



SEMINAR FOR BOLOGNA AND
HIGHER EDUCATION REFORM EXPERTS:

Enhancing Quality through Internationalisation

READER

University of Lisbon

6-7 October 2011



CONTENT

Chapter 1: Messages from the organizers

Lisbon and its University
Keynote speakers – short bio
The Fado singer and guitarists – short bio
News!

Chapter 2: Contributions from the Seminar Speakers

2.1. Keynote speeches
2.2. Discussion Groups

Chapter 3: Selection of documents, articles and recent conferences

Chapter 4: Background documents

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author(s), and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

CHAPTER 1: MESSAGES FROM THE ORGANISERS

Lisbon and its University

About Lisbon

As one of the most attractive and ancient European cities, Lisbon is a rich melting pot of cultures, serving as a stopping point for a great number of routes, hosting a significant immigration community and offering interesting economic possibilities and quality activities in the domains of education, science and culture.

Enjoying mild winters and cool summers freshened by soft Atlantic breezes, and offering some of Europe's finest hotels for both business and leisure, Lisbon is an ideal place to visit. The city itself, situated on seven hills, combines historical and modern features. Its pavements, cored with hewn cobblestones forming a myriad of designs, are unique in Europe. Many buildings are covered by characteristic tiles called *azulejos*, an Arab inheritance. Lisbon has more than 35 museums, modern convention centres, theatres, opera theatres, concert halls and unique and impressive monuments, such as the medieval castle of *S. Jorge* located at the top of Lisbon's highest hill, built by the Visigoths and expanded by the Moors, the impressive medieval cathedral – *Sé de Lisboa*, the tower of *Belém*, the monastery of *Jerónimos* which is Lisbon's biggest and most admirable religious monument, the square *Terreiro do Paço* and the quarter of *Baixa*.

A modern and attractive area of the city is the *Parque das Nações*. *Parque das Nações* was built on the heritage of EXPO'98 – the last World Exhibition of the 20th Century, which offers some of the most daring examples of contemporary architecture, Europe's largest Oceanarium, delightful thematic gardens, exhibition centres, theatres and event halls. All located along a breathtaking 5 km stretch of Tagus riverfront, in the heart of Lisbon, with easy access and parking, and benefiting from a wide array of shops, restaurants and bars. An invented city turned into reality.

As for modern and contemporary art, the Cultural Centre of Belém, the Modern Art Centre *José de Azevedo Perdigão* from the Gulbenkian Foundation and the National Museum of Contemporary Art are the most important museums to be visited.

The National Tile Museum (*Museu Nacional do Azulejo*) offers a wide range of very different activities, and you can visit the permanent exhibition of predominantly Portuguese Tiles from the 15th to 21st Century, with the temporary exhibition rooms, the restaurant and the shop.

The National Museum of Carriages (*Museu Nacional dos Coches*) is one of the most visited museums in Portugal and certainly of Lisbon, which houses and exhibits, an exceptional collection of ceremonial vehicles from the Royal family dating from 17th Century to late 19th Century. Considered the most remarkable collection in the world of this kind, it allows the visitor to follow both the technical evolution of animal-pulled transport and the changes of taste expressed in the decorative arts and vehicles ornaments.

Fado

Fado is currently a world-wide known symbol of Portugal, being represented for many years in foreign countries by Amália Rodrigues, and more recently by Dulce Pontes, Mariza and Katia Guerreiro, among others. Throughout the world, to the name of Portugal, there were two things immediately referred: the Fado and soccer. Although taking many forms, as it is sung differently in

Porto, Coimbra and Lisbon, the Fado is, by self-earned right, the very expression of the Portuguese soul. Fado seems to have first appeared in Lisbon and Porto, being later taken to Coimbra with the University students, having acquired different characteristics from the music played in Lisbon.

Portugal, since the moment of its birth, emerged in a crossroad of cultures. This makes difficult to point out a precise origin of Fado, but scholars agree that its origins go back many centuries, maybe even to times prior to the existence of Portugal as an independent country, being traced to the songs of the Moors living in Lisbon before the Christian take-over of the city. However, there are those who say that the Fado came to Portugal, once more through Lisbon, under the form of Lundum, the music of the Brazilian slaves. By this explanation, it should have arrived to Portugal with the sailors returning from their long trips, approximately in the year of 1822. Only after a while, Lundum started modifying until it became the Fado that we know today.

In the social program of the UNICA conference the Fado singer, Tania Oleiro is presenting a repertoire of Portuguese songs. Tania Oleiro, has been invited to sing in several renowned Fado houses in Lisbon and various halls, in Portugal and in some countries of Europe, alongside several names devoted to fado. This singer has participated in the concert of Rabih Abou Kahlil and is part of a project inspired in the film *Fados* of the cinema director Carlos Saura, where different generations of Fado singers and styles are recreated. This project has been presented in various European countries where the roots of Fado can be met, in the Moorish songs of the Al-Andaluz.

The Seminar's Venue

The seminar 2011 will be held on the campus of the Universidade de Lisboa (University of Lisbon).

With an outstanding scientific and cultural tradition, the *Universidade de Lisboa*, whose origin dates back to the establishment of the Portuguese University by King D. Dinis in 1288 and re-founded in 1911, is a state institution, a centre intended to produce, transmit and diffuse knowledge, culture and science at the highest level.

The *Universidade de Lisboa* has, currently, an estimated number of 23 000 students and a teaching staff of 1 600 highly qualified professors (70 % PhDs), many of whom are eminent cultural and scientific Portuguese personalities.

