



Internationalising learning outcomes

at The Hague University of Applied Sciences

JOS BEELEN

Abstract

This study aims to identify factors that impact on the internationalisation of learning outcomes of programmes at The Hague University of Applied Sciences (THUAS). The process of the articulation of learning outcomes has been studied at institutional, faculty and programme levels. Both document analysis and action research with trainers, managers and lecturers provided data for this study.

The study describes the broader issue and the layers of contexts in which THUAS operates: the global, European, national, local and institutional. Within the latter two, several strategies are distinguished, i.e. research on employability skills of students and THUAS' *Educational vision*. The strategies for internationalisation of learning outcomes at THUAS are then placed in an international perspective.

The next section zooms in on current practice on the basis of self-assessment and management reports of THUAS faculties. The analysis of these reports is followed by more detailed observations from individual programmes.

Analysis and observations are then connected to professional development for internationalisation of teaching and learning. Three elements of THUAS' extensive programme for professional development are discussed in more detail. The study ends with the identification of priorities to internationalise learning outcomes across THUAS.

Methodology

The data collection methods for this study consisted of document analysis, interviews with stakeholders in the internationalisation process and participatory action research with facilitators of professional development for internationalisation, managers and lecturers.

Since several of the interventions and processes researched in this study took place simultaneously and are currently continuing, in interaction with the adoption of various documents,

their time frame can be considered relevant. Therefore, information on when interventions took place and when documents were adopted has been included in this study.

This research builds on participatory action research in disciplinary spaces, that developed in parallel in Australia and in The Netherlands (see Leask, 2012, 2015; Green & Whitsed, 2013, 2015; De Wit & Beelen, 2012). Rather than only collecting data from action research with lecturers, data have been collected from other stakeholders, such as trainers, managers and international officers. Researching all relevant stakeholders follows the systemic approach advocated by Mestenhauser (2006), which stresses that internationalisation is not an isolated phenomenon in a university, but needs to be integrated into the key systems. Including more stakeholders than just lecturers builds on my study into business programmes at the Amsterdam University of Applied Science and HAN University of Applied Sciences (Beelen, 2017).

The broader issue

Since shortly before 2000, the realisation has been developing that traditional international student mobility had a limited impact and reached only a small minority of students. This contributed towards the emergence of the concept of internationalisation at home, which aims to reach all students. Internationalisation at home brought the home curriculum into the picture as the main vehicle for internationalisation for all students, without abandoning mobility as an extra opportunity for a minority of students.

As a consequence of this shift from mobility to curriculum, the key stakeholders in the internationalisation process also changed. In addition to the international offices, that continued to arrange mobility, academics came into the picture as the main 'owners' of teaching and learning.

This, in turn, led to the realisation that universities may have changed, but that academics have largely been forgotten in the process (Sanderson, 2008). Their skills for internationalisation were not developed, which, together with a lack of involvement, constitutes key obstacles to internationalisation world-wide, as the Global Surveys of the International Association of Universities (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010, 2014) demonstrated.

A new phase in the shift from mobility to curriculum started around 2012, when learning outcomes for internationalisation entered the discourse. The 4th *Global Survey* (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014) considered the internationalisation of learning outcomes 'booming'. Internationalisation of intended learning outcomes is considered a characteristic of quality of internationalisation, as is witnessed by the introduction of the Certificate for Quality in internationalisation (Aerden, 2015).

Another relevant component of the discourse on internationalisation, particularly for universities of applied sciences, is the development of employability or transversal skills by students. The *Erasmus Impact Study* (European Union, 2014) confirmed that students acquire

these skills, much valued by employers, by mobility. However, this raises the question how the non-mobile majority of students can develop these skills ‘at home’. This is also one of the main questions that faces the internationalisation of THUAS at present.

Contexts that impact on the internationalisation of learning outcomes at THUAS

THUAS operates in range of contexts, which all have an impact on the institution, its staff departments and the programmes of study that it delivers. These contexts conform to those distinguished by Leask in her *Framework for internationalisation of the curriculum* (2012, 2015).

Global context

In the global context, a number of trends can be observed that have an impact on regions, countries and, ultimately, on universities. Since circa 2010, a discussion has taken place around the world in which the values of internationalisation have been re-examined. Some perceived that internationalisation had lost its moral ground and had become too much focused on revenue generation, engaging itself more with means and tools than with aims (Brandenburg & De Wit, 2010). This caused the International Association of Universities (2012) to issue a statement affirming values in internationalisation. Nussbaum (2010, p. 26) advocated ‘transnational deliberation’ to overcome the global issues that all universities face.

Under the influence of these reminders of the values of international higher education, the common declaration that was issued after the Global Dialogue in Port Elizabeth, in January 2014, focused on three integrated areas of development. One of these was “increasing the focus on the internationalisation of the curriculum and of related learning outcomes” (De Wit & Jooste, 2014).

