

Guide of Good Practices  
**TEMPUS CORINTHIAM**  
PROJECT NO. 159186-2009-1-BE-SMGR

**VOLUME I**

**Part I** Quality of Internationalisation

---

**Part II** Internationalisation at Home

---

**Part III** Management of the International Relations Offices

---

**Part IV** Management of International Projects

---

Edited by:

Jos Beelen  
Anne Boddington  
Birgit Bruns  
Martin Glogar  
Carlos Machado



**Tempus**

European Commission

Guide of Good Practices  
**TEMPUS CORINTHIAM**  
PROJECT NO. 159186-2009-1-BE-SMGR

Part II  
Internationalisation at home

Edited by:  
Jos Beelen



The publication of this guide represents one of the  
objectives of the Tempus CORINTHIAM Project

# Index

## Chapter 1: Introduction Internationalisation at Home, history and conceptual notions

Internationalisation at Home and mobility .....	123
Tools for IaH: not just International classrooms .....	125
The international lecturer .....	126
The informal curriculum .....	127
Facilities .....	109
Assessing outcomes .....	128
Staff competences and staff training .....	128
Role of the international office in internationalising the curriculum .....	129
Quality assurance .....	130
Examples of practice .....	130
Resources, organisations, literature and web sites .....	130
References .....	131

## Chapter 2: The current debate and current trends in iah

Introduction .....	133
Internationalisation at Home and Abroad .....	133
From policy to implementation .....	133
Internationalisation at Home: Tool or aim? .....	134
IaH: varieties across Europe .....	137
IaH in Africa .....	139
North America .....	140
Latin America & Caribbean .....	140
Middle East .....	141
Policies for internationalisation of the curriculum .....	141
Implementing policies: success factors .....	142
References .....	142

## Chapter 3: Internationalisation of Palestinian Universities: reality and aspiration. The case of Hebron University

Introduction .....	147
Introduction to Hebron University .....	147
Choices to be made .....	148
Difficulties .....	149
Policies at Hebron University .....	150
Conclusion .....	152
References .....	152

#### Chapter 4: Challenges for the mind-set change for iaH at the Bezalel Academy of Arts and Design; a case study

About the institution .....	155
Vision and mission .....	155
Programmes .....	156
IaH at Bezalel: An overview .....	157
Restructuring of the IRO .....	159
Programmes to enhance IaH .....	160
Assessment of learning in internationalised curricula .....	163
Points of pride and good practice.....	163
Obstacles to IaH.....	166
Possible solutions to obstacles and the future of IaH at Bezalel.....	167
References.....	167
Appendix 1 : Incoming exchange students .....	168
Appendix 2 : outgoing exchange students .....	168
Appendix 3 : Bezalel's Partner Schools.....	169

#### Chapter 5: Internationalisation at home: the case of a Spanish university

Introduction.....	177
Internationalisation at Home.....	177
San Jorge University .....	178
The Office of International Relations .....	182
The use of IT.....	182
Strategic plan .....	182
Conclusion .....	183
References.....	184

#### Chapter 6: Quality of internationalisation, internationalisation at home, management of international relations and management of international projects; the case of Adam Mickiewicz University

Introduction.....	187
Management of international relations at AMU .....	189
Conclusion .....	194
References.....	194

#### Chapter 7: Internationalisation at home as an aspect of an internationalisation plan

Introduction.....	195
Methodology for the construction of an IaH plan from the general internationalisation plan ..	196
The Universidade de Vigo's internationalisation plan .....	198

Conclusion .....	211
References.....	212

### Chapter 8: Internationalisation at home at Universidad de Monterrey

Introduction.....	215
Mission.....	215
Vision .....	216
Internationalisation at UDEM.....	216
The strategic plan for the internationalisation of UDEM .....	219
New internationalisation initiatives .....	227
IaH activities at UDEM .....	228
Effects of IaH on the curriculum.....	229
Effects of IaH on students.....	233
The role of the International Office .....	234
Obstacles and how to overcome them .....	234
References.....	235

