

VIRTUAL CONFERENCE SERIES

REFLECTIONS ON
POST-PANDEMIC
UNIVERSITY
INTERNATIONALISATION

Document prepared by the UCH-1866 Project for Strengthening the Internationalization of Research and Doctorates at the University of Chile 2018-2021.

Authors:

Hans de Wit;
Andree Henriquez;
Daniela Perrotta;
Natasha Pine;
Sonia Moran;
Alice Solomon;
Oscar Garrido.

Compilation:

Alvaro Etchegaray Bascur.

Contact:

Internationalization Project,
Vice-Rectorate for Innovation and Development,
University of Chile.
internationalizacion.vid@uchile.cl

Design and layout:

Alice San Martín.

Credits Cover

Alice San Martín.

ISBN: 978-956-410-305-1

2022

Vice President for Research and Development.

University of Chile.

Santiago, Chile.

OPENING REMARKS

When we designed this series of virtual conferences, Chile had been in confinement for almost a year as a result of the pandemic. Twelve months which had meant the loss of thousands of lives, and in which millions of people had felt the multiple psychological, economic, and social effects that persist to this day, in our country. We now see that this point in 2020 was only halfway to the road we had to travel, and it is still uncertain when we will be able to return to “normality”

But, why wonder about post-pandemic university internationalisation? Why do so at a time when national and international priorities revolved around other focuses, undoubtedly more relevant? Because the pandemic also exposed that internationalisation, the way we have understood it till now, should be critically revised in its assumptions, models, and practices that we usually take for granted.

The reflections in this paper seek to understand internationalisation in its complexity, in the context in which it takes place, and in the discursive and practical tensions it contains. We say that this is not the same as mobility, but then, what is it? and how can we understand its purpose and edges? These are the questions that emerge in this text.

For the University of Chile, as an entity of the State and at the service of the country, to constantly cultivate critical thinking about the society in which it operates and about itself, is an imperative, even more so when humanity is going through one of the most uncertain periods of its history.

Finally, to thank the panellists, as well as the Consortium of Chilean State Universities (CUECH, in Spanish), for their commitment and work. It is our conviction that cooperation is the basis for the future of education and science globally.

André Henríquez

Executive Director

Internationalisation Project UCH-1866

One of the main hallmarks we have as public universities is our commitment to regional and national development and the search for solutions to global problems.

In this sense, collaborative work among academics of State Universities and the various educational organisations around the world is essential, contributing to the advancement of internationalisation in our institutions.

Today more than ever, it is necessary that we continue to deepen the links that will enable us to face the challenges of today's world and build a vision for the future.

Alejandra Contreras Altmann

Executive Director

Consortium of Chilean State Universities

INTRODUCTION

The global pandemic caused by Covid-19 since the end of 2019, has affected all dimensions of life on a planetary level. What many had hoped would be a brief parenthesis - with the luckier ones working from home and others forced to continue their work in person - over the course of months, it generated unprecedented disruption, with millions of lives lost, the collapse of health care systems and with long periods of confinement for the majority of the population, which brought about a range of psychological, social, and economic effects that persist to this day.

Universities have had to deal with the health crisis by implementing various measures to continue developing education, research, innovation, and links with the environment, where virtuality became the rule, but which at the same time highlighted the profound inequalities that still persist in our countries and of which universities are vulnerable, too. Thus, what began as an accelerated incorporation of distance education, the reduction of international mobility and the re-articulation of scientific cooperation processes, continues until today, the beginning of 2022, affecting higher education systems, even in countries that have managed to return to an occasional face-to-face mode in classrooms and workplaces.

This journey has led the university community to reflect on how - before and during the pandemic - internationalisation is understood and developed, and what the long-term consequences of the resulting transformations will be.

In that line, by the end of November 2020 - one year after the beginning of the COVID-19 global dissemination - the Vice-Rector for Research and Development (VID) of the University of Chile and its Internationalisation Project UCH-1866, together with the Consortium of State Universities of Chile (CUECH) and the Directorate of Energy, Science and Technology and Innovation of the Chilean Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DECYTI), held a series of four virtual conferences under the title “Post-Pandemic University Internationalisation. Where are we heading?”. Local and foreign specialists, recognised by their contributions in the university internationalisation discussion, took part in these events.

This document includes the contributions of seven prominent speakers, who address key aspects of the university internationalisation in the current context. Following the International Conference programme,

four main themes are presented, divided in chapters, which the guest speakers reflect on. In the first, entitled “*Post-Pandemic University Internationalisation: new ways or old habits?*”, Professor Hans de Wit - distinguished Fellow at the Centre for International Higher Education, Boston College, USA - addresses new possibilities and approaches of the post-pandemic university internationalisation, focused on curriculum and virtual connections, in addition to physical mobility. In that argument, Andreé Henríquez - Director of the Internationalisation Project of the Vice-Rectorate for Research and Development of the University of Chile - agrees that internationalisation refers not only to student exchange, but stresses coordination among university missions.

The future of internationalisation, says Henríquez, must be analysed within a multiplicity of possible scenarios, which higher education institutions will have to consider and deploy strategically.

In the second chapter, “*Internationalisation beyond mobility*”, Daniela Perrotta - academic and former National Director of International Cooperation at the Ministry of Education, Argentina - deliberates on the meaning of mobility, stating that this is only one of the facets of internationalisation, which must be seen “in a transversal way throughout the university institution, in training, research, and even in extension, linkage and knowledge transfer activities”.

On the other hand, Rector of the University of Aysen, Natacha Pino, analyses in the same chapter the possibilities and strategies of internationalisation from a young institution with a strong territorial commitment.

Rector Pino considers that the challenge for institutions such as the University of Aysen consists in “being able to generate a structure that addresses all these challenges and opportunities, and to integrate it into our new management model of networks and cooperation”

In the third chapter, “*University Internationalisation,*

Interculturality and Multilanguage”, Professor Sonia Morán - sociolinguist at University of Southampton, United Kingdom - addresses the relevance of language in internationalisation, and reflects on the necessity and consequences of the “Englishisation” of tertiary education, promoting an openness towards “alternative, dynamic, and organic linguistic policies, deconstructing our conceptualisation of and approach towards English and to academic language more generally, in order to reduce and avoid sociolinguistic inequality among our students, which can contribute to material inequality”. On the same subject, Postgraduate Director at University of Chile, Alicia Salomone, provides an analysis of university internationalisation and the development of linguistic policies

in higher education institutions, stating its great advantages in networking and joint education with foreign universities; also, the great challenges for universities to provide linguistic tools, “implementing the principles of equity and inclusion, which are at the basis of the educational model.

Finally, in the fourth chapter, “*Territory and University Internationalisation, is glocal possible?*”, University of Los Lagos Rector, Oscar Garrido, reflects on the possibilities of a “glocal” internationalisation, claiming that the health crisis brought to light that university internationalisation is possible through online platforms, and in that context, regional universities play an important role in its implementation.

Thus, this document provides valuable insights and lessons learned from COVID-19 health crisis. A pandemic that, two years after its beginning, still prevents millions of people from returning to their face-to-face life until 2019. Nevertheless, once this emergency has been overcome, it is essential to maintain the tools and initiatives deployed, and to build on their lessons in the implementation of university internationalisation, both now and in the decades to come.

INDEX

CHAPTER I	
POST-PANDEMIC UNIVERSITY INTERNATIONALISATION: NEW WAYS OR OLD HABITS?	7
Hans de Wit, Distinguished Fellow at the Centre for International Higher Education, Boston College, USA.	8
André Henríquez, Director of Internationalisation Project, University of Chile.	14
CHAPTER II	
INTERNATIONALISATION BEYOND MOBILITY	22
Daniela Perrotta, Academic, former National Director of International Cooperation, Ministry of Education, Argentina.	23
Natacha Pino, Rector of University of Aysen.	27
CHAPTER III	
UNIVERSITY INTERNATIONALISATION, INTERCULTURALITY AND MULTILANGUAGE	31
Sonia Morán, Sociolinguist at University of Southampton, United Kingdom.	32
Alicia Salomone, Postgraduate Director, University of Chile.	43
CHAPTER IV	
TERRITORY AND UNIVERSITY INTERNATIONALISATION, IS GLOCAL POSSIBLE?	52
Oscar Garrido, Rector of Los Lagos University.	53

CHAPTER I

POST-PANDEMIC
UNIVERSITY
INTERNATIONALISATION:
NEW WAYS OR OLD
HABITS?

By HANS DE WIT,
distinguished Fellow at the Centre for
International Higher Education, Boston
College, USA.

One of the most impressive things we have learned from the pandemic is that our students, professors, and administrators need a concrete physical environment, a living community on university campuses, where they can exchange ideas in the classrooms, but also live together outside them. The loss of this opportunity is tremendously negative for the success of our work as universities, which are highly interactive academic and social communities in research, teaching, and service to society. That is why we need to answer the question “new ways or old habits?” Yes, we must return to certain old habits, our physical campuses, but at the same time we need to use in those places the new ways we have learned so quickly and radically over the last 6 to 8 months.

We are going to talk about post-pandemic university internationalisation. The most important thing in the current situation we are living, and in the future, is that internationalisation cannot be an end in itself, but must always be linked to the essential objectives of our universities, teaching, research, and service to society. This will always be important if we must think in the post-pandemic future: internationalisation cannot remain the same as it used to be before the arrival of COVID-19, it must change, but it must always be at the service of what we do as universities.

It is true that internationalisation as a strategic concept is still quite new, almost 40 years. In the context of globalisation of our societies and economies, universities not only had to re-act to this process, but they also had to take a very proactive position to be part of the global knowledge economy. Only in the last four decades, we have made a fundamental change in the agendas of universities to include, as part of their strategy, the international dimension of teaching, research, and service to society.

In the last four decades, the international dimensions have also changed and reacted to a different context, because we always have to decide as institutions but also as governments and regional and international entities, what are we going to internationalise for? And based on that, what and in what way are we going to do it? but also taking into account what will be the impact of what we are generating with the internationalisation. It is a permanent and intentional process in response to the local, national, regional, and global context, because the scenario is constantly changing, and that is why, in the current and post-pandemic context, we need to ask ourselves what we are going to do differently from what we

had implemented before, and what will be the impact of internationalisation in the quality of our work as higher education institutions.

We must have a policy of concrete intentions to answer the questions. Reality shows that many universities still have a very fragmented and marginal internationalisation policy: it is not integrated into the whole of the institution's policy. There are very few policies that are central and broad (Hudzic, 2011). The process to generate an internationalisation integrated policy, even before the pandemic was very slow, and we must see if that will continue the same, or if we will be able to use the pandemic as an opportunity to develop a much faster process, in order to create a much more comprehensive political reality.

But it is true that the context is particularly important because there is no single model for internationalisation, the context in public and private universities in Chile is very different from the one in the USA. My own university, Boston College, is a Catholic Jesuit university, and just five kilometres from Northeastern University and four from MIT, but the internationalisation of these three universities is quite different, because their contexts are quite different, too, and that must always be taken into consideration: there is no single model. Not only the national aspect and type of institution, but also the geographical aspect is important. Internationalisation as a western or neo-colonial paradigm is moving towards a global concept. (Juliet et al, 2021, de Wit, 2020 a and b).

We also must understand how internationalisation is positioned in the context of international higher education, and two pre-pandemic trends were particularly important. First, the massification of higher education: there is even more demand in many countries of the world. Secondly, in conflict with this massification, is the importance of research and teaching for the global knowledge economy (Altbach et al, 2010).

On the one hand, there is a need for excellent, world-class universities, and on the other

hand there is a need to respond to the massive demand for higher education. This has had a major impact on internationalisation, because massification has meant that when there is no offer in their own countries, students go abroad to look for it. And with the knowledge economy, there is a competition for talents: competition for professors, students and funding, access to rankings and so on. But the current situation includes a third and very important dimension, the need for changes in the political, economic, social, and cultural environment in the world, and it is not only the pandemic that is driving these changes.

COVID-19 is something that, by the way, we now feel very strongly, all over the world, but at the same time, there are other trends that play a relevant role, and that combined with the pandemic, have a very strong impact on internationalisation. On one hand, the nationalist, populist, anti-global, anti-international trend we have seen in the USA. And there are many other countries in the same situation, such as Brazil, Hungary, or Poland

Another especially important factor has to do with the geopolitical tensions that exist in the world today. For instance, the tension between China and Australia, between China and the USA is very clear. Russia's policy and other global geopolitical crises also impact on the internationalisation of higher education. Because these tensions make it very difficult to see for international collaboration in research, which is necessary to solve the problems we are facing as well as for students and professors' exchange programmes, to have a common vision - a global citizen - to deal with sustainability and development issues.

Also, economic problems, resulting from the pandemic crisis, have a huge impact, since that makes it harder for universities to internationalise.

It causes more inequity in exchange possibilities, lets fewer people enter universities, increasing social inequality. However, there is also a great risk that many universities cannot easily survive

and internationalise in relation to more elitist, world-class, very high-level universities, such as Oxford, Harvard or Cambridge, and the new ones in Asia, which will survive this crisis (Marinoni and de Wit, 2020).

Nor can we forget that there are other especially important junctures, particularly the climate and all the problems that it implies for the mobility of students and professors in the internationalisation, for example (de Wit and Altbach, 2020).

There are two main and closely related components to internationalisation: internationalisation at home and internationalisation abroad. The second one has been most dominant pre-pandemic. The mobility of students for a full degree outside their countries; the mobility of students as part of the exchange for their own credits, for a semester or a year. The mobility of students who want to obtain certificates for language learning, the mobility of professors, administrators, and programmes.

That was the trend in pre-pandemic internationalisation, which in front of COVID-19 has come to a complete standstill. There is almost no student mobility for full degree programmes, exchange programmes have stopped and so have the short-term courses. Professors cannot travel, etc. So, internationalisation abroad has come to a stop, and we have to determine what will happen when we emerge from the pandemic. Will we return to a focus on mobility as a policy for internationalisation? Or will we emphasise internationalisation at home? It is also true that internationalisation abroad has always been quite elitist. And it is also a fact that the possibility of having an experience abroad is always important. As a student, I had the chance to study in Latin America for a year, and I took the opportunity. But the fact is that about 20% of students in Europe are mobile (because Erasmus programmes facilitate mobility within Europe), and approximately 10% in USA. But in the rest of the world, Latin America included, only one or two per cent of the student population, and a small percentage of professors, have the chance to go abroad.

