Languages and the Internationalisation of Higher Education

Languages and the Internationalisation of Higher Education

Edited by

Dolores González-Álvarez
and Esperanza Rama-Martínez

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 2: Specific Training for the University Community

Section 3: Language Testing and Accreditation

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACLES	Asociación de Centros de Lenguas en la Enseñanza Superior (Association of Language Centres in Higher Education [in Spain])
AERA	American Educational Research Association
AI	Artificial Intelligence
AKS	Arbeitskreis der Sprachenzentren (Association of Language Centres [in Higher Education in Germany et al.])
ALTE	Association of Language Testers in Europe
APA	American Psychological Association
ASTP	Army Specialised Training Program
CALL	Computer Assisted Language Learning
CAT	Computer Adaptive Test
CEFR	Common European Framework of Reference for languages
CIC	Classroom Interactional Competence
CLIL	Content and Language Integrated Learning
CLT	Communicative Language Teaching
CPE	Certificate of Proficiency in English
CRUE	Conferencia de Rectores de las Universidades Españolas (Board of Rectors of Spanish Universities)
CTT	Classical Test Theory

DS	Diploma Supplement
EAIE	European Association of International Education
EAP	Employee Assistance Programme
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
EHEA	European Higher Education Area
ELC	European Language Council
ELP	European Language Portfolio
EMEMUS	English-Medium Education in Multilingual University Settings
EOIs	Escuelas Oficiales de Idiomas (Official Language Schools)
EQUiiP	Educational Quality at Universities for inclusive international Programmes
ETP	English for Teaching Purposes
FCE	First Certificate in English
FL	Foreign Language
FSI	Foreign Service Institute
GT	Generalisability Theory
HE	Higher Education
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
HRM	Human Resources Management
IaH	Internationalisation at Home
IC	International Classroom

ICC	Intraclass Correlation Coefficient
ICLHE	Integration of Content and Language in Higher Education
ICT	Information & Communication Technology
IIE	Institute of International Education
IL	International Language
IM	Instant Messaging
IPs	Intensive Programmes
IPL	Introduction to Public Law
IRE	Initiation-Response-Evaluation
IRT	Item Response Theory
KPI	Key Performance Indicators
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
LA	Lexical Availability
LAL	Language Assessment Literacy
LC(s)	Language Centre(s)
LCE	Lower Certificate in English
LCP	Language and Culture Policy
LIU	Laureate International Universities
LLAS	Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies
LMS	Language Management System
LOA	Learning Oriented Assessment

LREs	Language-Related Episodes
LSP	Language for Specific Purposes
MALL	Mobile-Assisted Language Learning
MECD (MECS)	Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte (Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport)
MIM	Mobile Instant Messaging
NCME	National Council on Measurement in Education
NNS	Non-Native Speaker
NS	Native Speaker
NULTE	Network of University Language Testers in Europe
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OPI	Oral Proficiency Interview
PFL-SS	Portuguese as a Foreign Language for Spanish Speakers
PPHDL	Proyecto Panhispánico de Estudio sobre la Disponibilidad Léxica (Pan-Hispanic Project for the Study of Lexical Availability)
RI	Reliability Index
ROC	Receiving Operating Characteristic
RTP	Reflective Teaching Plan
SD	Standard Deviation
SdL-UAB	Servei de Llengües-Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (Language Service-UAB)
SEM	Standard Error of Measurement
SLA	Second Language Acquisition

STQ	Senior Teaching Qualification
TBL	Task-Based Learning
TEPs	Teacher Education Programmes
TOEFL	Test of English as a Foreign Language
(TOEFL) iBT	(TOEFL) internet-Based Test
UCLan	University of Central Lancashire
UCLES	University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate
UEM	Universidad Europea de Madrid
UG	University of Groningen
UNIcert®	University certificate
UNIcert®LUCE	UNIcert® Language Accreditation Unit for Universities in Central Europe
UTQ	University Teaching Qualification
VLE	Virtual Learning Environment
WLP	Worldwise Languages Programme
WLC	Worldwise Learning Centre