### Chapter 9: Implementing internationalisation at home at HAN University, the Netherlands

Introduction.....	237
The concept of Internationalisation at Home.....	237
The Global Survey .....	238
The conceptual framework of internationalisation of the curriculum .....	238
About HAN University.....	239
HAN's internationalisation policy and institutional plan.....	239
Initiatives and preparation: the International Offices.....	241
The HAN University process model.....	242
Implementation by programme.....	244
Assessing the process at HAN University .....	249
Analysis of the development process on the basis of the framework .....	251
References .....	253

### Chapter 10: Conclusions

Key findings.....	255
The Corinthiam survey on IaH .....	255
Conclusions.....	258

# Chapter 2

## The current debate and current trends in iah

JOS BEELEN

### Introduction

In this chapter, the current debate on Internationalisation at Home and internationalisation of the curriculum is presented. The European approach to Internationalisation at Home is compared to related concepts in other parts of the world. Notably Campus Internationalisation or Comprehensive Internationalisation in the USA and internationalisation of the curriculum in Australia. The situation with regard to internationalisation of the curriculum in other parts of the world is also briefly explained. Effective policies for internationalisation of the curriculum are compared and at the end of the chapter, success factors for their implementation will be presented.

### Internationalisation at Home and Abroad

Since its introduction in 1999, Internationalisation at Home has rapidly gained recognition as a main force in internationalisation. Knight (2006, p. 25; also Knight, 2008) distinguishes Internationalisation at Home as one of the two streams in internationalisation when she discusses key concepts, elements and rationales for internationalisation. She remarks that one stream is *internationalisation abroad*, including all forms of education across borders: mobility of students and faculty, and mobility of projects, programmes and providers. The second movement is that of *internationalisation at home* – activities that help students to develop international understanding and intercultural skills (Knight 2008, pp. 22-24). She does see a relation between the two streams: “The emergence of this concept coincides with or perhaps counteracts the increased emphasis on student mobility as expressed in new national and regional mobility programmes and also the growing interest in cross-border education.”

### From policy to implementation

Since the introduction of the concept of IaH the rationale for Internationalisation at Home seems unchanged. It is still only a small minority of students who seek to develop their international and intercultural competences through studying abroad.

Internationalisation at Home is directly related to the most important rationale for internationalisation identified in the 2010 Global Survey as being to “Improve student preparedness for a globalized/internationalized world” (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2010, p. 62, fig. I.B.6). It is remarkable that many still expect to achieve this aim for all students by sending a small percentage of them abroad, and in addition neglecting to assess their learning outcomes in a systematic way.

Although the relevance of IAH is widely recognised and many institutions now focus on internationalisation of the curriculum, the implementation is another matter. “Internationalisation at Home: A brilliant idea awaiting implementation” is the title of a 2007 paper by Joseph Mestenhauser. Almost five years later, IaH has progressed beyond a mere idea and has been acknowledged as a full complement to internationalisation abroad (Knight, 2006; 2008). It is now time to ask what progress has been made. What ideas have been developed on the implementation of internationalisation of the curriculum? After all, as Michael Fullan remarked: “Good ideas with no ideas on how to implement them are wasted ideas.” (Fullan quoted by Scott, 2003).

## Internationalisation at Home: Tool or aim?

In a 2010 article, with the self-proclaimed provocative title ‘The End of Internationalisation’, Brandenburg and De Wit draw the conclusion that the focus of internationalisation has shifted from a focus on loftier aims to a focus on the instruments that constitute the means to reach those aims. They mention that Internationalisation at Home has become one of them when they say: “Even the alternative movement of ‘internationalization at home’ of the late 1990s has shifted rapidly into this instrumental mood.” (Brandenburg & De Wit, 2010, p. 16). If Internationalisation at Home has indeed gone the way of internationalisation abroad, this means that at least it has reached maturity.

Internationalisation at Home is definitely a tool. The aim, as has been stated above, is to equip all students with the intercultural and international competences they need as future professionals and citizens.

### 2.1. Varieties across the world

Internationalisation at Home is related to other concepts associated with internationalisation and is both similar to and different from them. In the USA, the concept of Internationalisation of the Campus, or Comprehensive Internationalisation, has much in common with Internationalisation at Home. In Australia the concept of Internationalisation of the Curriculum (sometimes abbreviated to IoC) also has much in common with the concept of Internationalisation at Home. The term ‘Internationalisation of the Curriculum’ is both a general term across the globe and one that denotes a specific

approach in Australia. These two concepts will be discussed briefly here to allow a comparison with Internationalisation at Home.

