

Internationalising the student experience in Australian tertiary education: Developing criteria and indicators

Sophie Arkoudis
Chi Baik
Simon Marginson
Elizabeth Cassidy

January 2012



Australian Government

Australian Education International



Internationalising the student experience in Australian tertiary education: Developing criteria and indicators was developed for the University of Melbourne by Sophie Arkoudis, Chi Baik, Simon Marginson and Elizabeth Cassidy of the Centre for the Study of Higher Education.

Permission is granted for copying, distribution and use by other institutions, with appropriate acknowledgement.

Available in electronic form from <http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/>

ISBN 978-0-9872352-3-7

Further queries regarding permissions and availability:

Centre for the Study of Higher Education

The University of Melbourne

Telephone: 03 8344 4605

<http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au>

Table of Content

Introduction	4
Conceptual development	5
Internationalising the student experience for all students.....	5
The challenge of defining internationalising the student experience	6
Current examples of criteria and indicators	7
Inputs, outputs and outcomes	8
Findings from the National Forums	8
Definitions of internationalising the student experience	9
Dimensions, criteria and indicators.....	10
Concluding Comments	11
Dimensions, criteria and indicators for internationalising the student experience	11
References	15
Appendix 1: Discussion paper for National Forums	18
Appendix 2: Summarised feedback from the National Forums	24

Introduction

In mid 2011 Australia Education International provided support to the Centre for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE), University of Melbourne to develop criteria and indicators for monitoring and evaluating the internationalisation of the student experience, which could be used internally by universities to monitor and evaluate their activities and to identify priority areas for improvement. The project developed these criteria and indicators through consultation with the tertiary education sector in three National Forums.

Australian higher education is grappling with the issue of enhancing interaction between domestic and international students to enhance the student experience and the teaching/learning opportunities available through such interaction. While universities have attempted to address this issue in a number of ways, survey results appear to indicate that many international students anticipate levels of interaction with Australian domestic students that are not realised and other research suggests that both groups often remain largely segmented inside and outside classrooms. Similar issues, though less well documented, have arisen in VET.

To date, efforts to improve the interaction between international and domestic students have been mostly isolated from teaching and learning and mostly focused on activities outside the classroom. A key premise of this project is that positive aspects of student experience and teaching/learning opportunities that are available in an international education context offer a combined benefit to both domestic and international students.

Nonetheless, this area is complicated by a lack of agreement on the definition of terms such as 'internationalisation' and 'intercultural teaching and learning'. Also, although many would agree that a key objective of enhanced international and domestic student interaction is to develop 'global citizens' there is little agreement on the key characteristics and capabilities of such a 'global citizen'. This then complicates how progress towards such an intangible goal can be measured or tracked over time. Hence, it remains difficult to identify when systems and institutions are moving forward and where examples of high quality performance can be found.

What is currently missing is an agreed set of criteria for measuring the internationalisation of the student experience. This project attempts to achieve this within a narrow focus on enhancing the interaction between domestic and international students. The indicator framework developed includes numerical indicators where these are meaningful and can be agreed and made operational. Other aspects of internationalisation were found to be less easy to quantify and can only be evaluated through the process of expert judgement on the basis of standard criteria.

There were two main stages in the project:

Stage 1: Conceptual development (June-July 2011)

Review of the literature and existing research in the area, particularly but not only Australian-related material in both higher education and VET. This phase drew partly on recent work at CSHE primarily focused on higher education, and the work of Ly Tran (RMIT, ARC Postdoctoral Fellow) in relation to VET.

Stage 2: National Forums (August 2011)

Three National Forums were organised in Brisbane, Melbourne and Perth to gain feedback on the proposed indicators for internationalising the student experience, which were developed in Stage 1 of the study.

The next section briefly sets out the conceptual development for indicators and criteria for internationalising the student experience.

Conceptual development

In developing criteria and indicators for internationalising the student experience, we have drawn on current research on internationalisation in higher education, as well as an analysis of websites of Australian universities. This section will discuss the main findings that informed the conceptualisation of the criteria and indicators.

Internationalising the student experience for all students

In the research the focus is largely on internationalising the student experience for international students. The terms 'international' and 'domestic' students are used in much of the research to represent two groups of homogenous learners, even though the students within each group vary greatly in their educational experiences and English language background. The term 'international students' covers students from many backgrounds and on different learning pathways. It includes students studying in on-shore or offshore programs, and learners who may have lived and studied in many countries, those who have never left their home country, and those who are studying overseas for the first time. It has been argued that 'international' as a term does not capture the diversity that can exist amongst the international student body (Dogherty & Singh, 2005; Marginson, 2007; Arkoudis, Baik et al, 2010). Equally, 'domestic' students are also a diverse group. They are monolingual, bi-lingual and multilingual. They are culturally diverse. They may be from rural or migrant backgrounds, of low socio-economic status, or of Indigenous Australian background, to name just a few of the possible variations. Therefore, all students should be included in internationalising the student experience.

One of the strengths of Australian higher education is the diversity of the student population. This diversity provides potential for students to interact with peers from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The challenge for institutions and academics has been how to harness the potential for student diversity? The particular focus has been on how university teaching and learning can promote interaction between domestic and international students. Arkoudis et al. (2010) developed the *Interaction for Learning Framework*, which has been designed to facilitate and promote peer interaction for learning across diverse cultural and linguistic groups of students. It consists of six interrelated dimensions, each of which represents a particular aspect of teaching and learning associated with creating the conditions for effective peer interaction between students of diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The dimension *Planning Interaction* is central, as it is fundamental to each of the other five dimensions: *Creating Environments for Interaction*; *Supporting Interaction*; *Engaging with Subject Knowledge*; *Developing Reflexive Processes*; and *Fostering Communities of Learners*. These dimensions are outlined in further detail below.

The Interaction for Learning Framework

1. Planning interaction

Planning interaction involves academic staff including peer interaction activities into the design of their subject. It is the linking between the learning outcomes, and planned teaching and learning activities that draw upon student diversity to develop subject knowledge and skills in working across cultures. The framework recognises the importance of assessment in developing a purpose for interaction between domestic and international students.

2. Creating environments for interaction

The focus in this dimension is on the strategies that can be used to increase students' participation in the first weeks of classes. The main goals are to develop students' confidence in interacting with other students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and to provide opportunities for students to move out of their cultural comfort zones.

3. Supporting interaction

In this dimension, learners are informed about the expectations and benefits of working across different cultural and linguistic groups for their learning. Its main purpose is for students to understand the value of peer interaction and to set up the ground rules and expectations for learning tasks. Helping students understand the value of making these connections to enhance their own learning is a critical component of the framework.

4. Engaging with subject knowledge

The first three dimensions are important in preparing domestic and international students to work together. The main purpose of this dimension is to use linguistic and cultural diversity to engage with subject knowledge. This may include drawing on different skills, learning strategies and cultural experiences to co-construct subject knowledge.