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

DOLORES GONZÁLEZ-ÁLVAREZ
AND ESPERANZA RAMA-MARTÍNEZ

1. Introduction

The European Council set in 2008 the objective that all citizens of the EU should achieve proficiency in two languages as well as their mother tongue. Since then, Higher Education Institutions in Europe have promoted learning and using English and other foreign languages in university campuses. At the national level, the document elaborated by the Spanish Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport entitled "Strategy for the Internationalisation of Spanish Universities 2015-2020" (Estrategia para la Internacionalización de las Universidades Españolas 2015-2020) recommends as measures to improve the international attractiveness of our universities to increase the number of bilingual degree and master's programmes, taught in the official languages of Spain and other foreign languages, and to promote the acquisition of a sufficient level of English among teaching and administrative staff and members occupying academic positions. In this context, in which plurilingualism becomes a strategic axis in the process of internationalisation of universities, Language Centres serve as the key instrument to implement the process, by providing linguistic support for all the stakeholders engaged in international activity (student recruitment, teaching, research, mobility, graduate employment, etc.).

The internationalisation of universities encompasses a broad field of action ranging from high-ranking policy decisions to the implementation of tailored mechanisms aimed at improving good practices in training students, teachers and administrative staff in a foreign language, accrediting their foreign language communicative competence or promoting incentives to support the efforts made by the teaching and administrative staff to adapt to the process. It is essential to take decisions about languages of tuition, the languages to teach, the levels of proficiency to reach, the languages of scientific communication, the languages at the

campus and other language decisions. The general conditions of each university have to be carefully analysed and considered: languages of the country and the region, languages of neighbour countries, university networks and exchange programmes, the specialisation and general goals of the university and many other factors. And, of course, there is still a very intensive discussion about the role of English in a more and more multilingual context. All these issues have been discussed in University Language Centres and other institutions in Higher Education over the last few years. This is why the Association of Language Centres in Higher Education in Spain (Asociación de Centros de Lenguas en la Enseñanza Superior, ACLES) decided to dedicate one of its biannual conferences precisely to the current role of University Language Centres in the process of internationalisation of universities and the challenges they face. The conference was hosted by the University of Vigo in 2017 and the chapters in this book represent but a fragment of the fruitful debate that took place throughout the three-day event. Though most of the papers are based on the Spanish context, we believe that they may be of interest to researchers and practitioners working in countries that bear some similarities to Spain in terms of the role of English in the broader society, in terms of the proportion of international students and lecturers or in terms of the stage of implementation of English Medium Instruction (EMI).

The fourteen chapters that give form to this volume bring together solid empirical contributions with the aim of providing new insights into language policy issues, pedagogical practices and methods, and good practice in language testing, with the role of Language Centres as the connecting thread.

2. Overview of the volume

Being internationalisation one of the principles that determine quality standards in research, teaching and study programmes in Higher Education Institutions in Europe and the world over, the first section of the volume aims to describe the response given to this challenge in three European contexts. The first chapter by González-Álvarez pins down the recommendations put forward by the Board of Rectors of Spanish Universities (CRUE)[1] and endorsed by all the public and private

---

[1] CRUE (Conferencia de Rectores de las Universidades Españolas), founded in 1994, is a non-profit association formed by a total of 76 Spanish universities: 50 public and 26 private universities. CRUE is the main interlocutor of the universities with the Central Government and plays a key role in all the normative

universities in Spain to coordinate university language policies at a national level (see Bazo et al. 2017). The chapter addresses three basic tenets in the implementation of this language policy: accreditation, training and incentives, including students, lecturers and administration staff as target agents. Discussion touches upon a variety of issues ranging from the extant heterogeneity in accreditation levels to the different methodological and language support measures needed to launch EMI programmes successfully or the role of Language Centres in the process of internationalisation.

