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Starting point of IM(P)I

- The German partners felt a need to internationalise the project
- NUFFIC and SIU were also active in the field and joint in the very beginning
- In discussions with various European HEIs the need for a European approach was becoming obvious
How to select partners?

- All partners should be known as strongly engaged in the issue
- Regional coverage of Europe
- Collaborative partners of the first initiators
- Different types of partners (national agencies, transnational agencies, consultancy, HEIs, network organisation)
- (private-public, small-large, technical-full university, university of applied sciences, individual-network)
To provide a toolbox for medium and large group internal comparisons or check of internationalisation

To provide ideas for a structured strategy approach (objectives, activities, indicators)

To develop three examples of application and test the practicability and robustness of the chosen indicators:

- Individual institutional
- Small benchmarking group (3-5)
- Large benchmarking group (>10)

Find examples of good practice for processes

Define ways to choose activities, services, QA measures
Timeline:

June 2009  
Application approved by the EU in June 2009 (one of ten approved projects in this programme line)

10/09-4/10  
Research on indicator sets and development of the IMPI set of indicators

5/10-2/11  
Development of benchmarking groups with associate partners and test of the indicator set

3/11-5/11  
Exploitation of benchmarking exercise, preparation of results and documentation

6/11-3/12  
Development of external benchmarking group and data analysis: THIS IS WHERE YOU CAN JOIN IN!

4/12-6/12  
Transformation of results
What will be in there for you?

Website: • all results as soon as agreed upon by partners will be provided online

Benchmarking: • in the second benchmarking round, some individual HEIs and some networks will be able to participate actively (small fee)
  • analysis of their data
  • Chance to co-design the indicators

Dissemination: • A symposium will provide information
  • On each NAFSA and EAIE we will try to get a time slot for interim information
Thank you!

uwe.brandenburg@che-consult.de

This project has been funded with support from European Commission. This web content reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.
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Situation in many EU countries until 21st century

- IOs with traditional tasks (mobility, int. Student enrolment, counselling)
- International recruiting and marketing not an issue
- No tuition fees
- EU programmes small and inefficient (80s and early 90s)
Situation today

- Internationalisation hype
- International student mobility (degree studies) on the rise
- Global demand for university placements will nearly triple
The situation today

- **Market pressure:**
  - More exchange mobility
  - International experience (study or internship) gained importance in career planning (from a nice add-on in the 80s and 90s to a must-have)
  - Market growth produces pressure on HEIs to move into international recruitment and marketing and to enhance support services (notably in IOs)

- **Reputation / public accountability:**
  - Shanghai and THES ranking produce
  - National rankings

- **accountability:**
  - Governments and board of trustees look for return on investment
  - Target agreements are developed, increasingly including aspects of internationalisation
  - IOs ill prepared for such a step (small budgets, few staff, low-profile, no int. strategies, no accountability)

- **BUT: no coherent set of indicators for internal and external use!**
**Definitions**

- **Internationality** describes either an institution’s current status or the status discernible at the date of data acquisition with respect to international activities.

- **Internationalisation** describes a process in which an institution moves, in a more or less steered process, from an actual status of internationality at time X towards a modified actual status of extended internationality at time X+N. In this instance, in the event of proper planning, the actual status is set against an expected target status. The result is then the difference between the actual situation after expiration of the period n and the desired situation after expiration of the period n.
If you look for indicators…

- Availability is no reason to choose an indicator!
- Availability is not a given fact but a result of priority-setting
- The strategic outlook of an HEI has to overrule short- or medium-term improvement of indicators
- Indicator and Key figure: the difference

Focus:

- input and output indicators
- Outcomes are yet rather difficult or impossible to measure; however they should be in the focus on a later stage

Three possible levels:
- Research
- Teaching and Studies
- Overall Aspects
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Indicators are a very last step in the process

A useful approach:

1. definition of internationalisation targets
2. development of a coherent internationalisation strategy
3. short-, medium- and long-term measures ensuring the implementation and realisation of the internationalisation strategy
4. development of a quality management system that:
   - accompanying implementation of measures and their adjustment where applicable
   - documenting and analysing its influence on strategy targets

Focus on internal processes
Results from a German indicator project

- Overall 186 key figures and indicators
- 170 eligible for time series
- 162 in input and process
- 24 output indicators
- 69 for „overall aspects“, 45 for „research“ and 72 for „teaching and studies“
- Main effort for user: select the relevant indicators for the individual situation
Only for internal use or also system-wide?

