



**Linguistic policy framework document
for the internationalisation of the
Spanish university
system**

Language Policy Sub-working Group

CRUE-IC

Coordinators:

Plácido Bazo Martínez & Dolores González Álvarez

Members:

Aurora Centellas Rodrigo

Emma Dafouz Milne Alberto

Fernández Costales Víctor

Pavón Vázquez

October 2016

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Challenges of the implementation of linguistic internationalisation in Spanish Higher Education	3
3. Certification	7
3.1 Certification of students	8
3.2 Certification of teaching staff	10
3.3 Certification of administrative and service staff (ASS)	11
4. Training for language development	12
4.1. Training for internationalisation	12
4.2. Training actions for students	14
4.3. Training actions for teaching staff	15
4.3.1. Definition of the training framework	15
4.3.2. Training structure	16
4.3.3. Courses suggestions	16
4.4. Training activities for administrative and service staff (ASS)	17
5. Incentive programme	17
5.1 Incentives for students	18
5.2 Incentives for teaching staff	19
5.3 Incentives for administrative and service staff (ASS)	20
5.4 Supplementary actions	20
6. Conclusions	21
Authors	23
Acknowledgement	23
References	24

1. Introduction

For over a decade, higher education – both at European and Spanish level – has promoted the learning and increased widespread use of the English language and other foreign languages on university campuses. The extension of university access policies, the creation of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), the globalisation of the world economy or migration movements can be cited as key reasons justifying the need to examine the role that foreign languages – and especially English as a lingua franca of communication – play at 21st century international universities (Smit and Dafouz, 2012).

Along these lines, the document drafted by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport entitled *Strategy for the internationalisation of Spanish Universities 2015-2020 (Estrategia para la Internacionalización de las Universidades Españolas 2015--2020)* published in 2014 recommends as measures to increase the international appeal of our universities "to increase the number of Bilingual Degrees and master's programmes, taught in Spanish and English or other foreign languages¹" and "to promote the learning of an acceptable level of English by the ASS and TRS and other academic positions"²

We shall not forget that in 2008 the European Commission set the objective for all EU citizens to master two languages together with their native language (2 + 1). (European Commission, 2008). In this new context in which multilingualism presents itself as a strategic axis in the universities' internationalisation process, it is necessary to establish a set of homogeneous and common criteria, objectives and procedures between the different Spanish universities that guarantee teaching and learning quality.

Thus, the main objective of this document is to offer specific guidelines and recommendations on three basic lines of action - accreditation, training and incentives - on which to design a quality language policy in a changing and increasingly international context. This is intended to streamline the decision-making process by educational authorities and higher education institutions in Spain and the effective implementation of specific measures to promote the internationalisation through the use of languages,³ while being aware of the wide variety of internationalisation strategies of our universities, as well as the great asset

¹ Operational Objective 2.4 (p. 23) of the aforementioned document.

² Action 2.4. (p. 23) of the aforementioned document.

³ Authors such as Fernández-Costales and González-Riaño (2015) have pointed out the paucity of empirical studies that help make linguistic, academic and political decisions in the Higher Education field.

the Spanish language it represents for them, we shall focus only on those aspects related to foreign languages.

This document, commissioned by the Organisation of Internationalisation and Cooperation of the Conference of Spanish Universities Vice-Chancellors (CRUE - IC), is the result of the work carried out by the Language Policy Sub-working Group of this organisation since November 2015 and has been agreed upon, reviewed and endorsed by representatives⁴ from 22 Spanish universities at the meeting held on 3 March 2016 at the University of La Laguna. Some of the proposals presented here are based on the work that the Linguistic Policy Sub-working Group has been carrying out in the field of foreign language teaching and linguistic accreditation in recent years, particularly at CICUE Seminars on Language Policy held in 2011 and 2014 at the UNED headquarters in Madrid⁵.

2. Linguistic challenges of Higher Education internationalisation in Spain

Spanish universities are currently living a situation where the development of the international profile and, alongside it, the desire to provide students with specific skills to work in a globalised world, are promoting initiatives aimed at improving multilingual and inter-cultural communicative competence of graduates (Lorenzo, Trujillo and Vez, 2011). In some cases, such initiatives have been firmly supported by regional educational authorities. Thus, according to Halbach, Lázaro and Pérez (2013: 111), the Canary Islands government has established that at least 12 credits of the new degrees (5%) shall be taught in an EU language, preferably English. In 2008, the Generalitat de Catalunya, introduced a set of measures aimed at improving the level of English for university students and, more recently, the Parla 3 programme, with the aim that in four years time new graduates should have a B2 level in a third language.

Within these initiatives, along with different actions aimed at promoting mobility, designing double degrees, etc., there are those that, in a generic manner, could be called "bilingual (or multilingual) programmes".⁶ These seek to develop competence in a foreign language through the increase in credits

⁴ The list of representatives and their respective universities is located at the end of this paper.

⁵ I CICUE Seminar on Language Policy (Madrid, UNED 2011) and II Seminar on Language Policy: Teaching in other Languages and Linguistic Certification (Madrid, UNED 2014).

⁶ Aware of the linguistic diversity within the Spanish State, this document shall use the 'bilingual' label to refer to those programmes taught in an official language of an autonomous community and a foreign language (i.e. Spanish-English, Catalan-English) and the 'multilingual' label to refer to programmes that include teaching in two of the official languages of the university and one or more foreign languages (i.e. Galician-Spanish-English/French).

taught in that language, through the implementation of bilingual/multilingual degrees or the design of degrees taught entirely in a foreign language (Dafouz, Núñez, Sancho and Foran, 2007, Dafouz and Núñez, 2009, Pavón and Gaustad, 2013 and Ramos, 2013), particularly in English because it is a language that has acquired the *lingua franca* status in the scientific-technical and economics and business fields (Coleman 2006). Therefore, in all European countries and in many others around the world, universities offer instruction programmes through the *English - Medium Instruction* (EMI) or content and language integration programmes in higher education such as *Language Integrated Learning in Higher Education*, (ICLHE) (Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra, 2013; Fortanet, 2013; Hellekjaer and Wilkinson, 2009; Smit and Dafouz, 2012; Wilkinson, 2004; Wilkinson and Walsh, 2015; Wilkinson and Zegers, 2008), with the aim to provide students with the necessary linguistic tools to adapt to these global needs.

