

RUG Language Policy. An Inclusive¹, Dual²-Plus³ Approach.

Preparing world class graduates and fostering our staff in a globalising world.

Abstract

This paper illustrates the need for a consistent institutional language policy at the University of Groningen (RUG), given the fast developments in internationalisation at RUG and the changing needs from an increasingly diverse population of staff and students. The developments in the national and EU context show interesting examples and reveal the relevance of context and history. The recent discussion in academia marks the increasing dominance of English as a tool of communication in higher education and the need for more quality control. The academic experts also stress the importance of proficiency in the local language, and of intercultural competences, and advise to use an integrated content-based approach for language teaching and learning, development and support, based on new insights and technologies. Subsequently, this paper includes an advice for a language policy in line with the particular history and context of RUG, based on RUG's mission and vision, and concludes with an advice for implementation.

¹ Core definition inclusive: inclusive learning and teaching in higher education refers to the ways in which pedagogy, curricula and assessment are designed and delivered to engage students in learning that is meaningful, relevant and accessible to all. It embraces a view of the individual and individual difference as the source of diversity that can enrich the lives and learning of others (C. Hockings, 2010).

² Dual: local language plus English as a medium of instruction.

³ Plus: fostering multilingualism on a more individual level/in specific programmes.

Task Force RUG Language Policy

- Professor Frans Zwarts, Chair, Professor in Linguistics, former Rector RUG, University of Groningen
- Bernd Waechter PhD, Director of the Academic Cooperation Association (ACA)
- Robert Coelen PhD, Lector Internationalization of Higher Education, Vice-President International, Stenden University of Applied Sciences
- Wijnand Aalderink MA, Director of Education and Communication Services/Career Services, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Groningen
- Kevin Haines EdD, Consultant, Teacher/Trainer in English, University of Groningen & University Medical Center Groningen
- Grytsje van der Meer MA, Policy Advisor HR, University of Groningen
- Estelle Meima MA, Coordinator Testing & Assessment and Lecturer in English, Language Centre, Faculty of Arts, University of Groningen
- Kristel Modesti LLM, Legal Advisor, University of Groningen
- Franka van den Hende MA, Policy Advisor International Relations/Project Manager International Classroom, University of Groningen
- Marten Houkes MSc, Project Assistant International Classroom, University of Groningen.

Introduction

During the past 10-15 years, RUG has taken major steps in becoming an international university. Nowadays we have over a hundred English-taught Master programmes, 21 English-taught Bachelor programmes and more than 20 joint programmes with international partners. This has resulted in 12% of our students and 18% of our academic staff coming from abroad. Moreover, approximately 20% of our students do part of their study abroad. In sum, we have reached our goals set for this phase.

It is now time for the next steps. RUG is entering a new phase of internationalisation, in which internationalisation will be increasingly relevant for ALL staff and students, with a systematic approach of internationalisation as a quality instrument in education and research, and a monitoring system from which the added value of internationalisation will be evident. In 2013, the International Classroom (IC) project was started with the objective to qualify for the distinctive quality label for internationalisation (DQFI) awarded by the Dutch/Flemish accreditation agency “NVAO”, by demonstrating the added value and clarifying the institutional conditions of the international classroom. One of the first results of this IC project reveals that English language support should be directed more towards qualitative measures and contextualised needs, e.g. academic communication and study skills for students, and individual needs for staff.

In earlier years (2004-2007), English language support was provided on a large scale for academic and supportive staff, with directives from the Executive Board for assessment and monitoring. Assessment was generally done at a voluntarily basis, except for the Faculty of Economics and Business. These directives have resulted in different faculty policies for assessing and monitoring English for current staff, and various or no language policies for hiring new staff. Meanwhile, the numbers of staff and students dealing with English in their work and study environment have grown immensely, and there has grown a strong need for good quality control.

