung von ausländische Gastwissenschaftler

#### *Budgetrelevanz*

- 73) Internationalität als Kriterium bei der Festlegung von Haushaltsmitteln für Fakultäten/Fachbereiche

#### *Qualitätssicherung*

- 74) Anwendung spezieller Maßnahmen und Verfahren zur Sicherung bzw. Überprüfung der Qualität internationaler Aktivitäten

## 7. Taiwanese Indicatorlist

Chin & Ching, 2009

### ***Internationalization indicators suggested by local internationalization officers***

- 1) Administrative leadership commitments
- 2) Availability of internationalization support system
- 3) Availability of internationalized courses and foreign language courses
- 4) Building an internationalized atmosphere on campus
- 5) Financial support
- 6) Incentives for international collaborative research for faculty
- 7) Information accessibility (availability of English version of website)
- 8) Recruiting international faculties and students
- 9) Scholarship availability for international students
- 10) Seeking international partner schools
- 11) Strategic planning of activities (including periodic self-performance evaluation)
- 12) Study abroad program

### ***Internationalization indicators suggested by scholars/experts***

- 13) Appropriate staff and resources to support internationalization
- 14) Assessment and accountability mechanism in place
- 15) Articulated in the institution's Mission/vision
- 16) Clear university policy and guidelines to support internationalization
- 17) Faculty collaboration with colleagues in other countries
- 18) International scholars and students on campus
- 19) Internationalized programs (but not limited to use of English as teaching medium)
- 20) Professional foreign language programs availability
- 21) Sending local scholars and students abroad
- 22) Series of planned activities with initiatives being done
- 23) Support systems in terms of funding, infrastructures, and staffa

### ***Internationalization indicators suggested by international students***

- 24) Availability of an international liaison office/center
- 25) Extra-curricular, social, and cultural activities in campus
- 26) International recognition and international academic partners
- 27) International students and scholars on campus
- 28) Internationalized courses and programs availability
- 29) Internet presence (availability of English information in webpage)
- 30) Strong foreign language course availability (including Mandarin Chinese)

## 8. SIU

Hvordan måle internasjonaliseringen av norsk høyere utdanning? Forslag til indikatorer

### ***Ledelse og strategi***

- 1) Finnes en offentlig tilgjengelig internasjonaliseringsstrategi med konkrete målsetninger?
- 2) Er internasjonaliseringsstrategien forankret i institusjonsledelsen?
- 3) Er det nedsatt et utvalg som staker ut retningslinjer for og følger opp internasjonaliseringsarbeidet ved institusjonen?
- 4) Er internasjonalisering jevnlig et tema ved ledelsesmøter?
- 5) Har fakulteter og institutter en handlingsplan for internasjonalisering?
- 6) Finnes prosedyrer som sikrer et effektivt samspill mellom sentrale og desentrale internasjonaliseringsaktiviteter?

### ***Organisasjon og finansiering***

- 7) Er det satt av øremerkede midler til internasjonaliseringsarbeidet?
- 8) Hvor stor del av institusjonen egne midler brukes for å finansiere internasjonaliseringsarbeidet?
- 9) Gis det finansiell støtte til oppbygging av internasjonale faglige nettverk?
- 10) Hvis ja, hvor mye gis i støtte til å utvikle kontakter initiert i fagmiljøene og hvor mye gis i støtte til kontakter initiert sentralt ved institusjonen?
- 11) Gis det finansiell støtte til institusjonspartnerskap?
- 12) Finnes det et eget internasjonalt kontor ved institusjonen?
- 13) Hvor mange årsverk er satt av til internasjonaliseringsarbeidet?
- 14) Er eventuelle stillinger plassert sentralt eller desentralt ved institusjonen?
- 15) Finnes det tiltak for å sikre et effektivt samspill mellom vitenskaplig og administrativt ansatte på internasjonaliseringsområdet?

### ***Internasjonale avtaler og institusjonell forankring***

- 16) Hvor mange forpliktende, strategiske samarbeidsavtaler har institusjonen inngått?
- 17) Springer avtalene ut av fagmiljøenes kontakter eller initiativ sentralt ved institusjonen?
- 18) Hvor mange av avtalene knyttet det seg faktiske aktiviteter til det siste året?
- 19) Hvilke aktiviteter omfattes av avtalene?
- 20) Hvor mange avtaler omfatter både forsknings- og utdanningssamarbeid?
- 21) Hvor mange avtaler omfatter studenter?
- 22) Hvor mange avtaler omfatter ansatte?
- 23) Hvor mange av avtalene har som primær målsetning å tiltrekke kompetanse utenfra?
- 24) Hvor mange av avtalene har gjensidighet i kunnskapsutvekslingen som primær målsetning?
- 25) Hvor mange av avtalene har kompetanseoverføring som primær målsetning?