In the study by Wächter and Maiworm (2008) on the increase of English-taught degrees we can find an initial record which indicates that in 2007 more than 400 European universities offered programmes in English, representing a 340% growth in relation to the 700 undergraduate and master's courses analysed in 2002. A number that has continued to increase according to the data offered by the update of the study performed by these same authors: "The numbers of identified English-taught programmes went up from 725 programmes in 2001, to 2,389 in 2007 and to 8,089 in the present study" (Wächter y Maiworm, 2014: 16).

We can identify a large number of aspects that related to the implementation of a bilingual/multilingual educational model and that, indeed, influence in a decisive way on whether the objectives can be effectively achieved, such as the need to carefully define the objectives of the programme, the existence of a clear language policy in which the use of the different languages in the institution is explicitly established, or the benefits of selecting the appropriate initiatives and strategies so that the bilingual programme result in real gains (Marsh, Pavón and Frigols, 2013, Smit and Dafouz, 2012). Although among them all there is one that profoundly determines the quality of this type of programmes; the one that concerns the profile and the role of the participating teachers (Escobar, 2013). The changes required by the implementation of bilingual/multilingual programmes in higher education make the development of the linguistic and pedagogical skills of teachers one of the highest priorities and, thus, one of the aspects which requires more attention.

One of the starting points that should be raised by all the stakeholders involved, from the authorities at national or autonomous level responsible for the design of educational policies, the governing bodies of university and, finally, the teaching staff which shall be actively involved in these programmes, is the reason for these initiatives. In many cases, it is often argued that the internationalisation process of universities, or rather, the search to improve their international profile, makes it necessary to offer bilingual/multilingual degrees or to increase the number of credits taught in English with the aim of attracting international students. However, those who support this reason as one of the most important ones, if not the most important, do not usually notice that the international profile of a university is not only quantitatively measured in terms of incoming and outgoing mobility (Mellion, 2008). This type of internationalisation is described as "obvious", while there is another type of internationalisation, the so-called "invisible", in which the quality of the publications contributes as an enriching element, while, on the other hand, we find "necessary" internationalisation, based on the creation of collaborative networks of a professional and research nature. Hence, the introduction of bilingual/multilingual plans provides a summative element to the international profile of universities, although it is not in itself the indispensable, or even the most important, requirement for this profile to increase.

There is yet another type of added motivation that may make us consider that bilingual/multilingual degrees help improve the overall profile of universities, such as the improvement of the linguistic ability of students in a foreign language, understood as an additional element to enrich their professional profile; the existence of an awareness of the benefits in terms of academic performance and competencies derived from the transmission and work with highly complex material and through the verbalisation and comprehension processes in a language other than the native language; or also the contribution to the professional development of the participating teaching staff. Beyond this reasoning and motivations, it seems again necessary that an analysis be made of the contribution of future university graduates to the professional market and, in general, to society itself. Employability is a factor that must be taken into account prior to the decision on what type of studies are to be offered in a bilingual/multilingual modality.

At this point, we must pause at a critical aspect, the decision on which model of multilingual training is intended to be offered. At European level and also in Spain, many understand that the logical option is basically the use of English instruction, more specifically referred to as *English-medium Instruction* (EMI). For others, however, it is more effective to implement a language and content integration programme with a special focus on higher education *Integration of Content and Language in Higher Education* or ICLHE. The second case is a commitment to transfer the benefits of this type of approach, thoroughly described in primary and secondary education, to university education. While EMI is often the preferred choice in those contexts in which the development of foreign language competence is not a primary objective or even an objective to be considered, ICLHE turns out to be a more frequent choice when there is a more or less explicit intention in promoting the improvement in the use of the foreign language by the students.

Finally, we must refer to some of the challenges faced by the implementation of bilingual/multilingual programmes, many of which are of general nature, but which may have a great influence on higher education in particular. One of them, although not in order of importance, is the one related to the problem in the use of the foreign language. The teaching of academic content through a foreign language in higher education resides on three pillars: mastery of the language of instruction, an effective teaching methodology and personal attitude (Aguilar and Muñoz, 2014). In addition, it implies an increase in the workload of both students and teachers, with a possible inadequate mastery of the language of instruction by the latter – whose language is less expressive, less redundant and less clear in that language, with less linguistic variety, less emphasis on the necessary reiteration and repetition of ideas and concepts, and the limited use of metadiscursive resources and key term glossaries (Dafouz and Núñez, 2010). Likewise, students seem to have greater comprehension problems (caused by inadequate pronunciation and a vocabulary with which they are unfamiliar), and seem to understand the content superficially (Martyniuk, 2008). It is important to emphasise that the lack of academic skills in their own native language is reflected in the lack of academic skills in the ICLHE language (Aguilar and Muñoz, 2014). However, when compared to pre-university levels, little is known about the effects of ICLHE in terms of general competence of university students.

On the other hand, this particular challenge is related to the linguistic qualification of teachers (Pérez-Cañado, 2014). It is agreed that, as it is reflected in scientific literature, the minimum required level is C1 level (Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010: 288), in accordance with the criteria established by the Common European Framework of reference - CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001). While it is true that a C1 level, in many cases, only ensures that training has been obtained to pass a specific language test and that there is in fact a methodological training that is not visible through this linguistic accreditation which becomes more decisive for the effectiveness of teaching (Airey, 2004), the identification of a minimum linguistic level for teachers who wish to teach in a foreign language seems to be a basic measure to underpin the quality of teaching. Another of the challenges is the linguistic competence of the students. As with teachers, it is appropriate to require students to have a minimum level of knowledge and use of the language of instruction, which is usually established in a starting B2 level, that is, which can be certified at the time enrolling in these bilingual studies. Finally, it is worth highlighting as one of the most important challenges, at least in regard to the implementation of bilingual programmes in the Spanish state, the need to officially verify this type of degree. Be it a new degree taught in a foreign language or a revision of the existing degree certificate, usually by way of a mention in the European supplement to the degree, the verification is one of the most necessary measures when offering bilingual/multilingual degrees in any of their modalities. Without this type, let us refer to it as 'official accreditation of teaching offered', the validation of the studies taken is at the mercy of the personal decisions of individuals or institutions that have the power to take them in private terms, but are not publicly recognised outside the universities themselves.

3. Certification

Within the framework of the international university of the 21st century, it is necessary to agree on the required levels of English language proficiency (and other foreign languages) in order to avoid the enormous heterogeneity that affects both accreditation levels and the mechanisms employed to this end (see González-Álvarez, 2015; Halbach, Lázaro and Pérez-Guerra, 2013).