The global discussion on values in internationalisation is relevant to THUAS since it embraces global citizenship as a key policy focus and therefore aims to equip all its students with global citizenship skills (see Belt, Ham, Kaulingfreks, Prins, & Walenkamp, 2015, pp. 9-10). Van der Wende (2017, 11) notes that universities should have “broadened their mission for internationalisation” which would mean enhancing local access and “embrace diversity as the key to success in a global knowledge society; and to become truly international and intercultural learning communities where young people can effectively develop into global citizens.” THUAS as an accessible university in a diverse city seems to have the potential to be just such a learning community.

The European context of THUAS

The *European Parliament Study* (De Wit et al., 2015, p. 27) identified internationalisation of the curriculum as an emerging focus in Europe and the rest of the world and recommended paying more attention to internationalisation at home’s significance for all students (p. 30). It called for the integration of international and intercultural learning outcomes into the

curriculum. The *European Parliament Study* also introduced a new definition of internationalisation, stressing its intentional character, the relevance of reaching all students and its societal impact.

The European Union commissioned studies into the employability of graduates (Humburg, Van der Velden, & Verhagen, 2013), stressing the importance of students acquiring transversal skills. The *Erasmus Impact Study* (European Union, 2014) confirmed that students acquire these skills through international mobility, but also led to the question how the non-mobile majority of students acquires these skills.

In acknowledgement of this non-mobile majority of students, the European Commission developed educational policies to bring internationalisation to all students, also through its communication *European Higher Education in the World* (European Commission, 2013). European educational policies are directly relevant in the internationalisation process because lecturers were found to consider them an enabler, even when they were not familiar with their content (Beelen, 2017, p. 204). The focus on internationalisation at home was confirmed by the European Commission (2017) in its agenda on higher education. This agenda further includes the accessibility of higher education, which, again, is relevant for THUAS as a university of applied sciences in the highly diverse setting of The Hague. Many of its students represent the first generation to enter higher education in their families.

The Dutch national context

Policies by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (MINOCW) now include policies for internationalisation at home, which consider participation in international classroom 'at home' an alternative to traditional mobility. The Ministry's vision is largely based on an approach to internationalisation at home that was developed by Vereniging Hogescholen and Vereniging van Samenwerkende Nederlandse Universiteiten (2014).

At national level, studies at employability of graduates have been conducted for a range of disciplines in the economic domain (see Vereniging Hogescholen, 2014).

The Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (MINOCW) commissioned several studies into institutional policies and practices for internationalisation at home. The first of these was conducted by Nuffic (Van Gaalen et al., 2014) and is relevant to THUAS since it deals with institutional policies. The Nuffic researchers found that 76 percent of universities in the Netherlands include internationalisation of the home curriculum in their policies. However, they also found that activities lag behind institutional ambitions (p. 7), while at the same time, activities are taking place that are not connected to institutional policies.

In a later article, Van Gaalen and Gielesen (2016, p. 154) therefore conclude that Dutch institutions pay attention to internationalisation at home in their policies but do not generally have established implementation strategies. Nor do they use monitoring tools to determine the extent to which policies are being implemented.

THUAS seems to stand out in this respect in The Netherlands, because of its ambitious policies for internationalisation but also because it strives to follow this up with strategies, particularly for professional development of its lecturers.

The local context

THUAS is situated in city that is home to many organisations and companies that operate across Europe or the globe. In addition, THUAS has a highly diverse student population. The importance of diversity for THUAS is reflected among other in the research group Citizenship and Diversity.

That this local diversity is not without its issues was demonstrated in a study by Kleijwegt (2016), which included several cases from THUAS. The study identified issues around polarisation in diverse classrooms but also revealed that many lecturers and teachers were unprepared for dealing with these issues.

Van der Wende (2017, 11) stresses the local function that universities have and which she considers to be threatened by the global role that many universities give priority to. THUAS however, has developed a wide range of strategies for engagement with the city and considers this one of its core tasks. THUAS is therefore well aware of its local role and seems to act upon it.

THUAS' institutional context

THUAS has stated its ambition to be the most international university of applied sciences by 2020, but has only recently begun to define what the indicators for this ambition could be. The institution has operationalised its policies in three *compasses*: Wereldburgerschap [global citizenship], Internationalisation, and Networking. Together, these constitute the so called 'WIN-themes'.

The *THUAS Compass: Critical elements of Internationalisation* (January 2015) contains ten elements. Element 3. 'Internationalisation of the formal curriculum for all students' explicitly mentions internationalised curricula and learning outcomes. Element 7. refers to staff development and mentions wide ranging staff development to support internationalisation, explicitly mentioning [foreign] language and intercultural competence development.

THUAS already has a range of international programmes. Among these, European Studies achieved the Distinguished Quality Feature for Internationalisation of the Accreditation Organisation of The Netherlands and Flanders in 2016. On the basis of this, it was awarded the Certificate of Quality in Internationalisation in 2017. The Academy for Public Management, Safety & Law has had a UNESCO profile since 2009, which is relevant for THUAS' ambition to achieve UNESCO status for the entire institution.