Engberg and Green (2002) describe Campus or Comprehensive Internationalisation as:

*“a change that is both broad – affecting departments, schools, and activities across the institution – and deep, expressed in institutional culture, values, and policies and practices. It requires articulating explicit goals and developing coherent and mutually reinforcing strategies to reach them. A comprehensive internationalised campus has more than a series of courses or programmes that promote international learning: it intentionally links these components together to foster a learning environment and provide a set of experiences to as many students as possible” (Engberg & Green 2002, pp. 10-11).*

The focus on reaching ‘as many students as possible’ suggests a similar focus to that of Internationalisation at Home which, perhaps being slightly more ambitious, seeks to reach all students. In any case, both appear to be concerned with ensuring the development of international and intercultural skills, knowledge and attitudes to more than the small percentage of students who are internationally mobile, and with the provision of a particular type of learning environment on the home campus. The Institute of International Education (IIE) has since 2001 awarded the annual Andrew Heiskell Awards to ‘outstanding initiatives’ in different categories, including ‘internationalizing the campus’ and (from 2009) in the special category ‘internationalizing the community college campus’. Dutschke (2009, p.70) mentions two examples of winners in the former category, one of which included a year of study abroad while the other consisted of a short-term study trip. Over a number of years, a total of 400 students participated in 23 of those study trips at a university with 12 000 students; hardly a strategy that is reaching the majority of students. Dutschke also quotes the award criteria for the category ‘Internationalizing the Campus’ as: “advancing curriculum development and providing services to international students”. While these criteria have since been rewritten and the mention of services removed, Dutschke (2009, p. 72) concludes that study abroad is still the main component of internationalisation at most American universities, and that on-campus activities are often also tied to study abroad. The same view is held by Hudzik (2011, p. 9) when he writes: “The movement of students and faculty across borders for periods of learning and discovery is by its nature the primary experience and active-learning component of internationalization.”

In this regard, the emphasis is the reverse of that evident in the concept of Internationalisation at Home, in which study abroad is only a minor component, under certain conditions (as described earlier).



In relation to Internationalisation of the Curriculum in the Australian context, the following definition provides insights into the relationship between the concepts of Internationalisation at Home and Internationalisation of the Curriculum.

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

In her definition, Leask includes the services aspect, not mentioned by Knight, but certainly an important aspect of Internationalisation at Home as well. She also stresses the importance of the careful construction of learning environments, with specific reference being made to teaching and learning processes, given that students do not spontaneously start learning from each other the minute they enter an international classroom (Leask, 2010). While this definition does not explicitly mention study abroad, nor does it exclude it. In this regard Internationalisation of the Curriculum is more like Internationalisation at Home than the concept of Campus or Comprehensive Internationalisation in the USA. However, like Comprehensive Internationalisation, Internationalisation of the Curriculum is concerned with creating an internationalised campus environment through the provision of a curriculum and services that support student engagement with diversity, including the cultural and linguistic diversity that surrounds them in the world, in class and on campus (Leask, 2009, p. 206). Some of these services and activities may seek to actively encourage study abroad, integrated into the curriculum, as part of the total student experience. Internationalisation at Home, however, does not actively stimulate outgoing mobility in the way that Campus Internationalisation and, to a lesser extent, Internationalisation of the Curriculum do. Unlike Campus Internationalisation, Internationalisation at Home is focussed on developing international and intercultural learning outcomes in all students. In that respect it resembles Internationalisation of the Curriculum.

The aims of Internationalisation at Home, Internationalisation of the Curriculum and Internationalisation of the Campus have one thing at least in common – they seek to assist the majority, if not all students, to acquire intercultural and international knowledge, skills and attitudes. There are some differences in emphasis in the approaches taken:

An internationalised curriculum will:

- Engage students with internationally informed research and cultural and linguistic diversity.
- Purposefully develop defined international and intercultural perspectives.

- Progressively assess learning outcomes.
- Prepare students to deal with uncertainty by opening their minds and developing their ability to think both creatively and critically.
- Move beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries and dominant paradigms.
- Look different in different contexts.