In the specific case of Spain, in 2011 CRUE supported the creation of five Language Tables (for German, English, French, Spanish as a second language and Portuguese) in close cooperation with ACLES⁷ with the mission of "unifying criteria when it comes to certify levels of knowledge of different foreign languages while facilitating mobility between Spanish universities and their internationalisation" (ACLES, 2014: 9). The ultimate objective was to coordinate the criteria used in the various universities and to draft recommendations on examinations and level certificates and the implementation of agreements in relation to accreditation of language levels. In this context, accreditation refers to the passing of a skill test (linguistic), excluding other procedures such as courses, language stays, taking subjects in other languages, etc.

3.1 Certification of students

In the case of student accreditation, and in spite of a growing consensus related to the work of the aforementioned Language Tables, there is still an important diversity in relation to, for example, the level of English language proficiency demanded by universities from their graduates⁸, this being even greater in the access to the postgraduate programmes (Halbach and Lázaro, 2015).

In addition, the mechanisms used to certify different levels fluctuate enormously, ranging from internal tests (designed by the university itself), to stays abroad (Erasmus programmes or others), to the attainment of a number of credits in English or the completion of international exams (Cambridge, TOEFL, etc.) or CertAcles tests⁹.

In the specific case of degrees offered in English (and other foreign languages), an increasing number of universities is starting to require an entrance or threshold level to satisfactorily be able to take subjects in a foreign language (Gómez-López, Solaz Portolés, and

⁷ ACLES (the Association of Higher Education Language Centres) has developed a model of language proficiency exam, endorsed by CRUE and CERCLES, which requires successfully passing the four skills to obtain the corresponding level of the CEFR.

⁸ There are universities which lack any language requirement. In other cases, such as Andalusia, where a B1 in all the universities is required (Circular DGU - Regional Government of Andalusia 2010), or Catalonia, which has established a B2 requirement for obtaining the BA degree certificate (DOGC 6551 of 30 January 2014), these issues have been regulated by Regional regulations.

⁹ Some autonomous communities, such as the Valencian Community (DOCV 20 May 2013), Aragón (BOA of 3 December 2014) and Catalonia (DOGC of 2 June 2015) have regulated the verification of the linguistic requirement. It should also be noted that Catalan and Andalusian universities, through commissions created for this purpose and with the support of their respective autonomous governments, are already working together to certify proficiency levels of foreign languages.

Sanjosé López, 2014). For master's degrees, for example, the level of demand varies between B1 and C1, although decisions on levels depend largely on the different educational centres or degrees, the law of supply and demand, and the type of master's in question.

As for the requirements to participate in mobility programmes, once again there is great disparity. While some universities demand a language requirement only if established by the destination university, others do apply it to all mobility students. In other cases, language accreditation is regarded as a merit, without being a requirement. Let us not forget that the B1 level accreditation of the language of instruction is a recommendation of the Erasmus+ programme.

For overseas students studying in Spain, there is also a lack of consensus as according to data from the SFL Language Table (ELE) (September 2014), only 53% of universities demanded a Spanish language requirement and 95% stated that they did not verify it or restrict access depending on it. Finally, in regard to international mobility, universities that either recommend a certain level of entry or value those students with accreditation are the norm.

In view of this situation and in order to unify criteria it would be advisable to implement the following measures:

- 1) To recommend that B1 is the minimum level required in a foreign language to obtain the degree certificate in the different skills, notwithstanding the fact that universities may demand a higher level in the degrees that may require so.
- 2) To establish in bilingual/multilingual degrees¹⁰ a linguistic path defined with differentiated access profiles and a language proficiency level above B1.
- 3) To ensure the rigour of the accreditation and verification processes, in consultation with the commissions with which Spanish universities have been provided for this purpose, the CRUE and ACLES Language Tables, and respecting the decisions of these committees.¹¹
- 4) To facilitate the recognition among universities of accreditation mechanisms for access to degrees, mobility programmes and obtaining degree certificates.

¹⁰ Aware of the linguistic diversity within the Spanish State, this document shall use the 'bilingual' label to refer to those programmes taught in an official language of an autonomous community and a foreign language (i.e. Spanish-English, Catalan-English) and the 'multilingual' label to refer to programmes that include teaching in two of the official languages of the university and one or more foreign languages (i.e. Galician-Spanish-English/French).

¹¹ The agreement on accreditation of foreign languages signed by Andalusian universities in 2011 (and recently updated) includes languages such as Finnish, Hebrew, Japanese, Dutch or Polish, for which there are no Language Tables or recognition agreements in ACLES.

- 5) To include in the SET the duly certified exit level of the graduates and, in the case of bilingual/multilingual degrees, explicitly state the participation of students in such itineraries, in order to provide visibility to the added value of foreign languages knowledge.

3.2 Certification of teaching staff

Various studies coincide in pointing out the importance of the linguistic and methodological competence of the teaching staff in guaranteeing the quality and the adequate implementation of the international programmes, as well as in the academic results of the students (Coleman, 2006: 6-7; Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra, 2011; Kling and Hjulmand, 2008: 192--193; Marsh and Laitinen 2004: 2; Smith 2004; Shaw *et al.*, 2008: 269--70). In addition, recent reports from various European bodies stress the need to verify these competences (Baumann *et al.*, 2006: 3; Lauridsen, 2013: 8).

However, as evidenced by González-Álvarez (2015), O'Dowd (2015) and González-Álvarez, O'Dowd and Valcke (2015), there are huge discrepancies between universities both in terms of the requirements or lack thereof in regard to the language level of the teaching staff as in terms of the level required should that requirement exist (B1 to C1) and in the way of verifying it (linguistic test, classroom observation, self-report, attendance to training course, etc.). In this case, unlike what happens with the students, there are no guidelines or recommendations by the Autonomous Communities or from the Ministry itself.

On the other hand, experience in both university and non-university education has shown that having an advanced level in a foreign language is not enough to provide instruction in that language in an efficient manner, as it is critical to adapt the methodology and linguistic resources to the needs of students taking courses in a foreign language. In addition, not all skills, registers or speeches (oral and written) have the same presence and importance in the university lecture hall.