Research is carried out in laboratories, institutes and research centres sponsored by the public and private sectors as well as through exchange programmes with others universities and other national and international institutes. In what concerns research projects, quality services promoting schema, construction of infrastructures, overall modernisation and improvement projects in general, the *Universidade de Lisboa* is represented and participates in European Union, bilateral and international programmes and in inter-institutional European projects and programs.

At the international level, the *Universidade de Lisboa* favours the relations with the community through co-operation initiatives, namely in the fields of consulting, applied research, specialized services, technological transfer, assessment of projects and training, as well as in cultural activities. It also participates in and is a member of innumerable prestigious world organizations and networks which cover the interests, concerns and goals it pursues.

Keynote speakers – short bio

Jacques Lanares

Jacques Lanarès is Vice-Rector of the University of Lausanne, in charge of the Development of Teaching, Quality and Interface between science and society. He chairs the Quality Network for Swiss Higher Education institutions (board of vice presidents in charge of quality and of quality executives from all Swiss universities). He has created and developed the Teaching Support Unit of the University of Lausanne. He is expert for Quality matters in Higher Education for the European University Association (EUA), the French agency for Quality in Higher Education (AERES), the Irish Universities Quality Board (IUQB) and the World Bank.

Melita Kovačević

Dr. Melita Kovačević studied in Croatia (bachelor's and doctoral degree) and in the United States (master's degree). Her basic academic background is psychology. Her second bachelor degree was in phonetics. She had a numerous short and long visits to different European and American universities as a researcher, senior scholar or invited lecturer. Her main research interests are: cognitive psychology, psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, cognitive neuroscience and language pathology. She participated in numerous Croatian and European scientific and professional projects as a head of the project/project coordinator, or as a team member.

Dr. Melita Kovačević is a Full Professor at the University of Zagreb, Department of Speech and Language Pathology. She is a head of the Laboratory for Psycholinguistic Research, a director of Interdisciplinary Postgraduate Doctoral Study *Language and Cognitive Neuroscience* and a coordinator of the *Middle European Interdisciplinary Master Programme in Cognitive Science*. Currently she is a Vice-Rector for Science and Technology of the University of Zagreb.

Dr. Melita Kovačević is a member of many national and international working groups, bodies, foundations, councils, committees etc. (e.g. Steering Committee of EUA Council of Doctoral Education - EUA 11

CDE, Executive Board of the National Foundation for Science, Higher Education and Technological Development of the Republic of Croatia, UNICA Bologna Lab Coordinators, BFUG, National Committee for follow-up Bologna Process etc.). She is a National Expert for Strategic Action Plan for the Implementation of Bologna Process and National Promoter of Bologna Process. Dr. Melita Kovačević organized and participated in many national and international projects, conferences, workshops and seminars on educational issues and Bologna Process

Allan Päll

Allan Päll is a political science student from Estonia and the Chairperson of the European Students' Union (ESU) since July 2011, having previously been Vice-Chairperson. He has previously in 2007-09 led social policy and student financing policy and research in the Federation of Estonian Student Unions (EÜL) and has also been closely involved in the EUROSTUDENT project in Estonia. Before being elected Chairperson, he has been coordinating the work of ESU on EU policies and Quality Assurance and has been leading ESU's project "Quest for Quality for Students" which looks into information provision and aims to build a quality concept from the students' perspective.

Maria Mota, PhD

Maria Mota is Team leader of the Malaria Unit at the Institute of Molecular Medicine (IMM) of the University of Lisbon.

Maria Mota has a PhD (1998) in Molecular Parasitology at University College London, UK Post-doctoral research at New York University Medical Center, USA Principal Investigator at Instituto Gulbenkian Ciência, Oeiras (until 2005) International Research Scholar, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, USA (since 2005) Awarded the European Science Foundation Young Investigator Award Associate Professor at the Faculty of Medicine, University of Lisbon.

Click [HERE](#) for a slightly more detailed curriculum.

The Fado singer and guitarists – short bio

Tânia Oleiro

Tania Oleiro was born in 22nd of January 1979, starting to sing since an early age and succeeding at several Fado competitions. Tânia Oleiro has been invited to sing in several renowned Fado houses in Lisbon and various halls, alongside several names devoted to Fado in Portugal and in other countries of Europe. This musician has participated in the concert of Rabi'h Abou Kahlil and is part of a project inspired in the film Fados of the cinema director Carlos Saura, where different generations of Fado singers and styles are recreated. In 2010 she was included in the music collection "Divas of Fado aiming at distinguishing the importance of women in the internationalization of this music genre. In 2011, Tania Oleiro prepares her first disc recording which will be an assembly of songs from her repertoire of the past 10 years.

Professor Joel Pina

Joel Pina was born in 1920 in Rosmaninhal, at the district of Castelo Branco. It is a notable musician, who accompanied the group of Fado Diva, Amália Rodrigues during 30 years, receiving a cultural merit medal by the Portuguese State.

Jaime Santos Júnior

Jaime Santos Jr, Fado guitar player, had his apprenticeship with his father, Jaime Santos who was one of the most famous Portuguese guitar players, accompanying him in concerts until 1982. Over the past 25 years, Jaime Santos Junior has worked with the most distinguished Fado singers in Portugal and abroad.

Pedro de Castro

Pedro de Castro, is a renown Portuguese guitar player. He has played and recorded music with several Fado artists. He is the owner of *Mesa de Frades*, which one of the most emblematic Fado houses of Alfama.

News!

Lisbon is the last seminar in the series organized under the present Higher Education Reform III Information Project Contract. Negotiations regarding its renewal for the period 2012 – 2014 with both EAC and EACEA are on its way and we truly hope to share many new experiences with you in the near future. In the meantime, we would like to invite you to take good care of the **Higher**

Education Expert's Personal Handbook that you have just received. Apart from holding interesting information, inspiring quotes and a useful calendar, it contains a lot of blank pages where you will be able to write notes, thoughts, observations and contact details.