Travel usually goes hand in hand with a change in language. Virtually all students will be mobile for holiday or travel, but only a small minority of students go abroad for several months for study or placement. Short term mobility in the form of study visits abroad will, for most students, be the only study-related mobility they undertake. If these study trips are part of the curriculum for all students, they would fall within the concept of Internationalisation at Home. How much these trips contribute to increasing students' competences depends very much on the way they are set up and followed up. In the contexts of Australia and the US, international mobility requires a far greater effort than in Europe and involves considerable cost.

## IaH: varieties across Europe

The 2010 Global Survey shows that Europe as a whole scores low on “strengthening the international/intercultural content of the curriculum” (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010, p. 91, fig. I.D.7). The authors of the survey explain this low position on the European priority list by commenting on the fact that many European universities have already embarked on activities to internationalise their curricula and therefore assign less importance to it. At the same time, other universities would assign less importance to internationalisation of the curriculum because they are not yet ready to embark on the process (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010, p. 175).

The Global Survey does not distinguish between different countries or regions within Europe, but in fact there are considerable differences. The focus on Internationalisation at Home is strongest in the Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Norway and Sweden), Finland, the Netherlands and Flanders. Between 2006 and 2008, the EAIE delivered five training courses on Internationalisation at Home. Of the 82 participants, 10 came from Sweden, 6 from Denmark, 6 from Norway, 4 from Finland, 13 from the Netherlands and 7 from Belgium (all from Flanders). The total proportion of participants from Scandinavia, Finland, the Netherlands and Flanders (total population 47 million) was 56 % and shows a significant contrast to the 7 % of participants from Germany, France and the UK combined, with a total population of 207 million (<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu>). This makes it doubtful whether Egron-Polak and Hudson are correct in their conclusion. It seems remarkable that the focus on Internationalisation at Home apparently remains strong in universities that have already embarked on the process while it is simply not on the agenda of others. The low score of Europe is

therefore probably determined by the fact that this is as yet the case for the majority of European universities, except for a number in north-western Europe.

### *North-Western Europe*

It is no coincidence that the interest in Internationalisation at Home is strongest in small countries or in countries with a small population that need to adapt to the course of events determined by the bigger European countries and that other major player, the European Union. Small languages mean that there is a strong focus in these countries on English as a second language. This is demonstrated by the findings of *Education at a Glance* (2009) when it comes to the number of programmes delivered in English. Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands and Finland fall clearly into the category “many programmes in English”, while Flanders and Norway fall in the category “some programmes in English” (OECD, 2009, p. 316, Box C2.2.)

Another characteristic of these countries is that they have an internet penetration of more than 85 % of the population, ranging from 85.3 % in Finland to 94.8 % in Norway (Internet World Stats, June 2010, Internet Usage in Europe). They share this characteristic with Iceland (97.6 %) and Luxemburg (85.3 %). This may yet be an indication of the outward looking mindset in these countries.

### *The Netherlands*

In the Netherlands, most Universities of Applied Sciences have included Internationalisation at Home in their institutional policies. Foremost are Hogeschool van Amsterdam (HvA) and Hogeschool van Arnhem en Nijmegen (HAN). Both started to implement Internationalisation at Home across all their programmes and for all their students. The former university has designed a system for the support of the implementation of Internationalisation at Home (De Wit & Beelen, 2012). This is an attempt to address an obstacle that becomes manifest in the Global Survey: limited expertise of academic staff with regard to internationalisation (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010, p. 23). The focus on Internationalisation at Home is less marked in research universities in the Netherlands, but then research tends to have an international focus anyway.

### *Sweden*

In Sweden, the University of Malmö, where the concept of Internationalisation at Home originated and where it has been part of central policy since early days, has done regular surveys and reports on the state and progress of Internationalisation at Home (Nilsson, 2003; Bergknut, 2006, 2007).

### *Flanders*

Belgium is an interesting case. Teaching the second language of the federation (i.e. French in Flanders and Dutch in the Walloon region) is compulsory in secondary

schools. This means that English is the third language in Belgium. A recent suggestion to allow secondary schools to choose English as a second language raised a storm of protest in the midst of a tense political situation. This is indeed a political issue since it would require changing the constitution. In spite of this, there is a marked interest in English medium education in Flanders. Already in 2001, a conference on Internationalisation at Home took place in Flanders (Vlaamse Hogescholenraad, 2001). University College Ghent has regularly organised workshops and training events on Internationalisation at Home. The attention in Belgium's French Community (the Walloon region) is largely lacking, as it is in France.