Research on employability

The Research Group International Cooperation at THUAS contributes to the institutional development of internationalisation. It has generated a considerable body of literature on international competencies and employability, both through study or internship abroad (see

Van den Hoven & Walenkamp, 2015; Walenkamp, Funk & Den Heijer, 2015); Funk, 2015; Wieman, 2015) and on curriculum development (Funk, Den Heijer, Schuurmans-Brouwer, & Walenkamp, 2014). Alumni of IBMS at THUAS participated, together with alumni of five other IBMS programmes, in a survey on employability of graduates (Kostelijk, Coelen, & De Wit, 2015).

The Research Group International Cooperation is not the only entity within THUAS to focus on the development of employability skills of students. A working group of managers, lecturers and researchers produced a guide on the relevance of 21st century skills for the graduate profiles of police officers, accountants, nurses, financial advisors and airline pilots (Biemans et al., 2017).

Educational vision

THUAS' *Educational vision* can be considered a key institutional driver for its internationalisation. The revised *Educational vision* (Haagse Hogeschool, 2017) was finalised in March 2017, after a series of 'pressure cooker' sessions in which THUAS staff provided input. Some of the sessions were labelled 'internationalisation' while in other sessions, internationalisation was one of the components. This enabled specialists and practitioners of internationalisation to give their views while those less focused on internationalisation would still address the topic in the more general sessions.

196

The *Educational vision* contains explicit mention to the internationalisation of learning outcomes within individual programmes. Its section on global citizenship education includes the definition of that concept by UNESCO, which is connected to the ambition of achieving a UNESCO profile for the entire institution (p. 9).



THUAS institutional strategies in perspective

Few universities have developed explicit strategies to internationalise learning outcomes across the institution. Leeds Beckett University took the initiative to introduce graduate attributes in all formal curricula of its programmes. One of these attributes was a “global outlook”. In their 2013 publication, Jones and Killick cited Barrie (Jones & Killick, 2013, 170), who worked in Australian context and suggested that graduate attributes could be embedded in student learning through the formal curriculum (“engagement model”) or through the informal curriculum (“participatory model”). Jones and Killick chose the formal curriculum.

Leeds Beckett University’s approach consisted of a cross-faculty working group comprised of “those with a particular interest in internationalisation. It was felt that their experience would contribute to deliberations [...]”. The focus was on creating a guidance document and resources for course teams (171). The expectation was that the suggested reformulation of learning outcomes would cause academics to adapt their pedagogy and assessments so that students could demonstrate achievement of those outcomes. Jones and Killick (2013, 172) stated that, “support and development of staff will be crucial in achieving effective IOC [internationalisation of the curriculum].” Jones and Killick selected a cross-faculty working group made up of subject specialists interested in internationalisation, which led to some “highly productive professional conversations in the working group” (174).

Leeds Beckett University had already undertaken initiatives to stimulate academics to adopt learning outcomes. For instance, it had published a guide to writing learning outcomes (not specifically aimed at internationalisation). In that guide, Baume (2009, p. 35) pointed to the fact that some academics “hated” learning outcomes. In some cases, academics perceived learning outcomes as forms of control or surveillance, or as means of restricting learning and discovery. This aversion may also be related to the use of learning outcomes as an auditing or accreditation tool (Hussey & Smith, 2008).

VUB Brussels also implemented an institution wide approach to internationalising learning outcomes across the institution. To achieve this, the international office selected a number of pilot programmes and collaborated with Internationalisation coordinators within departments and programmes. They also involved educational developers from the university’s teaching and learning centre, who previously did not have expertise in the internationalisation of teaching and learning.

THUAS stands out in the Dutch context in the sense that it actively develops strategies for the internationalisation of learning outcomes as a follow up to institutional policies. On the other hand, the case of THUAS conforms to that of other Dutch HEIs in that the teaching and learning centre does not have an active role in the internationalisation of curricula. This corresponds to the situation at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences and HAN University of Applied Sciences (see Beelen, 2017).

This situation differs from that at many universities in English speaking countries. There, teaching and learning centres have a more central role in the internationalisation of education. An explanation for this is that HEIs in the United Kingdom, Australia and the United

States considered it necessary to adapt their teaching and learning to the needs of the international students that they recruited. With the growing numbers of international students in The Netherlands, this may become an important motivation for Dutch HEIs as well.

However, even with an active teaching and learning centre in place, successful implementation is not assured. When writing about the Faculty of Business at Leeds Beckett University, Blackburn and Finnigan (2015) mentioned that interactions with the university's teaching and learning unit were sometimes frustrating. This was especially the case when it came to translating institution-wide graduate attributes into learning outcomes and assessments at module level. This finding is in alignment with an obstacle identified by Carroll (2015, p. 103): the lack of support for curriculum design at the module level. However, in the case of Leeds Beckett, such support was available, and the teaching and learning unit provided feedback, but the academics still struggled to contextualise and describe learning outcomes for their modules.