The present seminar will also provide the experts the opportunity to participate in **Round Tables monitored by students on the topic of 'The added value generated through internationalisation'**. With the round tables we wish to create a flexible format for open discussion where everyone is on equal footing and can speak his/her mind freely. The 3 round tables will be chaired by 1 expert each who will animate the discussion and recap what was covered during the session. The students will deliver a short introductory speech and will present a list of issues/questions that will be discussed.

As you have probably noticed, **the Open Space** has been given a longer time slot in Lisbon. Once more, we would like to strongly encourage participants as well as NA and NTO representatives to come forward with proposals to share good practice and to promote peer learning. We invite participants to focus on the overall seminar theme of internationalization of higher education and the role the experts can play in this field. An Open Space request form has recently been distributed for the use of the experts and organizational purposes. As **a pilot action** within the Open Space, the **National Teams of Bologna Experts from the United Kingdom and Turkey** will meet and discuss topics of common interest like, among others, ECTS and DS labels, Tuning, etc. Discussions have already been started through the Virtual Community.

We are happy to welcome quite a few new Bologna and Higher Education Reform Experts in Lisbon. A specific **session for newcomers** has been scheduled during the Open Space too. It will include a variety of interactive exercises to give an overview of the role of the experts in the different countries. It will provide the newcomers with a chance to express their hopes and aspirations in being experts, an orientation to the training seminars (format, key features, and opportunities to get involved) and a discussion about the buddy system.

CHAPTER 2: CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE SEMINAR SPEAKERS

2.1. Keynote Speeches

‘Enhancing quality through internationalisation’

Jacques Lanares, Vice Rector University of Lausanne

Quality is constituent of the Bologna Declaration and one of the goals of the process was to increase mobility and internationalization in higher education. However, on the one hand, internationalization in itself does not always enhance the quality of the learning experience of the students nor the education or cursus. On the other hand the application of quality principles to international activities is not always evidence. This intervention will focus on conditions that contribute to enhancement of quality through internationalization so that international experiences of students bring an added value to their education at a personal and academic level. The relations between quality of learning and internationalization will be developed as well as the utilization of quality processes in international activities.

‘Enhancing quality through mobility at PhD level’

*Melita Kovačević, Vice Rector University of Zagreb,
EUA CDE Steering Committee Member*

For all those universities claiming that they are Research University, doctoral education is one of their core activities; and vice versa, research is a core activity of doctoral education. At the same time, it is not possible to detach research and doctoral education from quality: those are three inevitable parts that come together and only as such can assure prosperity of an institution. There are different ways to achieve and maintain quality in doctoral education, having mobility of doctoral candidates, definitely, as one of mechanisms on disposal that institutions could implement.

It is important to notice that mobility on PhD level is quite different from mobility of students on bachelor and master level; on doctoral level is integral part of the research project. This kind of mobility requires high level of flexibility within the system, however should be perceived as an extremely relevant aspect of doctoral candidates experience. Doctoral programmes should be structured in a way to allow and facilitate mobility between countries and to allow and support exchange of young researchers. Salzburg II recommendations on internationalization recognized relevance of mobility: how to achieve mobility, which will enhance quality itself of doctoral education and research, what are possible constraints and obstacles as well as means to facilitate international mobility will be discussed.

‘The students’ views on internationalisation’

Allan Päll, European Student Union

Recently, internationalisation as a policy discourse has emerged through powerful public and government incentive. This is an indication that internationalisation is seen as a response to globalisation in a way that would open up national systems of higher education while maintaining national competence and keep governments behind the wheel.

It is thus paramount to explore what challenges does this pose to the quality of teaching and learning and what opportunities rise from this. Naturally, mobility of students and staff, exchange and international cooperation through projects, are at the core of this discourse. But many questions arise, out of which three main strands will be addressed by the keynote.

How to foster an international culture and exchange of ideas and acceptance of different value sets in a cooperative environment so that students would not feel overwhelmed nor left out? And thus, how to ensure that student input is taken aboard in a meaningful way thus leading to quality enhancement?

How to avoid segregation by association or socio-economic background so that not only the “elites” would benefit from internationalisation?

And how to avoid the situation in which internationalization hand in hand with globalization establishes a narrow understanding of the mission of higher education instead of fostering global citizenship?

2.3. Discussion Groups

Institutional internationalisation strategies and the impact they have on the quality of the education programmes

Arthur Mettinger
University of Vienna

This workshop deals with the question as to how HEIs can make use of institutional internationalisation strategies to enhance the quality of educational programmes. Using Arthur Mettinger’s presentation of the University of Vienna’s internationalisation strategy which covers research, education, and service aspects we will be working on the following issues:

- Which goals should an internationalisation strategy focus on and why?
- Which types of student mobility correspond to Bachelor/Master/PhD-programmes?
- In what way can international staff influence the internationalisation of educational programmes?
- How can Joint Programs enhance the international profile of educational programmes?
- In what way can staff mobility contribute to a better quality of educational programmes?

Participants in the workshop will be invited to share their experience on these questions. Moreover, we will try to sketch major features that should go into an internationalisation strategy in particular with a view to increasing the quality of the educational programmes a HEI provides.