### *Germany*

In Germany, the National Agency for Socrates and Erasmus (DAAD) organises regular training seminars on 'Internationalisierung zu Hause', which are well attended. The German Universities of Applied Sciences have developed a range of international activities within their home curricula. Most of these are however aimed at particular groups of students and do not affect all students. They would therefore fall short of that essential characteristic of Internationalisation at Home and would rather resemble American practice.

### *United Kingdom*

In the United Kingdom there is strong interest in internationalisation of the curriculum and in intercultural education. The shift towards making use of the diversity of the student body in the UK is unmistakable, but the situation is fundamentally different from that in the rest of Europe since English is the language of instruction. The dimension of 'Internationalisation at Home' in the UK seems synonymous with Equality and Diversity issues (Jones, 2011, p. 27) and with the notion of global competences or a global outlook.

### *Southern and Eastern Europe*

The focus on Internationalisation at Home in Southern Europe is limited to individual institutions such as Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan (Mazzoleni & Senn, 2007). The Catalan universities ran a training course on Internationalisation at Home in 2006. Universities in Eastern Europe are largely absent from the stage of Internationalisation at Home.

## IaH in Africa

### *Africa as a whole*

The 2010 Global Survey outcomes show that 29 % of African universities count "strengthening the international/intercultural content of the curriculum" among their

priority policy items. Just 10 % include Internationalisation at Home, the lowest score of any region (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010, p. 91, fig. I.D.7).

### *South Africa*

So far, the focus on Internationalisation at Home seems limited to South Africa. Mobility to Europe and other continents involves travelling considerable distances and is therefore problematic. At the same time, South Africa's universities are dealing with a great variety of international students mainly from other African countries. These are both reasons why South African universities have embraced Internationalisation at Home, as has the International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA). The University of Cape Town embedded Internationalisation at Home in its institutional policy in 2006 and embarked on a process of operationalisation of the concept (Thomas & Kaunda, 2007). The Internationalisation Management Advisory Group at UCT held a colloquium on Internationalisation at Home in 2008, which was attended by representatives from most universities in the country. This was followed, in May 2011, by a two-day 'teachers' lab' at the University of Cape Town, in which teaching staff focused on integrating an international dimension into their existing courses.

## North America

North America has the highest scores in the Global Survey for both "strengthening the international/intercultural content of the curriculum" (40 %) and Internationalisation at Home (18 %) (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010, p. 91, fig. I.D.7), yet this does not mean that internationalisation of the curriculum is well advanced.

The American Council on Education has been mapping internationalisation since 2001. In its 2008 survey of American higher education, it concluded that: "Overall, internationalization does not permeate the fabric of most institutions; it is not yet sufficiently deep or as widespread as it should be to prepare students to meet the challenges that they will face once they graduate." (Green, Lu & Burris, 2008, executive summary). The same report reached the conclusion that internationalisation is not a high priority on most campuses, it is possible for students to graduate without any exposure to international/global issues and that, since 2001, progress has been slow and uneven.

## Latin America & Caribbean

Latin America scores fairly low on "strengthening the international/intercultural content of the curriculum", with 27 %. Only the Middle East has a lower score. The score on Internationalisation at Home is rather low with 11 %, just 1 % above that of Africa

(Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010, p. 91, fig. I.D.7). Internationalisation of the curriculum does not seem much developed in Latin America as a whole.

The World Bank published a report on the international dimension in higher education in Latin America in 2005. It came to the conclusion that “very little curricular change has occurred in Latin America” (De Wit, Jaramillo, Gacel-Ávila & Knight, 2005, p. 346).

In her discussion of higher education in Latin America, Gacel Ávila (2007, p. 404) concludes that “few institutions integrate international, global, intercultural or comparative topics in their curricula” and that the concept of internationalisation at home is “unknown”. She further concludes that the use of IT is used more to expand the national educational offer than for internationalisation of the curriculum.