This creates an opportunity to change the approach towards internationalisation at a local level. Generating a basis for internationalisation focused on teaching and learning, the definition of international and intercultural competences, creating a much more internationalised campus environment, these were necessary even before the pandemic, but not enough has been done. Now there is an opportunity to focus on this, and particularly, to use virtuality as a chance to develop students and professors' exchange programmes with other universities in the world, something called Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL), and that already existed before the pandemic. COIL is now much more feasible, because all professors and students have learned to use virtual platforms to stay connected with their professors, colleagues, or students, which can be projected outwards, towards a much more international environment. This opens a new possibility to internationalisation, focusing it a lot more at home, on the curriculum and on using physical mobility as an opportunity for students and professors who can, and want to, do something extra.

Thus, once again we must think about the reason why we are going to develop internationalisation, based on an internal-external context. We must think “are we going to keep doing it as before, only for a tiny percentage of students and professors, or are we going to promote an internationalisation including all professors and students using an integral internationalisation policy at home?”

And that implies what we are going to do: a more COIL-oriented policy, to an internationalised curriculum, in addition to defining international and intercultural competences.

And how are we doing this? Leaving the international relations offices. I am not against the importance of these offices, I myself ran one for several years. These offices particularly facilitate mobility and agreements, but they cannot be leaderships only for internationalisation at home. They must work together on this with all the other academic offices, human resources, financial resources, research, colleges, and faculties, among others, to implement a new internationalisation policy for everyone. This way, internationalisation can have a much higher impact on improving higher education quality.

I believe in the importance of a comprehensive policy for university internationalisation, able to make an impact on all dimensions of the study houses. That involves an internationalisation policy at a local level, as defined by my colleagues Beelen and Jones: “internationalisation at home implies the intentional integration of international and intercultural dimensions in both, the formal and informal curriculum for all students in the local educational context” (Beelen and Jones, 2015).

This is a change of approach to the internationalisation policy, which differs from the thought that conceives the internationalising action only through mobility. But we can also do it through the curriculum. As the Australian Betty Leask states, “curriculum internationalisation is the process of incorporating international, intercultural and

global dimensions in the curriculum content, as well as in learning outcomes, evaluation tasks, teaching methodologies and support services in a study programme” (Leask, 2015).

Another relevant aspect is that we must pay a lot more attention than before to the importance of another university mission: internationalisation for society, since it is true that we cannot only work in the internationalisation of research and teaching, but we must also think about how to be prepared to solve society’s problems at both local and international level, which includes considering the UN Sustainable Development Goals (Brandenburg et al, 2020).

In this way, we can think post-pandemic about a transition policy that prepares everyone with a global learning. Because all students, whether they are working in Santiago, somewhere else in Chile or in Latin America, will be professionals and also citizens with a global dimension. Curriculum internationalisation, under an integral policy, creates more opportunities for us to better prepare our graduates.

That also has consequences for how we define internationalisation. Already in 2015, I worked as a project leader to determine how we could modify internationalisation, so that it became more inclusive and less elitist. Mobility always plays an important role, but it is not isolated from the curriculum internationalisation. It must be stressed that internationalisation is not a goal in itself, but a way to improve quality, and should not focus only on an economic logic.

The above implies that internationalisation is defined as “an intentional process of integrating an international, intercultural, and global dimension in its purpose, functions, and delivery of post-secondary education, to improve teaching and research quality for all students and staff, and to provide a meaningful contribution to society” (de Wit et al, 2015).

That 2015 definition in my view, is even more important than before the pandemic, and should guide internationalisation. This means that post-pandemic we must return to a policy of more cooperation and less competition. We

must learn from the pandemic lessons. Moving towards global learning for all, using virtual platforms to make the exchange, towards a more beneficial internationalisation for the society. Again, it does not mean that I think mobility is not important, but there should be less of it, and we can do it differently (de Wit and Altbach, 2021).

To conclude, my colleague Knight and I (Knight and de Wit, 2018), have pointed out that, looking ahead to the next 20 years, it is important to ask ourselves what we have contributed through internationalisation during this period to make this world a better place, helping our planet to survive, and that a large part of the world population affected by poverty improves its welfare.

While together with my colleague Leask (de Wit and Leask, 2019) we have stated something similar. We need to “align the practice of internationalisation with human values, and the global common welfare requires that we first question some of our deep-rooted views about what it is ‘to be international’ as a university, as a professor, as a student, as a human being. This implies pushing the limits of our thinking and that of others, focusing on people and making sure that they develop and demonstrate the human values for which the institution stands”

References

- Altbach, P., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. (2010). Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution. Sense Publishers.
- Beelen, J., & Jones, E. (2015). Redefining internationalization at home. In A. Curai, L. Matei, R. Pricopie, J. Salmi, & P. Scott (Eds.), *The European higher education area: Between critical reflections and future policies* (pp. 67–80). Springer.
- Brandenburg, U., de Wit, H., Jones, E., Leask, B., & Drobner, A. (2020). Internationalization in Higher Education for Society (IHES), concept, current research, and examples of good practice (DAAD Studies). DAAD.
- De Wit, H., & Altbach, P. (2020, January 11). Time to cut international education's carbon footprint. *University World News*. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20200108084344396>
- De Wit, H. and Philip Altbach. (2021). Internationalization in Tertiary Education: Global trends and recommendations post Covid-19. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*. Volume 5, Issue 1, 2021, pp. 28-46.
- De Wit, H. (2020). Internationalization in Higher Education: a Western Paradigm or a global, intentional and inclusive concept. *International Journal of African Higher Education*.
- De Wit, H. (2020). The future of internationalization of higher education in challenging global contexts. *ETD - Educação Temática Digital*, UNICAMP, Brazil. Volume 22, no. 3.
- De Wit, H. and Betty Leask. (2019). *Towards new ways of becoming and being international*. *University World News*, 27 July, 2019, issue 562.
- De Wit, H., Hunter, F., Howard, L., & Egron Polak, E. (Eds.). (2015). *Internationalisation*
- Hudzik, J. (2011). Comprehensive internationalization: From concept to action. NAFSA.
- Knight, J. & de Wit, H. (2018). Internationalization of higher education: Where have we come from and where are we going? In Proctor, D. & Rumbley, L.E. (Eds.). *The future agenda for internationalization in higher education: Next generation perspectives into research, policy, and practice*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the curriculum*. Routledge.
- Marinoni, G., & de Wit, H. (2019, January 11). Is internationalization creating inequality in higher education. *University World News*. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190109100925536>.
- Thondhlana Juliet, Garwe Evelyn C., Hans de Wit, Jocelyne Gacel-Avila, Futao Huang and Wondwosen Tamarat (Eds.). (2021). *The Bloomsbury Handbook of the internationalization of higher education in the Global South*. Bloomsbury, London/New York.

By **ANDREÉ HENRÍQUEZ**,
**Director of the Internationalisation Project
at the Vice-Rectorcy for Innovation and
Development of the University of Chile.**

Answering the question that gives this seminar its name, is not just an exercise to be dealt with from theory, it requires a deep reflection from practice. Whether we are facing new or old habits in university internationalisation, requires an understanding of the legacy that institutions have of their past, the actions they are trying to take to transform themselves and the systemic relationship they build with their environment. For this reason, in this presentation we will try to respond on the basis of what the University of Chile has promoted through its internationalisation project, which is part of an institutional history; we will consider the context in which it takes place, and how the pandemic makes evident a series of inequalities, highlighting the risk of elitisation and the need for democratisation of university internationalisation. Finally, it will address the need to understand that we are not before a post-pandemic future, but before several possible versions of this, what forces us to think strategically how to create new ways to overcome old habits

University of Chile's Internationalisation of Research and Doctoral Studies Project began its implementation in 2015, thanks to the Ministry of Education (MINEDUC) funding. Until 2019, our implementation strategy and plans had been successful in terms of quantitative achievements, as well as those qualitative elements aiming at a change in the institution's organisational culture, to focus on internationalisation as a transversal axis of its development.

The design considered updated academic literature, the previous experience of an institution of more than 170 years, which has been a privileged player in Chile's development, as well as the challenges posed by a world in profound transformation. Four axes were the pillars for the entire project design. First, it was necessary to balance the sense of excellence, dominant concept in the academic culture, with the sense of relevance, that derives from our public role as a state entity. The conviction was that both the university's contribution to be a key player, not exclusive though, in the generation of knowledge to promote sustainable development, and the processes that ensure its quality at the international level were important, but not mutually exclusive.

Even though excellence has had a greater predominance in the international scientific development, global challenges like climate change, migration,

technological transformations, gender equality, among others, called for the construction of a different way of looking at things, one that would balance both concepts from story to actions. Excellence is a *sine qua non* condition per se, since excellence without pertinence risks uncoupling academic projects from the challenges facing society, losing its social legitimacy.

Secondly, and in line with literature, it was understood that university internationalisation was not the exclusive function of one unit within the organisational structure, but a transversal process that should permeate the entire institution. This, no doubt, was a challenge when we used to think of an institution that in its historical institutionalisation process has reinforced a functional model with a high degree of differentiation that creates silos, not only of knowledge, but also of management. Therefore, the internationalisation process should be able to generate institutional spaces for joint work, in order to ensure that all university functions collaborate to promote the internationalisation of research and doctoral programmes.

On the other hand, the third axis recognised that science is also living transformational processes leading towards convergence beyond disciplinary boundaries, to deal with complex, dynamic, and highly uncertain problems on a planetary scale, where interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approaches will be essential. However, it is evident that before the question of whether we are prepared to address these new approaches, it will take a while to be responded.

The above challenged the project to achieve an internationalisation that will overcome the boundaries of faculties, programmes, and disciplines, creating the conditions for cooperation around problems rather than activities, which also had to be agreed with our partner institutions, because even if it is obvious, internationalisation requires at least two participants.

Finally, the project attempted to go beyond the

mere adoption of internationalisation actions moving along the institutional boundaries, without modifying the culture, structure, or processes. It opted for one that was integrated into the institution and ultimately transformed it, so that internationalisation was part of the mission and strategies down to the processes and anchored in the culture.

For this purpose, it was necessary to recognise that not all academic units have the same levels of development in their international cooperation, and that the project should not ignore this situation. Due to this, we had to quickly abandon the notion that the university is a monolithic entity, and perhaps evoke the image of a train, which is integrated by multiple wagons with different characteristics and levels of development, but which is as a whole, heading towards a shared goal.

But this design and the results achieved were deeply strained by the national and international reality. Before the pandemic strike, Chile faced the shock of October 2019 social outbreak, which gave way to a new political process in which the university communities turned to be part of a historical phase. This is a phenomenon that has been repeated in other countries, which at the time implied the cancellation of or rescheduling international forums, seminars, and a series of activities with international partners. But what we thought at the time would be a transitory situation, crashed with the reality of a pandemic, which was already visualised in Europe, but had not reached Latin America, yet.

Faced with no mobility or face-to-face presence as a result of COVID-19, the project team of professionals and academics had to generate proposals for the continuation of the agenda without much experience and, why not say so, lacking in new ideas. Added to this, the automatic response to any call or email sent was “Travel is no longer possible, let’s talk about it later”. That was a good reflection of not knowing how to act, not only in Chile, but also in the most developed countries in international affairs and that are global referents. We had to face a

unique situation which forced us to sit and, eventually, reflect on what would follow next.

Besides, in this context, the cracks over which university internationalisation was developing, were exposed, many of which are linked to the Latin American reality. A recent report published by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC / CEPAL in Spanish), entitled “Building a new future”, pointed out that Latin America was confronted with three structural crises aggravated by the pandemic: the climate issue, the economic issue, and the inequality issue in our region. And these are elements we cannot avoid when talking about internationalisation, or even university.

Latin America’s gross domestic product has been falling for several years. This will mean that our region will have approximately 220 million people living in poverty. According to ECLAC, which means that we have gone back a decade in terms of economic development. And emerging difficulties are not only associated to equity, financing, and education quality, but also to aspects such as national sovereignty, cultural diversity, poverty, and sustainable development.

Similarly, because of climate change, the infectious diseases that Latin America is facing are somehow correlated with production patterns and the use of resources in the region. For example, with changes in land use in intensive agro-industrial activities, or with human susceptibility to diseases from other latitudes associated to war and instability phenomena

Our region is also in debt in terms of the resources available and what it is using to consume or export. We cannot ignore the fact that the region has a dependence on exports. Another obstacle that has a major impact on internationalisation in our region, and which prevents us from taking advantage of the potential of technological tools and platforms, is the existence of a considerable digital access gap, which is expected to increase as economies shrink, as well as state budgets in the coming years.

ECLAC (CEPAL), through its study, shows us that when reflecting on the post-pandemic context in Latin America, we cannot leave aside structural elements, which add further uncertainty, and most of all, they show us the fragility of our development models, which are also those of our university systems. Likewise, we must understand that when talking about internationalisation, we cannot think only about academic or student mobility, which often happens. That probably responds to the way public policies have influenced, we refer to government and administrators’ efforts to move forward on teaching curricula convergence issues, on instances of participation in accreditation of foreign agencies, which place a greater emphasis on the indicator than on the qualitative change.

There is another approach to internationalisation, which has a growing acceptance in the international academic community, and goes beyond student exchange programmes, stressing the importance of coordination among all university missions, or as we have called it at the University

of Chile: “our academic project”. According to Knight, Altbach & de Wit, Larse, Robson & Wihlborg (2015), “the extension of these dynamics in different regions of the world shows that the integration of an international dimension in the activities of universities - beyond the exchange of students and academics - is a global trend”.

But where did we come from? Between 2012 and 2017 the number of higher education students increased from 198 million to 220 million, globally. That demonstrates the dynamism and the way new layers, perhaps also social, are entering the higher education processes. In Latin America and the Caribbean, there was an increase from 23.7 million to 27.4 million in the same period. And even though our region always recorded slower progress before the pandemic strike mobility was expected to continue growing and its projections were not going to change.

In addition, from the 220 million international students globally, only 2.3% are Latin-American. That is to say, when we talk about university internationalisation from the Latin American viewpoint, we have an important gap in relation to the number of people who can live international mobility. We can agree with the fact that internationalisation, in its more traditional format, is expensive and becomes elitist, but not only because it is costly, but also because of other reasons, ranging from the knowledge of a second language to the social and psychological conditions which enable a young person to cope with a completely unfamiliar place.