### ***Studentmobilitet ut***

- 26) Har institusjonen en strategi for å øke antallet utreisende studenter?
- 27) Hvor mange delstudenter reiste ut fra institusjonen foregående studieår?
- 28) Hvor stor andel utgjorde disse av den totale studentmassen ved institusjonen?
- 29) Har institusjonen måltall for hvor mange studenter som skal reise ut på delstudier?
- 30) Antall utreisende delstudenter fordelt på land
- 31) Antall utreisende delstudenter fordelt på fag

- 32) Hvor mange delstudenter reiste foregående studieår ut gjennom bilaterale avtaler?
- 33) Hvor mange delstudenter reiste foregående studieår ut gjennom utvekslingsprogrammer, og hvilke?
- 34) Finnes det faste prosedyrer for å informere om mulighetene for delstudier i utlandet?
- 35) Tilbys det praktisk individuell veiledning i forbindelse med delstudier i utlandet, om hvordan bli tatt opp ved en utenlandsk institusjon og hvordan får godkjent kursene ved hjemmeinstitusjonen?
- 36) Blir delstudier i utlandet forhåndsgodkjent ved hjemmeinstitusjonen?
- 37) Hvis ikke, finnes det faste prosedyrer for å sikre godkjenning av studiene etter at studenten har vendt hjem?
- 38) Er kursene som tas i utlandet kvalitetssikret på noen måte av hjemmeinstitusjonen eller er det frie studiepoeng?
- 39) Hvordan er forholdet mellom antall studiepoeng ved normal studieprogresjon på hjemmeinstitusjonen og antall godkjente studiepoeng fra utlandet?
- 40) Stiller institusjonen krav til språkferdigheter hos studentene som reiser ut?
- 41) Finnes det faglige og pedagogiske strategier for å ta i bruk studentenes erfaringer etter at de har vendt hjem?

### ***Studentmobilitet inn***

- 42) Har institusjonen en strategi for rekruttering av utenlandske studenter?
- 43) Hvis ja, retter strategien seg mot selvfinansierte studenter eller studenter under norskfinansierte stipendordninger?
- 44) Hvor mange studenter med utenlandsk statsborgerskap var registrert som studenter ved institusjonen foregående studieår?
- 45) Hvor mange av de utenlandske studentene var tatt opp ved et gradsstudium foregående studieår?
- 46) Antall utenlandske studenter fordelt på land
- 47) Antall utenlandske studenter fordelt på fag
- 48) Hvor stor andel utgjorde de utenlandske studentene av den totale studentmassen foregående studieår?
- 49) Hvor mange studenter var registrert foregående studieår med videregående skole/studiekompetansegivende utdanning fra utlandet?
- 50) Hvor mange utgjorde disse av den totale studentmassen dette året?
- 51) Hvor mange studenter var registrert som innkommende delstudenter foregående studieår?
- 52) Hvor stor andel utgjorde disse av den totale studentmassen dette året?
- 53) Hvor mange av de innkommende delstudentene kom gjennom bilaterale avtaler?
- 54) Hvor mange av de innkommende delstudentene kom gjennom utvekslingsprogrammer, og hvilke?
- 55) Antall innkommende delstudenter fordelt på land
- 56) Antall innkommende delstudenter fordelt på fag
- 57) Har institusjonen et mottaksapparat for utenlandske studenter, som omfatter bolig, språkkurs og informasjon/veiledning?
- 58) Har institusjonen faglige og pedagogiske strategier for å ta i bruk de utenlandske studentenes erfaringer og perspektiver?

### ***Internasjonalisering gjennom informasjon og profilering***

- 59) Har institusjonen utviklet en plan for profileringsarbeid internasjonalt?
- 60) Hvis ja, vektlegges noen fagområder særlig i profileringen, og i tilfelle hvilke?
- 61) Har institusjonen spesielle satsingsland, i tilfelle hvilke?
- 62) Har institusjonen utviklet engelskspråklige websider?
- 63) Har institusjonen utviklet annet engelskspråklig profilerings- og informasjonsmaterieil?
- 64) Har institusjonen utviklet profilerings- og informasjonsmaterieil på andre språk enn engelsk/norsk?
- 65) Deltar institusjonen på internasjonale studentmesser eller utdanningskonferanser?

### ***Internasjonalisering forankret i fag og undervisning***

- 66) Antall studieprogrammer ved institusjonen på engelsk
- 67) Finnes det faste prosedyrer for å sikre den språklige kvaliteten på norske mastergrader tilbudt på engelsk?

- 68) Hvor mange norske studenter er registrert ved de engelskspråklige studieprogrammene?
- 69) Hvor mange utenlandske studenter er registrert ved de engelskspråklige studieprogrammene?
- 70) Antall studieprogrammer ved institusjonen på et annet språk enn norsk og engelsk (sett vekk fra språkfagene)
- 71) Antall studieprogrammer med en internasjonal faglig eller tematisk profil
- 72) Antall studieprogrammer med innlagt studieopphold eller praksisopphold i utlandet
- 73) Antall studieprogrammer arrangert i samarbeid med en utenlandsk institusjon (herunder også Erasmus Mundus)
- 74) Antall studenter på master- og PhD-nivå med koveileder ved en utenlandsk institusjon
- 75) Antall felles studieprogrammer som munner ut i dobbelt eller felles vitnemål
- 76) Har institusjonen konkrete planer om å innføre felles studieprogrammer og felles vitnemål med en eller flere utenlandske institusjoner?
- 77) Har institusjonen tatt i bruk ny teknologi for å tilføre undervisningen en internasjonal dimensjon?