This general Spanish framework is followed by the actual implementation of a language policy in a Spanish University, the Universidad Europea in Madrid. Fernández-Otero and Strotmann (Chapter Two) provide an example of good practice of how to involve key stakeholders and external experts in the process of developing an institutional language policy in accordance with (1) the priority actions indicated by the Board of Rectors of Spanish Universities and (2) international priorities set by the Laureate network.

Chapters Three and Four move out of the Spanish context to present the strategies implemented by the University of Central Lancashire and the Dutch University of Groningen, respectively. The former, through its Worldwise Learning Centre, developed the Worldwise Languages Programme in response to two core challenges identified in the area of language learning: firstly, the apparent "unpreparedness" and unwillingness of UK students with regard to learning a foreign language and, secondly, the growing number of international students pursuing degree programmes in UK universities who need to improve their general and academic English. In order to overcome these challenges, the programme's main objective is to make language learning provision more accessible, flexible and easily adaptable to meet individual needs and requirements; this is achieved by including the provision of an alternative learning environment to the traditional classroom, such as the Rosetta Stone software. Anysiadou provides a critical evaluation of this software identifying its main strengths and weaknesses.

Haines, in turn, describes the Groningen experience of an institution-wide "international classroom" project with a focus on the needs of the content teachers responsible for delivering the international programmes at Bachelor's and Master's levels through EMI. The project provides the

---

developments that affect Higher Education in Spain. It also promotes initiatives of a different nature in order to foster institutional relations, both national and international, and works to give value to the Spanish University System.

principles and practices that enable faculties to implement a policy focused on building international educational programmes within a conducive academic and social environment. In terms of language provision, lecturers are encouraged to recognise the role they play in instructing their students in the language of their academic or discourse community. This experience, supported by an over-arching policy, shows the role that Language Centres play in partnership with other units and faculties and the need to create sites of mutual engagement in which various stakeholders can cooperate to provide the teachers with the support they need.

Moving away from university language policies and the general implementation of internationalisation in three universities pertaining to the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), the second set of five chapters focuses on the implementation of pedagogical practices to enhance both the foreign language skills of students within bilingual programmes (Chapter Five) and the professional training of EMI lecturers (Chapters Six to Nine). Thus, Chapter Five proposes the use of chat-based conversations via mobile phones to improve oral and written communication. Andújar-Vaca reflects on the synchronous and asynchronous characteristics offered by this type of conversation. On the one hand, students participate in an almost instant chat-based conversation and, on the other hand, the asynchronous character of the application allows them to reflect on the language used, not only in terms of spelling, grammar or vocabulary but also on their pronunciation and tone in the case of voice messages. During this process of reflection, peer collaboration plays a fundamental role as students help each other negotiate meaning as well as notice possible errors during the conversation, teacher feedback being often unnecessary.

The following chapters in this section bring lecturer training into the picture. Banks (Chapter Six) analyses the use of video observation as a resource for supporting the classroom interactional competence of EMI lecturers. He argues that, despite the growing empirical evidence for the inclusion of learner-centred pedagogies, classroom interaction remains a controversial issue in the Spanish Higher Education context in which monologic transmission models continue to predominate. Classroom observation arises as a very useful means to showcase best practice in the use of classroom interaction and related functional language, such as asking and answering questions, eliciting responses, giving instructions, providing feedback, and starting and rounding up group work activities. He further argues that personalised authentic materials are a powerful way to provide relevant feedback leading to reflection and enhanced classroom interactional competence.

In his contribution, Jiménez-Muñoz (Chapter Seven) analyses the findings from a survey on 144 EMI-lecturer training programmes in 21 countries, evidencing differing target English proficiency levels and dissimilar components in accreditation programmes. In particular, he shows that most provisions have focused on presentation skills, pronunciation and general English level, but have largely overlooked methodological changes for lecturers to foster and integrate language into their practice. Using these as a backdrop, the case study of 162 EMI lecturers at Spanish universities is presented, evidencing important shortcomings in non-personalised training programmes, such as a pervasive teacher-centredness in course topics and pedagogical approach. The study finds that it is methodological aspects that become a growing concern for more experienced instructors, who demand more specific training on vocabulary presentation, language correction, and abilities geared towards offering linguistic support for students, both face-to-face and online. In view of these shortcomings, he proposes moving from pre-service, one-size-fits-all accreditation to a continuing professional development for EMI, putting forward a number of key actions that enhance lecturers' professional development as well as students' linguistic competence.