More recently, in 2012, the Executive Board started to offer free Dutch language courses for international students. This initiative received great enthusiasm from both the international and the Dutch students. In 2014, approximately 1,000 students are being expected to participate in a free Dutch language course. For international staff, faculties often pay for the Dutch language course, but there is no overall policy.

Current language infrastructure

Our RUG juridical and policy documents related to language and quality control are outdated. The English language directives from the Board date from 2004. The last version of the RUG Language Code of Conduct (“Gedragscode Voertalen”) dates from May 2003. This Language Code of Conduct is based on article 7.2 from our Dutch Law (“WHW”), which was included in 1992 for political reasons. The phrase ‘education and exams are in Dutch unless...’ illustrates the main concern then to protect the Dutch language. In 2011, the Dutch Education Council acknowledged the relevance of English in higher education in the context of a globalising world, in addition to the continuous importance of Dutch for Dutch culture and identity. The Council advised the Dutch government to require from all higher education institutions to establish a clear language policy, ensuring a good quality control of English and provision of Dutch language and culture for internationals. Considering the changes in the national as well as institutional context, it is clearly time for RUG to establish a new language policy.

Urgency

A few examples from the RUG context illustrate the urgency of a new language policy. In the current situation, there is no overall framework with common regulations to control the quality of English for staff. Although in the International Student Barometer (from 2009-2012), international students evaluate the academic English of their lecturers as “sufficient” (3.5/5.0), these scores are rather

average in an international comparison, and not satisfactory given our high ambitions for internationalisation. From a different perspective, the lack of Dutch language proficiency of many international staff and students hinders their inclusion in their new study, work and social environment. With most RUG governance bodies' meetings held in Dutch and most policy documents written in Dutch this limits the access to governance bodies and senior management positions for our internationals. Moreover, outside the formal setting of the international classroom, conversations and small talk are often in Dutch. For students another language related problem is that they often lack good academic communication and study skills, in both English and Dutch. In addition to English and Dutch, many staff and students do not have a good command of a second or third foreign language which would be beneficial, for example, when they are going for study or work abroad. Finally, the results of our IC pilot project reveal clear needs for extended and new lines of language learning and support.

National and EU context

Our wider context shows similar developments. Both in the national and in the EU context of higher education, there has recently been an increased attention for language.

In 2013, the Dutch government launched the action plan “Make it in the Netherlands” with the main objective to attract more internationals to stay in the Netherlands for work after their studies. Although the plan has a limited focus on certain fields or disciplines and economic gains, and lacks resources, it recognizes the high relevance of both the Dutch and English language in internationalisation of higher education. One of the planned activities is that NUFFIC will develop an online course in Dutch language, using the new opportunities of e-learning.

One year earlier, in 2012, the EU Commission published the document “Rethinking Education: Investing in Skills for Better Socio-economic Outcomes”. For Europe, considering the massive increase in the global supply of highly skilled people over the last decade, language competences are particularly important for reasons of competitiveness, employability and mobility (Kelly, M. (2013). Language competences for employability, mobility and growth. In: European Journal of Language Policy). The EU commission advocates a “dual” language policy (local language plus English as a Medium of Instruction), inspired by a clear vision, integrated with other policies in learning and teaching (e.g. learning outcomes) and supported by innovative methods (e.g. Integrating Content and Language in Higher education, an HE-focussed interpretation of CLIL) and adequate guidance and monitoring. With more than 400 languages spoken in Europe, the EU Commission recognizes the value of multilingualism, being reflected in many projects including projects RUG participates in (Intl Uni project and MAGICC project).

The first results of the Intl Uni project reveal that the majority of the HEIs offer programmes both in English and in the local language. Other HEIs have implemented a parallel or multilingual language policy, or have opted for English as a unique Lingua Franca. Support mechanisms in place tend to be more student than staff-focused and are primarily optional (from “Synthesis Report work package two”, January 2014). The Intl Uni project results also confirm that it is difficult, and often impossible, to distinguish language from culture (from “Synthesis Report work package three”, January 2014). Recent research has shown that foreign language learning is rather poor in Europe, with major differences between countries. In the new Erasmus Plus programme one of the conditions is that institutions should offer more flexible and cost efficient support for language preparation. The EU language policy is in line with the EU lifelong learning policy.