5. Developing reflexive process

In this dimension learners move beyond individual understanding so that they can utilise the knowledge base available within the community of learners. The key objectives of the fifth dimension of interaction are to promote higher levels of interaction and cognitive engagement through peer feedback and assessment to enhance students' critical thinking and reflection on their learning.

6. Fostering communities of learners

In this dimension, learners demonstrate independence and are able to move across different cultural contexts. The main purpose of this dimension is to use diversity as resource for independent learning between domestic and international students.

The challenge of defining internationalising the student experience

In the literature there are many references to the importance of internationalisation in higher education. The term is used to refer to the character of a university, its standing within the international community, its recruitment of students, and the teaching and learning outcomes of graduates, just to name a few. Internationalisation is now a central concern of universities and this has been the case for a number of years. What is new is the growing need for institutions to systematically monitor and improve their performance in relation to internationalisation, and as part of this process to collect better data on performance. The recent second cycle of Australian university audits, with the focus on internationalisation, has reinforced the importance for institutions of being able to identify, monitor and evaluate internationalisation activities.

Internationalisation is a broad concept. It can cover many aspects of a university's activities. The website analysis revealed that all of the 39 universities in Australia acknowledge the importance of internationalisation, both for Australian tertiary education and for their individual institution. This acknowledgement may be grounded in recognition that the institution must become international to remain competitive and to attract international students. More generally an emphasis on internationalisation reflects the strategic importance of driving a globalised perspective across all areas of university policy and practice. The findings of the analysis of Australian websites have assisted in framing the dimensions of the criteria and indicators developed in this document.

The most common definition of internationalisation used on websites is Jane Knight's (2003) definition, 'Internationalisation is the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution'; or Knight's updated 2004 version, 'Internationalisation is the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, function and delivery of post secondary education'. However, while these statements capture aspects of the phenomenon of internationalisation, in the websites there is little if any reference to criteria we can use to measure the internationalised student experience. Knight's (2011) recent paper on the development of indicators for international education hubs is a valuable addition to the literature, but of little immediate relevance to this project.

When internationalisation is mentioned more generally in the mission statement, or statement of goals and values of the institution, it is normally with reference to the diversity of the student body and the fostering of an international community. Only two university websites refer to internationalising the student experience. The concept of 'internationalisation at home' is not visible on the websites we looked at, although there is a growing focus on the importance of this in the literature in relation to teaching and learning practices (Leask, 2009; Luxon & Peelo, 2009; Sanderson, 2011). This is important given that 21.5% of Australian tertiary students are international (OECD, 2011).

We compared some of our website findings with Krause, Coates and James (2005), who analysed how Australian universities choose to depict their commitment to internationalisation on their websites, in order to explore what shifts may have occurred over the last six years. We found that 32 universities had a link from the home page to 'international students', compared to only 27 in 2005. Nearly all universities mention that their policies and practices had an international dimension, compared to two in 2005. 37 universities mentioned English language support and pathways to university study provided by their institution, compared to two in 2005. This highlights the growing focus on English language in proficiency in higher education. In addition, all universities mentioned that their students have opportunities to study abroad or engage in international exchange programs, compared to 13 universities in 2005. We also found that there was an increased emphasis on internationalisation within university graduate attributes, an element either missing or not explored by Krause et al (2005). There were 27 universities that listed 'global citizenship' as a graduate attribute. These listings usually included some of the following:

- Awareness of knowledge in a global context
- Ability to apply international perspectives
- Willingness to contribute to the international community
- Demonstrate cross-cultural awareness

However, the concept of 'global citizen', while attractive in itself, is used broadly and loosely by universities. As such this concept is far from providing the basis for consistent judgments or quantifiable metrics. Often 'global citizen' seems to function in lieu of an effective internationalisation agenda rather than as an expression of such an agenda.

Current examples of criteria and indicators

There are few available examples of university use of criteria and indicators for the purpose which is the focus of this project – the monitoring and evaluation of activities designed to internationalise the student experience for all students. Most existing criteria and indicators are concerned with the broader concept of internationalisation in its various dimensions. These dimensions include institutional mission statements, organisational support structures, international research activities, study abroad programs, quality assurance, to name just a few (Beerkens et al, 2010). For the most part these dimensions are not relevant to internationalising the student experience. One reason is that other OECD countries are less heavily engaged in international education. Australia has the largest percentage of tertiary international students in the OECD countries (OECD, 2011).

The only documented attempt to propose a framework for categorising indicators for internationalisation in Australia is the work of Krause, Coates and James (2005). They identified five dimensions. These were:

- The strategic dimension of internationalisation
- The teaching and learning dimension of internationalisation
- The student dimension of internationalisation
- The faculty dimension of internationalisation
- The research dimension of internationalisation

Their work provided a useful starting point for conceptualising the dimensions and indicators for internationalising the student experience as set out in Appendix A.

Inputs, outputs and outcomes

The project team sought to develop criteria and indicators that could be measured for institutional planning, evaluation and improvement. In developing the proposed criteria and indicators, our work was informed by James (2003), who in reviewing quantitative reporting of higher education, commented that there are three desirable features of performance indicators:

1. **Simplicity:** Indicators should be easy to interpret and be based on statistics which are efficient to collect.
2. **Validity and sensitivity:** Indicators should be relevant to the purposes to which they are put, flexible enough to reflect the diversity of institutional missions, and sensitive and adaptive to changes in practice.
3. **Brevity:** The number of indicators should be kept to a minimum otherwise data collection tends to become an end in itself.

In the formulation of the criteria and indicators, we focused on inputs and outputs rather than outcomes. Beerkens et al. (2010, p. 11) distinguish between inputs, outputs and outcomes in the following way: “Outputs are direct consequences from inputs, whereas outcomes are related to overall achievements”. Given the small-scale scope of this project, developing indicators that primarily focus on inputs and outputs was seen as the first step in developing a conceptual framework for internationalising the student experience.

We carefully considered what could be measured on a sound basis, while noting that much relevant to internationalising the student experience is not readily measured. The result was a discussion paper was developed that also included a very detailed list of indicators for the consultation with the sector in the three National Forums (See Appendix 1).

Findings from the National Forums

The National Forums were designed as working events in the form of ‘think-tanks’. The program of National Forums was framed to maximise participation, by holding three events in different parts of Australia: in Melbourne (University of Melbourne), Brisbane (QUT) and Perth (Murdoch University). A discussion paper with draft indicators and criteria was circulated prior to the Forums. Participants were asked to address the following questions:

1. What does it mean to have an internationalised student experience?
2. In relation to the draft criteria and indicators:
 - a. Do participants agree with the dimensions and criteria?
 - b. What should be deleted, added and why?
 - c. What measurements could be included in relation to the indicators?