Pimentel-Velázquez and Pavón-Vázquez (Chapter Eight) provide practical tools to consolidate or improve lecturers' English pronunciation to prevent the negative impact that an unintelligible pronunciation may have on an understanding of content during classroom instruction. The aim is teaching for intelligibility and comprehensibility above other considerations that have traditionally been identified as priorities in the teaching of pronunciation. Thus, in their proposal, suprasegmental features of English are given priority over segmental ones and native-like pronunciation is no longer an important goal.

Rieger and Szigeti (Chapter Nine) close this section with an overview of the Bologna Process and its effects on the social dimension of Higher Education. Their chapter focuses on a teacher training programme developed at Salzburg University of Applied Sciences (FH Salzburg) to train lecturers in this new scenario in which internationalisation and diversity management are key actors for success. Since it is important for the organisers to bring internal and external teachers together at one table for a more fruitful discussion, the programme is delivered in the frame of the institution's International Week and develops awareness among the university community of the students' needs in a new and international academic environment, reflects on the latest trends in teaching, and guides

teachers to propagate internationalisation in their teaching practice so as to open the international dimension also to non-mobile students.

The last section of the volume, Section Three, delves into a number of practical issues related to language testing (Chapters Ten to Thirteen) and accreditation (Chapter Fourteen). Chapters Ten and Eleven address quality assurance in developing and validating tests. Quality assurance of language tests has become an important issue in University Language Centres in Spain. The need to ensure the validity and reliability of standardised proficiency tests has brought about a greater unification and transparency in the testing process and has led to the creation of shared models within institutions that increase collaboration and guarantee good practice. Recent emphasis on quality controls and sound procedures puts pressure on the role of examiners and test developers with regard to the "principles and concepts that guide and underpin practice" (Fulcher 2012, 126). García-Rueda and Riera-Grau (Chapter Ten) focus on one stage in test development, namely piloting. They divide the piloting process into three stages: pre-piloting (preparing exercises and the piloting itself), piloting (data gathering) and post-piloting (marking, analysing and pooling feedback), and tackle questions to be considered in each of the stages to render a successful examination.

In Chapter Eleven, Zabala-Delgado and Rodríguez-Rodríguez, on their part, explain the bottom-up design of an open access online knowledge base that can serve as a training platform in language assessment for test developers. This design initiated with the analysis of teacher and institutional needs in two Spanish public institutions which develop language tests for adults at a national level, namely State Language Schools and University Language Centres, and developed these needs into contents for the platform. Because the teachers in these two contexts work in diverse settings, with different roles within the testing cycle, and have limited time to attend training courses, the aim of the platform is to produce content for self-study. It also intends to provide materials that can be used for training purposes, so that teachers can organise their own training sessions for newer colleagues in their institutions and hold standardisation sessions without requiring a top-down approach. The ultimate goal of the platform is to encourage language assessment literacy in the country while promoting unification and transparency in the testing process across Spanish public institutions.

The following two chapters in this section focus on the assessment of individual skills. Bradshaw (Chapter Twelve) reflects on the challenging issue of speech assessment. He begins with an analysis of the development of speaking assessment in high-stake exams over time, from the beginning

of the twentieth century to the present day, including a discussion of whether it is necessary to examine speaking at all. The rest of the chapter attempts to identify which aspects of speech should be tested, the different ways in which that assessment should be done and how to score speaking. He concludes with a brief look towards the future and the influence of technological advances in the process of testing and assessing speaking. Oliveira-Dias (Chapter Thirteen), on the other hand, reports on the implementation of lexical availability tests in class as a tool to (self-)assess students' lexical competence. The use of this type of tests in her Portuguese as a Foreign Language courses has allowed her to assess her students' range of vocabulary knowledge and to detect and correct common lexical errors. The tests have also positively contributed to the revision of vocabulary and to the active participation of students in the development of their lexical competence.