Policy examples

We have been able to find some interesting institutional language policies. Recent literature on English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) tends to focus on cases in specific departments in universities, with the exception of Lauridsen (2013) and the European Language Council⁴ who take a broader perspective. This focus on programme level could be indicative of the absence of integrated policies across institutions. Yet, the University of Maastricht (2013) has developed a comprehensive “English, unless” policy, aligned with their Strategic Plan (2012), in the context of their learning and working environment, and the social and employability context. The Maastricht policy is supported by results from a survey among (international) employers in the Netherlands, which indicate that 47% require university graduates to have a sufficient language level with specific competences of English and Dutch, while government institutions tend to require even three different languages. Erasmus University in Rotterdam (EUR) has recently implemented a dual language policy. The “Englishness” or “Dutchness” of the environment in which staff members work and their specific role determines the extent to which they need to be proficient in both English and Dutch. A language matrix has been developed by EUR for assessing required language proficiency.

Outside the Netherlands, juridical and political conditions are sometimes different. In Finland, there are two national languages: Finnish and Swedish. In her language policy (2007) the University of Helsinki shows to be very aware of her historical background and national bilingualism in relation to the internationalisation of the university. Multilingualism is seen as a strength and a resource for all members of the academic community. In Flanders, there are still severe limitations to offering English-taught bachelor programmes. In France, a recent government policy to allow French universities to teach in English caused a lot of controversy. In Italy, the “Politecnico di Milano” announced the teaching of all graduate education in English as of 2014, sparking quite a debate and even a case at the National Court.

These various examples within Europe show the relevance of context and history. At the same time, with an increased use of English in European higher education there seems to be a common concern over the possible loss of linguistic and cultural diversity. English is often pointed out as a major threat to multilingualism. House (2003) rightly differentiates between language for communication, enabling communication in a specific context, and language for identification, loaded with culture and belonging to a certain group or culture. While English serves as a facilitator, setting a framework for an international classroom, it also opens doors to new languages and cultures inside as well as outside this classroom.

Discussion in academia

The recent discussion in academia also illustrates the relevance of context and history for language policies. The influence of the English language as a medium of communication in research has been dominant for a long time already (de Wit, 2012). Additionally, over the past twenty years there has been a tendency in higher education to teach in English as an alternative for teaching in one’s mother tongue. Although there are sufficient reasons why it can be important to teach in English, there are also unintended negative effects which need our attention. It is a common misconception that teaching in English is equivalent to internationalisation. This misconception can result in less attention for other foreign languages and not sufficient focus on the quality of English of staff and students for whom English is not their native language (de Wit, 2012). Consequently, such a perspective could lead to a decline of quality and diversity in higher education.

The discussion about the language of teaching is influenced by the economic, political as well as the socio-cultural context. De Wit (2012) illustrates this with examples from Asia and Europe. In Asia, the approach seems more economically motivated and pragmatic: “English is the current common

⁴ European Language Council

language of communication in both research and teaching. If we want to stay connected to the rest of the world, we had better make use of that reality”. In Europe we see different approaches and debates. The aforementioned examples of Italy, France and Flanders reflect a strong political involvement and strong emotions in society. The debate in Northwest Europe has moved from political to more economic and academic. Whereas, in the 1990s, the Dutch parliament still demanded that teaching in English in higher education would be limited to a small number of programmes, there is now a common understanding that English is required to compete internationally, and there is a growing focus on the quality of teaching in English.

