

интенсификация академической мобильности. Коммюнике министров образования ЕПВО (2009 г.) установило целевые показатели наращивания академической мобильности к 2020 г. (так называемый «критерий 20-20-20»): «Не менее 20 % выпускников вузов ЕПВО должны пройти обучение или практику за рубежом» [6, р. 4]. Несмотря на то что впоследствии было отмечено, что для ряда стран ЕС данный показатель нереалистичен, стратегия постоянного увеличения академической мобильности повсеместно признается необходимым условием устойчивого развития Европейского Союза.

СПИСОК ИСПОЛЬЗОВАННЫХ ИСТОЧНИКОВ

1. EURODATA — Student mobility in European higher education / M. Kelo, U. Teichler, B. Wächter (eds.). — Bonn: Lemmens, 2006.
2. Mapping mobility in European higher education / U. Teichler, I. Ferencz, B. Wächter (eds.). — Bonn: DAAD, 2011.
3. Mobility: Closing the gap between policy and practice / E. Colucci [et al.] [Electronic resource]. — Mode of access: http://www.maunimo.eu/images/Oslo/eua%20maunimo_web.pdf. — Date of access: 01.06.2014.
4. Didelon, C. The European Union in the flows of international students: attractiveness and inconsistency / C. Didelon, Y. Richard // International review of sociology. — July 2012. — Vol. 22, №2. — P. 229—244. — P. 237.
5. On the way to ERASMUS+. A Statistical Overview of the ERASMUS Programme in 2011-12 [Electronic resource]. — 2013. — Mode of access: http://ec.europa.eu/education/library/reports/erasmus1112_en.pdf. — Date of access: 01.06.2014.
6. Communiqué of the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education, Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve, 28—29 April 2009 [Electronic resource]. — 2009. — Mode of access: http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Declarations/Leuven_Louvain-la-euve_Communique%C3%A9_April_2009.pdf. — Date of access: 01.06.2014.

SET OF INDICATORS TO MEASURE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF UNIVERSITY: EXPERIENCE OF EUROPEAN UNION

A. Rytau, MA in Humanities, Head of International programs and projects office, Department of International Relations, BSU

K. Makarevich, Deputy Head of Department of International Relations, BSU

Today internationalization is considered as “the process of integrating international, intercultural or global dimensions into the purpose, function or delivery of higher education” [1, p. 7]. For majority of European universities it is clear that internationalization is not just a specific function of management but phenomena related to institution as a whole, including its objectives. In that case in order to make correct decisions and design effective strategy university decision-makers have to understand what internationalization is, how it could be evaluated and what kind of targets need to be set up in order to achieve the necessary level of performance.

On the other hand, it is also important to show to stakeholders strengths and ambitions of university from an internationalisation perspective. All interested groups — ministries, enterprises, companies and public organizations, students and staff — need to have an access to information about the content and quality of study programmes and their international dimension. Internationalisation indicators are considered as an integral part of the system of indicators that can be used to inform the public about university performance.

There are also some other specific reasons to design a set of indicators for measuring international profile and activity of HEI, namely: needs to pass accreditation, benchmarking, ranking, self-evaluation and audit, quality improvement etc.

European experience in mapping and profiling internationalization is very extensive. During the last decade hundreds of studies and research projects dealing with this issue were carried out by European experts in higher education. Series of research projects were implemented by major international university networks — EUA, EAIE and EFQM (European Foundation for Quality Management), as well as by national research and consulting structures in almost each country of the European Union. As a result more than 30 tools for measuring or evaluating internationalisation of university were designed [2].

The MINT project (Mapping Internationalisation) implemented by the Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education (NUFFIC) in 2009 could be mentioned in this regard. Researchers have created the tool which allows institutions to assess (self-evaluate) their international activity on both central and program levels based on a set of qualitative and quantitative indicators. As a result HEIs applying the tool became able to benchmark good practices and identify areas of future improvement [3]. It is worth to be mentioned that MINT tool is now being used by several Belarusian HEIs within Tempus project “PICASA”.