Some of the insights on intercultural competence development of students and staff at European HEIs apply to THUAS. Gregersen-Hermans (2014) identified constraints in organisational capability as a decisive factor at three levels: the institutional, the disciplinary (i.e. the faculty) and the level of the individual lecturer. At THUAS, the strategies for professional development, such as currently under development, may hit such constraints if lecturers will participate in them on a large scale. However, this would depend on faculties and programmes facilitating lecturers to participate in professional development. Relevant to THUAS is also Gregersen-Herman's observation that rationales such as "internationalization is also about relating to diversity of cultures" or "celebrating cultural difference" [...] "offer little clarity on how higher education institutions who aspire to enhance intercultural learning and competence development have progressed in this regard" (p. 9). THUAS indeed displays a wide range of understandings of intercultural awareness or competences but does not pursue the purposeful development of intercultural skills in all its staff.

Policies and practices at faculty level: self-assessment and management reports

The seven faculties of THUAS and the Academy of Masters & Professional Courses wrote their self-assessment reports ('Midterm reviews') and management reports ('MARAPs') in March and April 2017. At that time, the final text of the *Framework*, including the explicit statement on the internationalisation of learning outcomes, was not yet available. Yet the *THUAS Compass: Critical elements of Internationalisation* already included the internationalisation of learning outcomes explicitly in 2015. The analysis of faculty reports that follows here sheds light on how internationalisation of learning outcomes is understood beyond policies and which activities faculties and programmes really undertake to generate internationalised learning outcomes.

Analysis of self-assessment and management reports

The explicit institutional focus on internationalising learning outcomes in the *THUAS Compass: Critical elements of Internationalisation* (2015) and in the *Educational Framework*, is less apparent in the self-assessment and management reports of the faculties. However, there is enough evidence to suggest that development of internationalised curricula is on the agendas of the faculties, but this is mainly mentioned in general terms. Several faculties show awareness that the internationalisation of learning outcomes needs to be addressed or should already have been addressed. Yet, the reports contain few concrete strategies to achieve this. Remarkable is that the role of curriculum committees in the development of internationalised curricula is hardly mentioned.

Few differences on the basis of discipline (see Leask, 2015, p. 108) could be observed in the ways faculties reported on the internationalisation of learning outcomes. The Faculty of Social Work and Education shows awareness that internationalisation of its competences is relevant and even mentions that this should already have been completed by 2015, but also concludes that it is a future priority.

The terminology used to describe learning outcomes is not uniform and several terms, such as competences, learning goals and learning aims are used simultaneously, denoting a lack of shared terminology, or possibly shared understanding. Mostly, the term ‘international’ is used in relation to learning outcomes, rather than ‘internationalised’, which may indicate a lack of awareness that internationalisation should be embedded within existing learning outcomes, although there is general awareness that internationalisation should be included in the curriculum. It may be concluded that the *THUAS Compass: Critical elements of Internationalisation* (2015) did not provide a strong enough driver for faculties to develop an explicit strategy for internationalising learning outcomes.

The faculty reports show few references to professional development of lecturers in relation to internationalisation. One faculty mentions the importance of professional development, but only names English language proficiency training as a concrete example.

Collaborative On Line International Learning (COIL) is not included in the reports as a tool for internationalisation of teaching and learning, although THUAS has considerable experience in this field and hosted the first European COIL conference on 1-2 December 2016.

The lack of support by educational specialists in curriculum development is mentioned by two faculties. The Faculty of Business, Finance and Management explicitly considers it an obstacle to achieving additional accreditation for one of its international programmes as well as for contextualising its new national profile (Sijben et al., 2017). In this respect, limited capacity is also mentioned. This corresponds with observations by other staff members at THUAS on the large distance between educational specialists and individual programmes as well as the lack of involvement of educational specialists in curriculum committees. At the same time, there is no evidence that these educational specialists have been involved in internationalisation or that they have specific expertise in that field.

A final consideration is the question how appropriate current THUAS monitoring tools for internationalisation of learning outcomes are, considering the wide divergence in internationalisation practices between programmes within the same faculty.

The reports of the faculties show that global citizenship and internationalisation are widely considered overlapping concepts and this view is also found with practitioners of internationalisation, policy advisors and researchers on internationalisation. Some stress that internationalisation is a tool to achieve global citizenship. Many staff members at THUAS therefore experience a separate operationalisation of the two concepts (e.g. through two separate compasses) as artificial. Lecturers are less explicit about this issue, but generally have a more developed understanding of internationalisation than of global citizenship. One faculty report attributes this to the lack of a definition in the original policy document for global citizenship.



Internationalising learning outcomes of individual programmes

Key observations on the internationalisation of learning outcomes of individual programmes add insights to the faculty reports. These observations from individual programmes are listed below. They have been collected through the action research with lecturers in training sessions, in focus group sessions with lecturers of Marketing and Commerce (CE) and through consultations with managers and trainers.