Increasing the quality of education programmes by means of faculty staff with vast international experience &/or from abroad

Dorothy Kelly
University of Granada

The presence and/or proportion of international academic staff is a common indicator for internationalization of higher education and for quality of teaching and learning. The session will address the issues surrounding the internationality of academic staff from at least these standpoints:

- Definitions and data collection
- Intended impact of having international academic staff
- Measuring the real impact

Some actual case studies will be put forward as a basis for discussion, and the various issues arising will be discussed from a critical standpoint. What do we mean by international staff? Are we referring to long-term or tenured positions? Are we referring to temporary mobility? What is vast international experience? What kind of impact are we expecting for the quality of teaching and learning? Is the impact the same in all disciplines? At all levels, for all three cycles? Is it the same for temporary visiting staff as for long-term engagement? Can we really measure the impact on the quality of programmes? Are expectations too high?

Reference will be made to EU-funded projects such as IMPI, U-Multirank and to work carried out by ACA or the Madrid Region Quality Agency, among others.

Quality indicators in internationalisation: what do they mean in different countries and in different mobility contexts? And how do different disciplines approach mobility in their programmes?

Hannah Leichsenring
CHE Consult, Germany

Internationalisation is considered to be of the utmost importance for increasing the quality of learning outcomes and becomes an increasingly complex field. So the need for transparency rises: What is done and what is achieved? HEIs need to answer these questions coming from agencies and ministries, but often feel that the way those institutions want to have the answers do not really reflect the HEI's own idea of quality in internationalisation.

Therefore, the workshop will focus on practical consequences of implementing a strategy:

- How to translate the institutional strategy into indicators,
- how to include different approaches within the institution and
- how to define quality when working with indicators.

Participants are invited to discuss what quality in internationalisation means in different countries (or even different institutions) and in different mobility contexts, and how disciplines differ in their approaches to include mobility in their programmes.

Planned learning outcomes:

Learn how working with indicators can help improving the quality of internationalisation

References:

Uwe Brandenburg, Hans de Wit: *The End of Internationalization*,
http://www.che.de/downloads/IHE_no_62_Winter_2011.pdf

An Overview of several indicator projects on internationalisation: *Indicator Projects on Internationalisation - Approaches, Methods and Findings. A report in the context of the European*

project "Indicators for Mapping & Profiling Internationalisation" (IMPI) http://www.impi-project.eu/pdf/full_indicator_projects_on_internationalisation-IMPI%20100511.pdf

More information on the IMPI project: <http://www.impi-project.eu/>

The Erasmus Programme and its impact on quality in higher education programmes

Hans Vossensteyn
CHEPS, University of Twente

The presentation / workshop of Hans Vossensteyn will be structured around the outcomes of a few recent research studies on the impact of the ERASMUS programme and how the participation of students in this programme can be improved. The ERASMUS programme is influencing European higher education on various levels. Next to providing students opportunities to study abroad or do a foreign internship, it stimulates international cooperation between academics and department. In addition, ERASMUS has boosted the attention for internationalization and triggered many universities to establish an internationalization strategy. Regardless of these landmarks, the ERASMUS programme is not known yet by all students and the amount of grants or the way these are allocated are insufficient to convince potential candidates of a study period abroad. Research shows that the potential number of mobile students with an ERASMUS grant could be seriously increased. Not only are many students interested in a study abroad period, also the ERASMUS budgets are not used optimally because of the decentral budgeting system. The working of the ERASMUS programme as well as the wider internationalization strategies to a large extent depend on the commitment and active participation of university and faculty leadership. Finally, if mobility is regarded an important asset of European higher education, more effort should go to communicating the ERASMUS programme as well as a thorough implementation of internationalization strategies.

Hans Vossensteyn recommends participants in his workshop to read the following documents' Executive Summaries:

- 'Improving the participation in the Erasmus Programme', European Parliament, Study 2010.
- 'The Impact of Erasmus on European Higher Education: Quality, Openness and Internationalisation', Final report by CHEPS, INCHER Kassel & ECOTEC, December 2008.

Both documents can be downloaded from the Lisbon Seminar's website: <http://lisbon2011.bolognaexperts.net>

CHAPTER 3: SELECTION OF DOCUMENTS, ARTICLES AND RECENT CONFERENCES

'Is Internationalisation having an identity crisis?'

Jane Knight (University of Toronto)

OECD IMHE INFO August 2011

There is no doubt that internationalisation has come of age. No longer is it an ad hoc or marginalised part of the higher education landscape. University strategic plans, national policy statements, international declarations, and academic articles all indicate the centrality of internationalisation in the world of higher education.

But, has internationalisation become a catch all phrase used to describe anything and everything remotely linked to the global, inter-cultural, or international dimensions of higher education? Is the recognition and status now linked to internationalisation putting it at risk? Is internationalisation losing its way? After several decades of intense development, is internationalisation having a mid-life crisis?

Not only has internationalisation transformed higher education, it has dramatically changed itself. Recent national and worldwide surveys of university internationalisation priorities and rationales show that establishing an international profile or global standing is becoming more important than reaching international standards of excellence. Capacity building through international cooperation projects is being replaced by status building initiatives to gain world class recognition and higher rankings. International student mobility is now big business and more closely aligned to recruitment of brains for national innovation agendas.

Other unintended consequences show that some private and public education providers are lowering academic standards and transforming into visa factories due to revenue generation imperatives and immigration pressures. More international academic projects and partnerships are becoming commercialised and profit driven as are international accreditation services. Diploma mills and rogue providers are selling bogus qualifications and causing havoc for international qualification recognition. Awarding two degrees from Institutions located in different countries based on the workload for one diploma is being promoted through some rather dubious double degree programs. And all of this is in the name of internationalisation???

At the same time, there are countless examples of positive initiatives which illustrate how collaborative scholarship crossborder education exchange, and campus learning based internationalisation strategies contribute to the development of individuals, institutions, nations, and the world at large.