This need for a more qualitative policy on teaching in English has also been recognised in Northern Europe. Among others, Bradford (de Wit, 2012) addresses some linguistic concerns combined with cultural and organisational challenges. Her linguistic concerns are related to the high number of staff and students involved, for whom English is not their mother tongue. The cultural challenges Bradford sees, concern the need of intercultural knowledge for developing internationalised curricula, more inclusive learning and teaching, and reciprocal cultural understanding. The organisational challenges she refers to are related to good and ongoing language support, not only for academic staff but extended to administrative and support staff. The cultural concerns addressed by Bradford are confirmed by Lauridsen and the European Language Council (2013): “It has become apparent that teaching difficulties are not simply a question of language but are rooted in profound cultural differences. Even in Britain, universities need to address the fact that they can’t just teach in English the way they teach native speakers”.

Innovative methods for support

From recent literature (for example Klaassen 2008, Airey 2011, Sandhu and Amara 2012, Lauridsen 2013) related to English Medium Instruction (EMI), it emerges that there are many new ideas and innovative methods for language training and support. Klaassen (2008) describes how training and support for staff should be integrated with the training and support of didactic and intercultural skills. The International Education Association of Australia provides a Good Practice Guide for teaching across cultures that integrates language development with intercultural awareness in good practice <http://www.ieaa.org.au/documents/item/128>. Our RUG Medical Faculty is currently introducing a reference model (Steinert 2010) to build a new approach to the professional language support of teachers in the G2020 programme, including needs analysis. The aforementioned authors describe the main adaptations for teaching in English (for example, in presentation and interaction), and give very practical recommendations (e.g. do not just translate your lecture, make a list of key terms, check pronunciation, practice and structure). Moreover, new technology (e.g. video) should provide the basis for individual reflection, feedback from teachers and peers, and be evidence for formative assessment.

Lines of support

Staff

The Steinert model used at our RUG Medical Faculty can help us to define a well-balanced line of support for teachers and other staff including several complementary approaches (individual and group; formal and informal), meaning that programmes can make the combination of choices most appropriate to the context(s) in which staff are working. The (central) mentorship role ensures that development is continuous and fits in with the individual’s past experience as well as their future needs and ambitions. While part of the OWI⁵ role will involve mentoring through workshops and in other less formal settings, peer coaching implies that OWI will often be ‘mentoring the mentors’ or facilitating mutual support between staff (see Airey 2011). One fundamental idea would be that for

⁵ OWI = Onderwijsinstituut (Institute for Medical Education in English).

every staff role, a line of support will be developed that at least includes all of the above elements i.e. formal, informal, group, and individual. A blend of face-to-face and online approaches can be used, as in Airey (2011), taking into account the need to find the most appropriate blend of content knowledge, pedagogy and technology (Koehler & Mishra 2009). It is essential that there is a clearly defined line of support for all teaching roles and other staff roles to ensure continuity and evaluation.

Students

For students, language support should be closely related to the curriculum. Innovative methods for support can possibly be reports students have written as well as video recordings of meetings and presentations, and self-reflection reports. In the EU MAGICC project, different scenarios of tasks related to learning outcomes for multilingual and multicultural competences for students are being created, and e-portfolio models for students are being developed (<http://www.unil.ch/magicc>).

Assessment

For the assessment of the language needs of teaching staff, we recommend the use of global scales such as those developed at the University of Copenhagen by Soren & Staehr (2013). The advantage of such scales is that they can be applied to the actual context in which staff are teaching, while also being benchmarked to more detailed CEFR⁶-related descriptors. This also allows us to set a minimum level of C1 for the proficiency of academic staff teaching in English, while still assessing their use of the language in context.

As much as possible, especially for the many staff falling within Category 3 (on the Copenhagen scales this is C1), this support should focus on work that staff have to do anyway (course or class preparation, presentation of teaching materials etc.) so that it adds a significant aspect to their actual work rather than presenting them with an additional “burden”. Clearly, academic staff falling within Category 2 (B2) or below on the Copenhagen scales will need extra language tuition beyond their work environment i.e. tailored language courses. For all other (non-teaching) staff, appropriate levels should be defined depending on the complexity of the English they need to use in their professional lives, which will differ significantly depending on the nature of the tasks they fulfil.