This does not mean that individual institutions in the region have not embraced the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum. Pontificia Universidad Javeriana is one of those. The World Bank report concluded that in Mexico, none of the surveyed institutions focused on integrating an international dimension into its curricula (De Wit et al., 2005, pp. 256-257). Universidad Regiomontana in Monterey however, has developed an institution-wide approach to Internationalisation at Home (Teissier, 2007). The university also set up virtual international classrooms, which were presented at the EAIE conference in Nantes in September 2010. Another active player in Mexico is the University of Guadalajara. The Mexican Association for International Education (AMPEI) will be instrumental in driving internationalisation of the curriculum forward in that country.

## Middle East

It was found that 25 % of universities in the Middle East include “strengthening the international/intercultural content of curriculum” among their top priorities, the lowest score of any region. Significantly, the Middle East is the only region that does not include Internationalisation at Home as a priority at all (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010, p. 91, fig. I.D.7).

## Policies for internationalisation of the curriculum

De Wit & Beelen, 2012, have outlined the strategy for internationalisation of the curriculum at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences (The Netherlands).

The strategy is a concrete articulation of internationalisation goals at the curriculum level. Yet it is not prescriptive to the point where it dictates exactly what skills, knowledge and attitudes must be taught, or how they must be taught. These decisions have

been left for the academic staff in control of the curriculum. This highlights the need for a finely balanced strategy-neither too prescriptive nor too open. The approach identifies a first level that will have an impact on the learning of *all* students, but give those who seek greater engagement the opportunity to pursue that and gain formal recognition for this through certification.

Leeds Metropolitan University has developed a strategy for embedding a global outlook as a graduate attribute across university programmes (Killick, 2011).

## Implementing policies: success factors

The successful implementation of a policy for IaH depends on a number of success factors, that may vary, depending on the institution or the context, but a number of them seem to be general.

- Leadership is committed to driving the process of internationalisation of the curriculum at university and faculty levels
- The institutional policy leaves individual programmes enough space to adapt it to the graduate attributes for particular disciplines and programmes
- Academic staff is engaged in internationalisation of the curriculum.
- The development of the international and intercultural dimension is supported by staff development units and coaches.
- Strategic alliances between stakeholders within the university such as between policy officers, quality assurance officers, HR managers, facilities managers and the International Office.

## References

- Beelen, J. (Ed.). (2007). *Implementing Internationalisation at Home* EAIE Professional Development Series for International Educators, Volume 2. Amsterdam: EAIE
- Beelen, J. (2011). First steps in internationalization at home. In *Educación Global, Vol 15*, 59-67.
- Beelen, J. (2011). Internationalisation at home in a global perspective: A critical survey of the 3rd Global Survey Report of IAU. In *Globalisation and Internationalisation of Higher Education* [online monograph]. *Revista de Universidad y Sociedad del Conocimiento*, 8, (2). Retrieved from <http://rusc.uoc.edu/ojs/index.php/rusc/article/view/v8n2-beelen/v8n2-beelen-eng>
- Beelen, J., & Leask, B. (2011). Internationalisation at home on the move. In *Handbook internationalisation*. Berlin: Dr. Josef Raabe Verlag. Retrieved from [www.raabe.de](http://www.raabe.de).

- Brandenburg, U., & Wit, H. de. (2010). The end of internationalization. *International higher education*, 62 (winter 2011), 15-17. Retrieved from: <http://www.bc.edu/research/cihe/ihe/issues/2011.html>
- Caruana, V. & Hanstock, J. (2008). Internationalising the curriculum at the University of Salford: From rhetoric to reality. In C. Shiel & A. McKenzie (Eds.), *The global university: The role of senior managers*. London: DEA.
- Crowther, P., Joris, M., Otten, M., Nilsson, B., Teekens, H., & Wächter, B. (2001). *Internationalisation at home; A position paper*. Amsterdam: EAIE.
- De Wit, H. (2011). Law of stimulating arrears? Internationalisation of the universities of applied sciences, misconceptions and challenges. In H. de Wit. *Trends, issues and challenges in internationalisation of higher education*, 7-24. Amsterdam: Hogeschool van Amsterdam.
- Deardorff, D. (Ed.). (2009). Implementing intercultural competence assessment. In D. Deardorff, (Ed.). *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence* (477-491). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Deardorff, D., Thorndike Pysarchik, D., & Yun, Z.-S. (2009). Towards effective international learning assessments: principles, design and implementation. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Measuring success in the internationalisation of higher education* (EAIE Occasional Paper 22), 23-37.
- De Wit, H., Jaramillo, I.C., Gacel-Ávila, J., & Knight, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Higher Education in Latin America, the International Dimension*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- De Wit, H. & Beelen, J. (2012). Socrates in the Low Countries: Designing, implementing, and facilitating internationalisation of the curriculum at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences (HvA). In J. Ryan (Ed.), *Cross-cultural teaching and learning for home and international students. Internationalisation of pedagogy and curriculum in higher education*. London: Routledge.
- Dunne, C. (2011). Developing and intercultural curriculum within the context of the internationalisation of higher education: terminology, typologies and power. In *Higher Education Research and Development* 30 (5), 609-622.
- Egron-Polak, E., & Hudson, R. (2010). *Internationalization of higher education: Global trends, regional perspectives* (IAU 3rd Global Survey Report). Paris: IAU.
- Feast, V., Collyer-Braham, S., & Bretag, T. (2011). Global experience: The development and preliminary evaluation of a programme designed to enhance students' global engagement. In *Innovations in education and Teaching International*, 48 (3), 239-250.
- Gacel Avila, J. (2007). The process of internationalization of Latin American higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 11 (3/4), 400-409.