A total of 56 people from 20 institutions participated in the Forums. The participants included those in university leadership positions such as Pro Vice-Chancellors and Deputy Vice-Chancellors (DVC), academic teaching roles, and professional support or administrative positions. The Forums provided the opportunity for sector wide discussion of internationalising the student experience, as well as facilitating detailed responses to the draft document. Feedback from the Forums informed the further development of the document, which was then sent out to the Forum participants for a second round of feedback, this time in written form.

Definitions of internationalising the student experience

Feedback was sought at the Forums regarding the definition of 'internationalising the student experience'. The main points that emerge from the discussion are summarised in Table 1.

It was clear from the discussion that it was difficult to get an agreed definition from those involved. There was consensus over broad notions related to internationalising the student experience that it should include both international and domestic students. There was also agreement that a new conceptualisation was required, as often the term 'internationalising' refers to international students and it does not encompass domestic students. While the Forums focused on graduate attributes as important for anchoring definitions of internationalising the student experience, there was less agreement about how this could be achieved. Some people commented that it was unclear how universities actually assessed whether graduating students had developed 'global competence'. While outward mobility programs were important, people noted that financial considerations limited participation.

Table 1: Summary of Forum discussions

Definition	How	Domains	Caveats
Integration of international and local students to form one unified student body.	Building reflective intercultural capacity in each person by promoting inclusion and respect.	Mixed culture campus environs and student residences.	Distinguish between undergraduates and postgraduates as well as international staff and students.
Fostering a diverse international teaching and learning community, which will represent Internationalisation for all students and staff.	Respect and value so as to engage. <i>Multi-lingual</i> communicative competence. Overhaul Anglo-centric approaches. Value diversity in staff by acknowledging and valuing diverse professional attributes and practices.	Teaching and learning. Internationalisation of the curriculum, including generic (global) elements and the bringing together of different local elements.	Different student goals lead to different kinds of desired internationalisation. There is as such a need to acknowledge these different goals by distinguishing disciplinary differences.
Globally portable student qualifications and recognised experience.	Institutional partnerships, embracing common learning outcomes and mutual qualifications recognition.	Outbound student mobility, including internships.	Problem of providing equitable vocational opportunities for both local and international students. Professional accreditation issues.

The Forum discussions emphasised the need for an agreed definition of internationalisation that both highlights the transformative nature of the concept and foregrounds the involvement of all students – international and domestic – in strategies designed to implement and achieve that transformation. The following definition of internationalising the student experience encompassed the observations from those who participated in the National Forums. In particular, the definition considers both the processes and outcomes for internationalising the student experience. In the second round of written feedback from those who attended the Forum, there was general agreement around the following definition:

- In terms of *process* ‘internationalisation’ means fostering a nationally and culturally diverse and interactive university community where all students have a sense of belonging.
- In terms of *outcomes* ‘internationalisation’ means graduates who are globally aware, globally competent and able to work with culturally and linguistically diverse people either locally or anywhere in the world.

Dimensions, criteria and indicators

Most of the discussion at the Forums focused on the criteria and indicators for internationalising the student experience. These have been summarised in Appendix 2. Overall, there were five key areas that emerged from the discussion, which guided the project team in developing the dimensions, criteria and indicators for internationalising the student experience presented in the next section of this paper.

1. **Reduce the number of indicators**

It was clear that there were far too many indicators in the discussion paper. The general view in all three Forums was that a smaller number of indicators would be more useful and manageable for institutional evaluation and improvement. The project team reduced the final set of indicators to eleven. These decisions were guided by the overall feedback from the Forums, where comments were made about the usefulness of particular indicators. There were also very strong views within the Forums that gathering information for evaluation of indicators should not be labor intensive.

2. **Acknowledge that the area of internationalisation is not easily quantifiable**

There was much discussion about what could be reasonably measured for the purposes of identifying areas of improvement for internationalising the student experience. It was difficult to indicate targets that institutions should strive for in all areas. Nor was it possible to indicate optimum targets, when institutions differ in terms of context and student demographics. Many indicated that the indicators should be fairly general to allow institutions to set their own target. Rather than set targets, the project team added further explanation about the indicator that could guide institutions in setting their own targets.

3. **Focus on curriculum design and assessment**

The teaching and curriculum dimension of internationalisation received much attention in the Forums. There was strong consensus that indicators should emphasise assessment in order to align curriculum design with learning outcomes. This was considered to be the domain of institutions, as policies and practices vary across institutions, as well as across different disciplines. Many of the attendees also mentioned the need for the institution to recognise and reward ‘international engagement of staff’ in recruitment and promotion processes, as part of increasing the focus on internationalising teaching and learning practices.

4. **Include items relating to internationalisation in routine student surveys**

A feature that was perceived to be missing in the indicators was the use of student feedback. Many made the comment that institutions could include in their quality of teaching surveys items related to the extent to which intercultural mixing contributed to students’ learning

outcomes. There was also agreement in the three Forums that items on intercultural mixing should be included in institutional student surveys. This feedback was relayed to iGraduate which currently administers the International Student Barometer¹, a survey instrument widely used across Australian universities.

5. Merge support services for students into the University Community section

While the criteria were deemed as important, it was felt that these issues mainly dealt with international student issues, such as housing and loneliness. Comments indicated that these issues were not necessarily related to internationalising the student experience. Many also considered this area too difficult to monitor.

Concluding Comments

The next section presents the dimensions, criteria and indicators that were refined after the National Forums. The project team sought written feedback from those who participated in the Forums and the responses received were in general agreement with the items in the document. The project team sought to further strengthen the validity of the framework by asking two universities² to pilot the indicator framework by offering examples of data that was available from their institution.

This was a difficult activity for them to complete for two main reasons. Firstly, it was apparent that the institutions did not routinely collect information related to internationalising the student experience (which confirmed general comments made in the Forums). Secondly, the administrative activities (for which data might be collected) of institutions' international offices are most often focused upon recruitment of international students, rather than internationalisation in terms of student experience and teaching/learning outcomes.

From the experience of this project, it seems clear that educational institutions need an integrated approach to internationalising the student experience that includes:

- a strategic approach towards achieving agreed outcomes;
- better articulation of relevant teaching and learning strategies; and
- a communication strategy that engages the university community.

The dimensions, criteria and indicators developed as part of this project can guide and assist institutions in developing such an integrated approach – but at the present time such an indicator framework can only be considered somewhat visionary in anticipation of institutions developing common strategies that are specifically focused upon internationalising the student experience in Australian higher education.

Dimensions, criteria and indicators for internationalising the student experience

Definition of internationalisation: We need an agreed definition of internationalisation that both highlights the transformative nature of the concept and foregrounds the involvement of all students – international and domestic – in strategies designed to implement and achieve that transformation. The National Forums and subsequent feedback and discussion have been especially insistent that internationalisation is a matter for all students.

- In terms of *process* 'internationalisation' means fostering a nationally and culturally diverse and interactive university community where all students have a sense of belonging.

¹ See for example: <http://www.universitiesaustralia.edu.au/page/media-centre/2011-media-releases/international-student-barometer/>

² The assistance of staff at the University of Melbourne and Swinburne University are gratefully acknowledged.