The tests available on the market to assess foreign language proficiency (including all proposals by the Language Tables of CRUE for accreditation purposes) focus mainly on general and not specific language competences in university teaching (Klaassen and Räsänen , 2006: 237; Kling and Hjulmand, 2008). This means that, by themselves, they are not entirely reliable when it comes to ensuring that the teaching staff has the necessary skills to successfully tackle foreign language teaching.

Some universities, aware of the importance of methodological skills, have developed their own competency verification systems, which are compulsory for teachers who join bilingual/multilingual programmes.¹²

In any case, regardless of the accreditation system of teaching staff adopted by the universities, it is necessary that these offer methodological support to teachers and even promote their participation in training actions of methodological content, regardless of the level of foreign language proficiency demonstrated (see section on training). Support measures should include language-based follow up programmes (ideally on demand) as well as classroom observation programmes, exchange of teacher experience programmes, resource and information banks of activities organised in other higher learning institutions.

Given that there are no higher guidelines for teacher accreditation, it would be advisable for universities to adopt the following recommendations:

- 1) To recommend the CEFR's C1 level (using as reference the certifications validated by the Language Tables and/or ACLES) as the minimum advisable requirement for teachers involved in bilingual/multilingual degree programmes.
- 2) To promote duly subsidised procedures so the teaching staff can prove their specific training for teaching in a foreign language.
- 3) To encourage the participation of teaching staff in training programmes for foreign language teaching, so that universities will ideally include them in their subsidised training plans.
- 4) To offer linguistic support during the teaching period.

3.3 Certification of administrative and service staff (ASS)

In order to successfully carry out an internationalisation language policy, it is necessary to have multilingual administrative and services staff (Behrent *et al.*, 2011, Fortanet, 2013). It is thus appropriate, as in the case of students and teachers, to follow a series of recommendations.

- 1) To identify and reflect in staff contracts the administrative positions where the use of foreign languages is necessary.

¹² This is the case of, among others, the University of Copenhagen and its specific TOEPAS test (cf. Kling and Stæhr 2012) and in Spain the University of Vigo and its foreign language teaching skills test HELA (González-Álvarez 2014) or the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid and its DOing plan.

- 2) To pay special attention to improving the language skills of this group with the aim of certifying an appropriate linguistic level, especially for staff who are in contact with the overseas community of the university or with internationalisation actions.
- 3) To consider the inclusion of a linguistic requirement (between B1 and C1 according to the service) in the promotion of certain managerial positions as well as for newly created positions.
- 4) To promote their participation in mobility programmes and in internationalisation actions at home, in order to engage this group in the internationalisation process of the university.

4. Training for language development

4.1. Training for internationalisation

Promoting the acquisition of competences for personal and professional development of all university community members is a strategic component of internationalisation that must be seen as a result of the improvement of the quality of the university institution.

Before addressing the question of how training should be articulated, we believe it is critical that both students and teachers and the ASS know exactly what it means to work towards improving the international profile of the university and, as one of the measures aimed towards this, to really understand what the teaching-learning process in a foreign language means, a process that relies not only on the change of vehicular language but also entails a substantial transformation in the class content management model, with a specific pedagogical instrumentation for the use of materials and a redefinition of the assessment model. Indeed, language competence and the ability to understand and verbalise the academic content shall determine the overall assessment in terms of learning objectives of the subjects. Once again universities shall have to make an effort to describe and explain the complexity of a bilingual/multilingual education to the students, who at first are generally suspicious of these initiatives since their first concern is the degree of difficulty which entails receiving instruction in a foreign language. Therefore, the first efforts should aim to

value the enriching aspect of this type of teaching and the impact on academic and professional development.

Let us not forget that the implementation by Spanish universities of a plan of this kind implies that these undertake to provide coverage and support to the different actions and proposals that are intended to train the entire university community - teaching staff, students, researchers and administrative and services staff.

Generally speaking, in the field of multilingual programmes there is often a large number of preconceived ideas, many of which are wrong or at least require a certain degree of clarification. One of them is that, as mentioned above, the possession of a minimal language level is an essential requirement in pursuing quality education. However, the accreditation of a given level does not ensure 100 percent the effectiveness in teaching. The accreditation of a C1 level, for example, certifies that a certain degree of mastery of the language is possessed in accordance with standards that are closely related to specific linguistic tests, but it does not necessarily imply the ability to use the language specifically in the academic field and for the purpose of the transmission of knowledge. There is a type of accreditation of less tangible or quantifiable nature that is in fact more necessary in the classroom or lecture hall and that is not visible through this type of purely linguistic measurements. In this way, we could often times find cases in which a teacher with a lower language level can be as effective or even more than another teacher who holds this accreditation and conversely; that a teacher with a higher linguistic accreditation does not obtain the results that could be, in theory, expected.

For this reason, universities must find a way to select the most qualified teaching staff, people who combine linguistic and pedagogical skills to teach according to basic quality standards (Mohan and Slater, 2005). And, for those cases where a short, medium or long-term training programme is intended to be implemented, a training programme covering this dual, linguistic and methodological training should be designed. In both cases, the objective should be to train teachers to help them gain proficiency in the language to work with academic material in a foreign language (Lorenzo, 2008).

The lecturer must be able to determine an academic use of the language according to objectives, contents and activities, to work with the different language skills in an integrated and balanced manner, to plan the linguistic needs according to the characteristics of the subjects, to work with the vocabulary and the necessary academic discourse

regarding the contents being dealt with (Lorenzo, 2002), in particular with regard to textual genres (Cendoya and Di Bin, 2010), to manage groupings in the classroom, to provide students with the tools that allow them to use the language as much as possible, to increase the input of authentic materials, to explore a different form of evaluation that suits the teaching being done, to promote the use of new technologies, and, in short, to use methodological strategies specifically required for the use of a foreign language as a vehicle for instruction: anchoring to previous knowledge; pre-lesson tasks; contextualising and connecting at the beginning of lessons; maximising redundancy; use of glossaries and mental maps; predominance of visual materials; promoting strategies for the discovery of new material; promoting cooperative work (Pastor, 2011), in groups (Dörnyei, 1997) and by projects (Bonnet, 2012); working on those aspects of pronunciation that have the biggest impact on comprehension (speech speed, correction for key concepts, emphasis on relevant information, resources to attract attention) (Valcke and Pavón, 2015); task-based teaching (Escobar and Sánchez, 2009; Poisel, 2012) and emphasising the scaffolding techniques of the language to promote its correct use and in the scaffolding of content as a means to facilitate its comprehension (rephrasing, redundancy, exemplification, circular explanation, comparison, use of synonyms and antonyms, etc.) (Van de Pol, Volman and Beishuizen, 2010).