### ***Internasjonalisering av forsker- og lærerstaben***

- 78) Har institusjonen en strategi for å rekruttere flere utenlandske forskere og lærere?
- 79) Lyses stillinger ut internasjonalt?
- 80) Har institusjonen et gjesteforskerprogram?
- 81) Hvor mange ansatte ved institusjonen har et utenlandsk statsborgerskap?
- 82) Hvor stor andel utgjør disse av det totale antallet ansatte?
- 83) Har institusjonen et apparat for å ta i mot utenlandske forskere og lærere, som omfatter bolig, barnehage m.m.?
- 84) Har institusjonen en strategi for at flere ansatte skal reise ut på kortere eller lengre opphold?
- 85) Hvor mange av institusjonens ansatte hadde et opphold i utlandet på to måneder eller mer foregående år?
- 86) Hvor mange av institusjonens ansatte har en grad fra en utenlandsk institusjon?
- 87) Hvor mange av institusjonens ansatte har undervisningserfaring fra utlandet?
- 88) Har institusjonen iverksatt tiltak for å styrke de ansattes språkkompetanse, særlig i engelsk?
- 89) Har institusjonen iverksatt tiltak for å styrke de ansattes interkulturelle kompetanse (for eksempel interkulturell pedagogikk og kommunikasjon)?
- 90) Har institusjonen prosedyrer for aktivt å ta i bruk de utenlandske ansatte i institusjonens internasjonaliseringsarbeid, ute og hjemme?

### ***Internasjonalisering av administrasjon og infrastruktur***

- 91) Har institusjonen et internasjonalt samarbeid om bibliotek tjenester?
- 92) Har institusjonen et internasjonalt samarbeid om IKT?
- 93) Har institusjonen et internasjonalt samarbeid knyttet til laboratorier?
- 94) Har institusjonen prosedyrer for å sikre de administrativt ansattes ferdigheter i fremmedspråk, særlig engelsk?
- 95) Tilrettelegger institusjonen for at også administrativt ansatte kan reise ut på kortere eller lengre opphold, for eksempel hospitere en periode ved en samarbeidsinstitusjon?

### ***Anbefalinger***

- 96) SIU anbefaler at institusjonene tar i bruk flere indikatorer i sitt strategiske arbeid knyttet til internasjonalisering
- 97) SIU anbefaler at Kunnskapsdepartementet tar i bruk indikatorene i styringsdialogen med institusjonene

## 9. Paige (2005) Performance assessment and indicators

R. MICHAEL PAIGE, 2005 “Internationalization of Higher Education: Performance Assessment and Indicators

### *University leadership for internationalization*

#### **9.1.1 Mission statement**

- 1) The university’s mission statement includes international education
- 2) The university’s mission statement sets international education as a university priority

#### **9.1.2 Promotion and publicity**

- 3) The university has written materials describing international education opportunities for faculty staff and students
- 4) The university president mentions international education in speeches

#### **9.1.3 Budget**

- 5) The university has a budget for international activities, staff and offices

#### **9.1.4 Leadership positions**

- 6) The university has a cabinet level administrative position for international education

#### **9.1.5 Promotion and tenure**

- 7) Faculty members get promotion and tenure credit for international activities
- 8) Faculty and staff hiring criteria include the international experience

#### **9.1.6 Student recruitment**

- 9) The international education dimension of university life is used in student recruiting

### *Internationalization Strategic Plan*

#### **9.1.7 Goals**

- 10) The plan sets international education goals for the university
- 11) The plan set international education goals for the faculties or departments

#### **9.1.8 Objectives**

- 12) The plan sets objectives for the university
- 13) The plan sets objectives for faculties and departments

#### **9.1.9 Inputs**

- 14) The plan provides budget resources for international activities
- 15) The plan provides staff resources for international activities

#### **9.1.10 Activities**

- 16) The plan lists specific internationalization activities for the university
- 17) The plan lists specific internationalization activities for faculties and departments

### **9.1.11 Timelines and targets**

- 18) The plans establish timelines and targets for internationalization

### ***Institutionalization of international education***

### **9.1.12 Committees**

- 19) The university establishes a university-wide committee responsible for international education
- 20) The university establishes a faculty and department committee responsible for international education

### **9.1.13 Accountability structures**

- 21) The university has a delegated officer responsible for data collection and analysis regarding international education
- 22) The university has a delegated officer responsible for the achievements of timelines and targets
- 23) The university has a monitoring procedure for assessing the progress regarding internationalization

### ***Infrastructure (professional units and staff)***

### **9.1.14 International students and scholars**

- 24) The university has an international student and scholar office (ISSO)
- 25) The university has qualified professionals running the ISSO

### **9.1.15 Study abroad**

- 26) The university has a Study Abroad Office (SAO)
- 27) The university has qualified professionals running the SAO

### **9.1.16 International exchanges, projects, grants, contracts**

- 28) The university has an international programs office (IPO) to support university initiatives
- 29) The university has qualified professionals running the IPO

### ***Internationalized Curriculum***

### **9.1.17 International Majors**

- 30) The university has undergraduate majors that are international in character such as area studies, international studies and foreign languages
- 31) The university has graduate majors that are international in character