- In terms of *outcomes* 'internationalisation' means graduates who are globally aware, globally competent and able to work with culturally and linguistically diverse people either locally or anywhere in the world.

Discussion in the Forums also emphasised that every institution is working in a distinctive context. The definitions, criteria and indicators are instruments of self-regulation. Therefore as a matter of course they will be interpreted and used in a manner sensitive to the particular mission, location and student mix in each institution.

1. The Strategic Dimension of internationalising the student experience for all students

Criteria	Indicators	Explanation
Published commitment to internationalisation in context of institutional policy and planning documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inclusion of outcomes relating to 'global competence' in statement of desired graduate attributes. ▪ Relevant and measurable key Performance Indicators and other evaluation criteria used in the institution's organisational areas/divisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The inclusion of 'global competence' in the university's statement of desired graduate attributes is important to frame the learning outcomes concerning internationalising the student experience within teaching and learning contexts. ▪ Management plans include strategic objectives for internationalising the student experience, how these will be monitored and evaluated, along with the organisational areas responsible for achieving KPIs, and specify how these will be monitored.
Allocation of specific roles and resources in relation to internationalisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proportion of staff resources allocated within the whole institution that are explicitly dedicated to international and internationalisation activities, within the context of institutional mission and strategic plans. These staffing resources will be measured in terms of equivalent full-time positions on an annual basis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resources are explicitly dedicated to support internationalising the student experience. This includes identifiable roles within department/school/faculty that address internationalisation strategies for teaching and learning; and support Australian Universities International Directors Forum (AUIDF) annual benchmarking results.

2. The Teaching and Learning Dimension of internationalising the student experience for all students

Criteria	Indicators	Explanation
Achieving intended learning outcomes for an internationalised curriculum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proportion of English-speaking students who are undertaking studies in a language other than English (LOTE). ▪ Proportion of students who participate in outward mobility programs. ▪ Student feedback in university surveys on the extent to which working in culturally mixed groups has contributed to their learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institutions set a target for the proportion of students undertaking LOTE, in order to promote the study of LOTE within the institution. ▪ Institutions set a target for the proportion of students who undertake outward mobility programs. ▪ Items related to culturally mixed groups should be included in regular institutional student surveys. For example, quality of teaching surveys, student experience surveys.
Promotion of teaching staff to develop internationalised teaching approaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff record of activities in relation to international engagement, and internationalisation of teaching, are considered in the recruitment process and included in the mandatory criteria for promotion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institutions develop their recruitment and promotion policies to recognise and reward internationalised teaching approaches.
Promotion and development of English language proficiency³ for all students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Core objectives of all degrees include the achievement of English language proficiency and this is specifically assessed in subjects. ▪ All student evaluations of teaching and learning in subjects include evaluation of English language learning outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Course reviews include a statement of English language learning outcomes, and identify, through course mapping activities, the subjects where these will be taught and assessed. ▪ Institutions include an item on the achievement of English language learning outcomes in the quality of teaching surveys.

³ The definition of English language proficiency is taken from the *Good Practice Principles* (AUQA, 2009: p. 2) as 'the ability of students to use English language to make and communicate meaning in spoken and written contexts while completing their university study'.

3. The University Community

Criteria	Indicators	Explanation
Enhancing the student voice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incorporation of objectives related to intercultural mixing of all students, in instruments of student evaluations and feedback on academic programs, student services and administration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ International Student Barometer results. ▪ University survey questions for all students that examine feelings of social inclusion within the university.
Professional development for academic and professional staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A number of professional development activities are presented relating to intercultural mixing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institutions set a target for the proportion of professional and academic staff undertaking international exchanges. ▪ Institutions develop a strategy or adopt a framework (e.g. <i>Finding Common Ground</i>) for incorporating intercultural mixing, with uptake and influence to be reviewed by DVCs Academic and International.

References

- Arkoudis, S. (2006). *Teaching International students: Strategies to enhance learning*. Melbourne: Centre for the Study of Higher Education.
- Arkoudis, S., & Starfield, S. (2007). *In-Course English Language Development and Support*. Canberra: Australian Education International.
- Arkoudis, S., Yu, X., Baik, C., Borland, H., Chang, S., Lang, I., et al. (2010). *Finding Common Ground: Enhancing interaction between domestic and international students*. Melbourne: ALTC.
- AUQA. (2009). *Good Practice Principles of for English Language Proficiency for International Students in Australian Universities*. Canberra: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.
- Australian Education International. (2010). International graduate outcomes and employer perceptions. Available at:
http://www.aei.gov.au/News/Latest-News/Documents/2010_International_Graduate_Outcomes_pdf.pdf
- Beerkens, E., Brandenburg, U., Evers, N., van Gaalen, A., Leichsenring, H., & Zimmerman, V. (2010). *Indicator project on internationalisation - approaches, methods and findings*.
http://www.che.de/downloads/indicator_projects_on_internationalisation_IMPI_100_511.pdf.
- Childress, L. (2009). Internationalisation plans for higher education institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education*. 13 (3), 289- 301.
- Clifford, V. A. (2009) Engaging the disciplines in internationalising the curriculum. *International Journal for Academic Development*. 14 (2), 133–143.
- Council of Australian Governments. (2010). International Student Strategy for Australia 2010-2014. Available at:
http://www.coag.gov.au/reports/docs/aus_international_students_strategy.pdf.
- Crichton, J. & Scarino, A. (2007). How are we to understand the “intercultural dimension? An examination of the intercultural dimension of internationalisation in the context of higher education in Australia’. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*. 30 (1), 4.1–4.21.
- Davies, I. Evans, M & Reid, A. (2005) Globalising citizenship education? A critique of 'Global Education' and 'Citizenship Education'. *British Journal of Educational Studies*. 53 (1), 66-89.
- Denson, N. & Zhang, S. (2010). The impact of student experiences with diversity on developing graduate attributes. *Studies in Higher Education*. 35 (5),529- 543.
- Dewey, P. & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before passion: faculty views on internationalization in higher education. Springer Science + Business. Published online: 17 February. Available at:
<http://www.qime.dufe.edu.cn/iecresearch/UserFiles/files/20110325105339082.pdf>
- de Witt, H. (2011). Internationalization of higher education: Nine misconceptions. *International Higher Education*, 64, 6-7.