4.2. Training actions for students

Training proposal in foreign languages of universities must offer practical and quality training that improves students' linguistic communication skills both in their own language and in the foreign language, enabling them to understand and express academic content (both oral and written), to successfully participate in mobility programmes and to deal with professional situations in multicultural and multilingual contexts.

A proposal of this type could include the following courses offer:

- 1) Training courses in oral and written communication skills.
- 2) Training courses in a foreign language specific to the subjects taught in a bilingual/multilingual programme.
- 3) Pronunciation courses.
- 4) Course to learn to communicate ideas clearly and effectively.
- 5) Course in multimodal communication (verbal and non-verbal resources).

- 6) Language immersion courses.
- 7) Complementary language training courses abroad.

4.3. Training actions for teaching staff

4.3.1. Definition of the training framework

It is necessary to establish a framework in which to deal with teaching staff training in order to be able to attend to training fields related not only to linguistic and methodological competence, but also to the competences that originate with the professional roles of the teacher: pedagogical competence, organisational competence, competences for the collaboration with other teachers or working environments, and competence for reflection and professional development (Lorenzo, Trujillo and Vez, 2011). The visualisation of these competences shall lead us to organise the training dealing with areas related to categories such as: "Knowledge and understanding", "strategies and skills" and "values" (Kelly, Grenfell, Allan, Kriza and McEvoy, 2004).

Structuring the teacher's training in regard to the development of the aforementioned competences has the ultimate purpose of helping the student construct a discourse that serves to understand and express the academic contents addressed. Let us not forget that one of the main problems that can be faced by –already enrolled– students when contextualising the situation in our universities, is the "understanding" due to the lack of academic skills in their mother tongue and reflected in the foreign language (Aguilar and Muñoz, 2014). Therefore, improving, the performance of the teacher entails:

- 1) Analysing the linguistic, pedagogical and academic profile of the lecturer and defining the degree of teaching competence to establish the level of training within the said training programme.
- 2) Following a methodology that adapts to the construction and transmission of contents through a foreign language.
- 3) Planning courses in training fields related to what lecturers involved in bilingual/multilingual education should know:
 - i) about the teaching and learning of content through a foreign language
 - ii) how to act in teaching and learning situations with international students
 - iii) how to convey intercultural values.

4.3.2. Training structure

It is advisable to develop a training plan that includes the academic and practical experience of teaching in a foreign language in a flexible and modular manner. This plan would include:

1. Initial and continuous training, both of a linguistic and methodological nature, for teaching in a foreign language.
2. Observation of new teaching staff by experts with signatures and other resources designed for this purpose.
3. Mentoring of lecturers experienced in foreign language teaching as a training strategy.
4. Opportunity to hold teaching stays in foreign universities to observe and participate in international teaching experiences and to perform joint teaching projects.
5. Lifelong learning for teacher trainers.
6. Quality assessment system for training programmes at European level to enable accreditation and mobility.

4.3.3. Courses suggestions

In addition to the training recommended in the previous section, it would also be advisable to offer lectures training in foreign languages, with courses similar to those suggested for students, as well as other specific ones to, firstly, meet students' needs to be able to integrate the learning of the language with the one of the content and, secondly, to be able to use educational teaching pedagogies in higher education that better suit this academic situation. Hence, the following could be among the contents of these courses:

With regard to the use of the foreign language:

- 1) Techniques for the use of vocabulary and academic discourse in the classroom
- 2) Creation and use of materials for teaching in a foreign language
- 3) Improvement of oral production and pronunciation
- 4) Techniques for the adaptation and/or use of original audiovisual material in a foreign language
- 5) Techniques for the adaptation and/or use of original written material in a foreign language

6) Seminars and mentoring action in a foreign language

Regard pedagogies:

7) Strategies for class management: grouping models and cooperative learning

8) Stimulation of autonomous learning: working by projects

9) Creation of integrated activities and tasks

10) Strategies for the scaffolding of language and content

11) Use of new technologies: programmes and materials in a foreign language, individual or collective projects with local students or students from other countries, online connections with lecturers or students from other foreign universities, etc.

12) Criteria and instruments for the assessment of learning adapted to the integrated learning of contents and foreign language.

4.4. Training activities for administrative and service staff (ASS)

The increasing internationalisation of universities in terms of both teaching and research requires a suitable degree of multilingualism by the administration and services staff. In order to prepare the ASS to face professional situations in multicultural and multilingual contexts, in addition to generic foreign language courses, the following offer of specific courses is made:

1) Specific oral communication courses for telephone assistance, reception of international student, service to visiting lecturers, etc.

2) Courses for the development of written communication: Academic information through e-mail, administrative and academic documentation in foreign language, preparation of information material on the university in a foreign language, web content, etc.

3) Stays in foreign universities to observe and collaborate in the administrative tasks related to internationalisation processes.

5. Incentive programme

The implementation of a language policy that is able to drive the promotion of languages for internationalisation purposes is necessarily based on a comprehensive incentive programme,

adjusted to the resources of each institution, including the entire university community. The following measures aim to promote the participation of the university community in the internationalisation of institutions and encourage its efforts.

5.1 Incentives for students

1. To offer subsidised foreign language courses or, failing that, discounts for students who enrol in language courses offered by the university itself during the degree.
2. To offer "zero courses" for students who are going to take bilingual/multilingual degrees or fully taught in English at the university, in which students are given the communicative tools necessary to be able to follow and make the most of lectures.
3. To reduce the fees for conducting tests leading to the accreditation of linguistic competence in a foreign language, preferably B1 level or higher.
4. To give priority to students from bilingual/multilingual degrees attending the Erasmus+ studies, Erasmus+ internship or other mobility programmes.
5. To provide linguistic support practices by students that certify a C1 level according to the CEFR.
6. To promote the granting of ECTS for passing foreign language courses in University Language Centres¹³.
7. To ensure that foreign students participate in mobility programmes, in addition to compulsory online courses funded by the European Union under the Erasmus+ programme, are provided the necessary linguistic support in the official language(s) of the autonomous community, with adequate courses and schedules which are properly subsidised.
8. To organise linguistic tandems between foreign and local students and language exchange activities.