The latest and most comprehensive study based on outcomes of the above mentioned surveys was IMPI project (Indicators for Mapping and Profiling Internationalisation). The project was implemented in 2009—2012. Six metalevel European institutions — Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Education (SIU), Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education (NUFFIC), Academic Cooperation Association in Belgium (ACA), CampusFrance, Polish Educational Foundation “Perspektywy” and spin-off from the German Centre for Higher Education Consulting and Research Organization “CHE Consult” [4] — were listed among the project core partners. The project was funded by the European Commission within the Lifelong Learning Programme. The aim of the project was to develop a comprehensive list of indicators that can be used by HEIs from very diverse geographical and academic contexts in the evaluation and monitoring of their internationalisation activities [5].

Within the project experts explored almost all existing in EU tools for measuring internationalization and made an attempt to classify numerous quantitative indicators and qualitative questions. First of all, indicators for mapping internationalization were used to measure three different elements in university performance chain: inputs, outputs and outcomes, wherein the inputs are the resources available to support internationalisation efforts, the outputs are the results achieved, e.g. direct consequences from inputs, and fi-

nally outcomes are so-called “overall achievements” which are linked to the strategic internationalisation goals of the institution, school or programme (for example, competencies of graduates, the quality of education programmes and research, financial benefits, benefits to the wider community or increased reputation) [4, p. 16]. In that case, different sets of indicators were designed to measure different aspects of university international activity in the “goals — outcomes” chain.

In majority of existing in EU tools for measuring internationalization indicators are classified within 5–12 categories reflecting university performance with regard to internationalization. Most of them include such categories as “policies/strategies/goals”, “organisational and support structures, including funding”, “curriculum/academic programs”, “international students, staff and scholars”, “international collaborations (joint programs/projects/researches/etc.)”, “communication (use of foreign/English language in study/research/PR)”, etc.

Today probably the most comprehensive set of indicators for measuring internationalization is offered by the IMPI project [5]. The Toolbox designed within the project allows HEIs willing to conduct self-evaluation to measure their internationalization through almost 500 indicators grouped in 7 categories and subcategories: 1. Students (study abroad, international students, general student data); 2. Staff (academic and non-academic staff members — general data, academic and non-academic staff members — outgoing staff, academic and non-academic staff members — staff from abroad, academic staff members, non-academic staff); 3. Administration; 4. Funding and finance; 5. Curricula and Academic Services; 6. Research, Promotion and Marketing (researcher profiles, visiting researchers, researcher activity, institutional profile, publications and citations, patents); 7. Non-Academic Services, and Campus and Community life (services to international students, services to study abroad students, services to staff).

At the same time the Toolbox enables universities to conduct tailored-made profiling and self-assessment, it means that university may select and choose from the very broad set of indicators the ones most relevant to its size, type and what is very important — to its strategy. Indicators therefore linked to the following goals: 1. to enhance the quality of education; 2. to enhance the quality of research; 3. to well-prepare students for life and work in intercultural and globalising world; 4. to enhance international reputation and visibility of the unit; 5. to provide service to society and community social engagement. The toolbox is available on-line free of charge on the web-site of the project <http://www.impi-project.eu/toolbox>.

After piloting the Toolbox and offering it to users around the world researchers were able to select the most used indicators, e.g. those which combine substantial use with high ratings of relevance. From 11 to 33 most used indicators were selected for each of above mentioned goals [5].

Due to the format of the publication we will limit our description to the 1st and probably the most obvious goal of university: to enhance the quality of education. The list of the most used indicators under this goal fall under several categories. The first category is “Students”. It is comprised of 11 indicators (out of 32). Four indicators related to academic mobility (“study abroad” sub-category):

- advising students on study abroad opportunities;
- providing specific contact information for international internships;
- students participation in outgoing exchange or mobility programmes;
- proportion of students studied abroad.

Two indicators cover international students body:

- proportion of exchange or mobility programme students;
- international students in programmes taught in the national language.

Five indicators related to general student data:

- graduates from international joint/double degree programmes;
- students in international joint/double/multiple degree programmes;
- graduates from international joint or double degree programmes;
- students involved in international shared supervision / co-tutelles;
- share of incoming exchange students of all students.