- de Witt, H. (2008). Changing trends in the internationalisation of higher education. Paper presented at the Centre for the Study in Higher Education, University of Melbourne, October 6, 2008.
- Dunne, C. (2009). Host students' perspectives on intercultural contact in an Irish university. *Journal of Studies in International Education*. 13(2), 222-239.
- Fahey, S. (2009). Trends in internationalisation and implications for universities. Higher Education Summit, Melbourne, 3-4 April. Retrieved on June 25th at: <http://www.monash.edu.au/international/dvc/assets/internationalisation2009.pdf>
- Gillan, M. Damachis, B. & McGuire, J. (2003). Australia in India: Commodification and internationalisation of higher education. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 38(14), 1395-1403
- Harrison, N. & Peacock, N. (2010). Cultural distance, mindfulness and passive xenophobia: using Integrated Threat Theory to explore home higher education students' perspectives on 'internationalisation at home'. *British Educational Research Journal*. 36(6), 877-902.
- Hickling-Hudson, A. & Sidhu, R. (2011). Australia's universities and the challenges of internationalisation. In Lindsay, B. & Blanchett, W. (Eds). *Universities and Global Diversity- Preparing Educators for Tomorrow* (pp.157-175). New York: Routledge.
- Hudzik, J.K. (2011). Comprehensive Internationalisation: From concept to action (executive summary). NAFSA, Association of international Educators. Available at: http://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/NAFSA_Home/Resource_Library_Assets/Publications_Library/2011_Comprehen_Internationalization.pdf.
- James, R. (2003). Suggestions relative to the selection of strategic system-level indicators to review the development of higher education. In A. Yonezawa & F. Kaiser (Eds.), *System-level and Strategic Indicators for Monitoring Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century*. Bucharest: UNESCO-CEPES.
- James, R. Krause, K. & Jennings, C. (2010) The first year experience in Australian universities: Findings from 1994 to 2009. Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne. Available at: http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/research/experience/docs/FYE_Report_1994_to_2009.pdf.
- Jiang, X. (2008). Towards the internationalisation of higher education from a critical perspective. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*. 32(4), 347-358.
- Kim, T. (2009) Transnational academic mobility, internationalization and interculturality in higher education. *Intercultural Education*. 20(5), 395-405.
- Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Educational*, 33, 2-3.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.
- Knight, J. (2011) Three types of education hubs: Student, talent and knowledge. *The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education*. Available at: http://www.obhe.ac.uk/documents/view_details?id=893

- Knight, J. (2011). Five myths about internationalisation. *International Higher Education*, 62, 14-15.
- Krause, K., Coates, H., & James, R. (2005). Monitoring the internationalisation of higher education: Are there useful quantitative indicators? In M. Tight (Ed.), *International Relations* (pp. 233-254). Oxford: Elsevier.
- 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.
- Luxon, T., & Peelo, M. (2009). Internationalisation: Its implications for curriculum design and course development in UK higher education. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 46(1), 51-60.
- Marginson, S. (2006). Dynamics of national and global competition in higher education. *Higher Education*, 52(1), 1-39.
- Marginson, S. (2007). Global position and position taking. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(1), 5-32.
- Marginson, S., Nyland, C., Sawir, E., & Forbes-Mewett, H. (2010). *International Student Security*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Marginson, S., & van der Wende, M. (2009). The new global landscape of nations and institutions *Higher Education to 2030 Volume 2: Globalisation* (pp. 18-62). Paris: OECD
- OECD. (2011). Education at a Glance 2011: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing. Available at:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2011-en>
- Sanderson, G. (2011). Internationalisation and teaching in higher education. *Higher Education Teaching and Research*, 30(5), 661-676.
- Scarino, A. (2009) Assessing intercultural capability in learning languages: Some issues and considerations. *Language Teaching*. 42, 67-80.
- Svensson, L. & Wihlborg, M. (2010) Internationalising the content of higher education: the need for a curriculum perspective. *Springer Science +Business*. Available at:
<http://www.springerlink.com/content/13170v8121106565/fulltext.pdf>
- van Damme, D. (2001). Quality issues in the internationalisation of higher education. *Higher Education*, 41(4), 415-441.
- Yang, R. (2002). University internationalisation: its meanings, rationales and implications. *Intercultural Education*. 13(1), 81-95.

Appendix 1: Discussion paper for National Forums

Overview

Australia Education International has commissioned the Centre for the Study of Higher education (CSHE), University of Melbourne to develop criteria and indicators for monitoring and evaluating the internationalisation of the student experience. Internationalisation is here considered primarily in terms of teaching and learning, and relations between international students and local students. The project team is Sophie Arkoudis, Chi Baik and Simon Marginson. The main aim of the project is to develop a conceptual framework of criteria and indicators, through consultation with the tertiary education sector in three National Forums. This paper is designed to inform discussion in the National Forums.

Australian higher education is grappling with the issue of enhancing interaction between local and international students. While universities have attempted to address this issue in a number of ways, survey results appear to indicate that many international students remain dissatisfied with their experiences and other research suggests that both groups are often fairly segregated inside and outside classrooms. Similar problems, though less well documented, have arisen in VET.

Part of the problem has been that interaction between international and local students has been isolated from teaching and learning activities, including the disciplinary context. Another problem is that definitions of 'internationalisation' and 'intercultural teaching and learning' vary markedly, and are often ill-defined (e.g. developments around the theme of 'educating global citizens'). These limitations preclude any attempt to gain an overview of comparative picture of performance in this area and hence to identify clearly when systems and institutions are moving forward, and where examples of high quality performance can be found.

What is currently missing is an agreed set of criteria for the exercise of judgement on internationalising the student experience, especially relations between local and international students, including numerical indicators where these are meaningful and can be agreed and made operational. Some matters lend themselves to indicators (for example the collection of data on time use) while other aspects of internationalisation can only be evaluated through the process of expert judgement on the basis of standard criteria.

There are two main stages in the project. These are:

Stage 1: Conceptual development (June-July 2011)

Review of the literature and existing research in the area, particularly but not only Australian-related material in both higher education and VET. This phase has drawn partly on recent work at CSHE primarily focused on higher education, and the work of Ly Tran (RMIT, ARC Postdoctoral Fellow) in relation to VET.

Stage 2: National Forums (August 2011)

The National Forums are designed to maximise participation, by holding three events in different parts of Australia: in Melbourne (University of Melbourne), Brisbane (QUT) and Perth (Murdoch University). The National Forums are designed as working events in the form of 'think-tanks'. They provide opportunity for sector-wide discussion. All higher education institutions on the public register have been invited, along with selected VET providers.

An exploratory conceptualisation of criteria and indicators for internationalising the student experience

Definitions of 'internationalising the student experience'

In developing draft criteria and indicators for internationalising the student experience, we have drawn on current research on internationalisation in higher education, as well as an analysis of the web sites of Australian universities and some VET institutions. Internationalisation appears in many institutional mission statements, at a general level. More specifically, internationalisation can also refer to particular cohorts of students (international onshore, or offshore students), and particular programs (study abroad or international exchange program).