- Internationalisation at home, including its instruments, such as Collaboratibe On LIne International Learning (COIL) are frequently considered an aspect for (elective) minors rather than an aspect of the (compulsory) major.
- Lecturers report that students in domestic programmes have difficulties with English medium literature
- High student numbers form an obstacle to developing and executing internationalisation activities for all students, e.g. through COIL.
- Lecturers in domestic programmes observe that students lack interest in broader issues, such as sustainability, but also raise the question if this would be a reason to omit these issues from the curriculum.
- Lecturers experience a lack of institutional support for internationalisation within their programme while at the same time they feel top down pressure for internationalisation
- Knowledge or methods from another country (e.g. Harvard cases) are frequently considered equal to internationalisation and not explicitly discussed in comparison to the Dutch or local contexts.
- The majority of staff members are familiar with THUAS' ambition to be the most international university of applied sciences.
- Among the three 'WIN-themes', internationalisation is considered the most concrete, although lecturers do not find it easy to contextualise internationalisation to their programme.
- Some lecturers in domestic programmes do not consider it relevant for their students to compare their own (future) professional practice of with that of fellow practitioners in other countries. They expect that practice will be identical with only some legal aspects being different.
- Research on markets or practices abroad often consists of desk research and does not involve contacts with students abroad (e.g. through COIL) or external specialists such as local or international guest lecturers.
- Internationalisation is perceived mainly as student activities and not as an area that lecturers should actively engage in
- The majority of lecturers are not familiar with the discourse on employability skills or transversal skills although they are aware of terms such as 'soft skills' or '21st century skills'. They tend to associate these skills mainly with intercultural communication skills.
- In many cases, programme learning outcomes or competence descriptions at graduation levels do not include international and intercultural dimensions. In a number of cases, this can be attributed to the fact these competence descriptions have been generated by the national platforms of programmes and that internationalisation was not included in them.

- Learning outcomes at module level equally lack reference to international and intercultural dimensions, which implies that these dimensions are not explicitly taught, learned or assessed.
- Learning outcomes at module level are often broad and similar to programme learning outcomes. This makes it difficult to assess the level at which a programme learning outcome is achieved within modules. However, in nearly all cases, the level at which a competence should be mastered has been indicated.
- Learning outcomes do not explicitly refer to transversal skills that are considered important by employers
- Lecturers have not always been involved in the articulation of learning outcomes of the modules that they teach. They also find it difficult to identify who is involved in formulating learning outcomes.
- Lecturers struggle with the formulation of learning outcomes and indicate that they have little expertise in this, although some are familiar with standard educational approaches, such as Bloom's taxonomy.
- There is little evidence of direct involvement of teaching and learning specialists in the formulation of learning outcomes.
- There is no indication that programmes benchmark learning outcomes with their international partners.
- Lecturers report that they are confused with regard to terminology and the meaning of terms, particularly around the similarities and differences between 'competences', 'learning outcomes' and 'learning goals'. There is no institutional framework for these terms and their meanings.
- Lecturers observed that a discussion on employability skills helped them to clarify the international and intercultural dimensions of learning outcomes both at the level of learning outcomes at programme level (PLOs) and learning outcomes at module level (MLOs)..
- Lecturers commented that they found it meaningful to use the Program Logic Model to formulate learning outcomes and align these with lecturer input, student activities and assessment.

Professional development for internationalisation

Parallel to the development of the *Educational vision*, the Unit External and International Affairs engaged two THUAS managers/lecturers to make an inventory of existing professional development options in the fields of internationalisation and of global citizenship, to identify gaps and to develop new options. These are to be offered through the existing infrastructure and channels of The Hague Center for Teaching and Learning (HCTL). This unit was established in 2014 to structure professional development. One of its main tasks is the development and delivery of the Basic Teaching Qualification Programme.

The overview of existing and new professional development options was finished in April 2017 and contained 35 items, mostly aimed at lecturers. The professional development options for other staff, such as internship coordinators and international coordinators, were mostly mobility related. This was also true for the only professional development option for programme managers, which focused on maximising the benefits of staff mobility. To address this, a new option for managers consists of the development of a programme's vision on internationalisation.

An external researcher developed a survey to determine the attitudes of leaders, managers and lecturers towards implementing global citizenship education. Sending this survey to all staff, although approved by the leadership, ultimately did not take place since the implementation models suggested were not considered compatible with THUAS' institutional leadership and management practices.

Among the existing professional development options were several that address aspects of teaching international classrooms such as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), see elsewhere in this volume. Three options address global citizenship education, diversity and intercultural dimensions of curricula.

The action research took place during the making of the inventory of existing options and the outcomes of the action research formed the basis for the development of new options. One of these options resulted in a pilot, *Training for International Learning and Teaching (TILT)*, in which again action research took place, with both the facilitator and the participants. Below, three key elements of the professional development offer at THUAS are discussed.