On the other hand, although there is a significant mobility at inter-regional level, when in Latin America we talk about people’s decisions to travel abroad to study, they keep having as their first options the USA or Europe, what tells about how unappealing the region is for a relevant part of the students themselves, especially postgraduate students. However, a revealing fact is that in Argentina, 84% of foreign students in its territory are from the region. In Chile that figure is 87% but drops in other countries of the area. Although most of the foreign students

in Latin America come from the same region, data indicates that Latin America sends more students to Europe and the USA.

One might think, are we people’s second choice? Is it always going to North America and Europe be the first option? And if so, why does it happen?

To answer these questions, one must be aware that one of the great challenges of the system is overcoming inconsistencies. According to ECLAC, these can be institutional, because we can be talking about and empowering internationalisation, but actually become secondary within our strategies, which is reflected not only in budgets or decision-making, but also in the field of public policies. The ups and downs mean that funding lines may disappear. This is exactly what is going on in Chile because they are not a priority and cannot compete with employment policies. From the public opinion viewpoint, university internationalisation can be understood as a luxury when compared to a policy to stimulate employment.

So far, an attempt has been made to describe some elements of context, both general and specific to internationalisation, which allow to project post-pandemic scenarios. It must also be considered that, from the point of view of scenario building, neither time nor actions should be viewed in a linear way. Past, present and future are conceptualisations that help us simplify reality. There are various possible futures, not just one, and analysing which are possible is relevant when reflecting on university and internationalisation.

Even several of these potential future scenarios are scalable, whether with national, regional, or global dimensions. Therefore, there is no single post-pandemic future, which might be implicit in our mind when thinking about the future.

One must be aware that the mental short-cut of thinking of the future as a straight line, only allows us a reduction of complexity at the intellectual level, but in practice they only exist in our minds, because reality is dynamic, complex, and uncertain. That is why it is necessary to

ask oneself, what elements help us to build future scenarios related to university internationalisation in order to make better decisions?

On these issues we can carry out a simple exercise, with a 2 x 2 scenario, in which we assign higher or lower levels of institutional priority (horizontal axis) and of public policy priority levels (vertical axis) regarding internationalisation. An ideal scenario would be when internationalisation enjoys a high institutional priority at the university, and at the same time it coincides with a period of public policy support, which obviously means that internationalisation will continue to strengthen. Of course, this cannot be separated from the many other factors which have become important in this discussion, touching on fundamental issues, such as the elitisation of the internationalisation process, but for the sake of the example, we can observe how these variables generate future scenarios. On the contrary, the worst situation for the next few years would be a relegation in terms of priority, both institutional and of public policy, showing a regression in internationalisation in the system.

We can also consider two intermediate scenarios. One of them, the most interesting, projects that institutions will continue to move forward on their own, despite being neglected by the public policy.

So, what do we seek to exemplify with this exercise? That there is no single post-pandemic future possible, but several scenarios and we have to set ourselves in them in order to design a strategy of university internationalisation.

From this, how can we respond to the second question in this event? “Looking inwards, new ways or old habits?”

The first thing we have managed to learn is that university contributes to tackle challenges, and in this case, internationalisation is a means, but as such, it is not something with a single purpose, it depends on where you stand to understand its aim. There might be, for example, a goal related to the contribution to global issues, and in that context discussions on climate change, overcoming poverty, or the 17 sustainable development goals, fit perfectly.

But there are also disciplines and human collectives behind these processes, having their own interests, and that perhaps differ from other fields, like engineering or medicine. On the other hand, they can be interinstitutional, as in the case of Consortium of Chilean State Universities (CUECH), which co-organised the event that brings us together today. When thinking about an internationalisation of state universities, there is an aim in the way of addressing it, as there is an institutional aim, such is the case of University of Chile or University of Santiago. There is a country’s purpose that is at the centre, the one that is pursued through a government and its public policies. And finally, there is the academic or student’s individual purpose, who will live internationalisation in a certain way, and that will contribute particularly to his/her life, profession, or career. This context has been essential, reflecting on this at the moment of orienting the project actions,

because it is linked to a strategic discussion, wondering how to deal with these purposes, from an academic coherence of a university project?

In addition to this discussion, which can be called geometrical in scope, as for the position in which the observer can approach internationalisation, there are two situations that are at the core of the discussion. First, to talk about internationalisation we need to address the asymmetries registered in our institutions and countries, especially in Latin America and the Caribbean. For instance, regarding material conditions, access to the internet may be possible, but students do not necessarily have a computer at home for exclusive use or must be shared with other family members. Or the broadband quality does not allow them to connect optimally. The place where they live may also be highly overcrowded, because they live with a lot of family members. The pandemic exposed this and other types of existing asymmetries, but the university and its physical attendance provided them with a minimally appropriate space to study. This does not necessarily happen at their homes and the confinement aggravated the precariousness of those conditions.

In turn, there are educational variables that help or hinder internationalisation. Not everyone has had the opportunities of living the same formative processes in Latin America, nor have they been able to access to a second language learning, for instance, good-quality English at early stages. This does not mean that internationalisation has to be responsible of all these asymmetry problems. It means that an internationalisation strategy must consider the existence of such realities and somehow be able to address them. Same thing happens with psycho-emotional conditions. Internationalising is not only taking a plane to a different place, but also a matter of attitude, trusting that such a process “will work for me” and run the risk.

But we also face disciplinary asymmetries. Internationalisation in engineering faculties is

higher in quantity versus humanities faculties, being evident in the data, so we need to think which are the factors that determine those differences in our region.

There are asymmetries in territories, talking about state or regional universities. You think from the capital city when you live in the capital city, but when moving to extreme areas, the concept of internationalisation also changes, and it is closely related to the local and regional development

And, of course, there are gender-related asymmetries in terms of university internationalisation.

The second element is the one that allows us the reverse movement of asymmetry, that is the democratisation of internationalisation.

Obviously, the first of the aspect's democratisation must address is preventing elitisation, where the academic, students and management groups themselves enjoy their benefits, not because of a plot against the rest, but as the almost natural corollary of the conditions that drive it. This requires the understanding of the internationalisation process and its purposes, what seems to be self-evident, but an institution that does not understand the context in which it develops its internationalisation, can not only fail to seize opportunities, but in the long run it may fragment an institution because of its asymmetries.

Similarly, we must also avoid the ritualism that we are beginning to reproduce, almost in a neo-institutionalist way, where it is more important to have mobility, sign the agreement or hold the competitions, losing the original purpose that moves us towards internationalisation. Now and then it is necessary to take a pause, re-think processes and progressively move away from the indicator as an end in itself. This is widely recognised, but when the time comes to formulate a project, the first thing that comes to mind is the indicator to be used, and those who evaluate also fall into the same spiral, postponing the content and the purpose of the

project. If asked to sum it up in one idea, internationalisation requires strategic thinking, not only specialists.

It should be noticed that the democratisation process of internationalisation cannot be confused with welfarism, which is something different and could imply a setback.

Finally, it is worth mentioning in the field of new ways, the importance offered by digitalisation, although it does not solve all issues. Nowadays, it can help and open new paths to internationalise. But we cannot lose sight of the existing inequalities, the need for democratisation, and deal with the usual practices. Even in scientific processes, activities like this must reduce the extension of deadlines. Teaching through virtual means cannot follow the same patterns used in its face-to-face application, and that requires modifications. There are still common practices that are transferred from the on-site scenario to the virtual one in a literal way, without any reflection. Also, changing our mental models regarding what we understand by internationalisation, to the way it has been stated in this document. A simple resolution of internationalisation, thinking of indicators or mobility, requires a significant change of mentality and strategic sense. It must be connected with the whole institution, and therefore, use an integral approach.

Internationalisation involves all university functions: research, innovation, artistic creation, teaching, and extension. None of them can be left out of the process. For the same reason, beyond the mobility, it is necessary to understand that internationalisation is also political, both in its definition (like when we mentioned South-South cooperation), and when inside an institution, internationalisation strategies are discussed, which are not only technical. This is a political-institutional decision, and therefore must be designed formally. It requires management, of course, but also a systemic vision.

In conclusion, in this presentation we are trying to respond whether we are facing new or old habits in university internationalisation, when thinking post-pandemic. First, as it was discussed, institutions are not independent of their history, every project or initiative is constructed and deconstructed on what the university is at a given time, therefore, old habits are also a response to that culture, structures, and deeply rooted processes. What the pandemic does is to strain what we have taken to be “truth” in internationalisation. Second, inequalities have become more strongly evident in this phase, and warn us about the danger of elitisation in our processes, where we can observe that inequality is not only an issue to the level of the students’ access, but it is reproduced among the disciplines, units, and gender, being probably a reflection of a society with deep asymmetries. Third, more democratisation of internationalisation is required, being the need to abandon ritualism one of the most relevant steps in the process. This is due to its weight in the reproduction of mental models and practices which maintain the status quo, without the capacity to think critically, not only about the results,



but also about the underlying principles we use when talking about internationalisation. Fourth and finally, the pandemic confronts us with the need to think about the future, but what kind of future? Here, the oversimplification of thinking of the future as a straight line is as dangerous

as thinking about no tomorrow at all. What we know is that there are various post-pandemic situation versions, institutions will have to think strategically about which ones are most likely and be organisationally resilient to develop internationalisation.



CHAPTER II

INTERNATIONALISATION
BEYOND MOBILITY

**By DANIELA PERROTTA,
Academic and former National Director
of International Cooperation, Ministry of
Education, Argentina.**

The central topic in this event, “thinking of internationalisation beyond mobility”, is for me a reflection on two issues.

The first one is, indeed, what is beyond mobility? Knowing that mobility has always been the “cherry on the cake” when thinking about internationalisation strategies for our institutions, as well as public policies for university internationalisation.

Mobility is the most visible face of what internationalisation means, as it is a face-to-face matter, and also to what institutions aspire to achieve in greater and better quantities.

Then, what is beyond mobility? And at the same time, what do we know about mobility? There is a double meaning in the invitation to this conference, which has to do with the lessons from the pandemic to think about the futures of internationalisation in higher education, but which also summons our university institutions to show pending challenges, which were latent and to which we had not come up with answers, yet.

Something which is not always put on the table in a categoric way, is that there are no more or less preferable forms of internationalisation. There is not a first or second-class internationalisation, no different hierarchies, thinking at the time of generating an internationalisation proposal. What we have are different internationalisation tools, mobility being one of them, and there are others with different purposes.

Mobility is an internationalisation tool, which generates a set of benefits associated 100% to physical presence, with being, sharing, being part of, connecting with a specific socio-cultural context, learning other languages and cultures in their place of origin. Mobility helps us to achieve that longed-for and sometimes unmeasurable goal of recognising others in building bridges of understanding. The construction of intercultural dialogues and solidarity is a big issue to think about today in a context of risk, insecurity, and of regression to certain nationalist health or xenophobic positions.

Part of this is obtained with mobility, but there are other issues dealing with intercultural competences, with the possibility of thinking of local topics on a regional and global level. Other tools also have it, not only mobility, but I think the pandemic allows us to put the different ways in which the university internationalisation is deployed on an equal footing,

without hierarchies among them, knowing they respond to different challenges or goals we want to reach whether institutional, regional, or others.

So, what is beyond mobility? And what do we know about it? The truth is that these long months have left us with many challenges and lessons to be able to improve the internationalisation practices and policies.

What do we know about mobility and what did we learn from this global emergency? What became apparent is that we do not know the universe of mobility as a whole. Here I reflect on Argentina's experience, in dialogue with other countries since you can also contribute with your own experience in managing these mobilities. What happened? A lethal disease emerged, the World Health Organisation declared the global pandemic for COVID-19 disease, in mid-March, and consequently, every country started taking measures. Successively, some did it simultaneously, but others in stages, depending on how the virus (which does not recognise borders) was circulating, situations of confinement, in some cases social distance, were taking place, but there we have graduations of the measures led by countries. There was a point when institutions were closed, physical attendance closed, which meant moving on to guaranteeing teaching and learning by other means, and we started the whole discussion about distance education, national responses, among others.

Indeed, institutions and borders were closed. All university community members, who are temporarily taking part of a government management, (but above all as an academic), felt very expectant and anxious to contribute to this process.

We were before a scenario where we did not know for certain who, how, when, and where were being mobilised, and if we go to statistics available about international mobility, we have the tip of the iceberg.

According to UNESCO Institute of Statistics

data, in relation to the mobility of incoming and outgoing international students, we know that Chinese students go, obviously, to USA, Canada, and Australia, and then, to a lesser degree, to other countries.

We know half of all the international students are from English-speaking countries, such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, The United Kingdom, and the USA, because there is a common language, the one of the international scientists.

We also know that, for example, the proportion of international students in France and Germany increased 6% and 8% respectively, because they started offering postgraduate programmes in English. The background information also indicates that China, India, and South Korea, represented 25% of all the outgoing mobility in 2016, while Southeast Asia plus China, experienced a growth boom in higher education.

There are lots of students leaving for other destinations, while Europe is the second largest origin zone. We are also aware of the way the mobility scheme works inside the Latin American region, in which Argentina is quite a big receiving country

Nevertheless, we have the image of the tip of the iceberg given by the annual reports, and we are measuring who are moving away to study for full careers, what is called a 100% international student, who goes to a country for undergraduate or graduate studies and/or returns or does not return.

And yet, the pandemic showed us there is a whole universe that is beyond our possibility to record or measure, because there is a large component of individual

mobility, or that of some researchers or professors who are not reporting it 100%. If you have a scholarship, you may report it more than on other occasions, and the pandemic left us in a situation like the airport in Tom Hanks' film, where the borders were closed, and we could not move. And those people, citizens of our countries, begin to call on our institutions and

governments for help to return home, to be able to stay with some kind of additional allowance, faced with a long confinement situation, or the interruption of their scholarship.

Lots of situations took place, teaching us many lessons. One of them is the need to keep records able to show in real time how, when, and where these mobile people in international education are, and I use the word “people” because we are talking about students, professors, researchers, and academic staff in all the system (and here I include the university system, which is a scientific topic), who were left “adrift” in this situation. The answers to handle the crisis were both swift and urgent because it is indeed a crisis but allows us to learn and to start talking about these issues.

And the answer is systemic. As a system, we need to start talking about it. And thus is how we began to include all those subjects we neither mentioned nor incorporated in the mobility kit we give our university researchers, students, and professors, such as health protocols and the capacity to assimilate mixed modalities. Or even go a step forward and discuss a taboo subject, like the psycho-affective assistance to people who have become stranded. This is the lesson of the first part of the question, and I will expand on the second one.

