

Intercultural competence, as a transferable skill, will be perceived as less relevant to effectively function within the context of an academic discipline. When students “join” the academic discipline, they are socialized toward how things are done within the discipline, both through formal and informal learning. Consequently, the impetus to develop advanced-level of competences to handle complex and controversial intercultural situations is lacking.

THE LEVEL OF THE INDIVIDUAL ACADEMIC

An individual academic is caught between the demands of the discipline and the institutional aspiration to educate graduates for a globalized labor market. Integrating intercultural competence as a learning outcome in education is perceived to take valuable time away from a focus on the academic discipline.

The past decades have seen a transformation from teacher-centered academic education to more student-centered approaches. For many academics, the role change from a teacher to facilitator is still an uncomfortable one. Adding the ability to understand cultural differences among students and within oneself, to recognize intercultural incidents, and to create an intercultural learning experience out of these, demands high levels of intercultural competence of an academic. Yet, traditionally these skills are not part of a university’s definition of the academic profile. This work demands specific pedagogic and didactical skills about which an academic may rightfully feel uncertain.

In their aspiration to develop interculturally competent graduates, university leaders need to focus not only on outputs or outcomes. Institutional work needs to be done on the missing link: the university’s organizational capability to deliver the desired results. To enhance intercultural competence development in its graduates, universities should focus on developing and implementing generic and discipline-specific learning outcomes. They should support the professional development of academic staff and enhance their ability to facilitate multicultural classrooms and intercultural competence development in students. They should also include intercultural competence as a basic requirement in all job specifications and human resource frameworks. To achieve such an ambition, a university-wide, adequately resourced change program—with a specific focus on intercultural competence development and in which a university engages actively with its stakeholders—seems to be needed. Focusing on the organizational capability to deliver is about transforming the dotted line between outputs and outcomes into a solid one. ■

Internationalizing Students in the Home Country—Dutch Policies

ADINDA VAN GAALEN AND RENATE GIELESEN

Adinda van Gaalen is senior policy officer /researcher at Nuffic, Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education. E-mail: avangaalen@nuffic.nl. Renate Gielesen is senior project manager at the same organization. E-mail: rgielesen@nuffic.nl.

The internationalization of higher education is a key priority for the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. Its aim is that all students in the Netherlands have obtained international and intercultural competencies upon graduation. No less than 91 percent of Dutch institutions participating in the study have an internationalization policy at the central level. Some institutions include the policy in their institutional plan, but close to 76 percent of all Dutch higher education institutions have a specific internationalization plan or are currently working to develop one. This is comparable to the global average of 75 percent in the International Association of Universities (IAU) 4th Global Survey 2014.

International and/or intercultural competencies of students are mentioned in many of the institutional strategy documents as the main goal of internationalization. Institutions tend to describe these competencies in general terms, specifying that further elaboration is to take place at the program level. Most institutions opt for a program-specific approach to international and intercultural competencies and are cautious when it comes to the implementation of a centralized institutional policy. Several policy plans explicitly mention that the context of a study program is essential in determining the relevant international and intercultural competencies. Institutions which do formulate competencies do not often distinguish between international and intercultural competencies. Examples of such competencies include (1) an attentive and inquisitive attitude; (2) intercultural effectiveness and communication; (3) knowledge of foreign languages; (4) flexibility and the ability to apply knowledge; and (5) ability to innovate according to international standards. This serves to demonstrate that—in addition to international and intercultural outcomes—internationalization can yield general learning outcomes, such as professional knowledge or personal skills.

INTERNATIONALIZATION AT HOME

These competencies cannot be achieved by all students through mobility alone. Between 2003 and 2011 a stable average of 22 percent of Dutch graduates has been inter-

nationally mobile within their study program, as opposed to 78 percent who stayed at home. Internationalization at home can potentially reach all students when structurally implemented in the curriculum:

The IAU 4th Global Survey 2014 shows that, globally, 14 percent of the participating institutions consider internationalization of the curriculum as the single most important internationalization activity. One of the main reasons for this could be that the focus on the curriculum brings internationalization to the core of education.

In the Netherlands, institutional policy plans mention many types of internationalization at home, such as inviting foreign lecturers, participating in international projects, offering intercultural skills modules and tailoring components of the study program to include different intercultural perspectives on a specific topic. In general, Dutch institutions do not regard internationalization at home as a literal alternative to mobility, but are inclined to view these approaches as complementary.

Yet, this relationship between the two sides of the internationalization coin is not reflected in policy documents. In fact, few institutions formulate a coherent and detailed internationalization at home strategy or develop monitoring tools. In addition, a lack of time or financial resources is an obstacle for implementation in many institutions. However, these are by no means the only reasons for the modest level of internationalization at home in some Dutch higher education institutions.

TEACHING STAFF

Preparation of teaching staff seems to be key in the success of internationalization strategies as teachers are essential for developing and carrying out curriculum changes. However, one of the most eye-catching results of the analysis of policy documents of all 54 publicly financed higher education institutions in the Netherlands is that teachers receive little training on internationalization of education. There is a lack of focus on the development of employee competencies required for successful implementation of internationalization at home activities. Some teachers, for instance, have difficulties integrating the various cultural backgrounds in an international classroom.