Who could have forecasted that internationalisation would evolve from what has been traditionally considered a process based on values of cooperation, partnership, exchange, mutual benefits, and capacity building to one that is increasingly characterised by competition, commercialisation, self-interest, and status building. Do these dramatic changes indicate that the once valued and perceived difference between internationalisation and globalisation of higher education is being eroded? Or is internationalisation having an identity crisis as to its fundamental values and what drives the process and outcomes?

Recent debates on the meaning and role of internationalisation have stimulated an interest in redefining internationalisation. But is a new definition of internationalisation the right response or

enough? How can we avoid a scenario where words might change but actions and, more importantly fundamental values, do not?

Internationalisation has always meant different things to different people, institutions and countries. It always will. Internationalisation has been guided by the principles that it must be linked to local context and purpose, that there isn't 'one way or a right way' to internationalise, and that it is a means to an end not an end unto itself. The challenge of strengthening and reinforcing the values of cooperation, exchange, partnership over the current emphasis on competitiveness and commercialisation is front and centre. Are we up to the challenge- can we focus on values and not only on definitions?

Information on the IMPI project (Indicators for Mapping and Profiling Internationalisation)

Project funded with support from the EC under the Lifelong Learning Programme – Erasmus

About IMPI

Bologna and Lisbon call for increased competitiveness and globalisation in higher education is developing rapidly, but so far no European-wide approach has been made to measure internationalisation. Transparency and accountability in internationalisation are not in place yet. To this end, a toolbox of indicators and related objectives and activities will be developed for European HEIs which will allow HEI's to individually define a level of internationality corresponding with their institutional goals. It provides options for comparison on the one hand but also offers opportunities for HEIs to choose their individual profile of internationalisation.

The project core partners are six metalevel institutions, SIU, NUFFIC, ACA, CampusFrance, Perspektywy and CHE Consult. The set of indicators will be co-developed by HEIs in order to ensure both relevance and acceptance in the community. The project aims at supporting HEIs to show how well-performing they are. Furthermore, it provides means for improvement for HEIs. The goal is to increase the overall performance of European HEIs in internationalisation. The milestones of the project will be a toolbox for HEIs to profile their internationalisation, as well as a number of dissemination instruments (workshops, symposium, website) which will bring together stakeholders from different levels to discuss the results and start implementation.

The project will lead to a considerable improvement in these areas and through new tools an improvement process on internationality will finally help to enhance the competitiveness of European HEIs

Further information about this project can be found at: <http://www.impi-project.eu>

'Five Myths About Internationalisation'

Jane Knight (University of Toronto)

International Higher Education, Number 62, Winter 2011

As internationalization matures, it is becoming a more important and complex process. Yet, it is also becoming a more confused and misunderstood concept. Internationalization is definitely past the “new flavor of the month” stage. It is firmly embedded in institutional mission statements, policies, and strategies as well as national policy frameworks. This signals that internationalization has come of age and is a legitimate area of policy, practice, and research in higher education. However, because of internationalization’s high profile it is now used to describe anything and everything remotely linked to worldwide, intercultural, global, or international. In short, it is a catchall phrase and losing its meaning and direction. This article suggests that over the years implicit assumptions have developed about internationalization, myths perhaps, that need to be exposed and discussed. A brief overview of five prevalent myths follows.

Myth One: Foreign Students as Internationalization Agents

A long-standing myth is that more foreign students on campus will produce more internationalized institutional culture and curriculum. While this may be the expectation of universities, reality often paints a different picture. In many institutions international students feel marginalized socially and academically and often experience ethnic or racial tensions. Frequently, domestic undergraduate students are known to resist, or at best to be neutral about undertaking joint academic projects or engaging socially with foreign students—unless specific programs are developed by the university or instructor. International students tend to band together and ironically often have a broader and more meaningful intercultural experience on campus than domestic students, without having any deep engagement with the host country culture. Of course, this scenario is not applicable to all institutions, but it speaks to the often unquestioned assumption that the primary reason to recruit international students is to help internationalize the campus. While this is a well-intentioned rationale, it often does not work out that way and, instead, serves to mask other motivations—such as, revenue generation or desire for improved rankings on global league tables.

Myth Two: International Reputation as a Proxy for Quality

Myth two rests on a belief that the more international a university is—in terms of students, faculty, curriculum, research, agreements, and network memberships—the better its reputation. This is tied to the false notion that a strong international reputation is a proxy for quality. Cases of questionable admission and exit standards for universities highly dependent on the revenue and “brand equity” of international students are concrete evidence that internationalization does not always translate into improved quality or high standards. This myth is further complicated by the quest for higher rankings on a global or regional league table such as the *Times Higher Education* or the Academic Ranking of World Universities. It is highly questionable whether the league tables accurately measure the internationality of a university and, more importantly, whether the international dimension is always a robust indicator of quality.

Myth Three: International Institutional Agreements

It is often believed that the greater number of international agreements or network memberships a university has the more prestigious and attractive it is to other institutions and students. But practice shows that most institutions cannot manage or even benefit from a hundred plus agreements. To maintain active and fruitful relationships requires a major investment of human and financial resources from individual faculty members, departments, and international offices. Thus, the long list of international partners often reflects paper-based agreements, not productive partnerships. Once again, quantity is seen as more important than quality, and the international agreements list is used more as a status symbol than a record of functional academic collaborations. In fact, a more recent trend is the paring down of the number of agreements to 10 or 20 institution-wide priority partnerships. This can lead to more comprehensive and sustainable

relationships but also to a sense of disgruntlement among faculty members and researchers about a top-down approach to internationalization and the curtailment of individual international research or curricular interests.

Myth Four: International Accreditation

International accreditations from foreign external national quality assurance agencies (especially from the United States) or professional engineering and business accreditation bodies are currently quite popular with universities in all parts of the world. The premise is that, the more international accreditation stars an institution has, the more internationalized it is and ergo the better it is. This is simply not true. A foreign recognition of quality does not speak to the scope, scale, or value of international activities related to teaching/learning, research, and service to society either through public engagement or private enterprise.