The terms 'international' and 'domestic' students are used in much of the research to represent two homogenous groups of learners, even though the students within each group vary greatly in their educational experiences and English language background. The term 'international students' covers students from many backgrounds and on different learning pathways. It includes students studying in on-shore or off-shore programs, and learners who may have lived and studied in many countries, those who have never left their home country, and those who are studying overseas for the first time. It has been argued that 'international' as the term does not capture the diversity that can exist amongst the international student body (Dogherty & Singh, 2005; Marginson, 2007; Arkoudis, Baik et al, 2010). Equally, 'domestic' students are also a diverse group. They are mono-lingual, bi-lingual and multilingual. They are culturally diverse. They may be from rural or migrant backgrounds, of low socio-economic status, or of Indigenous Australian background, to name just a few of the possible variations. It appears that tertiary institutions are increasingly focused on internationalising the students experience for all students studying in Australian universities.

Question:

What does it mean to have an internationalised student experience?

Definitions of dimensions and criteria

The most common definition of internationalisation used on university websites is Knight's (2003) definition 'Internationalisation is the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution'; or Knight's updated 2004 version: 'the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, function and delivery of post secondary education'. However, while these statements capture aspects of the phenomenon of internationalisation, there is little, if any, reference to criteria we can use to measure the internationalised student experience.

We agree with Krause, Coates and James (2005: p.243)⁴, that a direct measure of outcomes is not always possible. In reviewing quantitative reporting of higher education, James (2003) commented that there are three desirable features of performance indicators:

- **Simplicity:** Indicators should be easy to interpret and be based on statistics which are efficient to collect.
- **Validity and sensitivity:** Indicators should be relevant to the purposes to which they are put, flexible enough to reflect the diversity of institutional missions, and sensitive and adaptive to changes in practice.

⁴ The project team used as a starting point the quantitative performance indicators from Krause, Coates and James (2005) in developing the criteria and indicators for this discussion paper.

- Brevity: The number of indicators should be kept to a minimum otherwise data collection tends to become an end in itself. (Krause et al, 2005: p.242)

In identifying the dimensions and criteria of internationalising the student experience, we may need to select those that can be measured for institutional planning, evaluation and improvement.

Questions:

Do you agree with the dimensions and criteria identified below?

What should be deleted/added and why?

What measurements could be included, in relation to these indicators?

Table 1. The Strategic Dimension of Internationalisation

Criteria	Indicators
Commitment to internationalisation in institutional policy and planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Explicit statement in institutional mission statement and strategic objectives regarding internationalisation ▪ Decision-making and reporting structures in place to support and monitor the internationalisation of the student experience. ▪ Evaluation and benchmarking of institutional performance
Allocation of specific roles and resources in relation to internationalisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Senior appointment with designated responsibility for internationalisation ▪ Administration unit dedicated to managing and coordinating international affairs ▪ Proportion of resources explicitly dedicated to international activities

Table 2. The Teaching and Curriculum Dimension of Internationalisation

Criteria	Indicators
Curriculum designed to incorporate international perspectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number and worldwide range of formal partnerships with institutions in other countries, in relation to teaching and learning, e.g. joint course offerings, jointly badged degrees ▪ Proportion of students undertaking studies in languages other than English ▪ Percentage of students enrolled in subjects that have an international focus as a central element of the subject ▪ Number and percentage of students who undertake an offshore international experience as part of their degree, of (1) four weeks or less, (2) three months or less, (3) six months or less, (4) one year or less, (5) more than one year
Promotion and support of an internationalised and culturally diverse teaching staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number and duration of professional development programs available for full-time and sessional academic staff in strategies for teaching in culturally diverse settings

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of teaching awards at university and faculty level for leading teaching excellence in internationalising the curriculum ▪ Percentage of teaching staff undertaking staff exchanges or sabbaticals abroad, for periods of (1) four weeks or less, (2) three months or less, (3) six months or less, (4) one year or less, (5) more than one year ▪ Number of international visiting teaching staff per year, for periods of (1) four weeks or less, (2) three months or less, (3) six months or less, (4) one year or less, (5) more than one year ▪ Number and worldwide range of inter-institutional agreements for teaching staff exchange
<p>Teaching and learning practices designed to foster intercultural relations and learning in the classroom</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documented evidence of regular course review and evaluation of practices within disciplines designed to further integration of local and international students ▪ Proportion of subjects with a structured approach to culturally mixed student groupings, for example in assignment and project work ▪ Proportion of subjects with more than 20 per cent international students in which classroom-based English language assistance is available, additional to normal provision ▪ Proportion of subjects in which use is made of cross-cultural 'buddy' or mentoring schemes ▪ Proportion of subjects in which use is made of content examples drawn from international students' home countries
<p>Program accreditation allows graduates to practice professionally in a wide range of countries and constituencies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The extent to which institutional professional awards and accreditations are recognised internationally and allow graduates to practice internationally ▪ The extent to which curricula have equivalence with overseas universities and permit the granting of credits to students
<p>Promotion and development of English language skills</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ English language development advisory group, with a particular remit in relation to the implementation of DEEWR's <i>Good Practice Principles for English language proficiency for international students in Australian universities</i> ▪ Number of discipline-based English language programs integrated in the core curriculum ▪ Proportion of subjects that include English language proficiency in (1) the objectives specified in their subject outlines, and (2) their assessment criteria ▪ Proportion of academic staff who attend professional development activities on assessing English language of all students

Table 3. The University Community

Criteria	Indicators
Experiencing other cultures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of undergraduate/postgraduate/research degree students who are international students, and worldwide range of the countries of origin ▪ Number of formal international institutional exchange agreements ▪ Number of coursework scholarships dedicated to international students, proportion of these scholarships in coursework student load ▪ Number of research degree scholarships dedicated to international students, proportion of these scholarships in HDR load ▪ Level of support provided in international student scholarships (fees only? living costs? dependents?) ▪ Funds per student available to support international student exchange ▪ Funds per graduate student to support international research experience
Building connections between students from diverse backgrounds, beyond the classroom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of orientation programs offered with an international focus ▪ Does the university provide joint international and domestic orientation programs? If so, percentage of students who attend such joint programs ▪ Proportion of clubs and associations offering the opportunity for local and international students to mix ▪ Proportion of decision making bodies with international student representatives ▪ Proportion of international student leaders in mainstream student bodies and associations ▪ Number of institution-wide international and intercultural events ▪ Number of faculty events jointly organised by international and domestic students ▪ Number of peer support programs which encourage the mixing of local and international students, at (1) new arrival stage, (2) later stages ▪ Rates of participation of local and international students in peer support programs

Table 4. Support Services for Students

Criteria	Indicators
Support services that recognise and serve international student needs, while fostering intercultural mixing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New arrival services and programs that highlight and facilitate intercultural mixing ▪ Dedicated professional service capacity in areas of need specific to international students (e.g. housing English language proficiency, employment advice) capable of servicing the full international student population ▪ Training and on-going professional development programs in service areas specific to international students (e.g. housing, English language proficiency, employment advice)