- Hudzik, J. (2011). *Comprehensive internationalisation: From concept to action, executive summary*. Washington, D.C.: NAFSA. Retrieved from [www.nafsa.org.cizn](http://www.nafsa.org.cizn).
- Jones, E. (2011). Internationalisation, multiculturalism, a global outlook and employability. In *Assessment, Teaching and Learning Journal* (Leeds Metropolitan University), 11 (summer), 21-49.
- Killick, D. (Ed.) (2011). Embedding a global outlook as a graduate attribute at Leeds Metropolitan University. Leeds: Leeds Metropolitan University, Centre for Learning and Teaching.
- Knight, J. (2006). *Internationalization of higher education: New directions, new challenges (2005 IAU Global Survey Report)*. Paris: IAU.
- Knight, J. (2008). *Higher education in turmoil; the changing world of internationalization*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Leask, B. (2009). Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(2), 205-221.  
<http://jsi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/13/2/205> (1552-7808).
- Leask, B., & Beelen, J. (2010). Enhancing the engagement of academic staff in international education. In *Proceedings of a Joint IEAA-EAIE Symposium* (pp. 28-40). Melbourne: International Education Association of Australia.
- Leask, B. (2011). Assessment, learning, teaching an internationalisation, Engaging for the future. In *Assessment, Teaching and Learning Journal* (Leeds Metropolitan University), 11 (summer), 5-20.
- Mestenhauser, J. (2006). Internationalization at home; Systems challenge to a fragmented field. In H. Teekens (Ed.), *Internationalization at home: A global perspective* (67-77). The Hague: Nuffic.
- Mestenhauser, J. (2007). Internationalisation at Home: A brilliant idea awaiting implementation. In H. Teekens (Ed.), *Internationalisation at home: Ideas and ideals* (pp. 13-22). (EAIE Occasional Paper 20), Amsterdam: EAIE.
- Nilsson, B. & Otten, M. (Eds). (2003). Internationalisation at home [Special Issue]. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7 (1). OECD (2009). *Education at a glance 2009*. Paris: OECD.
- Scott, G. (2003). Effective change management in higher education. *EDUCAUSE Review*, 38 (6), 64-80.
- Teekens, H. (2001). *The international classroom; Teaching at home and abroad*. The Hague: Nuffic.
- Teekens, H. (Ed.). (2006). *Internationalization at home: A global perspective*. The Hague: Nuffic.

- Teekens, H. (Ed.). (2007). *Internationalisation at home: Ideas and ideals* (EAIE Occasional Paper 20), Amsterdam: EAIE.
- Teissier, C. (2007). Institutional development for internationalisation at home: A case study from Mexico. In H. Teekens (Ed.), EAIE Occasional Paper 20. *Internationalisation at home: Ideas and ideals*, pp. 23–32. Amsterdam: EAIE.
- Van der Werf, E. (2012). Internationalisation strategies and the development of competent teaching staff. In *Internationalisation revisited, New dimensions in the internationalisation of higher education*, pp. 96-102. Amsterdam: CAREM.