Myth Five: Global Branding

Myth five relates to the incorrect assumption that the purpose of a university's internationalization efforts is to improve global brand or standing. This confuses an international marketing campaign with an internationalization plan. The former is a promotion and branding exercise; the latter is a strategy to integrate an international, intercultural, and global dimension into the goals and teaching, research, and service functions of a university. The objectives, anticipated outcomes and investment in a global branding initiative, are different from those required for academic internationalization. Thus, it is a myth that an international marketing scheme is the equivalent of an internationalization plan. This does not deny the fact that a strategic and successful internationalization agenda can lead to more international visibility, but recognition is not the goal— namely, it is a by-product.

A common element in many of these myths is that the benefits of internationalization or the degree of internationality can be measured quantitatively—the number of international students, foreign faculty, institutional agreements, cross-border education programs, research projects, foreign accreditations, branch campuses, and so on. While trying to quantify outcomes as key performance indicators may serve accountability requirements, they do not capture the human key intangible performances of students, faculty, researchers, and the community that bring significant benefits of internationalization.

Summary

These five myths do not apply to all higher education institutions or to all countries, but they reflect very common and misleading assumptions. Of course, there are additional myths, as well as fundamental truths, about internationalization that require further reflection and discussion. The purpose of identifying and reflecting on these myths and truths is to ensure that internationalization is on the right track and that we are aware of intended and unintended consequences as higher education sectors weather these rather turbulent times where competitiveness, rankings, and commercialism seem to be the driving forces.

Chapter 6.4. 'Expectations and Recommendations for the future of Erasmus' from 'The Impact of ERASMUS on European Higher Education: Quality, Openness and Internationalisation

Final report by consortium CHEPS, INCHER Kassel & ECOTEC, December 2008

*Please note that the full report can be found at the Lisbon Seminar website:
<http://lisbon2011.bolognaexperts.net>*

6.4 Expectations and recommendations for the future of ERASMUS

The primary objectives of the ERASMUS programme are to strengthen mobility, cooperation and adding an international (European) dimension to higher education and all higher education institutions involved. Looking at the aims of this study, the impact of the ERASMUS programme on quality improvement in European higher education, it is clear that "quality improvement" has so far neither been one of the main objectives of the programme nor a reason for higher education institutions to join it. Quality improvement in teaching, learning, research, student services and openness to society therefore is a secondary effect that may have been aroused by all actions and activities needed to promote the primary objectives of ERASMUS. As such, ERASMUS may have had the unintended but very desired effect of improving higher education in Europe. If the Commission wants the ERASMUS programme to have a stronger role in quality improvement, then this should be made explicit in its communication.

This study has shown that the ERASMUS programme has been quite influential in the further development and quality improvement in higher education in many respects. This is really an enormous accomplishment: being an inspiration and stimulus of change and improvement is such a diverse higher education landscape driven by so many different and sometimes conflicting rationales. But as with most complex policy instruments, there is always room for improvement in the working and or targeting of policies and tools. Our survey results and case studies have provided a rich overview of issues that can be considered if the European Commission and the participants want to improve the working and effectiveness of the ERASMUS programme. Making such suggestions and recommendations is important as our surveys showed that the large majority of people involved expect that the impact of the ERASMUS programme on their institutions will even further increase. Even more respondents believe that the importance of other internationalisation activities will strongly increase.

It was found in our survey that among the new ERASMUS actions for the period 2007-2013, student mobility for placement and staff training in enterprises abroad and modernisation of higher education are rated as (highly) important for higher education institutions. This means that the ERASMUS programme could put more focus on these issues without reducing attention for the longer standing activities. Also the invitation of staff from foreign enterprises as well as virtual campuses is indicated as serious and desired development areas.

Based on the above observations a number of recommendations and potential innovative ideas can be formulated for each of the levels analysed in this study

6.4.1 Recommendations for the EU Commission

The study leads to a number of recommendations that can be made in the direction of the EU Commission, the supranational level. The surveys showed recommendations that mainly relate to the organization of the ERASMUS exchanges, such as:

- * Provide greater flexibility concerning the exchange conditions – such as country of origin, previous ERASMUS grant receiving and duration of stay abroad – to allow larger groups of students to become eligible for ERASMUS grants.
- Provide better information on and promotion of ERASMUS exchanges and centralised actions. Even though ERASMUS is the best known mobility programme, still many students only hear of mobility grants when they decide to become mobile, so it does not have a strong recruiting impact. This may be improved by stronger website use and regular easily accessible information

provision to large groups of students through many information channels. Also international seminars and conferences could be organised to widen the ERASMUS networks and to better target promotion information to students, families, academic and non academic staff.

- With regard to the centralised projects more funding is asked to have a better benefit cost relationship and to develop curriculum development cooperation that supports opportunities for shorter but more intensive stays abroad.
- Further strengthen and promote the placements in enterprises.

In the case studies, some recommendations were made for the EU Commission:

- The EU should continue to strongly push the national debates and policies on internationalisation and student mobility as it was done with the 2008 Mobility Conference in Nancy (4-5 November 2008) which showed that a more structured approach with better defined tasks and responsibilities for different stakeholders (EU, national governments, institutions) could help a lot.

- Analyse, if “quality improvement” is to take a greater role in the programme, how this concept is defined at the national level (e.g. by HE Quality Assurance Agencies) and how Erasmus can best be re-shaped to contribute towards some of its aspects

- Reduce the administrative requirements associated with participation in the centralised actions through simpler forms and less reporting obligations. But also the institutions should not add more requirements to the procedures themselves.