Internationalisation of the Basic Teaching Qualification Programme

The Basic Teaching Qualification Programme constitutes the only compulsory professional development for lecturers. It was found not to contain explicit attention for international or intercultural dimensions of teaching and learning.

It therefore does not address specific skills that enable lecturers to deal with the international dimension of education or with specific issues in diverse or multicultural classrooms. This is at odds with THUAS' focus on diversity as well as with the strongly diverse composition of its student body.

The lack of internationalisation and intercultural education in the Basic Teaching Qualification Programme of THUAS is not an isolated phenomenon. It was also found at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences and at HAN University of Applied Sciences (Beelen, 2017). Nuffic noted it across Dutch HEIs and recommended the internationalisation of the Basic Teaching Qualification Programme (Van Gaalen et al., 2014).

I worked on the internationalisation of the Basic Teaching Qualification Programme with a THUAS trainer and with staff at Hanze University of Applied Sciences. The latter institution has relevant knowledge on the topic through the development of a professional development track for internationalisation, the Senior Qualification for Internationalisation. This Qualification is based a matrix for skills for internationalisation by Van der Werf (2012) and on research by Troia (2013). However, the Senior Qualification mainly addresses the needs of lecturers that also have coordination tasks for internationalisation and who teach in international classrooms. Participation in this track is optional, which sets it apart from the Basic Teaching Qualification Programme proper. Like THUAS, Hanze University of Applied Sciences is exploring the internationalisation of its Basic Teaching Qualification Programme. The intercultural dimension is an explicit area of attention at Hanze UAS, since some of the developers of the Basic Teaching Qualification Programme are researchers involved in a learning lab for intercultural communication. Experiences with the delivery of the Basic Teaching Qualification Programme at Rijksuniversiteit Groningen are also included in the redevelopment of the Programme at THUAS.

The action research resulted in the development of five topics that can be considered basic knowledge in internationalisation and which are aimed to be integrated in the existing Basic Teaching Qualification Programme. An obstacle here is that the facilitators of the Basic Teaching Qualification Programme are not engaged in the internationalisation discourse seem to have little working knowledge of internationalisation. To overcome this, a training for these facilitators was developed. An alternative mode of delivery, which would not require the facilitators to develop their knowledge on internationalisation, is to deliver the internationalisation component of the Basic Teaching Qualification Programme as on line modules.

The case of the Basic Teaching Qualification Programme illustrates that, until now, training for internationalisation, global citizenship education and the intercultural dimension on the one hand, have been disconnected from training for teaching and learning on the other.

Training for International Learning and Teaching (TILT)

The action research revealed a lack of structured training for teaching in the international classroom. THUAS considers the didactic skills of lecturers in international classrooms a key element. The importance of this was confirmed by a foresight study on the use of Dutch and English in Dutch higher education (Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2017, summary, p. 11).

The focus on didactic skills led to the development of a professional development track with the title 'Training for International Learning and Teaching (TILT)' The first pilot was offered

early in 2017 to both lecturers who were already teaching in international classrooms, those who were preparing to do so and lecturers interested in teaching in English, in some cases mostly, or exclusively, to Dutch students. Participation in the training was optional. The training involved educational design and the internationalisation of learning outcomes and a publication by Carroll (2015) was used as a basis.

The pilot attempted to reach a middle ground between taking the situation of the lecturers as a starting point and an input based approach. It was experienced differently by those already teaching in English or preparing to do so on the one hand and those that were interested in the topic on the other. Therefore, it was decided to separate these categories in a next delivery of the training.

The participating lecturers could for the most part not indicate where the existing learning outcomes of the modules that they taught, originated or who had been involved in their development, and did not know to what extent educational developers had been involved in the process. They had not previously thought about specific transversal skills as components of the graduate profile. Lecturers responded positively to the use of the Program Logic Model (see Deardorff, 2015, p. 121) as a way to align learning outcomes with teaching, learning, and assessment and commented that the Program Logic Model led them to rethink the rationale and purposefulness of their plans but also to reflect on the impact on students.



The internationalisation pop up clinic

The action research has further led to the development of the pop up clinic for internationalisation and global citizenship. In this approach, specialists from the Unit External and International Affairs and others will analyse the situation of individual programmes in relation to the *Educational Framework*. They will do so through document analysis and semi structured interviews with the programme manager, internationalisation coordinator, the members of the curriculum committee and the educational specialist supporting curriculum development. The Clinic will lead to recommendations to the programme manager, which include suggestions for professional development for lecturers and other staff. The pop up clinic will also serve to stress the importance of developing a vision on internationalisation for individual programmes, since programme have been observed to struggle with this aspect.

The Executive Board of THUAS adopted the proposal for the pop up clinic but indicated that they would like the Networked curriculum to be included in the Clinic, so that this would address all three 'WIN-themes'.