The volume closes with a chapter on institutional accreditation (Chapter Fourteen). The accreditation process in academia usually means a lot of paperwork for the institutions undergoing it, and it is even more demanding in an international context. Such processes are however inevitable in order to establish the status or appropriateness of an institution, programme or module of study by a designated competent authority. Šajgalíková presents the general framework in which the language programmes must fit if they are to be accredited, the characteristics of the programmes that must be presented, and the consistency of the language programmes when linked to the examinations, as well as the external contextual conditions that must be fulfilled. Based on her experience with the introduction of the UNIcert® system in the Czech and Slovak Republics, she enumerates the most frequent challenges the applicant institutions must cope with and presents all the advantages that the accreditation processes themselves offer. The chapter ends up showing how much institutions and teaching staff involved in accreditation procedures can learn from the interaction with the accreditation body.

References

Bazo-Martínez, Plácido, Dolores González-Álvarez, Aurora Centellas-Rodrigo, Emma Dafouz-Milne, Alberto Fernández-Costales, and Víctor Pavón-Vázquez. 2017. *Documento marco de política lingüística para la internacionalización del sistema universitario español*. CRUE Universidades Españolas.

https://www.crue.org/Documentos%20compartidos/Sectoriales/Interna
cionalizaci%C3%B3n%20y%20Coorperaci%C3%B3n/Marco_Final_D
ocumento%20de%20Politica%20Linguistica%20reducido.pdf.

European Council. 2008. Council Resolution of 21 November 2008 on a
European Strategy for Multilingualism, 008/C 320/01, Strasbourg.
https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:
320:0001:0003:EN:PDF.

Fulcher, Glenn. 2012. Assessment Literacy for the Language Classroom.
Language Assessment Quarterly 9 (2): 113–32.
DOI: 10.1080/15434303.2011.642041.

Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte. 2015. Estrategia para la
Internacionalización de las Universidades Españolas 2015–2020.
https://sede.educacion.gob.es/publiventa/estrategia-para-la-internacio
nalizacion-de-las-universidades-espanolas-2015-2020/universidad/21475.

SECTION 1:

LANGUAGE POLICY AND INTERNATIONALISATION

CHAPTER ONE

LANGUAGES AND INTERNATIONALISATION: STRATEGIES AND POLICIES

DOLORES GONZÁLEZ-ÁLVAREZ

1. Introduction

For over two decades, Higher Education (HE), both at national and European levels, has increasingly extended the teaching and use of English and other foreign languages in university campuses, and English Medium Instruction (EMI) has become one of the main instruments for the internationalisation of our universities (Wilkinson 2004; Doiz, Lasagabaster, and Sierra 2013; Fortanet-Gómez 2013; Valcke and Wilkinson 2017). Phillipson (2009, 37) has gone as far as to suggest that "in the Bologna process, internationalization means English-medium higher education". This is perhaps an overstatement, as many European countries remain committed to teaching in the national language(s) and have developed policies to encourage the use of the local language(s) alongside English (Haberland, Lønsmann, and Preisler 2013). Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the past years have seen a huge increase in the number of English-taught programmes around the world, and in particular in Europe, not only in countries whose national languages are languages of limited diffusion, such as the Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark, Norway or the Baltic States, but also in Germany, Italy or France (Wächter and Maiworm 2014). Notwithstanding the recent boom in EMI programmes, these represent only 6 percent of the total number of programmes and enrol a scant 1.3 percent of students in Europe, a figure that translates into approximately 290,000 students (Wächter and Maiworm 2014). Nevertheless, this figure has increased eightfold in contrast to the first survey conducted by the same authors a decade earlier (2002). Unfortunately, the pace at which EMI is being implemented often comes without much consideration of the practical implications of using another language as the medium of instruction. Detractors question not

just the quality of teaching and learning but also the political and social ramifications of not teaching in the local or national language(s), or the availability of sufficient numbers of qualified students and/or staff to make programmes viable.