### **9.1.18 International Minors**

- 32) The university has undergraduate minors that are international in character such as area studies, international studies and foreign languages
- 33) The university has graduate minors that are international in character

### **9.1.19 International Courses**

- 34) The university has core curriculum international course requirements for undergraduates (e.g. international politics)
- 35) The university has international course requirements for graduate students

### **9.1.20 Languages**

- 36) The university has a second language requirement for undergraduates
- 37) The university has a second language proficiency graduation requirement
- 38) The university has a second language requirement for graduate students
- 39) The university has a graduate studies language proficiency requirement

### **9.1.21 Scholarships and awards**

- 40) The university has scholarships and awards for undergraduate students to study abroad
- 41) The university has scholarships and awards for graduate students to conduct research abroad

### **9.1.22 Resources**

- 42) The university has an international education curriculum committee
- 43) The university has a budget for international course development
- 44) The university has a faculty grant program for international curriculum development
- 45) The university provides faculty release time for international curriculum development

### ***International students and scholars***

#### **9.1.23 International student recruitment**

- 46) The university has scholarships and awards for international students
- 47) The university has a recruitment strategy for international students
- 48) The university has tuition waivers for eligible international students

#### **9.1.24 International student support**

- 49) The university has an international student office and advisors
- 50) The university has an arrival orientation program for international students
- 51) The university has a professional second language program on campus for international students

#### **9.1.25 Integration of university students into university life**

- 52) The university has academic programs that utilize international students as learning resources
- 53) The university has co-curricular programs for international students (e.g. homestay programs)

### ***Study abroad***

#### **9.1.26 Academic study abroad**

- 54) The university has study abroad programs for academic credit

#### **9.1.27 Work and tourism abroad**

- 55) The university has non-academic programs abroad such as work and tourism programs

#### **9.1.28 Specialized academic study abroad**

- 56) The university has academic study abroad programs designed for specific departments and faculties

#### **9.1.29 Study abroad requirements**

- 57) The university has a number of departments and faculties with partner universities abroad

### **9.1.30 Exchange agreements**

58) The university has study abroad exchange agreements with partner universities abroad

### **9.1.31 Student Support**

59) The university has scholarships for study abroad students

60) The university has pre-departure in-country and re-entry programs for study abroad students

### ***Faculty involvement in international activities***

### **9.1.32 Faculty support**

61) The university provides travel support for faculty to attend conferences abroad

62) The university provides funding for faculty to lead study abroad tours and programs

63) The university provides orientation programs for faculty interested in teaching and conducting research abroad

### **9.1.33 Exchange agreements**

64) The university has exchange agreements with partner universities that enable faculty members to work abroad

### **9.1.34 International grants and contracts**

65) The university provides release time for faculty to work on international grants and contracts

66) The university provides release time for faculty to work on university-sponsored development assistance projects

### ***Campus life / Co-curricular programs***

### **9.1.35 Campus life offices**

67) The university has a campus life office responsible and the international aspect of campus life is among its responsibilities

### **9.1.36 Student organizations**

68) The university has student organizations with an international focus (e.g. nationality clubs)

69) The university provides funding for university organizations to sponsor international activities

### **9.1.37 Campus programs**

70) The university offers international and intercultural programs on campus

71) The university offers international leadership opportunities for students

72) The university has a career development center with international job placements and advising

73) The university has residence facilities where international and domestic students can live together

74) International cuisine is served in the cafeteria

75) There is an international lounge for informal interactions with international students

### ***Monitoring the process***

### **9.1.38 Performance assessment process**

76) The university has a formal performance assessment process in place

77) The university has designated officers for performance monitoring

### **9.1.39 Performance indicators**

78) The university has developed performance indicators for internationalization

#### **9.1.40 Performance reviews**

- 79) The university holds internal performance reviews of internationalization activities annually
- 80) The university conducts external reviews of its internationalization activities every 5 to 10 years
- 81) The university has established a performance-reporting timetable
- 82) The university has a governance structure responsible for reviewing the annual reports, making suggestions for future activities, and making suggestions for revisions of the strategic plan

## 10. Campus France

Quality Charter for French Government Foreign Scholars

### *I - Before departure*

#### **10.1.1 Presentation of French higher education Opportunities**

#### **10.1.2 Information on foreign scholar Programmes**

- 1) Post on their websites information for students on all foreign scholar programmes, with hyperlinks to the relevant websites.

#### **10.1.3 Development of structured foreign scholar programmes**

#### **10.1.4 Preparations for departure**

- 2) Ensure, where applicable, that bi-nationally supervised doctoral thesis contracts and agreements, agreements on issuing diplomas resulting from international partnerships, Erasmus Mundus agreements and so forth are signed,
- 3) Provide candidates with accurate details of the proposed courses and their educational content,
- 4) Inform scholars of study course conditions including the academic year timetable, timetable of examinations and student's charter,
- 5) Appoint a contact person for scholars in the higher education institution and send his or her details to the Embassy, which shall contact the said contact person,
- 6) Provide scholars, before their departure, via the Embassy or online, with all useful information (accommodation possibilities, access to various university services, sports and cultural activities available, safety advice, town maps, university maps, etc.).