¹³ Royal Decree 1393/2007, as amended by Royal Decree 861/2010, stipulates in article 12.8 that students may obtain academic recognition in credits for participation in cultural, sports, student representation, solidarity and cooperation university activities. To this end, the curricula must include the possibility of each student obtaining at least 6 credits.

5.2 Incentives for teaching staff

1. To enable the accreditation of the language competence of teaching staff in the universities themselves.
2. To facilitate the convergence of Spanish universities to respect and recognise the accreditation to teach bilingual/multilingual degrees certified by other higher education institutions in our Spain.
3. To offer specific subsidised courses as well as a linguistic support service for lecturers who teach in a foreign language. These courses shall be aimed at improving the communicative and teaching techniques of lecturers when teaching non-linguistic subjects in the foreign language (methodology, academic writing, communicative skills, etc.).
4. To reduce rates for language training and accreditation tests, preferably of B2 level or higher.
5. To include the acquisition of a certified level (B2 - C1 - C2) as specific merit for the hiring of new lecturers and promotion in the teaching career.
6. To apply a reduction of teaching hours in the teaching load of lectures who teach non-linguistic subjects in a foreign language.
7. To ensure the commitment of the departments (and stakeholders) to maintain the teaching assigned in the foreign language for a minimum period of 3 consecutive years.
8. To give priority (or credit) lecturers teaching bilingual/multilingual degrees and who participate in fellowships, courses or international mobility programmes.
9. To provide support for the purchase of materials and resources in foreign languages for lecturers teaching in bilingual/multilingual itineraries.
10. To promote linguistic review programmes (of academic texts, reports, contracts, patents, project applications and any other documents resulting from teaching, research or knowledge transfer) as well as actions to improve oral and written competences to increase international production and dissemination of research.
11. To establish review mechanisms for the linguistic quality of teaching and recognition for excellence.

5.3 Incentives for administrative and service staff (ASS)

1. To offer language courses for the administration and services staff in which contents for communicative improvement are addressed for the performance of their functions: writing e-mails, managing specific documentation (calls, European projects, memorandum of understanding with other institutions, etc.), service to foreign students, etc.
2. To reduce fees for language training and in B1 level or above accreditation tests.
3. To promote the accreditation of the language competence of staff in the universities themselves.
4. To include the acquisition of a certified level (B2 - C1 - C2) as specific merit for the hiring of new administration and services staff in universities and taking such levels into account in the internal promotion of certain services (Internationalisation Vice-chancellor's Office, International Relations Office, Student Information Office, staff in charge of enrolment, issuance of certificates and degrees, library and similar units).
5. To give priority to the staff member whose proficiency level of the foreign language is recognised in his/her functions and who participates in fellowships, courses or international mobility programmes managed by universities.
6. To facilitate the access of the ASS to the language training courses for the accreditation of levels (preferably B2 or higher).

5.4 Supplementary actions

In order to contribute to the achievement of the recommendations suggested in each of the previous sections (accreditation, training and incentives), universities are invited to promote the following complementary actions:

1. To define an institutional language policy that explicitly establishes the use of different languages in the institution.
2. To give more weight, visibility and responsibility to the Language Centres as well as the languages departments in the accreditation and training of students, teaching staff and ASS, with the institutional support of the Vice-chancellor's office.
3. To promote the organisation of intensive international academic programmes (such as the Jean Monnet modules).

4. To encourage and strengthen the participation of universities in international teacher mobility programmes as receiving centres, so as to facilitate the presence in the lecture hall of teaching staff from the international partners of each of the universities under the conditions and periods established by said programmes.
5. To facilitate the reception of international lecturers, complementing with their own incentives, to the extent of their possibilities (assistance in finding accommodation, assigning suitable workplaces, access to university services, etc.), the resources obtained by these lecturers in their places of origin (sabbatical programmes, funding from international programmes, etc.).
6. To promote the recruitment of foreign students in internships and administration and services staff in exchange programmes of the international partners with an adequate level of English language proficiency to carry out support functions in the different services of the university, as well as the provision of grants of linguistic assistance and conversation to foreign students.

6. Conclusions

This framework document has addressed the three lines of action – accreditation, training and incentives – on which to design a quality Language Policy for the internationalisation of the Spanish university system. Aware of the vast diversity and heterogeneity regarding the accreditation of English language proficiency levels (and in other foreign languages) in order to obtain a university degree or to access studies in a foreign language, this document has offered a set of precise recommendations on the language levels to be required, as well as the mechanisms used to do so. In addition, it has elaborated in detail the training for students, teachers and ASS, in order to design and provide the necessary training actions for quality teaching and learning in a foreign language. Finally, a specific incentive list that includes the entire university community has been suggested in order to support with clear actions the adaptation and improvement efforts that internationalisation demands.

The recommendations suggested herein need the clear support and coordination of those most directly involved in the decision-making process of Spanish universities, as well as the different bodies and institutions responsible for

implementing such recommendations. It would also be necessary for the different universities to allocate a specific budget line to the three axes on which this document was based, in order to guarantee the viability and sustainability of the process of internationalization of the Spanish university system.

The authors (in alphabetical order)

Plácido Bazo Martínez (University of La Laguna), Aurora Centellas Rodrigo (UDIMA, Open University, Madrid), Emma Dafouz Milne (Universidad Complutense de Madrid), Alberto Fernández Costales (University of Oviedo), Dolores González Álvarez (University of Vigo), Víctor Pavón Vázquez (University of Córdoba).

Acknowledgements

The Sub-working Group responsible for drafting this document appreciates the collaboration, comments, contributions and express support of the following people who were present to represent their universities at the meeting held at the University of La Laguna on 3 March 2016 (in alphabetical order): Alejandro Alcalá Sintés (University of Jaén), Charles Bretherton Jones (Universidad Francisco de Vitoria), Antonio Bueno González (University of Jaén), Carmen Caballero Navas (University of Granada), María Luisa Capón Mouriz (University of La Laguna), Reinhard Dlugay (University of La Laguna), Cristina Escobar Urmeneta (Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona), Mar Fernández Sainz (University of Valladolid), Ana Fe Gil Serra (University of Almeria), Isabel Jaschek Corbalán (University of Salamanca), Nuria Mendoza Domínguez (Universidad Antonio de Nebrija), Amaya Mendikoetxea (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid), Flor Mena Martínez (University of Murcia), Isabel Pascua Febles (University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria), Cristina Pérez Guillot (Universitat Politècnica de València), Esme Prentice Chapman (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid), Elena Romero Alfaro (University of Cádiz), Francisco Rubio Cuenca (University of Cádiz), Teresa Susinos (University of Cantabria), Milka Villayandre Llamazares (University of León).