Spain, where language learning has long been the Cinderella of the education system, has been a relative latecomer to this trend. It is not until 2015 that the Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte (Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport) recommends among other measures to make our universities more internationally attractive, to increase the number of bilingual courses taught in Spanish and English or other foreign languages at both undergraduate and post-graduate levels, and promote the acquisition of sufficient levels of English for all faculty members and staff. This reflects the authorities' concern about the low level of Spanish students' English proficiency as compared to that of many of their European counterparts (according to the European Commission 2012). In this context, EMI has been embraced as the best solution to solve this problem and also as the best tool to compete internationally.

Indeed, well implemented EMI programmes can bring considerable added value to our universities, in particular by attracting non-Spanish-speaking international students, improving graduate skills and employability prospects of local students (i.e., internationalisation at home), and enhancing the international profile of Spanish Higher Education Institutions (henceforth HEIs) by setting up double degrees, exchange programmes and strategic alliances, thus helping universities rise in the international rankings. However, it is no less true that the level of proficiency of foreign languages in general–and English in particular–in Spain, though greatly improved in recent years, continues to be the Achilles' heel, preventing many institutions from taking further steps toward enlarging their offer of courses or full programmes in English, as they lack sufficient qualified local students and both academic and non-academic staff to guarantee the viability of EMI programmes. Additionally, there is absence of coordination and guidelines among Spanish universities on those issues that concern all the parties involved: the linguistic and methodological competences of lecturers, the linguistic competence of students or the training of all the parties (teachers, students and administrative staff). Though, as mentioned above, EMI is quite recent in Spain, the dimension and speed of its implementation has outpaced language policies, methodological considerations and empirical research.

On the other hand, moving towards linguistic internationalisation goes beyond offering studies through English or any other foreign language. The design of a university language policy should therefore transcend

instruction in English, with initiatives to consolidate the use of other languages among all the stakeholders involved in the internationalisation process, to provide administrative staff with specific internationalisation training, to enhance the quality of publications and to favour the creation of collaborative networking in professional and research areas (Ramos-García and Pavón-Vázquez 2018). In sum, universities need to reconsider their language policies, whether or not their policies have ever been made explicit, and re-think the role that English (and other foreign languages) play in the international university of the 21st century.

Along those lines, this chapter first provides an overview of the Spanish context and addresses issues such as the heterogeneous development of EMI and other internationalisation policies involving languages (Section 2). It then describes the process that led education authorities to the elaboration of a framework document endorsed by 76 (public and private) universities which contains guidelines and recommendations for the implementation of a university language policy in Spain, whose main objective was to organise shared initiatives and to apply homogeneous criteria in order to promote linguistic internationalisation (Section 3). The chapter also considers the role of University Language Centres in the implementation of the measures proposed.

2. The Spanish context

Important policy measures addressing language competence have been put in place in pre-university education in Spain: for example, there is now a broad offer around the country of bilingual/multilingual Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) streams in Primary and Secondary Education with regional regulations on the required linguistic qualifications for teachers enrolling in these programmes, as well as specific training programmes for CLIL teachers. The elaboration of language policies in Spanish universities, however, has been a matter of individual efforts rather than of the existence of common regulations or guidelines (Fernández-Costales and González-Riaño 2015; Ramos-García and Pavón-Vázquez 2018). With the exception of some bilingual regions (in which the implementation of linguistic policies to regulate the use of the two official languages has been a political and social issue in the last decades), in monolingual regions there have not been many attempts to implement language policies. This paints a heterogeneous picture, with few guidelines on important aspects such as the linguistic accreditation of

students and lecturers, the training of suitable EMI lecturers or specific internationalisation preparation for administrative staff.