### *II - On arrival in France*

#### **10.1.5 Reception on arrival**

#### **10.1.6 Accommodation**

- 7) Ensure that each scholar is assigned accommodation in the best possible conditions, in liaison with the specialised agencies and bodies.

#### **10.1.7 Reception at the place of study**

- 8) Welcome the foreign students on their arrival at the institution: promptly put them in contact with their contact person, organise a collective welcoming meeting, and present the scientific and educational features of the institution,
- 9) Provide useful information on life on the university campus with all the cultural, sporting and socio-cultural possibilities in addition to the information provided by the agency in charge of managing the student's scholarship, fellowship or grant,
- 10) Also help set up a one-stop office covering different public service agencies to facilitate administrative formalities. The local and regional authorities could thereby take part in welcoming and acclimating students, presenting life in France and the regions along with their economic, social and cultural aspects.

### ***III - During the stay***

#### **10.1.8 Teaching in foreign languages**

- 11) Pay particular attention to non-French-speaking students likely to experience the greatest difficulties with settling in and the highest risk of academic failure by offering them linguistic assistance and academic support suited to their situation from among the available training. It shall offer classes in a foreign language, especially in English, to ensure that the language barrier is not an impediment to learning.

#### **10.1.9 Mentoring and assimilation**

- 12) Organise mentoring by a French teacher and/or a French student, calling first and foremost on those who themselves have been on mobility programmes in foreign higher education institutions,
- 13) Introduce a range of initiatives to encourage the foreign students to settle in and mix with their fellow French students in the higher education institution and, where appropriate, ask the foreign students to take part in promotional actions ("Europe Days", "National Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus Days", etc.) and mentoring actions,
- 14) Assist the foreign students with their search for a work placement,
- 15) Ask mentors to inform the agency of any problems that may arise when supervising the students they are in charge of.

#### **10.1.10 Statistical and quality monitoring**

- 16) Provide the agency in charge of the dossier with the necessary information to be able to statistically track the scholars (by nationality, level and academic subject) with reference to the national measures set up,
- 17) Also provide the agency with the necessary data to monitor the quality of the scholars' academic progress (qualifications pursued, participation in exams and results obtained),
- 18) Integrate the students into the current or future alumni networks,
- 19) Make an event of awarding diplomas to students by creating, where appropriate, a ceremony to this end,
- 20) Foster contacts with business and other organisations in connection with any work placements they may offer.

### ***IV - On returning home***

#### **10.1.11 Alumni networks**

- 21) Keep in contact with former scholars and, where appropriate, involve them in actions to promote higher education in their home countries.

#### **10.1.12 Foreign scholar follow-up**

- 22) Provide agencies with the information to be forwarded to the Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs on the qualifications obtained by the participants at the end of their scholarship, fellowship or training course and, where appropriate, at the end of their stay in France,
- 23) Issue students with the documents required for their study period in France to be recognised in their home country and shall use the tools designed to make European higher education qualifications clearer and easier to understand (the diploma supplement and the European CreditTransfer System).

#### **10.1.13 Assessment of the entire foreign scholar system**

## 11. U-Map

### ***teaching and learning profile***

- 1) Orientation of degree
- 2) Subject areas covered
- 3) Degree level focus
- 4) Expenditure on teaching

### ***student profile***

- 5) Mature or adult learners
- 6) Students enrolled (headcount)
- 7) Part-time students
- 8) Students enrolled in distance learning programs

### ***research involvement***

- 9) Expenditure on research
- 10) Peer reviewed publications
- 11) Doctorate production

### ***regional engagement***

- 12) First year bachelor students from the region
- 13) Importance of local/regional income sources
- 14) Graduates working in the region

### ***involvement in knowledge exchange***

- 15) Cultural activities
- 16) Income from knowledge exchange activities
- 17) Patent applications filed
- 18) Start up firms

### ***international orientation***

- 19) Foreign degree seeking students
- 20) Importance of international sources of income
- 21) Students sent out in European and other international exchange programs
- 22) Incoming students in European and other international exchange programs
- 23) Non-national teaching \* and research staff

## 12. NVAO Programme accreditation and internationalisation

The framework for the assessment of internationalisation as a distinctive (quality) feature consists of six standards and each of these standards has at least one criterion.

### ***Vision or policy on internationalisation***

- 1) The programme has a vision or policy on internationalisation. This vision/policy has been made explicit, is shared by the staff members, and stakeholders have been consulted during the formulation or revision of the vision/policy.
- 2) The vision/policy on internationalisation includes verifiable objectives and benchmarks.
- 3) The elements of the vision/policy on internationalisation (such as objectives and benchmarks) are evaluated periodically and form the basis for improvement measures.

### ***Learning outcomes***

- 4) The vision/policy on internationalisation has been adequately transferred into the intended learning outcomes of the programme.
- 5) The programme can demonstrate that the intended international & intercultural learning outcomes are achieved by its graduates.

### ***Teaching and learning***

- 6) The programme's curriculum, educational practice and assessment of students are in line with the vision/policy on internationalisation and the intended international & intercultural learning outcomes.

### ***Staff***

- 7) The engagement and composition of the staff (in quality and quantity) makes the achievement of the intended international & intercultural learning outcomes possible.
- 8) Staff members have sufficient international experience, intercultural competences and language skills to make the achievement of the intended international & intercultural learning outcomes possible.