- Provide more information to participating institutions on new themes, in particular the establishment of joint degrees.

- Reduce the average duration of ERASMUS stays abroad – from 6,5 month on average today closer to 3 months – by making them more intensive. This frees up resources for more mobility grants without making the periods too short to benefit from a truly international experience.

- * Increase the identification and dissemination of good/bad practices amongst the national agencies and the institutions

Recommendations for the future at EU level

Within the wider context of the new ambitions formulated by the High Level Expert Forum on Mobility to strongly strengthen and expand international student and staff mobility, the European Union could consider a number of innovative actions to further facilitate mobility:

- Request more EU funding to increase the number of (Erasmus supported) mobility and encourage the multiplication of various sources of financing at all levels (such as national, regional, local and institutional).

- * Encourage the differentiation of ERASMUS grants by country of origin and country of destination like now in some cases is done at national or institutional level.

- Stimulate more regulated and more intense short mobility periods (3 months up to a semester to maintain the truly international experience) and adapt, if necessary, the curriculum to maintain the integration of ERASMUS students in normal curriculum courses

- Strengthen the focus on centralised projects like curriculum development cooperation to facilitate “internationalisation at home” through integrating internationalisation concepts in basic curricula and integrate more foreign staff and guest lecturers.

- Consider opening up new target groups for the ERASMUS programme such as participants of non-EU countries and students just after secondary education (e.g. in pre-university summer schools).

- Consider new type of actions for example shorter intensive periods abroad for students and staff in the form of short visits by student groups, organisation and visit of exhibitions, etc.

- Include grants for students and staff that already have benefited from an ERASMUS grant.

- Continue to promote awareness among the participating countries on specific challenges like:
 - o easy and cheap visas for mobile students and staff portability of grants and loans

- o guidelines for institutions how to support international students
- o language education (in secondary and higher education)
- Make stronger links between ERASMUS and other programmes like COMENIUS.
- Create stronger links with the European voluntary services initiatives, e.g. through combining voluntary work and an Erasmus stay abroad.
- Continue to support ERASMUS awards, e.g. for the most innovative ERASMUS projects, the most innovative student accommodation provider

6.4.2 Recommendations for national governments and national agencies

With respect to national governments the following issues can be recommended to improve the working of the current ERASMUS programme:

- Develop coherent national internationalisation policies and keep this on the policy agenda including removing barriers to mobility mainly such as recognition, visa policies and student accommodation policies.
- Make EU higher education more attractive for students who now go to the USA or Australia, for example by offering more programmes in English, make student support portable for study in Europe, provide extra scholarships for study in Europe to cover extra costs, keep tuition fees within limits.
- To facilitate higher education institutions to operate within the national internationalisation strategy and to be internationally active.
- To strongly promote the ERASMUS programme and encourage institutions to use ERASMUS actions and tools in a structural, coherent and efficient way.
- Help to keep the administrative processes as simple and efficient as possible
- * Support a uniform implementation of ECTS and Diploma Supplement in higher education institutions.
- Subsidise student unions and initiatives to integrate foreign students into regular student life.
- Increase national, regional, local funding to increase the number of (Erasmus supported) mobility.
- Expand the opportunities for the portability of national student financial support, such as grants, loans, family allowances, tax incentives etc. for study abroad.
- Give priority to other issues supporting European mobility like easy and cheap visas for mobile students and staff.

Recommendations for the future for national authorities and agencies

To generally stimulate international mobility national governments could:

- Stimulate internationalisation in secondary education through integration of internationalisation elements in the curricula and study visits abroad (mutual exchanges of pupils with foreign schools).
- Stimulate language education in secondary and higher education.
- Differentiate mobility grants on the basis of financial need paying also attention to less advantaged groups falling out of the current support.
- Set up guidelines and expectations (benchmarks) for higher education institutions as to enhance mobility numbers, information provision, student services, etc.

6.4.3 Recommendations for institutions

In the surveys it was suggested that ERASMUS could be made more beneficial for institutions and departments. For the high level management of institutions one could think of the following improvement areas:

- Keep internationalisation policies on the management agenda with a strong emphasis on removing barriers to mobility, such as lack of recognition of study periods abroad.
- Maintain good international networks but carefully select ERASMUS partner institutions for intensive cooperation.
- Be active in creating a good service infrastructure for student mobility (such as public relations, international offices, professional internationalisation staff) and in providing student accommodation (e.g. use of online booking systems through which mobile students can arrange their accommodation in advance) and other services.
- Provide more language training opportunities for mobile students and staff.
- Include leadership commitment in stimulating mobility.
- Funding should be increased for mobility and intensive cooperation projects, also from institutions and from the private sector.
- There should be a stronger promotion of the ERASMUS programme by higher education institutions, rectors, managers, and central coordinators.
- Improve the support for incoming students and ensure that they are aware of specific procedures (e.g. visa, ...).
- Offering more internships and placements to increase student mobility.
- * Better use of teaching staff mobility to upgrade the “internationalisation at home” experiences for non mobile students.
- Better recognition and career incentives for teachers involved in Erasmus.

At departmental level the following improvements were suggested.