Conclusions on professional development

The action research has contributed to identification of gaps in the existing offer of professional development and to the development of new options. The existing professional development for Internationalisation was mostly related to mobility and was not explicitly connected to teaching and learning, except in the global citizenship education training, which includes didactic techniques.

Professional development facilitators observe that lecturers are convinced of the value of employability skills but are not consistently thinking of these in relation to the graduate profile. Lecturers do not have a clear picture of what employers, alumni, students on placement and others find important. The graduate profile has not yet been sufficiently 'unpacked' to start the discussion on specific employability skills and how to translate these into learning outcomes.

Priorities

The action research resulted in the identification of the following priorities for the internationalisation of learning outcomes across THUAS.

1. Training of the facilitators of the Basic Teaching Qualification Programme in internationalisation and assisting them to internationalise the five components of that Programme.
2. Making methodologies for teaching diverse groups of students an explicit element of the Basic Teaching Qualification Programme.
3. Training educational specialists in internationalisation of learning outcomes, using employability skills as the starting point for clarification of the international and intercultural dimensions of the graduate profile, and the Program Logic Model as a tool.
4. Stimulating the view that internationalisation can serve as a tool for the development of global citizenship.
5. Including both educational specialists and internationalisation coordinators as members of curriculum committees.
6. Delivering professional development for internationalisation to teams of lecturers within individual programmes rather than at central level for lecturers from a range of different programmes.
7. Assisting programmes in benchmarking learning outcomes with their international partners.
8. Developing a glossary for terminology related to learning outcomes in order to facilitate a common understanding of these terms across THUAS.
9. Reporting on the development of internationalisation at the level of individual programmes rather than at faculty level.

REFERENCES

- Aerden, A., (2015). *An introduction to international and intercultural learning outcomes*. Brussels: European Consortium for Accreditation in Higher Education. Retrieved from ecahe.eu
- Baume, D. (2009). *Writing and using good learning outcomes*. Leeds: Leeds Beckett University.
- Beelen, J. (2017). *Obstacles and enablers to internationalising learning outcomes in Dutch universities of applied sciences* (Doctoral dissertation Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan, Italy).
- Belt, J., Ham, A., Kaulingfreks, F., Prins, B., & Walenkamp, J. H. C. (2015). *World citizenship, Developing intercultural competence in international and multicultural Dutch classrooms; the effectivity of the PREFLEX@Home Programme: A pilot study at the Hague University of Applied Sciences*. The Hague: The Hague University of Applied Sciences.
- Biemans, P., Sjoer, E., Brouwer, R., & Potting, K. (2017). *Werk verandert; 21st century skills in de praktijk* [Employment is changing; 21st century skills in practice]. The Hague: Inholland University of Applied Sciences and The Hague University of Applied Sciences.
- Blackburn, M., & Finnigan, V. (2015). All systems go to a global outlook. In W. Green & C. Whitsed (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on internationalising the curriculum in disciplines; Reflective narrative accounts from business, education and health* (pp. 59-72). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2010, winter edition). The end of internationalization. *Boston College Newsletter*, 62, 15-17.
- Carroll, J. (2015). *Tools for teaching in an educationally mobile world*. London: Routledge.
- Deardorff, D. (2015). *Demystifying outcomes assessment for international educators; A practical approach*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- 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* (pp. 156-167). London: Routledge.
- De Wit, H., & Jooste, N. (2014, February 21). Can international education be truly equal and global? *University World News*, issue 308. Retrieved from www.universityworldnews.com

- De Wit, H., Gacel Avila, J., Jones, E., & Jooste, N. (2017). *The globalization of internationalization; Emerging voices and perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Egron-Polak, E., & Hudson, R. (2010). *Internationalization of higher education: Global trends, regional perspectives*. IAU 3rd Global Survey Report. Paris: IAU.
- Egron-Polak, E., & Hudson, R. (2014). *Internationalization of higher education: Growing expectations, essential values*. IAU 4th Global Survey Report. Paris: IAU.
- European Commission (2013, 11 July). *European higher education in the world*. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Brussels: Author.
- European Commission (2017, 30 May). *On a renewed EU agenda for higher education*. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social committee and the Committee of the Regions. Brussels: Author.
- European Union (2014). *The Erasmus Impact Study. Effects of mobility on the skills and employability of students and the internationalisation of higher education institutions*. Brussels: Author.
- Funk, A. (2015). Internationalisation, international competencies and employability: Lessons from the HBO Monitor. In J. H. C. Walenkamp (Ed.), *The world's mine oyster* (pp. 147-167). Delft/The Hague: Eburon/The Hague University of Applied Sciences.
- Funk, A., Den Heijer, J., Schuurmans-Brouwer, A., & Walenkamp, J. H. C. (2014). *Internationalizing curricula; Needs and wishes of employers with regard to international competences*. The Hague: The Hague University of Applied Sciences.
- Green, W., & Whitsed, C. (2013). Reflections on an alternative approach to continuing professional learning for internationalisation of the curriculum across disciplines. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(2), 148-164.
- Green, W., & Whitsed, C. (Eds.) (2015). *Critical perspectives on internationalising the curriculum in disciplines; Reflective narrative accounts from business, education and health*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Gregersen-Hermans, J. (2014). The missing link in intercultural competence development: The university's organizational capability to deliver. *International Higher Education*, 78, 8-10.