### ***Services***

- 9) Services provided to national and international students (information provision, counselling, guidance, accommodation, library, Diploma Supplement, ...) are sufficient in view of the vision/policy on internationalisation and the intended international & intercultural learning outcomes.
- 10) Services provided to the staff (information provision, training, facilities, ...) are sufficient in view of the vision/policy on internationalisation and the intended international & intercultural learning outcomes.

### ***Students***

- 11) The engagement and composition of the student group is apt for achieving the intended international & intercultural learning outcomes.
- 12) The international experiences gained by the student group are in line with the international vision/policy and the intended international & intercultural learning outcomes.
- 13) The inbound and outbound mobility of students (degree and credit mobility) is in line with the international vision/policy and the intended international & intercultural learning outcomes.

## 13. EMQT

(By the time of publishing this report, not all task forces in the EMQT project had finalised their action and indicator lists.)

### Goals concerning the institution

**I1** Open doors to other kinds of mobility and cooperation

**I2** Boost reputation / increase visibility of the HEI through ERASMUS

**I3** Enrich the institution's teaching offer **and services** by international mobility

**I4** Achieve institutional awareness of intercultural diversity

### Goals concerning the students

**S1** Allow every student an Erasmus mobility according to his/her needs

**S2** Achieve transversal competencies **and awareness of intercultural diversity** (*also link to society*)

**S3** Ensuring the most successful stay with emphasis on academic achievement

### Goals concerning Society

**So1** Building awareness of European **citizenship**

**So2** Foster interaction between university and non-university organisations **as well as the civil society**

Task Force A: Organisational Models

<b>Actions</b>	<b>I 1</b>	<b>I 2</b>	<b>I 3</b>	<b>I 4</b>	<b>S 1</b>	<b>S 2</b>	<b>S 3</b>	<b>S o 1</b>	<b>S o 2</b>
TFa A1: Provide an institutional backbone for ERASMUS mobility	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TFa A2: Tune the organisational structure to your strategic goals in ERASMUS	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
TFa A3: Support staff mobility through TS and STA activities	X	X	X	X	X		X		
TFa A4: Promote intercultural training courses for academic and non-academic staff	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
TFa A5: Stimulate companies to provide top-up grants for incoming ERASMUS students	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
TFa A6: ERASMUS top-up Grant system with additional funding for outstanding but economically challenged outgoing students	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
TFa A7: Establish (a) Service Learning module(s) based on ERASMUS study or placement	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X

Indicators	A1 back-bone	A2 tune to goals	A3 Staff mobility	A4 intercultural training	A5 companies top-up grants	A6 additional funding for OUT	A7 Service Learning module(s)
TFa I1: <b>Composite Indicator:</b> Do you have an organisational structure for ERASMUS? Do you have an ERASMUS office (independent or as part of an IRO)? Do you have mobility made explicit in your mission statement? Do you have a strategy on ERASMUS ? Do you provide incentives for staff to get involved? Do you have a quality management system for ERASMUS? Do you have (a) scheme(s) to support ERASMUS students with special needs (e.g. disabled, study with child, etc.)? <b>Development Indicator:</b> -Do you set corridors for growth in respective indicators? If yes, how? - Do you adjust corridors according to actual indicator development; if yes, how?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TFa I2: Staff in the IRO in relation to the number of ERASMUS incoming and outgoing students	X	X					
TFa I3: % of ERASMUS Students (incoming) involved in TFa A5					X		
<b>TFa I4: % of ERASMUS Students (incoming) involved in TFa A7</b>							X
TFa I5a: % of acad. staff involved in TFa A5					X		
TFa I5b: % of non.-acad staff involved in TFa A5					X		
TFa I6a: Absolute number of acad. staff involved in TFa A5					X		
TFa I6b: Absolute number of non.-acad staff involved in TFa A5					X		
TFa I7a: % of acad. staff involved in TFa A3			X				

TFa I7b: % of non.-acad staff involved in TFa A3			X				
TFa I8a: Absolute number of acad. staff involved in TFa A3			X				
TFa I8b: Absolute number of acad. staff involved in TFa A3			X				
TFa I9a: % of acad. staff involved in TFa A7							X
TFa I9b: % of non.-acad staff involved in TFa A7							X
TFa I10a: Absolute number of acad. staff involved in TFa A7							X
TFa I10b: Absolute number of non.-acad staff involved in TFa A7							X
TFa I11: institutional (or institutionally initiated) funding for ERASMUS over the overall EU ERASMUS funding (no staff, material investment translated into money)	x	x		x	x	x	x
TFa I12: <b>Quality Composite indicator:</b> Do you have a structured process for the operational management of ERASMUS mobility? Do you monitor the mobility of students with respect to cycles? Do you use results from the monitor for strategic decisions? Do you run regular satisfaction surveys related to ERASMUS Do you use the results for quality assurance (e.g. the process of operational management) Do you communicate results with partners - do you draw action related partners from continuous negative results	x	x		x	x	x	