For students, their language proficiency should be assessed in relation to the specific programme entrance requirements and learning outcomes/graduate attributes. The “Can do” descriptors from the European Framework should be used for assessment in addition to international tests to further develop academic communication and study skills throughout the programme. For example: Can-Do for essay writing at C1 = can write clear, well-structured expositions of complex subjects, underlining the relevant salient issues. Can expand and support points of view at some length with subsidiary points, reasons and relevant examples (Council of Europe 2001: 62).

RUG language policy: aims and objectives

From literature, developments and examples described above, it is clear that RUG needs a language policy that takes into account its specific history and context, actual strategic plan and internationalisation policy. RUG has a long history of internationalisation, and has always been open to other languages and cultures. The RUG mission states that we “prepare students for a life and career in a globalised world. RUG strives to be a truly international university and a major global player”. Our values illustrate how we do this: “we highly value our cross-disciplinary character; our work contributes to international developments. We work in a context of academic excellence and integrity, and embrace diversity. Being an international university should be reflected in, for example, an inclusive⁷ environment with equal rights and access for all staff and students, an international perspective throughout research disciplines and degree programmes, and an international perspective

⁶ CEFR: Common European Framework of Reference for Languages.

⁷ Inclusive: understandable, accessible and relevant (Hockings, C. (2010)).

at the institutional level, reflected in all policies and regulations” (RUG Internationalisation Vision, 2014. This includes our language policy, as well as our policies on University Teaching Qualifications (UTQ/BKO and STQ/SKO), learning outcomes/graduate attributes⁸, international marketing and admissions, and the selection of our international partners.

The aim of our new RUG language policy should be to make ALL staff and students feel at home and confident, and comfortable in using another language, so that we can all be effective in what we do, as we strive for academic excellence. **We envision language proficiency as a competence both for effective participation and inclusion during study and work at RUG as well as for employability and international mobility in a life-long learning context.** We intend to be a bilingual university, fostering individual multilingualism and enhancing linguistic and cultural diversity and awareness. In our perspective, language proficiency is strongly related to intercultural competences and with teaching and research related skills.

If RUG wants to be a truly international university and prepare her students for a life and career in a globalised world, English is the “lingua franca” in education and research, a communication tool for transferring knowledge, competences and attitude, with maybe the exception of a few programmes and disciplines with a specific Dutch focus. Providing education and research in English is also a logical choice in order to attract an internationally diverse group of talented students and to conduct high-level research. At the same time, RUG has strong regional roots and a long history of engagement with society. Dutch is part of our culture and identity. Additionally, as described in our internationalisation vision, we aim to “use diversity of staff and students as a resource”. Consequently, RUG’s mission and vision will result in an inclusive dual-plus language policy, accommodating the use of Dutch and English, and fostering multilingualism on a more individual level.

Dual-plus language policy

A dual-plus language policy fostering multilingualism will have the following implications. Accommodating the use of Dutch implies that ALL international staff and students at RUG should learn about Dutch language, culture and society to a functional level for their study, work and social environment, and be facilitated in their learning process. Accommodating the use of English implies a good quality control system, in particular for all non-native speakers of English, and language support integrated with intercultural competences and pedagogical skills, closely related to the curricula and to specific needs. Fostering multilingualism applies to, for example, our students going abroad for study, or our staff working with colleagues from different language and cultural backgrounds. While, in such specific contexts, proficiency in a third or even fourth language can be very useful, multilingualism is overall highly valued by employers and highly relevant for international mobility and understanding. Additionally, the five other world languages (German, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Chinese) should be integrated in the curriculum of specific programmes. In the related policies, English language proficiency and intercultural competences should be an integral part of our University Teaching Qualifications (UTQ/BKO and STQ/SKO), as well as in programme learning outcomes/graduate attributes.