If it is not mobility, what is it? What can we do? And here is an endless number of these internationalisation areas, which more than areas are tools that see internationalisation in a transversal way throughout the university institution, in training, in research, and even in extension, networking, and knowledge transfer activities.

Perhaps we can start arguing not only the virtual mobility issue, but planning and modifying our curricula, to make them truly international. Beyond careers, disciplines are shaping our understanding of what international really is. I believe we are standing before the major challenge of start viewing that, even topics that seemed to be so far away (such as an agronomist working on harvest-related issues, or veterinarians dealing with different animal health problems), can involve global factors that require a look beyond the conjuncture, beyond the national, to understand the different areas of his professional experience, of his disciplinary training, and even beyond research (which is the most visible face). Because researchers are networking, there are also incentives for us to go international.

But going back to training, we have started to generate a change when building programmes or the curricula. In this, it is essential not only the incorporation of English literature or from other countries. It is to be able to learn critical conceptual knots for training, in a key beyond my regional, local, or national scenario. Here we have a lot to learn from the strategies of researchers training abroad and returning with these discussions.

The classrooms of our courses can also be a space to incorporate those tools that contribute to an inclusive democratising internationalisation, which

effectively transcends the idea of mobility. The internationalisation of programmes, curricula, the possibility to generate mirror classrooms or mirror programmes, mixed modalities, with counterparts from other countries, enable us to solve the inconvenience of what to do if we do not have mobility. But this also allows us to lay the foundations for a mature discussion that there is no better or worse way of internationalising, but that all are valid and fit the purposes we pursue as an institutional policy, as a systemic

policy, or as a state insertion policy, within the framework of international cooperation actions in the field of education.

In our classrooms and how we generate knowledge, the way we transmit it, how we train, how we enable teaching-learning processes based on the recognition of a set of values, of thinking about issues beyond our national reality, in all these fields the university is an additional tool for foreign policy and meeting between our countries.

**By NATACHA PINO,
Rector of the University of Aysen, Chile.**

For us, from the University of Aysen, more than 1,300 kms away from the capital of Chile, it is very interesting to have the possibility to talk about the way we do internationalisation from such a faraway place, so distant, and yet, so interesting.

The first thing to ask is what we do to go beyond mobility, which is the simplest way of internationalisation, but it definitely goes much further.

In this context, we must first say that there is an internationalisation project led by the University of Chile since 2015, which recognises collaborative, networked work, that has been enhanced by the Consortium of State Universities of Chile (CUECH), and which, in a certain way, gives it a greater value. It tries to understand internationalisation beyond the academics and students' mobility. For the State universities, being able to share experiences, contacts, ways of doing, is something very valuable, that is why networking is something we need to encourage with a view on internationalisation

A recent study by SUCTIA (*Systemic University Change Towards Internationalisation for Academia*, project funded by Erasmus+ programme of the European Union) invites us to ask how do we do this change? How can we look at internationalisation in a systemic way? This study sought to raise answers in some European Union countries on how institutions relate to, or how we academics relate to internationalisation.

In the University of Aysen case, for example, which is a young university where we do not have all registration and support systems implemented, much of what happens at international contacts level occurs on an individual basis, it arises from the academic or researcher him/herself, and sometimes we do not have that register in time either. It is also important to point out what mechanisms are used, how we encourage that internationalisation, how we motivate them to become part of the commitment with internationalisation, and what good institutional practices we can find.

Finally, a key point is that this does not just involve students and academics. There may be internationalisation from our professional teams or staff, from our entire university community, thinking about the way to incorporate certain elements to work.

The SUCTIA study found that knowing the fundamentals and commitment with internationalisation activities was essential, and that depends mainly

on the person's role within the organisation. Those in leading positions (e.g. linkage officer, international relations officer, network manager, or head of a department), somehow people in these positions have a much stronger commitment to internationalisation activities. But perhaps this is not the case if we look at other areas of the university. What is important is that we always know how our internal players are really committed, or if they understand the importance of internationalising certain actions.

Another important aspect revealed by the study is how clearly defined the concepts at stake are. In other words, what are we going to understand by a good practice? Perhaps the one that brought the best result, the one we could measure, the one that showed us something we did not know, one that improved our indicators. Based on institutional definitions, we must know what we are going to define by internationalisation.

Another very relevant result from this study has to do with the way we communicate and disseminate what is being achieved as a result. We all like to be in the news if an internationalisation programme has been carried out, if a very prominent professor from another university has been brought in, if we had the chance to connect and work on a research project with colleagues from other institutions. Therefore, being able to communicate is key. But beyond egos, it is very important for the institution, to transmit how these international relationships are helping to improve the university. How, from what others do, from those with more experience than us, we can learn how to develop a better internationalisation.

Also crucial is how we are able to offer awards that encourage internationalisation. For example, we can deploy different types of initiatives where the award is to attend an international congress, whether face-to-face or virtual.

In other fields, perhaps offering the chance to participate in an international network of directors of administration and finance. Why do we always think that everything involves a trip? Maybe it is enough with developing

these connections, but we must be alert to recognise those achievements through internationalisation actions.

Finally, to move forward in terms of internationalisation, it is necessary to invest time, money and provide support to the administrative staff. Conventions and agreements are always required. If it is about physical mobility, it will require operative matters, but at least we will need collaborative conventions, quite often in two or three languages.

Given this context, what happens in Chile, the impulse given by CUECH, what this study tells us is where to focus our attention.

At the University of Aysen we have five years of institutional life. We do not have our own campus, but we have two workplaces in the city of Coyhaique, allowing us to develop our eight careers widely. We are currently 40 academics and 394 students. In these five years, we have materialised more than 10 collaboration agreements with international entities, some with universities in Germany, Spain and the USA. For us, due to our geographical location and the way we used to understand pre-pandemic mobility, that involved travelling per se, which turned out to be very complex. It is hard to coordinate flights that arrive in time for stopovers in Santiago. Of these ten links, almost half are with universities and study centres on the other side of the Andes, because for us in the Aysen Region, it is easier to connect physically with Argentina. It is a curious fact but needs to be considered.

As a regional university, we are in an extreme zone, which means that internet and physical connectivity are not very fluid. Therefore, everything gets more complicated. There are several things that are difficult regarding human capital due to our geographical location, but at the same time this gives us a strong territorial sense, and based on that, we are always looking for relationships with institutions like ours, in terms of being state universities, regional, and with research in common subjects. And in this extreme zone, issues such as nature, environment

and sustainability open up an enormous range of internationalisation possibilities.

So far, this international search at University of Aysen is carried out practically on an individual basis, with each of our academics, through their own lines of research, moving forward to connect with those having an interest in studying issues like the biosphere, aquatic systems, or ice. There is much about the region that makes us attractive to others.

Now, how do we go about building those relationships? With all these elements of a regional university, from an extreme area, looking for and building those links, we want to move towards an integral model. A model that not only looks at students, academics, and researchers, but also considers experiences of internationalisation from outside that can be inserted and made present in our institutions. There is a wide space to grow and share experiences, here. A space that allows our administrative support and operative processes to find models to follow in internationalisation, in addition to links to generate learning.

With this model, we aim not only at exchanging, but also at cooperating, generating alliances, and being able to manage those relationships. Now, how did we use to do it before the pandemic? We travelled. But after closing airports and cities we could not do it any longer. Therefore, I think the pandemic leaves us with all this learning in relation to what we could do when we are unable to move.

We do not know how much longer this situation will take, but we did learn how to communicate and how to use virtual tools. Now we find it easier to contact an academic from another university and ask him/her to share a lesson with us. Or contact a researcher on a matter of interest and generate a meeting. We do not need to move any more. Evidently, there is much more to do beyond mobility.

Regarding the challenges, the first step is to design this model of management, networking, and cooperation. For this purpose, we plan to generate a network structure, seeking strategic links depending on how the University of Aysen projects itself, how it grows and how it establishes new working lines.

The fact that internationalisation allowed us to give answers to society on common issues is also very interesting, because we do not need to be in the same place to deal with a problem. What happens in similar regions? Perhaps we are facing similar problems. How, from different geographic spaces we can provide an answer to those topics. Perhaps we can meet around areas of research or development projects, but finally we can look at a similar problem from other spaces and with several players, and what we want is to provide an answer.

Another important challenge is that such a process must be integrated by all of us who are part of the university. We should all have a place: students, academics, and collaborating professionals. But in the end, we should not close ourselves in that formal view, but rather the new

internationalisation - or the way we call it - this network cooperation should move forward in incorporating all the entities of the university.

It is also necessary to establish contacts that are academically valuable, with a view to develop competitive proposals. Always thinking about how to add value and how to absorb good practices implemented by others.

In a deeper look, reflection is needed on the way we interact with different cultures, how we understand languages, how we recognise other

knowledge in those cultures. How, through internationalisation, we are able to gather new learning from these different spaces, and how we absorb these good practices.

We are not only thinking about mobility, but also about being connected and generating responses together, so as to share experiences. For us, as University of Aysen, the challenge is to be able to generate a structure that addresses all these challenges and opportunities, and to incorporate it to our new network and cooperation management model.

CHAPTER III

UNIVERSITY
INTERNATIONALISATION,
INTERCULTURALITY AND
MULTILINGUAGE

By SONIA MORÁN,
Sociolinguist at University of Southampton,
United Kingdom.

This year of pandemic has been extremely turbulent at the international level. At least in my own experience, the professionals in this field have had to *go about responding* to events as they came along (and which unfortunately continue as I write this), without much time for stopping, thinking, and planning, instead of mainly “reacting” in a steady way to the drastic changes and demands of the pandemic. This series of conferences allows us to do that, precisely, regarding such an important question like, where are we going with university internationalisation?

In this text, I would like to consider what it means to be an “international” or “an internationalised” university, from the point of view of language and from the point of view of intercultural communication. Particularly, I will reflect on the role played, or should play the English language in university internationalisation, to what extent tertiary education in multilingual and culturally diverse contexts should undergo some kind of “Englishisation” process (Kirkpatrick, 2011) in what ways and with what possible consequences.

To go deeper into these matters, I am going to incorporate the research work we carried out at the research centre I belong to, the Centre for Global Englishes (CGE), at the University of Southampton. I will also incorporate other research performed in the field of applied linguistics on the use of English as a means of instruction. With this, I hope to present an international overview that indicates where the university linguistic and communication policies seem to be heading at the global level, with what consequences, and what we can learn - from the research and the pandemic lessons - to move towards a transforming and inclusive internationalisation in linguistic-communicative dimensions

To contextualise, I should explain the type of research work we carried out at the Centre for Global Englishes, and what we have to do with the concept of internationalisation in higher education. Perhaps the name of the centre already offers some clues, since it suggests that we studied how English is used as a global language, in its complexity, dynamism, and plurality. Particularly, we explored in a descriptive and critical way the sociocultural and linguistic dimensions emerging from the variable use of English in international contexts and we are also concerned about the linguistic, communicative, symbolic, and material effects that these types

of uses have on different groups of speakers who use English as a contact language (www.soton.ac.uk/cge).

One of the catalysts that led to the creation of the Centre, was the observation that at present, what are considered 'non-native' speakers of English make up most of this language users in the world (Brumfit, 2001). It is estimated that for every native speaker of English, there are at least four non-native speakers of English (Crystal, 2008). This estimation is probably out of date, and there are certainly even more nowadays. However, the estimation reveals that one of the most frequent uses of English is as an international lingua franca (Jenkins, Baker and Dewey, 2018), and it was suspected that this relatively unusual situation, could have significant and transforming consequences, not only for the circulation of communication and contents at a global level, but also for the evolution of the use of English and symbolic, ideological, identity and participation equity for speakers all over the world (e.g. Jenkins, 2000; Pennycook, 2007). In the field of English research as a Lingua Franca (ELF), therefore, we explore how English is used as a means of contact between speakers of diverse linguistic and cultural contexts (Jenkins, 2009), i.e. a crucial type of communication for the international academic activity, nowadays. Although currently English is not the only 'global' academic lingua franca, it is one of the predominant for the exchange of knowledge through publications and international congresses (Mauranen, 2012). For a while now, the use of English has even increased as a university vehicular language in countries where other languages performed this function, since it is seen as a communicative instrument facilitating mobility and competitiveness at the tertiary level, as well as cooperation and intercultural learning. It has even been said that communication in international and multilingual universities is a 'prototype' of ELF communication (Smit, 2010). For this reason, the university has become a fundamental context

for researchers interested in the expansion and use of English, as well as in its linguistic, social and learning consequences, whether positive or negative.

In the ELF field, our work involves disengaging the way intercultural communication is produced in multilingual contexts where English is shared, but where the speakers cannot assume they share cultural, linguistic, or communicative norms. In these contexts, it cannot be assumed that speakers are (or should necessarily be) oriented towards the same set of norms, given the diversity of their experiences, objectives, and semiotic resources. Instead, we understand that the norms and linguistic practices developed in this type of intercultural communication are locally negotiated in each interaction, and therefore they emerge and are recreated in each moment (Jenkins et al. 2018).

Through thorough observation and analysis of ELF oral and written communication (e.g., Jenkins et al. 2018), it has been concluded that 'ELF' interactions must be understood as multilingual communication in their own (Jenkins, 2015), even when they only seem to reflect the use of English or another language. And this is because the multilingual and cultural resources that our students and academics have in their semiotic repertoires, for example, influence each other (Jenkins, 2015; García and Li Wei, 2014) providing *variable* forms to the language used and to the cultural expressions and referred affiliations. Even though in ELF intercultural communication there is a great deal of reproduction of 'familiar' linguistic and communicative patterns, that we would recognise as standardised varieties of languages and models, we observe at the same time an increase in linguistic *variability* in the way these speakers modify the use of English and other linguistic resources, with results that do not fit with pre-established ideas of what 'good' or 'correct' speech means. One of the most important conclusions, is that we can no longer consider 'non-native' speakers of English as 'poor' speakers when their use deviates from

established or idealised models of native English (Jenkins et al. 2018). Instead, we argue that ‘non-native’ speakers, such as me, recreate and reform the use of English and of other languages in different ways, to achieve different communicative and identity purposes.

Therefore, the variability through which we build intercultural communication, usually successfully, by the way, questions the usefulness and prevalence of language ideologies that argue that in order to communicate ‘efficiently’ and ‘correctly’, we must adhere to a set of monolithic and fixed rules, and that we should not ‘mix different languages’ (e.g., García and Li Wei, 2014).