- do you use indicator results in quality improvement activities							
TFa I13: Composite Indicator: Do you have a strategy on ERASMUS ? Do you have a process established to make a decision related to organisational structures concerning ERASMUS? Do you have a monitor system in place which regularly (once a year) checks whether the structures still fits needs? Do you have a regular communication tool (e.g. meeting) bringing together administrators and academics? Do you have a regular communication tool (e.g. meeting) bringing together IRO and other administrative units? Do you have a task-distribution scheme in place which defines who is responsible for what?	X	X					
TFa I14: % of the overall ERASMUS budget invested for top-up grants under action TFa A6						X	
TFa I15: % of ERASMUS outgoing students funded under Action TFa A6						X	
TFa I16a: % of acad. staff involved in TFa A4				X			
TFa I10b: Absolute number of non.-acad staff involved in TFa A7							X
TFa I11: institutional (or institutionally initiated) funding for ERASMUS over the overall EU ERASMUS funding (no staff, material investment translated into money)	x	x		x	x	x	x

<p><b>TFa I12: Quality Composite indicator:</b></p> <p>Do you have a structured process for the operational management of ERASMUS mobility? Do you monitor the mobility of students with respect to cycles? Do you use results from the monitor for strategic decisions? Do you run regular satisfaction surveys related to ERASMUS Do you use the results for quality assurance (e.g. the process of operational management) Do you communicate results with partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- do you draw action related partners from continuous negative results</li> <li>- do you use indicator results in quality improvement activities</li> </ul>	x	x		x	x	x	
<p><b>TFa I13: Composite Indicator:</b></p> <p>Do you have a strategy on ERASMUS ? Do you have a process established to make a decision related to organisational structures concerning ERASMUS? Do you have a monitor system in place which regularly (once a year) checks whether the structures still fits needs? Do you have a regular communication tool (e.g. meeting) bringing together administrators and academics? Do you have a regular communication tool (e.g. meeting) bringing together IRO and other administrative units? Do you have a task-distribution scheme in place which defines who is responsible for what?</p>	x	x					

TFa I14: % of the overall ERASMUS budget invested for top-up grants under action TFa A6						X	
TFa I15: % of ERASMUS outgoing students funded under Action TFa A6						X	
TFa I16a: % of acad. staff involved in TFa A4				X			
TFa I16b: % of non.-acad staff involved in TFa A4				X			
TFa I17a: Absolute number of acad. staff involved in TFa A4				X			
TFa I17b: Absolute number of non.-acad staff involved in TFa A4				X			
TFa I18: % of students participating in outgoing ERASMUS mobility	X	X	X			X	
TFa I19: What is the development in the percentage rate of students participating in outgoing ERASMUS mobility in the last 5 years? (attached question: why?)	X	X	X			X	

Task Force B: Language Issues:

Actions	I 1	I 2	I 3	I 4	S 1	S 2	S 3	S O 1	S O 2
TFb A1: Offer language courses	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TFb A2: Offer tandem-learning programmes	X		X		X	X		X	
TFb A3: Standardize language levels at the HEIs			X	X			X		X

Indicators	A1 Language	A2 tandem-	A3 language
<p>TFb I1: <b>Composite Indicator:</b>            Do you offer language courses for incoming students?            Do you offer pre-arrival language courses for incoming students?            Do you offer virtual language courses for incoming students?            Do you offer year/semester-long face-to-face language courses for incoming students?            Do you offer language courses for outgoing students?            Do you offer pre-arrival language courses for outgoing students?            Do you offer virtual language courses for outgoing students?            Do you offer year/semester-long face-to-face language courses for outgoing students?            Do you offer language courses for teaching staff?            Do you offer language courses for non-teaching staff?            Do you offer language courses for specific purposes (subject-related courses: Medicine, Law, Engineering, etc.) for incoming students?            Do you offer language courses for specific purposes (subject-related courses: Medicine, Law, Engineering, etc.) for outgoing students?</p>	X		
<p>TFb I2: <b>Composite Indicator:</b>            Do you require proof of language proficiency for incoming students?            Do you require proof of language proficiency for</p>			X

selecting outgoing students? Do you require proof of language proficiency for placements?			
TFb I3: Do you offer different language courses levels?	X		X
TFb I4: Is language tuition free at your HEI?	X		
TFb I5: Do you offer tandem-learning programmes?		X	
TFb I6: <b>composite indicator</b> Do you use the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference)? Do you monitor the distribution of outgoing students over the CEFR levels? Do you monitor the distribution of incoming students over the CEFR levels? <b>development indicator</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you set corridors for growth in respective indicators? If yes, how?</li> <li>• Do you adjust corridors according to actual indicator development? if yes, how?</li> </ul>	X		X
TFb I7a: % of incoming students attending at your HEI the language course units they need (where <i>units</i> means <i>units especially designed for Erasmus/exchange students</i> )	X		X
TFb I7b: % of outgoing students attending at your HEI the language course unit they need (where <i>units</i> means <i>units especially designed for Erasmus/exchange students</i> )	X		X