Management and administration

In management and administration, Dutch is the primary language at RUG, in accordance with Dutch society in general, while English is the secondary language. This implies that while RUG is managed and administered in Dutch (both internally and in relation to the Dutch authorities), the university also:

⁸ See Jones, E. and D. Killick (2013). Graduate Attributes and the Internationalized Curriculum.

- communicates both in Dutch and English in such a way as to ensure that staff and students are in a position to perform their functions in the organisation regardless of linguistic and cultural background
- ensures that students and staff who are not (yet/sufficiently) proficient in Dutch are able to communicate with relevant administrative staff in English
- ensures that communication regarding the rights and duties of staff and students are available both in Dutch and in English
- ensures that formal, written communication in letters/emails/documents is available both in Dutch and in English
- ensures that communication on the RUG website with relevance for non-Dutch speaking students, staff members and/or their internal or external audiences is available in English.

Recommendations

Overall

- To establish an INCLUSIVE, DUAL PLUS language policy in line with RUG mission and vision, interrelated with RUG policy on University Teaching Qualifications (UTQ/BKO and STQ/SKO), HR policy on staff recruitment, development and support, learning outcomes/graduate attributes, and international marketing/admissions, implying that:
ALL staff and students should master Dutch and English to a level required for their work, study and social environment, in an integrated approach with intercultural and didactic skills. The PLUS component adds that other languages than English and Dutch should be fostered and supported on a more individual level (for students and staff) and in specific programmes.
- To foster an inclusive multicultural learning environment; all staff should possess the intercultural competences required for their work environment during their first year of teaching whereas students will develop these during their BA.

For English

- For staff, to establish an overall quality control framework for assessing and monitoring (in terms of “CAN DO”⁹) the English of all staff (academic and administrative) and provide adequate feedback and a line of support
- For students, to define both the required level of English related to academic communication and study skills in the entry requirements and in learning outcomes/graduate attributes, at programme level, and provide an adequate line of support.

For Dutch (language and culture)

- To define and establish a functional level of Dutch for international staff and international students¹⁰ in their specific study, work and social environment and for future employability and mobility, and provide an adequate line of support.

For other languages

- To offer and support learning and development of other languages than English and Dutch on a more individual level and in specific programmes, resulting in provision for learning German, French, Spanish, Portuguese and Chinese including the options for on-line learning, fostering effective participation and inclusion during study and work at RUG and future employability and mobility in a life-long learning context.
- To offer all students the opportunity to take TOEFL/IELTS or other internationally recognised language tests at RUG.

For multiculturalism

- Tailor-made training/feedback will be offered to staff to support them in teaching in a multicultural classroom and environment. Multicultural competences¹¹ will be made an integral part of UTQ and STQ.

⁹ CAN DO statements refer to competences defined in Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR, 2001).

¹⁰ International being defined here as non-native Dutch speakers.

¹¹ Multicultural competences for staff and students will be defined and specified within the specific functional context.

- Students will work on multicultural communication skills while taking their respective courses, collecting evidence/samples of their intercultural skills and with the opportunity to gather them in an e-portfolio, and may also be offered a multilingual/ multicultural module to take as an elective, for extra credits.

For overall management

- To implement this language policy for formal communication (internal and external) in management and administration.

Advice for implementation

This policy document is intended to be used for debate, policy-making and discussion with all stakeholders and for our international profiling. In establishing this new language policy, inspired from our overall mission and vision, it will be crucial to involve ALL various stakeholders.

Several work packages have been defined to elaborate on the drafted policy. Working groups – with academic and non-academic staff and students, covering a wide range of expertise and experience – will be given the task to develop specific policies and activities within the defined work packages. The following work packages have been defined:

First phase (March/April):

- work package **student policies and support**

Chaired by O&S, include Language Centre, admissions, quality control/educational expertise, Student Service Centre, student. From Task Force: Frans Zwarts, Estelle Meima.