Haagse Hogeschool (2017, 22 maart). *Onderwijsvisie & -kader voor ons voltijd bacheloronderwijs* [Educational vision and framework for our full-time bachelor programmes]. The Hague: Author.

Humburg, M., Van der Velden, R., & Verhagen, A. (2013). *The employability of higher education graduates: The employers' perspective*. Brussels: European Union.

International Association of Universities (2012). *Affirming academic values in internationalization of higher education: A call for action*. Paris: Author.

Hussey, T., & Smith, P. (2008). Learning outcomes: a conceptual analysis. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 13(1). doi: 10.1080/13562510701794159

Jones, E., & Killick, D. (2013). Graduate attributes and internationalized curriculum: Embedding a global outlook in disciplinary learning outcomes. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17 (2), 165-182. doi: 10.1177/1028315312473655

Kleijwegt, A. (2016). *2 Werelden 2 werkelijkheden; Hoe ga je daar als docent mee om?* [Two worlds, two realities; How do teachers deal with that?]. The Hague: Ministry of Education, Culture and Science.

Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen (2017). *Nederlands en/of Engels? Taalkeuze met beleid in het Nederlands hoger onderwijs* [Dutch and/or English? Choice of language based on policies]. Amsterdam: Author.

Kostelijk, E., Coelen, R., & De Wit, H. (Eds.) (2015). *The development of international competences by IBMS alumni; An examination of the match between education and professional needs*. Amsterdam: Centre for Applied Research on Economics and Management.

Leask, B. (2012). *Internationalisation of the curriculum in action; A guide*. Adelaide: University of South Australia.

Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the curriculum*. London: Routledge.

Mestenhauser, J. (2006). Internationalization at home; Systems challenge to a fragmented field. In H. Teekens (Ed.), *Internationalization at home: A global perspective* (pp. 61-77). The Hague: Nuffic.

Sijben, G., Stoelinga, B., Molenaar, A., Ubachs, M., Bulthuis, P., & Van Gulik, P. (2017, 18 March). *Framework International Business. Profile, programme learning outcomes and process background of the Bachelor of Business Administration programme International Business* (draft version).

- Troia, M. (2013). *On enhancing professional development in an internationalisation context* (Doctoral dissertation, Groningen, University of Groningen).
- Van der Wende, M. (2017). Reframing global engagement. *Boston College Newsletter*, 90, 12-14.
- Van der Werf, E. (2012). Internationalisation strategies and the development of competent teaching staff. In J. Beelen & H. De Wit (Eds.), *Internationalisation revisited; New dimensions in the internationalisation of higher education* (pp. 97-103). Amsterdam: Centre for Applied Research on Economics and Management.
- Van Gaalen, A., & Gielesen, R. (2016). Internationalisation at home: Dutch higher education policies. In E. Jones, R. Coelen, J. Beelen & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Global and local internationalization* (pp. 149-154). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Van Gaalen, A., Hobbes, H. J., Roodenburg, S., & Gielesen, R. (2014). *Studenten internationaliseren in eigen land; Nederlands instellingsbeleid* [Students internationalise in their own country; Policies of Dutch universities]. The Hague: Nuffic.
- Van Hoven, R., & Walenkamp, J. H. C. (2015). *Study or internship abroad and the acquisition of international competencies*. The Hague: The Hague University of Applied Sciences.
- Vereniging Hogescholen (2014). *Wendbaar in een duurzame economie; Een externe analyse van het economisch domein ten behoeve van de verkenning hoger economisch onderwijs* [Flexible in a sustainable economy; An external analysis of the economic domain for the 'verkenning hoger economisch onderwijs']. The Hague: Author.
- Vereniging Hogescholen & Vereniging van Samenwerkende Nederlandse Universiteiten (2014). *Gezamenlijke visie internationaal* [Joint vision international]. The Hague: Authors.
- Walenkamp, J. H. C., Funk, A., & Den Heijer, J. (2015). Internationalizing curricula. Needs and wishes of alumni and employers with regard to international competencies. *Internationalisation of Higher Education. An EAIE Handbook*, 2015(1), 84-103. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Wieman, A. (2015). Needs and wishes of alumni and employers. Research into the requirements of the labour market for international competencies in the Bachelor programme HBO ICT of The Hague University of Applied Sciences. In J. H. C. Walenkamp (Ed.), *The world's mine oyster* (pp. 107-145). Delft/The Hague: Eburon/ The Hague University of Applied Sciences.

We know what we are, but know not what we may be.
(Shakespeare: *Hamlet*)