**Internal use**
- **Issues:**
  - has to consider cultural differences between departments
  - Some departments are more international than others
- **Facilitators:**
  - Framework conditions in the institution are comparable
  - Institution-wide strategy dominates departmental strategy

**External, system-wide use:**
- **Issues:**
  - Diversity between institutions (size, conditions, types, strategies)
  - No common understanding of internationalisation
- **Facilitators:**
  - Public pressure
  - Common national framework conditions (in Germany only partly)
General Use: Overall and Teaching/Study

Teaching:
- Percentage of international students with non-German education
- Percentage of incoming / outgoing international exchange students
- Percentage of lecture stays abroad undertaken by lecturers (TS mobilities) in relation to the total number of lecturers
- Percentage of graduates with joint or double/multiple degree

Research:
- Percentage of professors appointed from abroad
- Percentage of third-party funding for international projects with international cooperation partners

Service:
- Number of posts (full time equivalent=FTE) in the international core business in relation to the total number of administrative posts
- Number of posts (full time equivalent=FTE) in the international areas of counselling and tutoring of students and admission in relation to the total number of students
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However…

- The responsibility for selecting the right indicators lies with the user
- Different needs and interests to be considered (newspapers, ministries, companies, university leadership, academics, students)
- There is no one set of ultimately valid indicators!

Stipulations:

- Even a toolbox cannot be applied without the necessary institutional framework
- IOs act in an institutional setting with individual players and their (known or unknown) set of preferences (rational choice)
Pressure of Internationalisation

- Board Of Trustees
- Government Ministry
- Academics
- Administration

External visibility (world-class university)
Internationally Employable graduates
Opportunities

Accountability
Comparability

Results
Arguments
Data
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The day-to-day dilemma…

Counter-productive: Internationalisation as lip service
- Every university is a world-class university
- Being international and recruiting the best
- …

ad-hoc internationalisation:
- Monday morning indicators
- The fast and furious…
- Administration: Give to the Emperor what the Emperor demands

Why is „more“ equivalent to „better“?
- High international student numbers
- Many outgoings
- Many…
What is needed...

- Internationalisation Strategy based on a holistic approach
- Strategy-based confident decisions: what to do and what NOT to do.
- Profile building on own interests and perceptions
- Be realistic:
  - What is necessary, what a nice-to-have?
  - Where are we? What are we?
  - Priorities…
Not everything that can be counted, counts.
Not everything that counts can be counted.

*Albert Einstein*

Not everything is measurable and needs measuring:

- The famous „world-class university“:
  - reputation can NOT be measured but felt
  - Nobody is excellent in everything
  - Indirect means: in which networks do you act, which university approaches you, where do the students come from and why…

But most achievements are measurable:

- E.g.: Goal „increase internationalisation at home“ – Possible measurements „international faculty / international students time series-based“
What is quality in internationalisation?

Question of perspective…

In general:

The level of quality in internationalisation is equivalent to the congruence between stated goals, created expectations, experienced conditions and remaining outcomes as perceived by the providers (leadership, academics, administration) and the recipients (students, academics, ministries, etc.).
The volcano of relative and absolute quality

relative quality: Perceived „gap of quality“

absolute quality:
threshold of minimum quality

stated goals
created expectations
experienced conditions
remaining outcomes
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CHE in cooperation with CHEPS; OST Paris and CWTS
Leiden has been selected by the EU Commission to develop
a third generation world ranking of universities.

This will follow the multidimensional, non-league table
approach of the CHE ranking ([www.university-ranking.de](http://www.university-ranking.de) and
[www.excellenceranking.eu](http://www.excellenceranking.eu))

and will also build on the classification project
([http://www.utwente.nl/cheps/research/projects/ceihe](http://www.utwente.nl/cheps/research/projects/ceihe)).
Thank you!

uwe.brandenburg@che-consult.de