The second major category is “Curricula and Academic Services”. Indicators with the highest relevance reflect the following areas of internationalization of curriculum:

- incorporation of mobility windows into the curriculum;
- information for incoming international students;
- study load for foreign language;
- international joint/double/multiple degree programmes;
- study programs in English/foreign language, etc.

Another crucial area of university life of great importance in relation to internationalization is “Funding and Finance”. Indicators to measure this sphere are the following:

- total budget dedicated to internationalisation;
- proportion of international students who receive a scholarship from hosting institution or from external sources;
- the total budget for scholarships and what proportion is dedicated to scholarships for international students.

As a conclusion it is worth to be mentioned that indeed the European Union has a very strong experience in mapping and profiling university internationalization. This experience is very valuable for higher education institutions in Belarus. Despite the fact that existing measuring tools in Belarus cover major areas of international activity, in some cases indicators used can be considered as non-significant in terms of revealing quality or effectiveness of internationalization [6]. For example, such indicators as number of partnerships or memberships in university networks are more ostensible than objective. Therefore, it is really important to take a look at European experience and good practices in the sphere of management of internationalization.

REFERENCES

1. Knight, J. Internationalization: key concepts and elements. Internationalization of European Higher Education. An EUA / ACA Handbook. — Berlin; Shtuttgart, 2008.
2. Existing tools for measuring or evaluating internationalisation in HE [Electronic resource]. — Mode of access: <http://www.nuffic.nl/en/library/existing-tools-for-measuring-internationalisation.pdf>. — Date of access: 01.06.2014.

3. Mapping Internationalisation (MINT) [Electronic resource]. — Mode of access: <http://www.nuffic.nl/en/expertise/quality-assurance-and-internationalisation/mapping-internationalisation-mint/mapping-internationalisation-mint>. — Date of access: 01.06.2014.

4. Beerkens, E. Indicator Projects on Internationalisation — Approaches, Methods and Findings / E. Beerkens [Electronic resource]. — Mode of access: http://www.che.de/downloads/indicator_projects_on_internationalisation__IMPI_100511.pdf. — Date of access: 01.06.2014.

5. The IMPI Project outcomes 2012 [Electronic resource]. — 2012. — Mode of access: http://www.impi-toolbox.eu/pdf/IMPI_Outcomes_2012_04_09_rev.pdf. — Date of access: 01.06.2014.

6. Rytan, A. Quality assurance and internationalization: the BSU experience in developing the quality management system (QMS) / A. Rytan // Quality Assurance Tools for the Management of Internationalization. — Mohyliv-Podilskyi; Kyiv: Hoverla—CEL, 2011. — 200 p. — P. 75—91.

ИНТЕГРАЦИОННЫЕ ПРОЦЕССЫ В ЕВРОПЕ И ЕВРОПЕЙСКАЯ СИСТЕМА ОБЕСПЕЧЕНИЯ КАЧЕСТВА

С.В. Пешкун, начальник отдела международных связей ПГУ

Европейская интеграция — сложный и многоуровневый процесс, направленный на достижение политического, правового и социально-экономического объединения государств, которая преимущественно осуществляется посредством функционирования Европейского Союза, регулируемого Советом Европы, Европейской комиссией и другими институтами ЕС. Европейский Союз как основной результат интеграции — международное образование — сочетает признаки международной организации, поэтому носит межгосударственный характер, и государства, что позволяет рассматривать его как надгосударственное образование [1]. Однако формально он не является ни тем, ни другим. В определенных областях решения принимаются независимыми наднациональными институтами, а в других — осуществляются посредством переговоров между государствами-членами.

Для понимания интеграционных процессов в Европе в настоящее время, а особенно процессов гармонизации систем высшего образования, первоочередным выступает понимание идей и принципов объединения.

Идеи панъевропеизма как никогда стали актуальными после Второй мировой войны, когда на ослабевшую экономику стран континента повлияло множество внешних факторов, справиться в одиночку с которыми не представлялось возможным. В результате совместных усилий самых активных стран на континенте появляется ряд организаций и сообществ: Совет Европы, НАТО, Западноевропейский союз, Европейское экономическое сообщество, призванных обеспечить политическую и социально-экономическую стабильность.