Understanding this type of communication in multilingual and intercultural contexts has very important repercussions and invites us to rethink the role and nature of English, and of other languages, in the university internationalisation process and in the teaching of English at present and for the future. Despite the number of studies showing the importance of recognising and making linguistic diversity visible in universities (Jenkins and Mauranen, 2019), research work carried out at our centre suggests that university internationalisation does not only go hand in hand with English, but also with monolithic, idealised, and obsolete ‘native’ models, which regulate who enters and who stays out of the academic conversation, and based on how much they can imitate Anglophone models of communication (e.g. Jenkins, 2014). Besides, the teaching of English at universities continues to focus on the reproduction of these models (Jenkins, 2014) that reflect a series of norms which have been developed in communities outside the experience and needs of communication that multilingual speakers have in other parts of the world. The problem is that a model of education in which teaching, and the use of academic English are focused only on native standards, does not reflect the fluid and variable communicative practices we find in the ELF communicative contexts.

In this case, a mismatch is produced between what we teach and what we ask of our students, and the diversity they will find and need to navigate in actual intercultural communication. At CGE, we have developed a special interest group focused on higher education, and for several decades we have been observing how English is gaining more and more weight and roles in university educational contexts in which it is not officially used among the university community.

We observe how the use of English as a vehicular language is growing to teach subject matters which are not related with the English language as such, what we call English as a means of instruction” or EMI/EME (“English Medium Instruction” o “English Medium Education”). For instance, it is estimated that EMI programmes have even increased 100% in Europe, from 2001 to 2014, although we can also see an upward trend in Asian countries (Wächter & Maiworm, 2014). Even though perhaps to a lesser extent, I

know there is also an incipient interest in Latin American university contexts in developing this kind of programmes as internationalisation strategies

Even the pandemic is contributing to this growth in the use of English. Even though it has forced us to remain at home and resort to digital education, it seems to have opened the opportunity to create many more international virtual classrooms, and therefore opportunities to experience with the use of English as a vehicular language, and as a lingua franca with students and professors from several parts of the world.

While some colleagues have referred to EMI growing trend as ‘an unstoppable train’ (Macaro, 2015, p.7), we must be cautious, since we cannot accept that EMI is an unstoppable train towards internationalisation without previously considering possible (socio)linguistic, social, economic, and learning consequences it may have for different groups of students, and without stopping to consider up to what point the linguistic models and expectations we work with, contribute to the inclusion, invisibility and penalisation of the linguistic and identity diversity of our teachers and professors.

In fact, in the study of ELF and other disciplines in Applied Linguistics (e.g., Critical EAP, Academic Literacies), we have long noticed that one of the challenges of 21st century higher education is transforming its conception and treatment about the ‘academic language’ to align the mismatch formerly mentioned, and thus prepare our students for the negotiation of diverse, multilingual, and dynamic communication they will face at the global level.

In addition to being a formative responsibility, it is a responsibility of sociolinguistic inclusion, since educational approaches that understand English and its use as the reproduction or imitation of Anglophone standards often discriminate against, penalise, and therefore disempower multilingual students and

professors when producing linguistic practices that, although they are often communicatively successful, do not conform to the norms of the standard. For example, the excluding power of these approaches is evident in the university entrance exams, which regulate who gets into programme and who does not.

Even though these exams (e.g., IELTS, TOEFL) are usually considered ‘international’, they in fact require a majority to reproduce an idealised ‘national’ speech pattern, such as the British and American variants (Jenkins and Leung, 2019). Approaches towards academic language keep affecting students and professors during different stages of university programmes, as they mediate access to contents, the learning and understanding process, the evaluation of that knowledge, social and symbolic relationships, and even the participation level of the students.

In addition to experiencing limitations to the ability of creativity and expression with the use of English, the widespread belief that EMI programmes should use *only* English, and therefore alienate other local and/or minority languages, can restrain the capacity to use other valuable linguistic resources that students and professors have in their communicative repertoires, and that empirical research suggests they are often useful to consolidate content learning among multilingual students (e.g. Kirkgoz, Karakas, Kavak and Morán Panero, forthcoming).

So, before we embark on implementing EMI, we must ask ourselves: why do we resort to English so much? Why is it growing so exponentially? And, above all, why is it used as a vehicular language? There are many reasons why universities and governments decide to make a local or national policy from this type of education.

For example, we see those English promises to be a tool facilitating international mobility, and that we will be able to attract more international students, which also has an economic benefit (Galloway, 2020). It is believed that by providing

local students and professors with English proficiency through EMI, it would also facilitate their physical mobility abroad and at the same time, in principle, we could help to develop their intercultural awareness and notions of global citizenship (Galloway, 2020)

But obviously, English goes beyond physical mobility, English is seen as a tool for both *information and social mobility* (e.g., Morán Panero, 2016). Currently, this aspect is very significant, since the pandemic has paused physical mobility, but communication through English still provides us with possibilities for internationalisation despite this limitation. For example, developing English competences can help us to access knowledge created in other parts of the world, but at the same time help our students and professors to disseminate knowledge created locally.

On the other hand, it is also understood that by providing our students and professors with English language skills, we can foster the employment and competitiveness of these professors and students. Although in many EMI programmes it is said that learning English is not one of the explicit objectives, in other contexts improving students and professors' English competences does appear as a programme goal (Galloway, 202)

The problem is that EMI programmes have been growing too fast, without certainty that these promises can actually be turned into realities, and not enough studies telling us what the potential risks are if we embark on a kind of education in which English is the language of instruction (Dearden, 2014). For example, until relatively recently, there has not been so much research on how it affects university students' understanding of content, although there were studies in linguistic immersion contexts at earlier levels of education. Also, some doubts have arisen around what implications EMI education has for the development of disciplinary communicative skills in students' mother tongues in their disciplines, and there was not even incontestable evidence that using English as a vehicular language helps to develop a better level of English among 'non-native' students and professors.

And finally, perhaps one of the most significant questions also to be asked is, if we are giving increasing relevance and roles to English at university, what are the risks of excluding a segment of students from our local societies?

Over the last ten years, much interest has arisen to provide answers to these questions, and we are experiencing something of a 'boom' in research on EMI and its effects. Far from offering a unified vision of the benefits of internationalising tertiary education through EMI, results suggest there is much variability from context to context. For example, in some programmes there is a certain degree of concern that students do not seem to be understanding subject content at the same level as they would in their mother tongue (Kim, 2017), in other contexts it seems that the additional effort required by the use of English can even facilitate

and enhance content comprehension without negatively impacting learning or grades achieved (Dafouz and Camacho-Miñano, 2016).

While in some programmes, students' participation in classroom interaction may be increased or even democratised (Smit, 2010), in others a decrease in students' interventions has been observed, which is attributed to anxiety generated by using English. Also, there is variability between studies which assess whether upgrading the role of English to a vehicular language result in more and better learning of this language.

While some studies identify development of some communicative competences in English among some students, especially in vocabulary and strategic skills in negotiating ideas, others have not recorded improvements in the language (Dalton-Puffer, 2011).

There are lots of local factors to be considered to understand the differences (e.g., motivation, initial level, discipline, the effect of whether it is voluntary or imposed, the effect of pioneering programmes, evaluation criteria and methodology, etc.). Although I cannot go further into details here, it is important to emphasise that giving more roles to English does not always automatically lead to an improvement in the language learning quality and /or the educational experience, as it is often heard in speeches attributing EMI a 'double gain'.

There seems to be more consensus about the idea that monolingual policies stating that *only* English should be used as a vehicular language, in EMI programmes can be counterproductive in multilingual contexts, where students share other local and national languages. On the one hand, it is feared that this policy may 'devalue' such languages, especially if considered minority languages, but also because it seems to repress the trans-linguistic processes (García and Li Wei, 2014) that multilingual speakers use to communicate and to develop their understanding of the subject

they are studying. While in EMI contexts where students have similar linguistic repertoires, the use of resources we attribute to different languages seems to facilitate teaching and act as a necessary didactic scaffolding (Kirkgoz et al, forthcoming), multilingual practices can also generate exclusion problems in highly diverse contexts, where no linguistic resources other than English are shared (Jenkins and Mauranen, 2019).

In relation to the evidence available on whether this type of EMI experience can lead to developing more sociolinguistic and intercultural or global awareness among our students, there are also differences according to the context. Several studies suggest that having experiences in which English is used as an intercultural lingua franca in higher education contexts, fosters the development of an appreciation for multilingualism and also an appreciation for the diverse or 'non-native' uses of English (Cojo, 2010; Kalocsai, 2014).

Apparently, many learners have also started to value more their own communicative skills and their linguistic variation in English when participating in ELF communication, though, at least in Spanish-speaking contexts this sociolinguistic awareness can also be developed among students thanks to their observation of the diversity of Spanish usage (Moran Panero, 2016). Concerning the way in which we develop intercultural awareness and how we understand or conceptualise people we associate with 'other cultures', it seems that mere exposure, interaction, or contact through mobility and exchange programmes does not always in itself lead to the deconstruction of national stereotypes (Humphreys and Baker, 2021). Therefore, promoting intercultural 'contact' is not always enough, unless accompanied by a reflexive and critical process by university institutions (ibid.).

What I want to emphasise is that, just as we understand that there isn't or there

should not be a unique, monolithic approach to developing university internationalisation policies in general, neither is there a unique approach to designing linguistic policies to accompany such internationalisation. On the contrary, linguistic policies must respond to global factors, but above all to local factors and players, and must take into account many different dimensions in each institution.

For example, the model proposed by colleagues Dafouz and Smit (2020) for researching and theorising multilingual university contexts with EMI programmes, contains six main dimensions to be considered: roles of English and other languages, the needs of different academic disciplines, official language administration, involved players and their interests and needs, day-to-day pedagogical practices and processes, and internationalisation and globalisation processes at each university. Although this model is initially proposed for researchers, the dimensions can also be informative for administrators and faculty in charge of designing language policies in their institutions.

Apart from not having a universally applicable recipe (e.g., ‘English-only’ EMI), it is also necessary to be prepared for even the most complex and inclusively designed policies require negotiation, assessment, and revision. This is particularly important, because the intentions, implementation, and effects behind a language policy, do not always align with each other. In many cases, when generating a language policy to try to solve a problem (e.g., attracting international students through EMI), we create new problems (excluding non-English local students and potentially increasing inequality in our national population). For example, at CGE we had a PhD student who has carried out a study on EMI policy in Pakistan and discovered that in medical programmes there is an attempt to implement a monolingual policy in which *only* English is used to learn contents, and there are graduate doctors who claim experiencing problems to communicate with their patients in local languages (Sajjad, 2018). Their study is an example of how prioritising English is not always the right answer, and this needs to be assessed in each programme.

In case English happens to be the right answer, usually in combination with other languages, we also need to be critical about the way English is conceptualised and how it fits into the educational context, to try to align it with the use of a dynamic and variable English we observe in the interactions where it works as a lingua franca (Jenkins, 2014). This requires considering what the objectives related to English are. For example, we need to decide whether simply ‘using’ it is a synonym of success, or whether we seek to develop its learning in an explicit way. We must consider what approaches or models are prioritised in classrooms and establish, for example, if students reproduce the imitation of standardised national ‘native’ English, or whether, on the contrary, we foster ‘post-normative’ approaches (Dewey, 2012) that value accuracy and the negotiation of *ideas and contents*, over the imitation of idealised but often unnecessary language standards for communication.

The role and nature of English in student assessment should also be discussed, for example, whether it is fair to require a level of English for access to or graduation from a programme, or if in EMI subjects 'language accuracy' should be assessed at the time of scoring his/her work, or not.

At CGE we believe these steps are necessary to move from a merely 'symbolic' internationalisation, as explained by Turner and Robeson (2008), towards a truly 'transformative' internationalisation (ibid.), linguistically as well. This means that a 'deep' international orientation must be integrated into ways of thinking and doing academic communication, but if in our institutions we expect our students and professors to produce English in a 'native' English model (normally based on British or American academic English models) we are maintaining a *national* orientation reflecting how English is used in a specific nation.

On the contrary, to design a language policy that includes English as an internationalisation tool, an 'ELF' orientation must be incorporated, i.e., one that does not invisibilise or penalise linguistic diversity and variability, and that rewards successful and creative communication beyond the faithful reproduction of prescriptive 'native' linguistic regulations. Even though in ELF study we have focused on English, it is essential to underline that these prescriptivist ideas should also be revised regarding the use of other global languages for academic purposes, such as Spanish.

At CGE we have been studying for years the kind of internationalisation that different universities that consider themselves as 'international' seem to achieve. We have gathered data from the websites of more than 60 universities around the world to study their linguistic policies and their regulating mechanisms (e.g., Jenkins, 2014), and we have also carried out more in-depth institutional case studies (e.g., Jenkins and Mauranen, 2019). Although there are naturally many differences among the language policies for internationalisation of

each country and institution, it is striking that, in most cases, universities that understand that internationalisation implies Englishising the university, still place native English models at the centre of their approach (Jenkins, 2014). This model is normally assumed by both faculty and students due to the omission of an explicit and open policy for variation in the linguistic practices of its student population and is perhaps most strongly reproduced when resorting to international standardised exams such as IELTS, TOEFL or Cambridge as an admission and/or graduation criteria. We also found out that students using English as an additional language are required to demonstrate a range of language skills, while it is assumed that native speakers are prepared for intercultural communication through English (Jenkins, 2014). However, no one is born 'native' in the language skills needed for academic and disciplinary communication, and therefore we must not assume that Anglophone students automatically stand out as communicators in academic contexts (Mauranen, 2012). Indeed, some researchers suggest that they could even be less prepared to communicate in different ELF contexts (ibid).

Our research also indicates that, while most international universities in English-speaking countries seek to 'celebrate' their campus diversity, language diversity in the use of English and other 'cross-linguistic' processes is hardly ever included in these efforts. More recently my colleague Professor Jennifer Jenkins and I have been lucky to work on what we call an 'impact' study in the UK to establish whether there are change signs in the international university tertiary education landscape (Jenkins and Morán Panero, forthcoming). We observe there is an increasing appreciation of multilingual language diversity, and of the variable use of English among professors and students at the micro-institutional level, i.e., there are signs of basic changes. Even though this is good news, examples in which this is translated into language policies at the macro institutional level are still a minority (ibid.).