-
- Integrated student services where such services can foster intercultural relations while meeting all students' specific needs
 - Proportion of international students living in cross-cultural housing provided by or subsidised by the institution
 - Assistance with interpreter and translator needs as appropriate
 - Regular monitoring of each individual international student, in relation to (1) social integration and support, (2) intercultural mixing
 - Institution-wide and individual precinct policy, planning and provision of a safe environment on and near campuses
 - Availability of adequate and well-advertised counseling services in relation to (1) difficulties of intercultural mixing, (2) instances of discrimination or abuse
-

References

- Arkoudis, S., Baik, C., Yu, X., Borland, H., Chang, S., Lang, I., Lang, J., Pearce, A. and Watty, K. (2010). *Finding Common Ground: Enhancing interaction between domestic and international students*. Melbourne: ALTC.
- Doherty, C., & Singh, P. (2005). How the west is done: Simulating western pedagogy in a curriculum for Asian international students. In P. Ninnes & M. Hellstén (Eds.), *Internationalising Higher Education* (pp. 53-74). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre.
- James, R. (2003). Suggestions relative to the selection of strategic system-level indicators to review the development of higher education. In A. Yonezawa & F. Kaiser (Eds.), *System-level and Strategic Indicators for Monitoring Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century*. Bucharest: UNESCO-CEPES.
- Krause, K., Coates, H., & James, R. (2005). Monitoring the internationalisation of higher education: Are there useful quantitative indicators? In M. Tight (Ed.), *International Relations* (pp. 233-254). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Marginson, S. (2007). Global position and position taking. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(1), 5-32.

Appendix 2: Summarised feedback from the National Forums

Table 1. The Strategic Dimension of Internationalisation

Criteria	Indicators	Suggestions
Commitment to internationalisation in institutional policy and planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Explicit statement in institutional mission statement and strategic objectives regarding internationalisation ▪ Decision-making and reporting structures in place to support and monitor the internationalisation of the student experience ▪ Evaluation and benchmarking of international performance ▪ Internationalisation adds to graduate profile attributes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Contextual definition needed to clarify what 'Internationalisation' means for the individual institution</i>
Allocation of specific roles and resources in relation to internationalisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Senior appointment with designated responsibility for internationalisation ▪ Administration unit dedicated to managing and coordinating international affairs ▪ Proportion of resources explicitly dedicated to international activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Consider rewording indicator dot point two, 'Administration unit whose responsibilities include managing and coordinating international affairs'</i> ▪ <i>Consider rewording 'Amount' of resources, not a proportion of resources</i> ▪ <i>Criteria Indicators need to be flexible enough for institutions to adopt in the context of their own environment</i>

Mixture of process and outcome indicators needed.

Student feedback surveys should include questions on the international relevance of courses, subjects and the overall student experience.

Assessment should be included in this table.

Table 2. The Teaching and Curriculum Dimension of Internationalisation

Criteria	Indicators	Suggestions
<p>Curriculum designed to incorporate international perspectives</p> <p><i>A link between curriculum and learning outcomes needs to be developed</i></p> <p><i>Whilst the number and percentage of students is a good indicator for mobility, curriculum design is less useful as an indicator in this instance</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number and worldwide range of formal partnerships with institutions in other countries, in relation to teaching and learning, e.g. joint course offering, jointly badged degrees ▪ Proportion of students undertaking studies in language other than English ▪ Percentage of students enrolled in subjects that have an international focus as a central element of the subject ▪ Number and percentage of students who undertake an offshore international experience as part of their degree of (1) four weeks or less, (2) three months or less, (3) six months or less, (4) one year or less, (5) more than 1 year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Indicators need to be more indicative of the individual institutions definition of internationalisation</i> ▪ <i>Assessment is an important aspect of curriculum; teaching and learning, which effects students experience in class, and as such, should be mentioned in this section</i> ▪ <i>In regards to the third indicator dot point, 'percentage of students' is not the most useful way of measuring this indicator</i> ▪ <i>The first indicator dot point is more of an indicator of mobility than internationalisation of the curriculum</i> ▪ <i>Indicator dot point two is useful</i> ▪ <i>In relation to indicator dot point three, it will be difficult to identify international focus in courses</i> ▪ <i>In relation to indicator four- there is a large body of literature that indicates other indicators relevant to this section, for example the <u>IMPI</u> project</i> ▪ <i>AUIDF has good data on outward mobility</i>
<p>Promotion and support of an internationalised curriculum and culturally diverse teaching staff</p> <p><i>Consider alternative wording for this criteria to further clarify, for example such as 'Promotion and support of teaching staff to work in international and culturally diverse contexts'</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number and duration of professional development programs available for full-time and sessional academic staff in strategies for teaching in culturally diverse settings ▪ Number of teaching awards at university and faculty level for leading teaching excellence in internationalising the curriculum ▪ Percentage of teaching staff undertaking staff exchanges or sabbaticals abroad, for periods of (1) four weeks, (2) three months or less, (3) six months or less, (4) one year or less, (5) more than one year ▪ Number and worldwide range of inter-institutional agreements for teaching staff exchange ▪ International engagement of staff is a factor in promotion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The international engagement of staff needs to be considered as part of the recruitment process and as part of criteria for promotion</i> ▪ <i>Need to further clarify indicator dot point one; is this criterion about teaching diverse student groups or diverse teaching staff?</i> ▪ <i>Alternative wording for indicator dot point one which should specify 'participation' rather than availability of professional development programs</i> ▪ <i>Indicator dot point four could be problematic because most staff exchange agreements are informal</i>

<p>Teaching and learning practices designed to foster intercultural relations and learning in the classroom</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documented evidence of regular course review and evaluation of practices within disciplines designed to further integration of local and international students ▪ Proportion of subjects with a structured approach to culturally mixed student groupings, for example in assignment and project work ▪ Proportion of subjects with more than 20 per cent international students in which classroom-based English language assistance is available, additional to normal provision ▪ Proportion of subjects in which use is made of a cross-cultural 'buddy' or mentoring schemes ▪ Proportion of subjects in which use is made of content examples drawn from international students' home countries (+ student feedback includes questions about this in regular surveys) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Indicator dot points two, three, four and five will be very difficult to define and measure in a useful way</i> ▪ <i>In this section, consideration of student feedback on whether subject improved for example, '(My) ability to interact with students from different cultures'</i> ▪ <i>In relation to indicator dot point five, a comparative approach is good but not necessarily from each home country</i> <p><i>These may be measurable at a local program level but not across the whole institution. They could be more useful at a program level, for example it is difficult for staff to be aware across the board of how people are teaching. We should think about the need to vary indicators for different institutional contexts and levels of engagement, such as at the level of schools, faculties and programs.</i></p>
<p>Program accreditation allows graduates to practice professionally in a wide range of countries and constituencies</p> <p><i>These criteria could also be relevant to curriculum design</i></p> <p><i>International internships may also be worth considering here</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The extent to which institutional professional awards and accreditations are recognized internationally and allow graduates to practice internationally ▪ The extent to which curricula have equivalence with overseas universities and permit the granting of credits to students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Need to consider these indicators as specific to international students</i> ▪ <i>Need to address English academic language and language in general (not just English)</i> ▪ <i>Both indicators in here are good in theory but will be very difficult to measure, as outcomes will be different for every course</i>