TFb I8a: % of incoming students whose language needs – as from counting appropriate applications – are not covered with the course units offered by your HEI (i.e. number of „ <i>not fulfilled</i> “ applications over the total of incoming students)	<b>X</b>		<b>X</b>
TFb I8b: % of outgoing students whose language needs – as from counting appropriate applications – are not covered with the course units offered by your HEI (i.e. number of „ <i>not fulfilled</i> “ applications over the total of outgoing students)	<b>X</b>		<b>X</b>
TFb I9a: Number of general language course units offered according to the students' demand	<b>X</b>		<b>X</b>
TFb I9b: Number of language course units for specific purposes offered according to the students' demand	<b>X</b>		<b>X</b>
TFb I10a: for each actually involved CEFR level: <i>ratio of</i> number of incoming students attending language course units, offered at your own HEI and intended to prepare for that given CEFR level, <i>over</i> number of incoming students who applied for a course unit preparing in that very CEFR level.	<b>X</b>		<b>X</b>
TFb I10b: for each actually involved CEFR level: <i>ratio of</i> number of outgoing students attending language course units, offered at your own HEI and intended to prepare for that given CEFR level, <i>over</i> number of outgoing students who applied for a course unit preparing in that very CEFR level	<b>X</b>		<b>X</b>
TFb I11: % of teaching staff attending language courses	<b>X</b>		
TFb I12: % of non-teaching staff attending language courses	<b>X</b>		

**Task Force D: Performance and Recognition**

Actions	I 1	I 2	I 3	I 4	S 1	S 2	S 3	S O 1	S O 2
TFd A1: Assess Bilateral Agreements (value)	X	X	X	X	X		X		
TFd A2: Involve the same academic bodies in the approval of Bilateral Agreements (BAs), Learning Agreements (LAs) and in recognition	X	X	X	X	X		X		
TFd A3: Monitor performance during mobility and recognition after mobility	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
TFd A4: Ensure transparency in recognition	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
TFd A5: Ensure flexibility in recognition	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Indicators	A1 Assess agreements	A2 single responsible body	A3 monitoring performances & recognition	A4 transparency in recognition	A5 flexibility in recognition
TFd I1a: ratio “number of academics involved in student mobility over number of Erasmus outgoing students”	X	X	X		
TFd I1b: ratio “number of academics involved in student mobility over number of Erasmus incoming students”	X	X	X		
<p>TFd I2 : <b>Composite indicator (if yes, how; if not, why not)</b></p> <p>TFd I2a1: do you have a single academic body responsible for the approval of Bilateral Agreements (BAs), Learning Agreements (LAs) and for recognition?</p> <p>TFd I2a2: do you favour coordination among the flow coordinators related to a given degree-course or group of degree-courses?</p>	X	X	X		
TFd I3a: ratio “number of academics involved in student mobility over number of bilateral agreements”	X	X	X		
TFd I3b: ratio “number of Erasmus student grants over number of available exchange places (according to bilateral agreements)”	X	X	X		

TFd I4a: ratio “number of achieved credits over agreed credits in LA”			X	X	X
TFd I4b: ratio “number of students who achieve the total number of agreed credits over total number of outgoing students			X	X	X
TFd I5a: ratio “number of recognized credits over achieved credits”		X	X	X	X
TFd I5b: ratio “number of students who obtain total recognition of the achieved credits over total number of outgoing students”		X	X	X	X
TFd I6: ratio “number of students who leave with a previously approved LA over total number of outgoing students”		X	X	X	X
TFd I7: Number of recognized credits per months abroad		X	X	X	X
TFd I8: <b>Composite indicator (if yes, how; if not, why not)</b> TFd I8a: Do you assess bilateral agreements? TFd I8a1: how many times a year do you carry out any kind of assessment? TFd I8a2: for each level do you compare agreed to reached figures (exchange places)? TFd I8a3: for each level do you assess numbers of agreed credits? TFd I8a4: for each level do you assess numbers of achieved credits? TFd I8a5: for each level do you assess numbers of recognised credits? TFd I8a6: do you assess if the agreed field of study is suitable?	X		X		

TFd I8a7: for each level do you compare agreed to reached duration of mobility period? TFd I8a8: do you assess a reciprocity ratio? TFd I8a9: do you evaluate geographical distribution of your bilateral agreements?					
TFd I9: <b>Composite indicator</b> (if yes, describe how, if not, why not) TFd I9a1: do you evaluate recognition procedures for mobile students through questionnaires, interviews, focus groups, etc? – please describe TFd I9a2: how do you assure that students leave with a previously approved LA? – please describe your procedure TFd I9a3: how do you assure that learning outcomes are comparable to the home learning outcomes? – please describe your procedure	X	X	X	X	X
TFd I10: <b>Quality Composite indicator (if yes, how; if not, why not)</b> TFd I10a1: Do you assess satisfaction of ERASMUS exchange students (ingoing & outgoing) based on academic experience? TFd I10a2: Do you provide support services for Erasmus exchange students? TFd I10a3: Do you provide counselling based on your students' needs? TFd I10a4: Do you apply flexibility in order to ensure recognition of achieved credits?		X	X	X	X

Publisher:  
CHE Consult GmbH  
Verler Str. 6  
D-33332 Gütersloh

Phone: +49 (0) 5241 / 21179-71  
Fax: +49 (0) 5241/ 21179-52  
Internet: [www.che-consult.de](http://www.che-consult.de)

ISBN 978-3-941927-03-2



This project has been funded with support from European Commission. This web content reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.