After the La Laguna meeting the document received several written observations from Inmaculada Fortanet (Universitat Jaume I), Mireia Trenchs and Mireia Calm (Universitat Pompeu Fabra), Carmen Caballero and Dorothy Kelly (University of Granada) and representatives of the Language Tables of the CRUE. The Sub-working Group would also like to thank all them for their suggestions and contributions.

References

- ACLES (2014) CertaAcles. Accreditation Model for ACLES exams. Available at http://www.acles.es/multimedia/enlaces/9/files/fichero_136.pdf
- Airey, J. (2004) "Can you teach it in English? Aspects of the language choice debate in Swedish higher education". In R. Wilkinson (ed.), *Integrating content and language. Meeting the challenge of a multilingual higher education*, Maastricht: Maastricht University, 97--108.
- Aguilar, M. and Muñoz, M. (2014) "The effect of proficiency on CLIL benefits in Engineering students in Spain". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 24(1): 1--18.
- Baumann, B., Van de Craen, P., Marsh, D. and Wilkinson, R. (2006) Report Workshop 5: Medium of Instruction. *ENLU closing conference*, Nancy 8--9 April 2006. Available at <http://www.celelc.org/archive/conference/Conferencedocuments/nancyWS5.pdf?1370253482>
- Behrent, S. et al. (2011) CERCLES Position Statement on Language Policy in Higher Education in Europe. Available at: <http://www.aks--sprachen.de/wp--content/uploads/2015/01/CercleS--Language--Policy--Position--Statement--revised--Nov--2011.pdf>
- Bonnet, A. (2012) "Towards an evidence base for CLIL: how to integrate qualitative and quantitative as well as process, product and participant perspectives in CLIL research". *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1 (4): 66--78.
- Cendoya, A., and Di Bin, M. (2010) "A CLIL experience based on the use of tasks and different genre types". *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 3 (1): 11--17.
- Coleman, J. (2006) "English--medium teaching in European higher education". *Language Teaching*, 39: 1--14.
- Comisión Europea (2008) *Comunicación de la Comisión al Consejo, al Parlamento Europeo, al Comité Económico y Social Europeo y al Comité de las Regiones. Multilingüismo: una ventaja para Europa y un compromiso compartido*. Available at <http://eur--lex.europa.eu/legal--content/ES/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52008DC0566&from=ES>
- Council of Europe (2001) *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dafouz, E., Núñez, B., Sancho, C. and Foran, D. (2007) "Integrating CLIL at the tertiary level: teachers' and students' reactions". En D. Wolff, D. Marsh (eds.), *Diverse contexts*

- converging goals. Content and language integrated learning in Europe. Volume 4.*
Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 91--102.
- Dafouz, E. and Núñez, B. (2009) "CLIL in higher education: devising a new learning landscape". In E. Dafouz, M. Guerrini (eds.), *CLIL Across Educational Levels: Experiences from Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Contexts*. Madrid: Santillana, 101--112.
- Dafouz, E., and Núñez, B. (2010) "Metadiscursive devices in university lectures: A contrastive analysis of L1 and L2 teacher performance". In C. Dalton-Puffer, T. Nikula and U. Smit (eds.), *Language Use and Language Learning in CLIL Classrooms*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 213--231.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., and Sierra, J.M. (2011) "Internationalisation, multilingualism and English-medium instruction." *World Englishes*, 30 (3): 345-359.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., and Sierra, J.M. (eds.) (2013) *English--Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Changes*. Bristol. Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1997) "Psychological processes in cooperative language learning: group dynamics and motivation". *The Modern Language Journal*, 81 (4): 482-493
- Escobar, C., and Sánchez, A. (2009) "Language learning through tasks in a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) science classroom". *Porta Linguarum*, 11: 65-83.
- Escobar, C. (2013) "Learning to become a CLIL teacher: teaching, reflection and professional development". *International Journal of Bilingual education and Bilingualism*, 16 (3): 334--353.
- Fernández--Costales, A., and González--Riaño, X.A. (2015) "Teacher Satisfaction Concerning the Implementation of Bilingual Programmes in a Spanish University". *Porta Linguarum*, 23: 93--108.
- Fortanet, I. (2011) "La Universidad multilingüe: Aspectos a tener en cuenta." Communication presented at the *Seminario de Política Lingüística, CICUE*. UNED, 31 March-1 April.
- Fortanet, I. (2013) *CLIL in Higher Education: Towards a Multilingual Language Policy*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Gómez--López, A., Solaz Portolés, J.J. and Sanjosé López, V. (2014) "*Competencia en lengua inglesa de estudiantes universitarios españoles en el contexto del EEES: nivel de dominio lingüístico, estrategias metacognitivas y hábitos lectores.*" *Revista de Educación*, 363, 154--183.
- González--Álvarez, D. (2014) "HELA (Higher Education Lecturing Accreditation): *la acreditación del profesorado universitario para la docencia en inglés en la Universidad de Vigo.*"

Nous Reptes per als Centres de Llengües: Estándards de Qualitat. Universitat de Girona, 44--54.

González-Álvarez, D. (2015) *Análisis de los requisitos lingüísticos para la expedición de títulos y para la participación en programas bilingües y de movilidad*. Paper presented at the Plenary Session CRUE - Internationalisation, Cooperation, University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria.

González-Álvarez, D., O'Dowd, R., and Valcke, J. (2015) "Training and assessing university teachers for teaching in English." Paper presented at the *27th EAIE Conference*, Glasgow.

Halbach, A., Lázaro Lafuente, A. and Pérez Guerra, J. (2013) *"La lengua inglesa en la nueva universidad española del EEES"*. *Revista de Educación*, 362: 105--132.

Halbach, A., and Lázaro, A. (2015) *"La acreditación del nivel de lengua inglesa en las universidades españolas: Actualización 2015."* Available at <http://www.britishcouncil.es/sites/britishcouncil.es/files/british--council--laacreditacion--del--nivel--de--lengua--inglesa.pdf>

Hellekjaer, G.O. and Wilkinson, R. (2009) "CLIL in higher education", *Bulletin 7, EuroCLIL*.