<p>Promotion and development of English language skills</p> <p><i>Consider alternative wording to further clarify for this criteria such as, 'Promotion and development of 'Professional communication' skills</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ English language development advisory group, with a particular remit in relation to the implementation of DEEWR's <i>Good Practice for English language proficiency for international students in Australian universities</i> ▪ Number of discipline-based English language programs integrated in the core curriculum ▪ Proportion of subjects that include English language proficiency in (1) the objectives specified in their subject outlines, and (2) their assessment criteria ▪ Proportion of academic staff who attend professional development activities on assessing English language of all students ▪ English language proficiency included in graduate attributes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Indicator dot point one does not reflect that action is more important than organisational structure</i> ▪ <i>Indicator dot point two needs to clarify that the number of discipline based English language programs will be affected by the size of the institution</i> ▪ <i>Indicator dot point three will be very labor intensive to check</i> ▪ <i>Indicator dot point four does not recognise that it is not appropriate for all academic staff to be assessing English language competence</i>
---	---	--

Existing surveys could be useful

Table 3. The University Community

Criteria	Indicators	Suggestions
Experiencing other cultures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of undergraduate/postgraduate/research degree students who are international students, and worldwide range of the countries of origin ▪ Number of formal international institutional exchange agreements ▪ Number of coursework scholarships dedicated to international students, proportion of these scholarships in coursework student load ▪ Number of research degree scholarships dedicated to international students, proportion of these scholarships in HDR load ▪ Level of support provided in international student scholarships (fee only? Living costs? Dependents?) ▪ Funds per student available to support international student exchange ▪ Funds per graduate student to support international research experience ▪ Students in peer support programs ▪ Curriculum experience ▪ Language studied as part of a change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The kind of measures that the indicators in this section point to assume that international student enrolments at high levels are an institutional target which is problematic as a benchmark</i> ▪ <i>Some universities may not want or may not be focused on having high levels of international student enrolment</i> ▪ <i>Percentage of students who have had an international experience upon graduation in their program should be considered here</i> ▪ <i>These indicators need to define 'scholarships' better, they should take into account whether the student is full time, HDR, on a bursary (partial not included)</i> ▪ <i>Support of international student exchange needs better definition, it should take into account, for example the different types of scholarships</i> ▪ <i>A useful addition would be a question or questions about curriculum related experiences because in country studies and language programs in degrees are very different to exchange (Funds per student to support exchange- needs more thought)</i> ▪ <i>A useful addition would be an indicator to identify and measure programs which have International content- e.g.: Islamic Banking Major</i> ▪ <i>Need to take into account dual and joint degrees (UA Measures this already biannually)</i>

<p>Building connections between students from diverse backgrounds, beyond the classroom</p> <p><i>These indicators need to be further clarified and worked through except for indicator dot point eight, 'Rates of Participation...', which is useful</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of orientation programs offered with an international focus ▪ Does the university provide joint international and domestic orientation programs? If so, what is the percentage of students who attend such programs? ▪ Proportion of clubs and associations offering the opportunity for local and international students to mix ▪ Proportion of decision making bodies with international student representatives ▪ Proportion of international student leaders in mainstream student bodies and associations ▪ Number of faculty events jointly organised by international and domestic students ▪ Number of peer support programs which encourage the mixing of local and international students, at (1) new arrival stage, (2) later stages ▪ Rates of participation of local and international students in peer support programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>This section seems to be predicated on an old model of international students and what/ who they are which needs to be reconsidered as this is always changing and each student's situation is different</i> ▪ <i>Percentage of orientation programs offered shows very little, it would be more useful to ask simple yes/ no questions</i> <i>For example, 'Is the orientation online?', 'Does the individual faculty offering orientation?', 'Is the program aimed at different groups of students with different backgrounds and pathways to university'? These questions and the resulting criteria assumed that all students are on campus students where as they may be off shore or off campus students</i> ▪ <i>Taking measure of the offered institution wide international and intercultural events is possibly useful but what it will not measure the quality of these events and if they work to promote internationalisation in any useful way</i> ▪ <i>A useful addition would be a measure of social media operated by universities to encourage interaction (as opposed to student run sights)</i> ▪ <i>'Do you do student satisfaction surveys which measure the events and activities which are effective' would be a useful question to ask here</i> ▪ <i>'Do you offer service and learning/ work preparation programs which integrate students into work experience needs and integrate international students into the community' would also be a useful measure to be taken in this section</i>
--	---	---

* - The conception of a typical 'international student' is predicated on an old model of what this may mean - i.e. An international student may have undertaken secondary school in Australia - they may not be on campus students etc and this needs to be taken into account.

- Student experience surveys could be an indicator for this section - findings for international student satisfaction for example, would be useful.

Table 4. Support Services for Students

Criteria	Indicators	Suggestions
<p>Support services that recognise and serve international students needs, while fostering intercultural mixing</p> <p><i>Think about adding (...while promoting intercultural understanding) to this criteria</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New arrival (<i>and ongoing students</i>) services and programs that highlight and facilitate intercultural mixing (<i>offered via diverse modes, across the entire student body</i>) - consider additions to further clarify ▪ Dedicated professional service (<i>this could be further explained with specifics such as mental health, financial advice communication skills staff</i>) capacity in areas of need specific to international students (e.g. housing, English language proficiency, employment advice) capable of servicing the full international student population ▪ Training and on-going professional development programs in service areas specific to international students (e.g. housing, English language proficiency, employment advice) ▪ Integrated student services where such services can foster intercultural relations while (<i>recognising and</i>) meeting all students' specific needs ▪ Proportion of international students living in cross-cultural housing provided by or subsidised by the institution ▪ Assistance with interpreter and translator needs as appropriate ▪ Regular monitoring of each individual international student, in relation to (1) social integration and support, (2) intercultural mixing ▪ Institution-wide and individual precinct policy, planning and provision of safe environment on and near campuses (and safety awareness education) ▪ Availability of adequate and well-advertised counseling services in relation to (1) difficulties of intercultural mixing, (2) instances of discrimination or abuse ▪ Relation to Australian laws and values 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Take into consideration the facilitation of work experience/ job readiness in the relevant discipline</i> ▪ <i>Institutional commitment to demonstrate to employers and professional associations the benefit of employing an international student</i> ▪ <i>How would indicator dot point four be usefully measured?</i> ▪ <i>Mainly international student issues – important but not for internationalising the student experience</i> ▪ <i>Remove housing as there are more useful measures</i> ▪ <i>Critical incident plan that responds to onshore-offshore events and disasters that impact on international student well being should be included here</i> ▪ <i>Consider the addition of an indicator which measures the provision and facilitation of facilities that deal with the needs of individuals with diverse faiths and cultural values?</i>