Issues to address: assessment of entry and exit English language proficiency levels and competences for students, use of internationally accepted tests, diploma recognition, integration of language and intercultural competences in learning outcomes/graduate attributes, development of a more integrated line of support for language and intercultural competences, language learning and support for Dutch, and for other languages on a more individual level and in specific programmes. Use of e-portfolio and e-learning.

- work package **HR policies for staff recruitment, development and support**

Chaired by HR, include Language Center, quality control/educational expertise, ESI, O&S, lecturers

From Task Force: Frans Zwarts, Kevin Haines, Franka van den Hende

Issues to address: requirements and overall framework for assessment and monitoring of English, feedback and lines of support for RUG staff (academic and administrative); reassessment of recruitment policies, promotion of language advancements, integration of language and intercultural competences in university teaching qualifications, language learning and support for Dutch, and for other languages on a more individual/programme level.

- work package **inclusiveness**. Chaired by ???, include Language Centre, lecturer in intercultural communication, ESI, O&S, HR, Communications, NEXT project? student.

From Task Force: Wijnand Alderink, Franka van den Hende.

Issues to address: effective inclusion of students and staff from diverse backgrounds at RUG and in Dutch society, Dutch language and culture courses, Intercultural Effectiveness Tool, buddy/mentor system, on-line courses, intercultural events, projects with companies.

- work package **legal affairs**. ABJZ. From Task Force: Kristel Modesti. Issues to address: guidelines, if and what RUG documents, national and European Code of Conducts, procedures or other information must be available in both Dutch and English, under binding Dutch administrative and other laws. In particular, make it possible to raise an objection or complaint to a decision in English (in those cases that are now, by law, dealt with in Dutch) and allow and facilitate the complaint commission to deal with the objection or complaint in English. To update the RUG Language Code of Conduct.

Second phase (May):

- work package **finance**. Chaired by FPB, include Director HR, O&S, Language Centre, ESI.

From Task Force: Frans Zwarts, Franka van den Hende.

Issues to address: RUG investments and students contributions (tuition fee, additional service package) for language learning and support.

- work package **marketing and communications**. Chaired by Communications, HR, O&S, Language Centre. From Task Force: Frans Zwarts, Franka van den Hende. Issues to address: create internal and external awareness through marketing and communication among staff and students about the “inclusive dual plus” language policy in general, the opportunities to learn English and Dutch, other languages, about Dutch culture and society, and the language conditions for students and staff. To be included in brochures, websites etc.

For reasons of time, efficiency and an integrated approach, the advice is to position all work packages under the Task Force Language Policy of the International Classroom project. All working groups report to the Task Force. The proposals from the working groups will be discussed and integrated into one overall proposal in the Task Force. With advice from the IC project group and IC expert group, the proposals will be presented for decision-making to the Executive Board before **July 2014**.