Available at <http://www.euroclil.net/index.php?inhoud=inhoud/bulletins/bulletin7/8.html>

Kelly, M., Grenfell, M., Allan, R., Kriza, C. and McEvoy, W. (2004) *European Profile for Language Teacher Education – A Frame of Reference. A report to the European Commission*. Available at http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/lang/doc/profile_en.pdf

Klaassen, R., and Räsänen, A. (2006) "Assessment and staff development in higher education for English--medium instruction: A question raising article". En R. Wilkinson, V. Zegers and C. van Leeuwen (eds.), *Bridging the assessment gap in English--medium higher education*. Bochum: AKS--Verlag, 235--255.

Kling, J. and Dimova, S. (2015) "The Test of Oral English for Academic Staff (TOEPAS): Validation of standards and scoring procedures." In A. Knapp and K. Aguado (eds.) *Fremdsprachen in Studium und Lehre - Chancen und Herausforderungen für den Wissenserwerb*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 247-268.

Kling, J. y Hjulmand, L.L. (2008) "PLATE – Project in Language Assessment for Teaching in English". In R. Wilkinson y V. Zegers (eds.) *Realizing content and language integration in higher education*. Maastrich: Maastrich University, 191--200.

- Kling, J. and Stæhr, L.S. (2012) "The development of the Test of Oral English Proficiency for Academic Staff (TOEPAS)". Available at http://cip.ku.dk/forskning/cip_publicationer/CIP_TOEPAS_Technical_Report.pdf
- Lasagabaster, D. and Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (eds.) (2010) *CLIL in Spain. Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lauridsen, K., (2013) *Higher Education Language Policy*. European Language Council. Available at: <http://www.celelc.org/activities/Workinggroups/ResourcesWorkingGroups/HELanguagePolicy--Final2013wsummary.pdf?1370253478>
- Lorenzo, F. (2002) "Stages in content--based instruction course development in English teaching at tertiary level". En A. Bueno, G. Tejada and G. Luque (eds.), *Las Lenguas en un Mundo Global*. XX Congreso Nacional de AESLA. Universidad de Jaén, 179--191.
- Lorenzo, F. (2008) "Instructional discourse in bilingual settings. An empirical study of linguistic adjustments in content and language integrated learning". *Language Learning Journal*, 36 (1): 21--33.
- Lorenzo, F., Trujillo, F. and Vez, J.M. (2011) *Educación bilingüe: integración de contenidos y segundas lenguas*. Madrid: Abstract.
- Marsh, D. and Laitinen, L. (2004) "Medium of instruction in European higher education: Summary of research outcomes of European Network for Language Learning amongst Undergraduates (ENLU)". *Task Force 4*. Jyväskylä: UnicOM, Jyväskylä University.
- Marsh, D., Pavón, V. and Frigols, M.J. (2013) *The Higher Education Languages Landscape: Ensuring Quality in English Language Degree Programmes*. Valencia: Universidad Internacional de Valencia.
- Martyniuk, W. (2008) "CLIL – at the core of plurilingual education?". En R. Wilkinson, V. Zeger (eds.), *Realizing Content and Language Integration in Higher Education*. Maastricht: Maastricht University, 13--18.
- MECD (2014) *Estrategia para la Internacionalización de las Universidades Españolas*. Available at <http://www.mecd.gob.es/educacion--mecd/dms/mecd/educacion--mecd/areas--educacion/universidades/politica--internacional/estrategia--internacionalizacion/EstrategiaInternacionalizaci--n--Final.pdf>
- Mellion, M.J. (2008) "The challenge of changing tongues in business university education". In R. Wilkinson, V. Zegers (eds.) *Realizing Content and Language Integration in Higher Education*. Maastricht: Maastricht University, 212--227.

- Mohan, B. and Slater, T. (2005) "A functional perspective on the critical theory/practice relation in teaching language and science". *Linguistics and Education*, 16: 151--173.
- O'Dowd, R. (2015) "The training and accreditation of teachers for English Medium Instruction: A survey of European universities". Available at http://sgroup.be/sites/default/files/EMI%20Survey_Report_ODowd.pdf
- Pastor, M.R. (2011) "CLIL and cooperative learning". *Encuentro*, 20: 109--118.
- Pavón, V. and Gaustad, M. (2013) "Designing Bilingual Programmes for Higher Education in Spain: organizational, curricular and methodological decisions". *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1 (5): 82--94.
- Pérez-Cañado, M.L. (2014) "Teacher training needs for bilingual education: in--service teacher perceptions". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, advance access, 1--30. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2014.980778.
- Poisel, E. (2012) "Competence development through task--based learning". In D. Marsh and O. Meyer (eds.), *Quality Interfaces: Examining Evidence & Exploring Solutions in CLIL*. Eichstätt: Eichstätt Academic Press, 251--263.
- Ramos, A.M. (2013) "Higher Education Bilingual Programmes in Spain". *Porta Linguarum* 19: 101--111.
- Smith, K. (2004) "Studying in an additional language: What is gained, what is lost and what is assessed?" In Wilkinson, R. (ed.) *Integrating Content and Language: Meeting the Challenge of a Multilingual Higher Education*. Maastricht: Universitaire Pers Maastricht, 78--93.
- Smit, U. and Dafouz, E. (eds.) (2013) *Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education*. AILA Review, volume 25. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Valcke, J. and Pavón, V. (2015) "Transmitting complex academic information effectively: a comparative study on the use of pronunciation strategies for highlighting information in university lectures". In R. Wilkinson and M.L. Walsh (Eds.), *Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education: From Theory to Practice*. Frankfurt--am--Main: Peter Lang, 323--341.
- Van de Pol, J., Volman, M. y Beishuizen, J. (2010) "Scaffolding in teacher--student interaction: a decade of research". *Educational Psychology Review*, 22 (3): 271--296.
- Wächter, B. and Maiworn, F. (eds.) (2008) *English--Taught Programmes in European Higher Education*. Bonn: Lemmens.

- Wächter, B. and Maiworn, F. (eds.) (2014) *English--Taught Programmes in European Higher Education*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Wilkinson R. (ed.) (2004) *Integrating Content and Language. Meeting the Challenge of a Multilingual Higher Education*. Maastricht: Maastricht University.
- Wilkinson, R. and Zegers, V. (eds.) (2008) *Realizing Content and Language Integration in Higher Education*. Maastricht: Maastricht University Language Centre.
- Wilkinson, R. and Walsh, M. L. (2015) *Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education: From Theory to Practice*. Peter Lang: Maastricht.