This means there is still much work to do to achieve a more inclusive, less superficial, and more committed internationalisation, as well stated by De Wit and Hunter (2015)

From an intercultural and multilingual viewpoint, inequalities continue to be observed in universities, and we understand that students' experience with English is not equative. An important bias still prevails depending on whether they are considered native or non-native speakers of the language. We need to imagine alternative, dynamic, and organic language policies, and to deconstruct our conceptualisation and approach to English, and to academic language more generally, to reduce and avoid sociolinguistic inequality among our students, which can lead to material inequality, as well.

References

- Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education*, 45(1), 43–70.
- Brumfit, C. (2001). *Individual Freedom in Language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Cogo, A. (2010). Strategic Use and Perceptions of English as a Lingua Franca, *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*. 46/3: 295-312
- Crystal, D. (2008). ‘Two thousand million?’ *English Today*, 24/1: 3-6.
- Dafouz, E. and Camacho-Miñano, M. (2016) “Exploring the impact of English-medium instruction on university student academic achievement: The case of accounting”. *English for Specific Purposes*, 44. Pp. 57–67.
- Dafouz, E. and Smit, U. (2020). *ROAD-MAPPING English Medium Education in the Internationalised University*. Cham: Palgrave.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content and language integrated learning: from practice to principles. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182-204.
- de Wit, H., & Hunter, F. (2015). The Future of Internationalization of Higher Education in Europe. *International Higher Education*, (83), 2-3.
- Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a medium of instruction – a growing global phenomenon*. London: British Council. Available online at: https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/e484_emi_-_cover_option_3_final_web.pdf
- Dewey, M. (2012). Towards a post-normative approach: Learning the pedagogy of ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1(1). 141–170.
- Galloway, N (ed). (2020). English in Higher Education. *British Council Report (Part 1)*. Available at: https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/L020_English_HE_lit_review_FINAL.pdf
- García, O. and Li Wei, (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Humphreys, G., & Baker, W. (2021). Developing intercultural awareness from short-term study abroad: insights from an interview study of Japanese students. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 21(2), 260-275.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The Phonology of English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). ‘English as a Lingua Franca; interpretations and attitudes’, *World Englishes*, 28/2: 200-207.
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a Lingua Franca in the international university: the politics of academic English language policy*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J. (2015). ‘Repositioning English and Multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca’. *Englishes in Practice*, 2(3): 49
- Jenkins, J. and Leung, C. (2019). From mythical standard to standard reality. The need for alternatives for standardised English language texts. *Language Teaching*, 52, 1.

- Jenkins, J. and Mauranen, A. (2019). *Linguistic Diversity at the EMI Campus*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J., Baker, W. and Dewey, M. (2018). *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Kalocsai, K. (2014). *Communities of Practice and English as a Lingua Franca*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kim, EG. (2017). 'English-medium instruction in Korean higher education: Challenges and future directions', in Fenton-Smith, B et al. (eds) *English medium instruction in higher education in Asia-Pacific: From policy to pedagogy*. London: Springer. pp. 54–72
- Kirkgoz, Y., Karakas, A., Kavak, V.I., and Morán Panero, S. (forthcoming). *Classroom Discourse in EMI Courses in Turkey: On the Dynamics of Translanguaging Practices*. British Council New Connections in EMI papers.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). *Internationalization or Englishization: Medium of instruction in today's universities*. Hong Kong: Centre for Governance and Citizenship, The Hong Kong Institute of Education.
- Macaro, E. (2015). English medium instruction: Time to start asking some difficult questions. *Modern English Teacher* 24/2: pp. 4–7
- Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF. Academic English shaping by non-native speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morán Panero, S. (2016). *Orienting to the spread of English as a global lingua franca: Voices from the Spanish-speaking world*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Southampton.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.
- Sajjad, P. (2018). *A study of the perceptions of lecturers and students towards English-medium instruction in Pakistani Higher Education*. Doctoral Thesis. University of Southampton.
- Smit, U. (2010). 'CLIL in an ELF classroom: on explaining terms and concepts interactively'. In e Dalton-Puffer, C, Nikula, T. and U. Smit (eds.) *Language Use and Language Learning in CLIL Classrooms (AILA applied linguistics series 7)*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 259–277.
- Turner, Y., & Robson, S. (2008). *Internationalizing the university: An introduction for university teachers and managers*. London: Continuum.
- Wächter, B., & Maiworm, F. (Eds.). (2014). *English-taught programmes in European higher education: The state of play in 2014*. https://www.lemmens.de/dateien/medien/buecher-ebooks/aca/2014_english_taught.pdf

By ALICIA SALOMONE,
Postgraduate Director,
University of Chile.

1. Introduction

The approach from which I prepared this presentation on university internationalisation, interculturality and multilanguage at the University of Chile, has to do with my role as Postgraduate Director at the Vice-Rectorate for Academic Affairs. By virtue of this position, since 2015, I have been a part of the Executive Committee that leads the of Internationalisation Project¹ and, in this framework, since 2016, I have participated in the creation and consolidation of the Postgraduate English Programme. This led me to undertake a stay at the University of Southampton, between 2018 and 2019, which purpose was to carry out a research project that I am going to present in its main lines (Salomone, 2019).

I understand the idea of internationalisation, from Foskett and Maringe (2012), as the primary strategy through which universities around the world have responded to the globalisation challenges. Jane Knight (2004:11) explains that higher education internationalisation is the integration of international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the university mission and functions of teaching, research, and service. For universities, being international involves defining reasons, objectives, approaches, and strategies, as well as making decisions involving different levels, from the national and educational to the institutional.

Anchoring the idea of internationalisation in the Chilean and Latin American context, and connecting that notion with multilingualism and interculturality issues, I would like to reflect on the following two questions. The first one explores how current internationalisation processes in Chilean universities could be periodised and characterised, including the type of objectives and scope such processes have had. The second asks how internationalisation impacts language policies - explicit and/or implicit - of our universities.

¹ See: <https://www.uchile.cl/internacionalizacion>

2. The road to university internationalisation in Chile

To periodise university internationalisation in Chile, I propose to distinguish four periods, comprising from the early 1990's to the present day² The first period, covering the 1990s, laid the structural bases for contemporary internationalisation to take place. The second, extending throughout the first decade of the 2000s, allowed the initial steps to be taken towards an internationalisation that prioritised especially the international linkage of postgraduate programmes, and particularly, PhDs. I place the third period around the year 2013, a key moment for moving from a focused internationalisation to one of an institutional or comprehensive nature. Lastly, the fourth period, beginning in 2015 and continues to the present day, is characterised as the time when the country's main research universities took on internationalisation as a strategic institutional objective.

At the beginning of 1990, Chile's transition to democracy began after 17 years of a dictatorship that, among other consequences, led to the country's international isolation. In this sense, one of the most significant efforts of the decade was the re-establishment of multilateral relationships seeking to strengthen political stability, economic development, and the reintegration of Chilean academy into international science networks (Ramírez, 2005). In this scenario, a fundamental milestone was the creation, in 1998, of the Ministry of Education's Programme for the Improvement of Higher Education Quality (MECESUP), which was

an essential basis for the strengthening of the university system in those transitional years³.

During the first decade of the 2000s, the MECESUP Programme supported the postgraduate system through a series of competitive funding competitions aimed at creating and consolidating master's, and above all, PhD programmes. The orientation towards the internationalisation of postgraduate programmes was not explicit at the beginning but took shape throughout the decade by means of a series of recommendations that encouraged the implementation of actions aimed at strengthening the national-international linkage of programmes perceived as more competitive globally. Among these initiatives, it was suggested that student mobility should be encouraged, especially *outgoing* students, also the strengthening of academic staff qualifications by obtaining doctorates at prestigious international universities and the creation of collaborative programmes with foreign counterparts. Within this framework, it was also pointed out that for the success of the internationalisation programmes, it was important for academics and students to develop their communicative skills in foreign languages, particularly in English.

In 2013, the Ministry of Education launched the so-called Performance Agreements (Reich et al., 2011), re-situating internationalisation from its initial focus on specific postgraduate programmes with a high-profile for global insertion to a more comprehensive perspective. This aimed at a broader internationalisation of the postgraduate system and, particularly, of doctorates at each institution. Three institutions benefited from these Performance Agreements: The Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, the University of Concepcion,

2 I distinguish the current process of internationalisation, related to contemporary globalisation, from the international relationships and linkage that Chilean universities, the University of Chile among them, have maintained with higher education institutions in other countries throughout its history.

3 About MECESUP programme, see: http://dfi.mineduc.cl/index2.php?id_portal=59&id_seccion=3586&id_contenido=14892

and the Austral University⁴. These institutions received funds to reinforce the internationalisation of their doctoral programmes in priority areas for the Chilean economic model viewed as the ones having the greatest internationalisation potential. Those areas were biotechnology, biomedical sciences, astronomy, environmental sciences, and forestry sciences. For the formulation of the Agreements, universities were asked to define objectives, strategies, and actions, and also to commit to indicators that would guarantee the sustainability of the initiatives in the long-term.

In 2015, the Division of Higher Education (DIVESUP) of the Ministry of Education, giving continuity to the line of Performance Agreements of 2013, launched a new funding instrument for internationalisation, focusing on the two main higher education institutions in the country: the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, and the University of Chile, the only ones by then with a seven- year institutional accreditation, which is the highest granted by the National Accreditation Commission. However, the objective of this competition differed from that of 2013, since it was not only about consolidating the internationalisation of the doctoral programmes, but also about driving the comprehensive internationalisation of these two leading research universities. These projects lasted for three years, between 2015 and 2018, and in their second phase (2018 and 2021), together with the aforementioned universities, University of Concepcion was also granted funding, since it had also achieved a seven-year accreditation in 2018.

The Ministry of Education did not establish strict guidelines for the formulation of these internationalisation projects. However, three central orientations could be deduced from the competition reference terms, upon which the universities articulated their proposals⁵ On the one hand, they should establish strategic alliances with prestigious international counterparts; on the other side, they had to internationalise research and doctoral programmes. Thirdly, they were asked to increase student mobility indicators, considering not only out-going but also in-coming mobility, since they were seeking to attract international students to Chilean postgraduate programmes, especially those from Latin America.

Between 2015 and 2021, the University of Chile has developed two internationalisation projects (UCH1566 y UCH1866) whose objective is to consolidate the institution's position as a university benchmark of

4 The projects were as follows : UC-1203 Internationalisation of doctoral programmes in scientific and technological areas: a platform for regional leadership in the formation of researchers of excellence; UCO-1202 Consolidation and strengthening of the international linkage of UDEC doctoral programmes in the areas of science, technology and environment; AUS-1203 Strengthening and internationalisation of UACH doctorates to improve competitiveness and productivity within strategic areas for social and productive development: bio-sciences, bio-technology, and veterinarian sciences.

5 Information on this competition is available at: http://dfi.mineduc.cl/index2.php?id_seccion=5322&id_portal=59&id_contenido=34481

excellence and pertinence in Latin America, aiming at its best global insertion and at a better regional integration in research and postgraduate training. The project prioritises the deployment of South-South cooperation, but it is not exclusive, which means that, while research teams can continue their traditional collaboration with metropolitan universities, they must include at least one Latin American counterpart in their projects.

3. Internationalisation and language policies in Chilean universities

From the scenario outlined above, the question arises as to how globalisation and the consequent university globalisation has affected the development of language policies in Chilean higher education institutions, particularly, at the University of Chile.

During the first decade of 2000, the State of Chile implemented a language policy through the Ministry of Education, the purpose of which was to consolidate the teaching of English in Chilean school education. Such initiative materialised in the creation of *English Open Doors Programme* (PIAP, in Spanish), created in 2004 and implemented since 2008, whose purpose is the progressive expansion of English learning through the different school levels⁶. The goal is that, by the end of their secondary education, students should have a pre-intermediate or intermediate level of English (B1-B2 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR))

Yet, the Ministry of Education has not defined an explicit policy regarding the incorporation of foreign languages, particularly English, in higher education. In fact, the linguistic issue had not appeared as a priority in the MECESUP projects of the early 2000s. Whereas since 2013, MECESUP began to give signs that it was promoting

a semi-declared language policy, what was observed in certain specific indications included in the Performance Agreements. These made explicit the need to consolidate English learning among academics and students, so that they would achieve at least an intermediate level of command in the language. It is worth noticing that no similar orientation was given concerning other foreign languages nor for the languages of the minorities in the country.

In this scenario, decision-makers realised that the ministry guidelines suggested the existence of a close relationship between internationalisation and language policy, which in turn gave way to a series of actions started in this area. On the one hand, English language teaching programmes were introduced in the main institutions, gaining strength since 2013 onwards. In this regard, the following programmes are worth mentioning: the English UC programme, at the Pontifical Catholic University, the UDEC English Online Programme, at the University of Concepcion, and the English Institutional Programme at the University of the Frontier, among others. On the other hand, several universities defined requirements regarding the level of English demanded of their postgraduate students, which take on distinctive characteristics depending on the institution particularities and study programmes.

Regarding English language teaching programmes, universities' new policies have aimed at the achievement of an intermediate or advanced level of linguistic proficiency by students, with an emphasis on the development of communicative skills for academic and research purposes. Priority is given to the development of academic writing skills and the delivery of oral presentations of various kinds, including three-minute thesis exhibitions or the design of elevator speeches (ESs).

In addition to the above, some universities and/or postgraduate programmes, have adopted requirements such as placement tests at the beginning or end of studies; the achievement of certain scores in international standardised exams such as IELTS or TOEFL; carrying out

6 See <https://ingles.mineduc.cl/>

internships in international research centres; the presentation of posters and papers in international conferences, and the publication of articles in prestigious journals, all of it as a previous step to doctoral graduation.

4. Linguistic policies and the teaching of English at University of Chile

At the University of Chile, the implementation of the internationalisation project in 2015, led to a reflexion on linguistic policies and their associated issues, such as interculturality and intercultural communication. This has been a debate that has permeated the different university bodies, from management and central policy design to the academic units and programmes, including academics and students.