References

- Airey, J. (2011). Talking about teaching in English: Swedish university lecturers' experiences of changing teaching language. In: *Ibérica*, 22 (pp. 35–54).
- Broomans, P., Jensma, G.Th., Vandevoorde, H., & M. Van Ginderachter (2008). Introduction. In P. Broomans, G.Th. Jensma, H. Vandevoorde & M. Van Ginderachter (Eds.), *The beloved mother tongue. Ethnolinguistic nationalism in small nations: Inventories and Reflections* (Groningen Studies in Cultural Change, XXXIII) (pp. ix-xi).
- Caroll, J. & J. Ryan (2005). *Teaching international students. Improving learning for all*. Routledge.
- Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- European Commission (November 2012). *Rethinking education: investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes*. Strasbourg. COM (2012) 669.
- European Commission (July 2013). *European higher education in the world*. COM (2013) 499.
- Haines, K., E. Meima. & M. Faber (2013). *Formative Assessment and the Support of Lecturers in the International University*. In Tsagari, D., S. Papadima-Sophocleous, and S. Ioannou-Georgiou (eds.): *International Experiences in Language Testing and Assessment*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH.
- Harlin, E.M. (2013). Watching oneself teach – long-term effect of teachers' reflections on their video-recorded teaching. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 2013, 1–15.
- Hockings, C. (2010), *Inclusive learning and teaching in higher education: a synthesis of research*.
- House, J. (2003). English as a Lingua Franca, a Threat to Multilingualism? In: *Journal of Social Linguistics* 7 (4).
- Jones, E. and D. Killick (2013). Graduate Attributes and the Internationalized Curriculum: Embedding a Global Outlook in Disciplinary Learning Outcomes. In: *Journal of Studies in International Education* 17(2), (pp.165–182).
- Kelly, M. (2013). *Language competences for employability, mobility and growth*. In: *European Journal of Language Policy*. UK: Liverpool University Press in association with the European Language Council.
- Klaassen, R.G. (2008). Preparing lecturers for English-medium instruction. In R. Wilkinson, & V. Zegers (eds.), *Realizing Content and Language Integration in Higher Education* (pp. 33–42). Maastricht: Maastricht University.
- Koehler, Matthew J. and P. Mishra. (2009). What is the technological pedagogical content knowledge? *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 9(1), 60–70.
- Language Proficiency at Maastricht University (2013). *Policy note on the contribution of languages to functioning in an international environment*.
- Lauridsen, K.M. (2013). Higher Education Language Policy. Working Group under the European Language Council. In: *European Journal of Language Policy*, 5(1) (pp. 128–138).
- Leask, B. and J. Wallace (2011). *Good practice report learning and teaching across cultures*. AGOLT: Australian Learning and Teaching Council.
- Sandhu, S. and F.M. Amara (2012): Theories and Practical Steps for Delivering Effective Lectures. *Journal of Community Medicine and Health Education* 2: 158
- SOG Policy Paper (2014). *Assuring the mastery of English by academic staff at the University of Groningen*, January 2014.
- Soren, J.M.K. & L.S. Stæhr (2013). The development of the Test of Oral English Proficiency for academic Staff (TOEPAS)
http://cip.ku.dk/forskning/cip_publicationer/CIP_TOEPAS_Technical_Report.pdf/

Steinert, Y. (2010). Faculty development: From workshops to communities of practice. In: *Medical Teacher* 2010, 32 (pp. 425–428).

Wächter B. & F. Maiworm, *English-taught Programmes in European Higher Education*, ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education, Bonn: Lemmens, 2008.

Wit, H. de. (2012). *An introduction to higher education internationalisation*. Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI), Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan, Italy.

Wit, H. de and N. Ripmeester (2012). *Het behouden van buitenlandse studenten voor de Nederlandse arbeidsmarkt; een vergelijkende analyse van beleidsplannen en initiatieven in vier Europese landen: Duitsland, Denemarken, Zweden en Finland*.

Relevant links

Action plan OCW/SER Make it in the Netherlands:

<http://www.internationalstudy.nl/sites/default/files/Gedragscode>

Advice Dutch Education Council: <http://www.onderwijsraad.nl/publicaties/2011/weloverwogen-gebruik-van-engels-in-het-hoger-onderwijs/item4497>

Assessment framework NVAO for internationalisation:

http://www.nvao.net/page/downloads/Beoordelingskader_BKK_Internationalisation_14-11-2011.pdf

Code of conduct for international students in higher education:

<http://www.internationalstudy.nl/sites/default/files/Gedragscode>

EU Commission document: http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/rethinking/com669_en.pdf

EU Intl Uni project: <http://intluni.eu>

EU MAGICC project: <http://www.unil.ch/magicc>

Good practice principles for teaching across cultures: <http://www.ieaa.org.au/documents/item/128>