- Give positive and objective information about student mobility and enable and promote it as a part of the study programmes at an early stage.
- Use mobile student’s feedback (e.g. use Erasmus Ambassadors) to inspire potential new mobile students, e.g. through seminars and information fairs.
- Increase the awareness of centralised actions amongst Erasmus coordinators
- Try to remove mobility barriers such as recognition, language training for mobile students and staff, organising the academic calendar.
- Reduce the internal bureaucracy around student mobility and do not add unnecessary complementary information request to EU forms.
- Intensify cooperation with enterprises for student placements as an alternative way of Student mobility and make use of the good practices
- * Intensify the benefit of teacher mobility both for the institution, the teacher and the students via innovative approach (e.g. International weeks)
- Reward and compliment academic and support staff actively involved in the programme.
- Increase the international-orientation of study programmes to promote “internationalisation at home”.
- See the ERASMUS programme as an opportunity to think “outside the box” and use the Intensive programmes and Curriculum development projects to learn from international experiences to initiate improvement processes in the area of curriculum innovation, quality improvement, and internationalisation at home.
- Further exploit and transfer experiences gained by mobile teachers, staff, students.
- Stimulate contacts between foreign and local students, e.g. subsidise activities of local student unions that represent mobile students, such as the local branches of AIESEC.
- * Integrate acquisition of transversal competences (such as soft skills and intercultural cooperation) into curricula.
- Organise enterprise guided projects for international teams of students.

The case studies generated a number of practical issues and good practices that could help increase the impact of the ERASMUS programme at institutional level:

- Select your partners carefully, to maximise synergies in teaching and research, and continually review existing partnerships. Some higher education institutions had to review their partnerships arrangements after some time of collaboration: this is not negative, just acknowledges that the situation/ interests of the institutions may have changed.
- Be creative in providing stakeholders for enthusiastic participation in the programme (some examples are provided in the case-studies, such as the organisation of international teaching weeks -which provided a good platform for student/staff and staff/staff networking, participation in research activities such as conferences, etc within the framework of academic staff exchanges- or the creation of “best exchange awards”).
- Also be open to make the most of the programme and think “outside the box”: quality improvement was not an initial aim or requirement of the programme. Yet, many institutions have taken advantage of the programme to also improve their quality in creative ways.
- Learn from collaboration with other universities by using their experience in areas such as modernisation of curricula, teaching methods, and management of the ERASMUS programme.
- Plan ahead: take into consideration that Erasmus may require substantial organisational change: many higher education institutions have set up international offices partly or totally as a result of their involvement in the programme, joint work between different university units increases (in particular in relation to student services), etc.
- Plan ahead: provide international students with pre-arrival information such as academic courses on offer, health care coverage, accommodation, costs of living, etc. and do it with sufficient time: this will reduce the number of queries from students and make their experience less stressing.
- Take stock: as well as planning ahead it is important to take stock of previous experiences through the establishment of channels for organisational learning through the transfer of lessons from participation in Erasmus (again, the case studies provide some models of how higher education institutions have done this in practice).
- * Bring leadership in: leadership commitment will enable the institution to implement the programme creatively to the greatest advantage of the higher education institution.
- Reward academic staff actively involved in the programme as coordinators: as their involvement in the programme can be time consuming and little recognition is given in terms of career development. Time-off teaching and financial rewards have been used in many institutions.
- Do not forget about those members of staff who participate in the programme to a lesser extent: they teach foreign students and are thus a component of the programme; several higher education institutions have organised training for staff on the marking of Erasmus students, to apply common standards across the institution.
- Do not overlook informal and unexpected impacts when taking stock on the participation in the programme: these are a very important component of Erasmus (for instance, in terms of networks created, capacity-building, etc.).
- Encourage the integration and make use of foreign students in the classroom: they bring often valuable knowledge about other contexts and integration will add to the results of the programme.
- Whenever possible, provide students with language teaching, as language continues to be a barrier to make full use of the Erasmus experience.

Innovations for the future at institutional management level

At management level one could think of the following innovative policies regarding internationalisation and ERASMUS:

- * Provide satisfactory housing facilities, for example through a central search and booking system that can be entered online by mobile students.
- Provide additional grants on top of ERASMUS grants.
- Allocate ERASMUS grants on the basis of financial need.

- Better organise feedback from previous outgoing and incoming students.
- Improve recognition (procedures) and agreements between sending and receiving institutions.

Innovations for the future at institutional departmental level

At department level the following innovative ideas can be raised:

- Integrate soft skills acquisition and intercultural cooperation into curricula.
- Organise enterprise-guided projects for international teams of students

CHAPTER 4: BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Please note that the following documents can all be found on the Lisbon Seminar website:
<http://lisbon2011.bolognaexperts.net/>

- * 'Is Internationalisation having an identity crisis?' by Jane Knight - OECD IMHE INFO, August 2011
- * The Internationalisation Debate: 'Five Myths About Internationalisation', by Jane Knight –
- * International Higher Education, number 62, Winter 2011
- * 'The Pedagogical Dimension of Internationalisation? A Challenging Quality Issue in Higher Education for the Twenty First Century', by Monne Wihlborg - European Educational Research Journal volume 8 Number 1, 2009
- * 'Flemish Indicators for Internationalisation Processes' presentation by Michael Joris, December 2009
- * 'The Impact of Erasmus on European Higher Education: Quality, Openness and Internationalisation', Final Report by consortium CHEPS, INCHER and ECOTEC, December 2008
- * 'How to measure internationality and internationalisation of higher education institutions! Indicators and key figures', by Uwe Brandenburg and Gero Federkeil - CHE Working paper N° 92 July 2007
- * 'Choices in Internationalisation: how higher education institutions respond to internationalisation, europeanisation and globalisation' Published by CHEPS, 2007
- * 'Globalisation and Higher Education', by Prof Dr. Simon Marginson and Prof. Dr. Marijik van der Wende - Education Working paper n°8 OECD July 2007
- * 'Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: historical and conceptual perspectives' by Jane Knight and Hans de Wit

[The Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of Regions 'Supporting growth and jobs –an agenda for the modernisation of Europe's higher education systems' has recently been published \(20.09.2011\). The document can be found on the Seminar's website too.](#)