So far, the University of Chile has not defined an explicit linguistic policy for the teaching and academic use of foreign and minority languages, although recently some progress has occurred in both directions. Regarding the first, the Institutional Development Plan 2017-2026 (p.90), drawn up by the University Senate, in its Strategy V (Development of an institutional strategy for the internationalisation of the University of Chile) Objective 4 (Internationalise programmes or subjects with the aim of inserting students in the international context and attracting students from Latin America and the rest of the world), has compromised an increase in the number of subjects taught in English. As for the incorporation of the country's minority languages, a significant step was the sanctioning by the University Senate, in September 2019, of a policy of recognition of indigenous peoples, their cultures and languages.^{7,8}

In the case of English language, both at undergraduate and postgraduate studies level, a *de facto* policy is still operating, which is expressed in the existence of programmes aiming at strengthening students' language skills. These programmes are increasingly articulated with the Student Equity and Inclusion Policy⁹, issued by the University Senate in 2014, which seeks to broaden access to higher education for traditionally excluded sectors because of socio-historical reasons. In a country where English is socially

7 "University policy to advance in the incorporation of indigenous peoples, their cultures and languages at the University of Chile". See: <https://www.uchile.cl/noticias/158587/universidad-de-chile-aprueba-politica-de-pueblos-indigenas>

8 Relevant initiatives regarding the teaching of the Mapudungun language have been carried out in the Faculty of Philosophy and Humanities, and in the Faculty of Agronomic Sciences; In the latter case, the courses are related to communicative and intercultural needs linked to interactions with rural communities.

9 "Student Equity and Inclusion Policy", issued by the University Senate in 2014. See: <https://www.uchile.cl/portal/presentacion/vicerrectoria-de-asuntos-estudiantiles-y-comunitarios/oficina-de-equidad-e-inclusion/politicas-de-equidad-e-inclusion/150567/politica-de-equidad-e-inclusion-estudiantil-en-la-universidad-de-chile>

marked (Matear, 2008), the University of Chile has committed to provide the required training so that its students, regardless of their former background, can acquire the necessary tools to interact in an increasingly internationalised academic environment (Morales & Salomone, 2020).

In 2016, sponsored by the institutional internationalisation project, the Postgraduate English Programme was created (University of Chile, 2020), which currently depends on the Transversal Training Unit of the Postgraduate Department of the Vice-Rectorate for Academic Affairs. The main objectives of the programme are the following:

1. To prepare students to perform successfully in an internationalised academic context using English as a *lingua franca* (Jenkins, 2014).
2. To cover the linguistic, academic, and intercultural needs of those who wish to carry out and/or socialise their research in English.
3. To provide tools for students to perform adequately in their study area and professional development.

Similarly, considering the competences to be acquired by students at the end of their educational process, the Programme aims for its graduates to be able to:

1. To interact effectively with native and non-native English speakers in academic contexts.
2. To present their research orally in English at conferences and other academic events.
3. To produce written work responding to academic requirements and standards.

The pedagogical philosophy upon which the Postgraduate English Programme is based, understands learning as a personal and group process of knowledge building that takes place in the interaction produced between students and professors. Consequently, the teaching

methodology prioritises a communicative and situated approach aligned with the *post method* suggested by Kumaravandilevu (2006). Along these guidelines, the professor acts as a learning facilitator within a constructivist teaching context, and the student, as an activist agent of his/her own learning can adopt, appropriate, English for his/her own needs and goals.

The Programme seeks to favour the academic and professional integration of students and future graduates, offering them training that allows them to intervene in an internationalised academic space, where English works as the *lingua franca* of communication among people who do not have a common linguistic and cultural background, and also as an increasingly widespread means of instruction. Taking up ideas from Telma Gimenez et al. (2015:603), English is understood as a fluent, dynamic, hybrid and co-constructed language resource within a practice community linking the different participants in intercultural communication. This also means assuming that language is a flexible and diverse resource “which necessarily varies according to different usage contexts” (Baker and Huttner, 2017)

The Postgraduate English Programme works along two development lines. On one hand, it offers English language courses with academic orientation, ranging from beginner to advanced level (A1-C1 in the CEFRL).

On the other hand, it runs In-depth Workshops, directed to students with a B2 level or higher who wish to consolidate their oral, written, and pedagogical skills. Workshops currently offered are *Essentials for Academic Writing*, *Essentials for Academic Presentations* and *English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI): Planning and Teaching your Subject in English*.

Since 2020, the *English as a Medium of Instruction* Workshop has been offered for doctoral students and also for professors of disciplinary courses who want to transition from Spanish to English as a medium of instruction. This course creation has gone parallel to the opening of new international cooperation opportunities through

the launching of virtual mobility programmes. This is what has happened, among other initiatives, with the Virtual Mobility Programme of the Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU), that works on English as a medium of instruction¹⁰. Through virtuality, this programme has enabled the expansion of in-coming and out-going mobility for undergraduate students in all knowledge fields, generating a high level of interest among local students. Moreover, a recently conducted study by the International Relations Office evidenced that students valued positively the possibility of attending classes at a foreign university and the contact with students from other countries. At the same time, the vast majority of students pointed out that the use of English as a medium of instruction represented neither an obstacle to learning achievement nor for class interactions.

At postgraduate level, the growing incorporation of English as a medium of instruction has had positive consequences for the development of collaborative programmes with other institutions. This is what happens, for instance, with the Double Doctoral Degree Programmes in Electrical Engineering with the University of Manchester and with the University of Nottingham, the Joint Doctoral Degree Programme in Biomedical Sciences with the University of Groningen, the Joint Doctoral Degree Programme in Medical Sciences with Tokyo Medical and Dental University (TMDU) and the Master in International Law, Investment and Trade with the University of Heidelberg, among several others. Furthermore, the use of English has allowed the organisation of summer activities with foreign universities, such as *2021 South Campus Postgraduate Summer School*¹¹, and elaborate joint doctoral courses on sustainable development issues, like those currently being designed within the framework of the ACCESS Platform for Chile-Sweden Cooperation¹². Beyond all these opportunities associated with the incorporation of English as a medium of instruction at the University of Chile, this development also opens up a series of challenges to be faced by the institution in the short and medium term. Among these, the following are worth mentioning:

1. *Language challenges*, because it will be necessary to respond to the needs of students and academics who do not have, at least, an intermediate level of command in English (B1-B2).
2. *Cultural challenges*, given the fact that English in Chile is often associated with the identities of higher social groups.
3. *Equity challenges*, as people who come from disadvantaged social sectors to a large extent, have had no previous opportunities to access English language learning.

10 See: <https://www.uchile.cl/convocatorias/177638/convocatoria-cursos-virtuales-red-apru-segundo-semester-2021>

11 See: <http://www.agronomia.uchile.cl/noticias/173084/exitosa-tercera-version-del-summer-school-de-postgrado-2021-campus-sur>

12 See: <https://accesschilesweden.org/access-research-school>

4. *Pedagogical challenges* since academics interested in incorporating English as a medium of instruction will need support to implement learner-centred teaching methodologies appropriate to the use of English as a lingua franca.
5. *Financial and academic management challenges* arising from the management complexities and high costs involved in sustaining language teaching programmes for students and academics in a massive institution like University of Chile.
6. *Ideological challenges*, since the incorporation of English as a medium of instruction may confront resistance between certain groups of academics and students, who judge that English dissemination jeopardises our national, cultural, and linguistic identity.

5. Closing remarks

Since the 2000s second decade, the main Chilean research universities have been undergoing comprehensive internationalisation processes, which going beyond student mobility and recruitment, have started to permeate the undergraduate and, above all, postgraduate training. These processes have intensified the international connection of our university system, fostering the collaborative linkage of local higher education institutions with counterpart institutions both within and outside Latin America

However, even within our region, the consolidation of internationalisation processes

requires the foreign language commands at a level that enables academic communication and interaction between professors and students, facilitating at the same time intercultural communication. Among these languages, English undoubtedly plays a key role, but this must not make us forget that there are disciplines where other languages may be relevant, and therefore should also be considered. In this framework, it must be borne in mind that in the Chilean academy there is still a debt to be settled with Portuguese, one of the two dominant languages in the region, and whose command becomes essential to strengthen relationships with Brazilian universities and Luso-speakers.

The incorporation of foreign language teaching into the educational processes has meant a great challenge for Chilean universities but has also opened up new linkage opportunities with other universities around the world, what has enabled training to be optimised based on cooperation and the openness to intercultural dialogue. Nonetheless, in a country where access to foreign languages is still socially limited, our universities, particularly the University of Chile, should persevere in their commitment to provide this knowledge and tools to students and professors requiring them. Proceeding this way, will make it possible to put into effect the principles of equity and inclusion that are at the basis of the institutional educational model and simultaneously favour the enhancement of intercultural dialogue and communication.

References

- Baker, W. & Hüttner, J. (2017). English and more: a multisite study of roles and conceptualisations of language in English medium multilingual universities from Europe to Asia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 38(6), 501-516.
- Foskett, N. & Maringe, F. (Eds.). *Globalization and Internationalization in Higher Education*. London: Continuum.
- Gimenez, T., Salles El Kadri, M., Cabrini Simoes Calvo, L., Pimentel Siqueira, D., (2015). Inglés como lingua franca: desenvolvimentos recentes. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada* 15(3), 593-619.
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a Lingua Franca in the International University. The Politics of Academic English Language Policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Knight, J. (2005). An Internationalisation Model: Responding to New Realities and Challenges. In H. De Witt, I. Jaramillo, J. Gacel-Ávila & J. Knight (Eds.), *Higher Education in Latin America. The International Dimension* (pp. 1-38). Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding Language Teaching. From Method to Postmethod*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers. doi:10.4324/9781410615725
- Matear, A. (2008). English language learning in education policy in Chile: can English really open doors for all? *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 28: 2, 131-141.
- En <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188790802036679>
- Morales, M. y Salomone, A. (2020). Internationalization, English Language and Linguistic-Equality Issues at Universidad de Chile. Poster presented in the International Education Research Virtual Poster Fair 2020, NAFSA International Education Week, 16-20 November, 2020 IEW Campus Connection.
- Ramírez, C. (2005). Internationalization of Higher Education in Chile. In Jaramillo, I & Knight, J. (Eds.), *Higher Education in Latin America: The International Dimension*, pp. 149-173. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Reich, R. (2011). Development Agreements 2011-2014. Chilean government. Seminar SCT-Chile. Innovation and Harmonisation. In http://sctchile.consejodirectores.cl/documentos_WEB/Marco_General/1.Convenio_de_Desempeno%202011-2014_%20Ricardo_Reich.pdf.
- Salomone, A. (2019). Internationalisation and English as a Medium of Instruction. Opportunities and challenges that EMI poses for the internationalisation of postgraduate's programmes in Chilean universities. Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of MA in Global Englishes by taught course. Southampton (UK): The University of Southampton.
- University of Chile (2017). Institutional Development Plan 2017-2026. In <https://www.uchile.cl/portal/presentacion/senado-universitario/documentos/30784/plan-de-desarrollo-institucional-2017-2026>
- University of Chile. (2020). Postgraduate English Programme Documents

CHAPTER IV

TERRITORY AND
UNIVERSITY
INTERNATIONALISATION,
IS GLOCAL POSSIBLE?

By OSCAR GARRIDO,
Rector of Los Lagos University, Chile.

In March 2020, the World Health Organisation declared a global pandemic and warned about the complex scenarios that could arise. This situation with global repercussions, has had consequences in every country and affects all aspects of life. From the experience of a small institution situated in the south of Chile, a reflexion on internationalisation and its scopes from a local level allows us to analyse the way the Rectory of Los Lagos University management, and the Presidency of the Inter-American Organisation for Higher Education (IOHE) have been contributing to it. This article will account for that duality, sharing the work of both institutions, their evolution and actions performed in the sanitary contingency, which will allow us to get closer to the response that originated this document.

University Internationalisation

Higher education internationalisation is a process that enables us to generate cooperation and integration bonds with higher education institutions around the world with common interests, which should be incorporated into international entities that encourage such cooperation among universities, which facilitate the generation of mutually convenient exchanges and the development of joint actions. Defining internationalisation is not quite so simple, the concept has been evolving and it is not the purpose of this document to enter that discussion. It is worth mentioning that university internationalisation is a complex ongoing process developing since the 1980s decade, when we began to get acquainted with the concept of globalisation, which has evolved into teaching processes, apart from involving other institutional functions, such as research, management, and links with the environment (Knight, 2005).

Los Lagos University is a public university located in the south of Chile, in Los Lagos Region, created on August 30, 1993 (MINEDUC, 1993). It is an institution with no more than 10.000 students, accredited by the National Accreditation Commission for four years, has 84% of academics with postgraduate degrees and two campuses in the cities of Osorno and Puerto Montt, in addition to a branch in Santiago, Chile and another on the Isla Grande of Chiloé. The university offers 27 undergraduate careers, 6 professional careers with continuity of studies for technicians, 10 technical careers and 8 postgraduate degrees.

It concentrates its academic and research activity in the region where its main campuses are located and is the largest university in the region as for the territory covered and the number of students.

The IOHE (Garrido, 2018) is a non-profit association, founded in 1980 in the city of Quebec, Canada. It has an active presence in 28 countries in the Americas, with more than 350 members and its presidency is held for a second term by the Rector of Los Lagos. IOHE is focused on the Americas (North, Central, and South) without renouncing the possibility of linking up with other parts and latitudes of the world. 21 universities in Chile alone are members of the IOHE, these are universities of the Rectors' Council, universities of the Consortium of State Universities, and private universities. Among the associate members are the Interuniversity Development Centre (CINDA, in Spanish), the Rectors' Council of Chilean Universities (CRUCH, in Spanish), the Consortium of Chilean State Universities (CUECH, in Spanish, and the Corporation of Private Universities (CUP, in Spanish).

In its early years, IOHE was presided over by Gilles Boulet between 1980 and 1989. Then, rectors from different universities in Brazil, Peru, Canada, and Mexico have led it, and for the first time in these 40 years, it has been chaired between 2017 and 2021, by a Rector from a State university in the region, such as Los Lagos University.

The IOHE has four major programmes, and one of them seeks to generate levels of convergence and articulation of doctoral programmes among accredited quality universities in different parts of America. Known as "CAMPUS", its objective is to be able to converge, in terms of identifying credits, certifications, recognition and the possibility of generating student exchanges in the field of doctoral programmes. One of the most important programmes is the Institute for University Management and Leadership, or "IGLU", in Spanish, which is highly recognised

in the Americas, aiming at training higher education managers. In this, the management teams of the institutions have the possibility to access specialisation courses, in which many Rectors from Chile and the rest of the continent, have taken part, where in addition to training, they have the possibility to get to know experiences of other universities with similar characteristics, so that they can build on those experiences. Another is the programme Women Leaders of Higher Education Institutions ("EMULIES, in Spanish) which is a space for reflection and exchange formed by women which, since its creation, has worked with the aim of promoting research, encouraging the development of capacities based on training, fostering cooperation and exchange, and driving dissemination and communication about women in leadership and decision-making positions. Besides, four years ago, the Inter-American Space for Higher Technical and Technological Education ("IESTEC", in Spanish) was born. Understanding that in Latin America there is an important and sometimes neglected space from the point of view of teaching and technical-academic development, the programme has the purpose of strengthening training, research, and innovation in short careers of technical and technological higher education institutions in the Americas, sharing experiences with the aim of building a communication, integration and development network adapted to their own characteristics.