International Institutional policies devote little attention to the development of competencies of their lecturers and staff to prepare them for the implementation of the various forms of internationalization at home.

Incorporating internationalization at home as a standard component of lecturer professionalization programs such as the Basic Teaching Qualification (BKO) in the Netherlands can open teachers' minds to the possibilities internationalization offers them. Some institutions have already developed this idea a little further and developed a voluntary

extra module in the BKO framework. Such a module can offer teachers concrete tools to make internationalization support their specific teaching methods and objectives. It will help teaching staff gain insight into the potential learning experiences offered by internationalization.

GREAT POTENTIAL

In general, it seems that the concept of the international classroom in Dutch higher education institutions is aimed mainly at talented students from abroad. In some instances, it is almost seen as a side effect that Dutch students could increase their international and intercultural competencies in an international classroom.

Most institutions opt for a program-specific approach for international and intercultural competencies and are cautious when it comes to the implementation of a centralized institutional policy.

Higher levels of internationally and intercultural competent graduates can therefore be achieved if institutions consciously create controlled situations that lead to intercultural collaboration and the utilization of students' specific international knowledge. Such measures will help the institutions to make optimal use of the international classroom's added value.

Other activities that seem to offer great potential to develop international and intercultural competencies in students, and yet are mentioned only rarely in policy documents, are virtual mobility and development cooperation projects. Virtual mobility projects have been developed in many institutions over the past 5 to 10 years. Yet this is not reflected in the attention this activity is given in institutional plans. Those who are active in this area are modest in referring to them in terms of sources for building competencies of Dutch students.

A FRAMEWORK OF POLICIES

Most Dutch higher education institutions specifically mention the importance of international and intercultural competencies for their students in their institutional strategies. In addition, internationalization at home receives a fair amount of attention in these documents. However, the concept will benefit from greater clarity and possibly an institutional framework. Institutional policies could for instance include a provision specifying that all study programs must

incorporate relevant international and intercultural competencies. The appropriate method of testing these competencies should then also be specified in institutional policies. In addition, policies can be further elaborated by a clear definition of terms such as *curricular internationalization*, *internationally oriented curricula* and *international classroom*.

The Dutch government is interested in increasing the number and impact of internationalization at home activities in higher education. However, while any national framework for internationalization at home might include direction, means, and methods, but more important is that this should go hand in hand with sufficient freedom. This allows study programs to experiment and discover which forms of internationalization (at home) suit their specific program profile.

Institutional policies could include a provision specifying that all study programs must incorporate relevant international and intercultural competencies.

The focus on students' international and intercultural competencies can be intensified by the Dutch government by encouraging study programs and institutions to apply for a distinctive (quality) feature for internationalization from the Dutch-Flemish Accreditation Organisation. The core of the evaluation framework for the certificate are the international and intercultural learning outcomes as defined by the program itself. The advantage of this model is that it supports and even stimulates program-specific internationalization. This allows for an optimal degree of "value added" internationalization, relevant to the unique features of a program, while still using a framework which can be applied to all programs.

In a society where higher education institutions have a high level of autonomy, as is the case in the Netherlands, national internationalization policies need not only reflect national economic objectives, but foremost the core tasks of higher education institutions, in order to be effective. ■

Ideological Shift in Indian Higher Education Internationalization

MONA KHARE

Mona Khare is professor at the Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education: Department of Educational Planning, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi. E-mail: monakhare@nuepa.org.

India's booming economy in recent years has been supported by a fast growing service sector, increasing share in global markets, a rapidly growing middle class and an exploding youth population. With the college-age cohort in India projected to reach 400 million by 2030, the international community is viewing India as an important partner in education development. The global sentiment is supported by the focus of the ongoing Twelfth Five Year Plan, in making India a regional educational hub by fostering greater international collaborations. This is the obvious outcome of increasing globalization and internationalization of education worldwide, as well as India's desire to emerge as a regional education hub, as part of its strategy to strengthen its regional presence both economically and politically.

INCREASING EXCHANGE AND COLLABORATIONS—SHIFTING IDEOLOGY

The opening up of the economy under financial constraints in the 1990s was a landmark shift in India's ideology from "protectionism" to "liberalism" and is reflected in its approach to educational development planning. Although educational services are still not freely tradable under the General Agreement on Trade in Services framework, various forms of connecting with the international academic community have emerged rapidly during the last decade or so. While there is no explicit strategic plan to act as a guiding force in this regard, a shift in internationalization practices is becoming evident. India no longer wants to be identified as a "recipient nation," but rather to emerge as an equal partner. India's movement from a North-South recipient nation to a partner in South-South, North-South, and triangular cooperation is seen as a major indicator of this ideological shift. This movement can be understood by way of several key changes in recent years.

CO-CREATORS

The newer modes of international education cooperation consist of co-innovation and co-creation in both South-South and North-South directions, and well defined long-term as well as thematic partnerships. Philanthropy in