The issue which probably differed mostly among universities was the verification of linguistic levels. The need to certify linguistic levels started in 2010 for a very simple reason: When the new degrees adapted to the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) were designed and verified in 2010, several universities (and in some cases regional governments, e.g. Andalusia and Catalonia) included the certification of a B1/B2 level of a foreign language to obtain the degree. That meant that when those students reached the final years of the degree, the academic authorities started to think about how to certify those levels. The mechanisms used to certify different CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for languages) levels fluctuated enormously, ranging from internal tests (designed by the university itself), to stays abroad (Erasmus programmes or other), to the attainment of a number of credits in English or the completion of international exams (Cambridge, TOEFL, etc.). Yet another problem arose, namely how to certify the level of language proficiency of students participating in mobility programmes, since a good number of host universities started to set a language requirement.

The Board of Rectors of Spanish Universities (Conferencia de Rectores de las Universidades Españolas; hereafter CRUE) took stock on this heterogeneity with respect to the mechanisms to verify language levels, mechanisms which very often mixed up and confused training and accreditation. One of the important outcomes was the creation of five language boards (for German, English, French, Spanish as a Second Language and Portuguese) in close cooperation with the Spanish Association of University Language Centres (Asociación de Centros de Lenguas en la Enseñanza Superior; henceforth ACLES) with the mission of unifying criteria when it comes to certifying levels of knowledge of different foreign languages to facilitate mobility between Spanish universities and their internationalisation. The ultimate objective was to coordinate the criteria used in the various universities and to draft recommendations on level certificates (CRUE 2011). This set of recommendations has definitely contributed to standardise criteria concerning the certification of linguistic levels.

There have been, however, very few attempts to delineate the actions that universities should take in order to successfully launch and operate HE degree programmes offered in English (Lauridsen 2013; Marsh, Pavón, and Frigols 2013; Jiménez-Muñoz this volume). Thus, there is still great diversity, for example, in the issue of qualifications and forms of accreditation which are required of teachers to teach through English.

Various studies coincide in pointing out both the importance of the linguistic and methodological competence of the teaching staff in guaranteeing the quality and the adequate implementation of the international programmes, as well as in the academic results of the students. In addition, recent reports from various European bodies stress the need to verify these competences (Baumann et al. 2006, 3; Lauridsen 2013, 8). There is however a lack of consensus among Spanish universities as to what the acceptable level of English should be in order to teach subjects in that language at university level. In this regard, Halbach and Lázaro (2015, 8) found that more than half of Spanish universities required a B2 or less to allow lecturers to enrol in EMI programmes, 28 percent of the universities demand a C1, while 34 percent have no requirement at all. And not only are there huge discrepancies between universities in terms of the requirements or lack thereof and in terms of the level required–should that requirement exist–, but also in the method of verifying it (O'Dowd 2018, 9). Some rely on evidence of teachers' communicative competence, others on classroom observation or even on evaluation by students attending classes; yet others require that teaching and linguistic competence be demonstrated through the completion of a formal evaluation process. Some universities, aware of the importance of methodological skills, have developed their own competency verification systems, which are compulsory for teachers who join bilingual/ multilingual programmes. However, most of the universities concerned with methodological skills adopt much less rigorous systems, simply requiring attendance at training courses in pedagogical techniques.

Diversity and lack of guidelines also impinge on EMI teacher training. Klaassen and De Graaff (2001, 282) found that switching the language of instruction may affect "the lecturers' didactical skills in the sense that they are less flexible in conveying the contents of the lecture material, resulting in long monologues, a lack of rapport with students, humour and interaction". However, the figures in O'Dowd (2018) show that the majority of institutions which provide training pursue improving lecturers' English language proficiency and communicative skills and overlook CLIL teaching methodology or the development of academic language. The absence of a bilingual methodology from a good number of teacher training programmes would appear to confirm a commonly-held belief in university education that language proficiency in itself is sufficient for teachers to teach subjects through another language (Dafouz et al. 2007; Dearden 2015). Research in this area, however, has repeatedly pointed out that teaching subjects through English is much more than simply translating class content into a second language (Cots 2013; Dafouz et al.