The participation of Los Lagos University in the IOHE traces its origins back 30 years ago, and recognises four milestones or moments: 1) beginning of membership in the organisation in 1991; 2) vice-presidency of Andean Countries, from 2013 to 2015 leading the universities of Chile, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia; 3) general vice-presidency in 2017, in parallel as Vice-presidency of Andean Countries for a second period (2015-2017); and 4) presidency since 2017, chosen by IOHE member institutions, and confirmed for second term.

Internationalisation at Los Lagos University

This house of studies is born in 1993 by Law of the Republic, and in 1994 the Direction of International Relations is created. Once the dictatorship was over, one of the fundamental milestones is marked by State policies driven at university level and the student mobility programmes.

In 1997 network participation begins with 50 agreements, in 2005 the Student Mobility Programme was created with 100 international agreements. Thanks to the continuous collaboration with IOHE, emphasised by the Vice-Presidency for Andean Countries and the openness of academic body of researchers, Los Lagos University has 300 ongoing international agreements. The actions traced back since the beginning of the University in terms of internationalisation, will result in 2020 in an updated Internationalisation Policy. Its purpose is positioning the Los Lagos University in the local, regional, national, and international context, as an institution that seeks excellence and continuous improvement through the internationalisation of its areas and functions, as well as contributing to the training of students and graduates in different areas, such as science and technological development, artistic creation and links with society. It is thus understood that cooperative relationships are present throughout university activities, which is why three specific objectives have been established.

First, to reinforce institutional capacities for the positioning and insertion of the university in local, national, and international educational communities in terms of academic mobility, networks, cooperation projects, contacts with international entities, among others. Secondly, to promote suitable spaces for the development of alliances and projects with strategic national and international players, according to institutional aims and interests. Thirdly, to plan, manage, evaluate and provide feedback on internationalisation in the areas of undergraduate, postgraduate, research and links with the environment, generating procedures, instruments and mechanisms for its development.

The pandemic presented us with new scenarios in all university areas, from virtual classes to teleworking, and the rapid adaptation that higher education institutions undertook was no exception for international relations. The pandemic effects on internationalisation raised at least four lines of action: the impossibility of physical transport forced us to design new strategies to maintain linkages and collaboration; virtuality was revalued, as it had not been used to its full potential; it made it possible to focus on exchange programmes at the level of mobility and collaboration in priority areas of research and innovation; and it led to the recognition that distance education expansion would have a greater role at the regional, national, and international levels. On this last point, it should be noted that distance education has been undervalued, especially in Chile, due to the lack of more powerful projects to certify the quality of these processes.

The pandemic leaves challenges for higher education institutions, which in internationalisation focus on student mobility, academic exchange, and cooperative work among institutions, to provide adaptive responses in times of crisis, which must be assumed with greater cooperation, creating a knowledge community with an intercultural content.

This is why it is necessary to generate strong international collaborative actions for the articulation between higher education institutions, which belong to different networks and associations. There are several challenges to be tackled, among the most relevant ones:

- Opportunity to reform and reflect upon the role of higher education and the challenges the current scenario will present in terms of internationalisation.
- Adapting to the reconfiguration of students' interests and university priorities.
- Boosting collaboration in the university world facilitated by innovation technologies allowing contact among various institutions.
- Enhancing the non-face-to-face experience achieved in higher education.
- Maintaining academic activity with creativity, with other opportunities and forms of exchange, that do not necessarily imply on-site mobility, generating new learning experiences.
- Possibility to move forward in the joint generation of virtual (hybrid) academic programmes among universities from different countries.

The experience of Los Lagos University in internationalisation

Before the pandemic, the University of Los Lagos maintained cooperation with foreign countries in various international networks, where the following stood up: IOHE, the Union of Universities of Latin America and the

Caribbean (UDUAL, in Spanish), and the Orion Association, a global network of universities and non-governmental organisations operating in Latin America, the Caribbean, and Europe. As mentioned above, our university has a policy of internationalisation that has allowed the consolidation of a formal regulated model of Student Mobility, so as not to have difficulties in certifying the status of foreign students, nor of students from the same university who travel abroad through strategic alliances, which in turn is a management focused on increasing the number of foreign scholarships for student mobility. This is due to the lack of a more aggressive policy in the country that allows exchange (Santander Scholarships, Pacific Alliance, Chile Scholarships, and others), in addition to the monitoring and control of international agreements with responsible academics and links with counterparts.

International agreements are part of the intention of formal collaboration between institutions where the acting and commitment framework of the interested parties is defined. Los Lagos University has 300 collaboration agreements with 214 higher education institutions in 30 countries: 52% in South America, 23% in North America, 21% in Europe and 4% in other continents. As for student mobility, while the figures represent a lower participation in our country, since 2012 there have been 423 foreign students studying at the university. Of these, 80% are in undergraduate programmes and 20% in postgraduate programmes, and most of them come from Latin America (63%) and Europe (31%). 184 students went abroad from our university in the same period, concentrated in Latin America (80%) and Europe (19%), lower figures mainly associated with cultural barriers of language and funding.

International participation in the 2016-2019 period, has enabled 436 members of the academic staff of Los Lagos University to travel abroad for international conferences and congresses, internships and stays for both, research, and teaching, among other activities. Cooperation activities with IOHE have been

the most rewarding, considering the number of institutions involved, as it has allowed academics and officials from the areas of university management to participate in courses and internships: IGLU course on institutional management (33 participants), IGLU course on gender policies (16 participants), internships abroad (21 participants), innovative educational models award (6 participants), and Management of Innovation Environments Programme/ International Congress on Knowledge and Innovation (27 participants).

Internationalisation in pandemics, actions and developments

The pandemic has presented us with considerable challenges in internationalisation, but this has not stopped interinstitutional links and cooperation. Cooperative work between institutions has remained. Work with IOHE, keeps active, managing activities from the presidency that are possible to be carried out, given the current pandemic restrictions, and the commitments acquired in the various programmes in which academics and directors participate. The Directorate of International Relations continues to work, managing new agreements and supporting different actions developed at the university in terms of internationalisation in the academic and research area. In this field it is worth noticing some of the actions that continue to be developed in pandemic. As in many universities, mobility has come to a standstill, but enabled the generation of an innovative telecollaboration project in teaching - the *Telecollaboration Project Chile-USA* - with the Edward Waters College in the US city of Jacksonville, in the state of Florida, which fosters the use of a certain language through online technology. Also, it is important to highlight a broad international collaboration agreement with universities in Sweden, New Zealand, and USA to support a research, innovation, and technology transfer project, an alliance that led to the award of a US\$ 1.5 million project to strengthen and develop a research project in the area of plant genetic resources.

An experience arising in 2019 and that became stronger in pandemic, is implemented by the IOHE to boost virtual mobility, understanding that there are limitations of resources and mobility between countries. This experience offers higher education institutions an alternative vision to traditional mobility models, for the promotion of academic exchange in higher education, allowing students the opportunity to take subjects in virtual or distance learning mode, offered by IOHE member institutions. The eMOVIES programme consists of a consortium of higher education institutions, where each institution makes available a number of places (courses or subjects) offered in virtual mode, so that a student exchange plan can be established in accordance with the available offer. Every institution establishes conditions or requirements for receiving exchange students and commits to issue the corresponding certificate or recognition to those who meet the academic and/or administrative demands required,

and this exchange is based on the principle of collaboration and reciprocity, implying no cost for the student. eMOVIES second semester 2019 results recorded the participation of 12 universities, with 587 courses and 5,381 places, while in 2020, 72 universities in the Americas participated, with 3,807 courses and a coverage of 17,189 students. These are significant data from the viewpoint of coverage, scope, and magnitude of the initiative driven by IOHE, which can undoubtedly be improved, further standardised, and seek better conditions of guarantee, security, and quality for the participants of the programme.

These actions, regardless of the conditions of the current pandemic context allow us to confirm that e-learning should be a relevant instrument to be promoted. It should be placed at the service of student mobility and internationalisation, as well as for the development of consortiums and working groups in research, postgraduate studies and other subjects related to university work.

Also in international matters, the seventh edition of the Congress of the Americas on International Education (CAIE), which had previously been held in the Canadian cities of Montreal and Calgary, Monterrey in Mexico, Rio de Janeiro in Brazil, Bogota in Colombia, and Quito in Ecuador is planned to be held for the first time in Chile, in October 2021 in a virtual context. The CAIE (IOHE, 2020) is a forum that gathers the main players and decision-makers linked to the internationalisation of higher education in the Americas, with the aim of reinforcing contacts, exchanging experiences, and tracing the future

of academic cooperation in the region, becoming one of the most significant actions developed by IOHE.

Conclusion

The internationalisation of higher education, from a broad conception, allows us to involve all areas of university development, understanding that mutual cooperation and exchange programmes are necessary for the development of institutions, their academics, and their students. The pandemic has situated us in a different scenario and has put us to the test under complex circumstances for countries, and in particular, for universities, that have had to maintain their activities at a distance and be innovative in a scenario with restricted movement. Reviewing the initial question in a pandemic context of where we are going to, or whether the “glocal” is possible, this document shows that it is possible to maintain internationalisation actions despite health restrictions, where innovation and the commitment of higher education institutions is key to generate collaborative actions. The pandemic and the actions promoted leave us with some lessons and future challenges: university internationalisation must take a new look from online support platforms; the reinforcement of international university networks is possible from collaboration and commitment of higher education institutions and international institutions; and it is possible, from a regional university to contribute to the development of internationalisation.

References

- De Wit, H., Jaramillo, I., Gacel-Avila, J & Knight, J. (2005). *Un Modelo de Internacionalización. En Educación Superior en América Latina, La Dimensión Internacional* (pp.1-38). Colombia: Mayol Ediciones.
- Garrido, O., Julien, D. & Altamirano, O. (2018). *La OUI y sus Contribuciones al Desarrollo y Fortalecimiento de Redes para la Internacionalización de las Américas. En Educación Superior y Sociedad* (pp.85-104). Caracas, Venezuela: Instituto Internacional de Unesco para la Educación.
- Ministerio de Educación. (1993). *Crea Universidad de Los Lagos*. Mayo 10, 2021, de Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional, Sitio web: <http://www.leychile.cl/N?i=30605&f=1993-08-30&p=>.
- Organización Interamericana de Educación Superior [internet] *Sobre el CAEI*, [consultado 10 de mayo, 2020], Disponible en: <https://caie-caei.org/>.

CICLO DE CONFERENCIAS VIRTUALES
Internacionalización Universitaria, Interculturalidad y Multilinguaje

INTERNACIONALIZACIÓN UNIVERSITARIA, INTERCULTURALIDAD Y MULTILINGUAJE

Dep. de ...
 Vicerrectoría de ...

Alicia Salomone, U. de Chile

Andree Henríquez A. Universidad de Chile

Hans de Wit

CICLO DE CONFERENCIAS VIRTUALES
Internacionalización universitaria post pandemia: ¿nuevas formas o viejos hábitos?

Internacionalización universitaria post pandemia: ¿nuevas formas o viejos hábitos?

al: Internacionalización universitaria post pa

CICLO DE CONFERENCIAS VIRTUALES
Internacionalización más allá de la movilidad

MOVILIDADES: NO CONOCEMOS EL UNIVERSO

- La mitad de todos los estudiantes internacionales se mudan a cinco países de habla inglesa: Australia, Canadá, Nueva Zelanda, Reino Unido y Estados Unidos.
- La proporción de estudiantes internacionales en Francia y Alemania ha aumentado al 8% y al 6%, respectivamente, en parte porque ofrecen cada vez más programas de posgrado en inglés.
- China, India y la República de Corea representaron el 25% de toda la movilidad saliente en 2016.
- Europa es la segunda región emisora más grande, representando el 23% del total en 2016, pero el 76% de los 0,9 millones de estudiantes europeos móviles se quedan dentro la región.

Daniela Perrotta

LIVE (twt)
 LIVE YouTube

CICLO DE CONFERENCIAS VIRTUALES

INTERNACIONALIZACIÓN UNIVERSITARIA POST PANDEMIA

¿NUEVAS FORMAS O VIEJOS HÁBITOS?

Alicia Salomone, U. de Chile

Marcela Tapia INTE-Unap

Sonia Morán, U. de Southampton

Sonia Morán, U. de Southampton

Re-pensando el inglés en la enseñanza

La enseñanza del inglés todavía se centra en la adquisición de modelos nativos anglofonos. Entender, aprender y poco realistas. (How are we doing?)

Políticas comunicativas: todos los contextos y momentos en contextos globales (ELF) vs. nativos (L1)

Fuente: General: identificación y desarrollo de estudiantes y profesores multilingües "re-activos"

Grupo de interés especial en la Educación Superior y el inglés

Natacha Pino Acuña, Rectora Universidad de ...

Daniela Perrotta

EFFECTOS DE LA PANDEMIA EN LA INTERNACIONALIZACIÓN

Imposibilidad del traslado físico ha obligado a diseñar nuevas estrategias para mantener la vinculación y la colaboración.

Valorización de la virtualidad que no había sido utilizada en todo su potencial.

Oportunidad de focalizar los intercambios a nivel de la movilidad y de colaboración en las áreas prioritarias de investigación e innovación.

Expansión de la educación a distancia, modalidad de enseñanza que va a ganar un mayor protagonismo a nivel regional, nacional e internacional.

Puesta en valor de las redes y los consorcios universitarios nacionales e internacionales para afrontar situaciones de crisis y compartir buenas prácticas.

Oscar Garrido

Misconception about Internationalization

We consider internationalisation too much as a goal in itself instead of as a means to an end.

Internationalisation is not more and less than a way to enhance the quality of education and research and their service to society.

Hans de Wit

Anoek van den Berg

André Henriquez A. Univers...

VID



**VIRTUAL
CONFERENCE
SERIES**

ISBN 978-956-410-305-1