

Ensuring quality in EMI: developing an assessment procedure at the University of Freiburg

Susanne GUNDERMANN

University of Freiburg
Sprachlehrinstitut (SLI) - EMI - English Medium Instruction
Universitätsstraße 5, 79098 Freiburg, Germany
susanne.gundermann@sli.uni-freiburg.de

Gregg DUBOW

University of Freiburg
Sprachlehrinstitut (SLI) - EMI - English Medium Instruction
Universitätsstraße 5, 79098 Freiburg, Germany
gregg.dubow@sli.uni-freiburg.de

Trotz der geradezu exponentiell ansteigenden Verbreitung von englischsprachiger Hochschullehre (sogenannter *English Medium Instruction*, kurz: EMI) insbesondere in Deutschland, gibt es hierfür bislang kaum Qualitätsstandards und Evaluierungsverfahren. Eine Ausnahme findet sich an der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, die neben verschiedenen Maßnahmen zur Sicherung und Verbesserung der Lehrqualität im Allgemeinen auch eine eigene EMI-Fachabteilung unterhält. Diese Abteilung wurde beauftragt, ein Evaluierungsverfahren zu entwickeln, um die Lehrqualität in englischsprachigen Studiengängen sicherzustellen und gegebenenfalls zu verbessern. Nach einer Einführung in den Kontext der allgemeinen und EMI-spezifischen Lehrqualitätssicherungsmaßnahmen an der Universität Freiburg stellt dieser Artikel die drei einzigartigen Charakteristika und den Ablauf der EMI-Qualitätssicherung vor und beschreibt sowohl deren Nutzen als auch deren Grenzen. Der Artikel endet mit Empfehlungen für andere Hochschulen, die eine systematische Evaluation der englischsprachigen Lehre planen und einführen wollen.

Stichwörter:

Englischsprachige Hochschullehre, Lehrqualität, Evaluierung, Feedback.

Keywords:

English medium instruction, teaching quality, assessment, feedback.

1. Introduction

The shift from teaching in the local language to teaching in English has become a growing trend in higher education in Europe over the past two decades. Wächter and Maiworm (2014: 37) report on a 239% growth in the number of English-taught degree programmes at European universities between 2007 and 2014. In absolute numbers, most of these English-medium instruction (EMI) programmes are offered in the Netherlands, Germany and Sweden. Looking at relative numbers (i.e. including population size, number of higher education institutions, number of enrolled students etc.), EMI is not exactly a mass phenomenon in Germany as not even half of all universities offer programmes in English and the percentage of EMI programmes in relation to the total number of programmes lies around a mere 6% (Wächter & Maiworm 2014: 40).

Nevertheless, within the past seven years, the number of EMI programmes in Germany has increased almost fivefold from 214 to 1030 programmes in absolute numbers (ibid.: 43; see also Wächter & Maiworm 2007: 32). Despite its exponential growth, no common quality standard for university teaching in English has been established yet, either at federal or at state level. The only existing policy is summarized in the *National Code of Conduct for German Universities Regarding International Students* (HRK 2009), a self-commitment signed by the rectors of 139 German universities:

[...] 4. Degree programmes offered by German universities are generally taught in German. If another language, in most cases English, is specified as the language of instruction for part or all of the degree programme, **the university will ensure that the teachers have the necessary language proficiency and skills required** and that appropriate foreign language teaching materials are available. For students who are not adequately proficient in the German language, any important information – including information on general everyday life at university – will be made available in the respective languages of instruction. (Extract of the *National Code of Conduct for German Universities Regarding International Students*, HRK 2009; emphasis by the authors)

While it is common practice in EMI in higher education to require students to prove a given threshold level of English in the admissions process, assessment of teachers' language proficiency is still a major lacuna in the German university landscape, despite the declared intentions in the above-mentioned code of conduct. This article will outline the EMI teaching quality assessment at the University of Freiburg. After a brief overview of the context of EMI and teaching quality at the University of Freiburg, we will introduce a procedure developed to ensure and enhance teaching quality in English-taught programmes. An analysis of the benefits and limitations of this procedure will then build the basis for recommendations for its implementation at other universities and/or in other higher education contexts.

2. Teaching quality at the University of Freiburg

The University of Freiburg (hereafter UFR), founded in 1457, is a comprehensive university with currently eleven faculties, ranging from theology, law and medicine over philology, economics and humanities to mathematics, chemistry, biology, environment and engineering. In the academic year 2016/17 more than 25,000 students were enrolled, 17.1% thereof being international students.¹

2.1 English medium instruction programmes at the University of Freiburg

The University of Freiburg currently offers 257 different degree programmes, 18 of which are entirely taught in English as of 2018. Thus, EMI only makes up for

¹ International students are defined as students with a nationality other than German who are enrolled in a university in the German federal territory (Statistics glossary, University of Freiburg: http://www.statistik.uni-freiburg.de/gloss/aus_stud).

7% of the total number of programmes, but it is a steadily growing niche to which roughly one programme per year is added. Many of these programmes are interdisciplinary and most of them are specifically advertised as international programmes, some even maintain quotas per world region in order to achieve a balanced mix of students in their programmes. Except for one Bachelor's programme, all EMI programmes at UFR are offered at Master's level. In light of this focus on graduate education, it is no surprise that language admission requirements for students are in most cases rather high with a C1 level based on the *Common European Reference for Languages* (CEFR) or an *International English Language Testing System* (IELTS) band of 7.0 respectively. Academic teaching staff in these EMI programmes – at least permanent or long-term staff – predominantly consist of German native speakers, with few exceptions especially at the faculties of engineering and environment and natural resources. The first EMI programmes were established in the mid-2000s and up until 2015, no specific assessment of teaching quality in English had been in place.

2.2 Ensuring teaching quality at the University of Freiburg

The UFR addresses teaching quality from numerous angles. First of all, there is the strategically-oriented *Stabsstelle Lehrentwicklung* (teaching development unit) whose aim is to give advice and support to the President for Academic Affairs, to the senate commission and to faculties on measures to improve the quality of teaching. This unit also coordinates and assists ancillary projects dedicated to the quality of teaching and learning at UFR such as awarding funding to advance innovative teaching concepts and mentoring programs.

Secondly, the *Arbeitsstelle Hochschuldidaktik* (higher education didactics unit) offers workshops and consultation for teaching staff and programme directors in order to foster the development of teaching competencies at the UFR. Teachers interested in a thorough training in higher education didactics can undergo a 200-hour, module-based training programme which culminates in obtaining a state certificate of higher education didactics (*Baden-Württemberg Zertifikat für Hochschuldidaktik*), signed by the state minister of education. Occasionally, the didactic training workshops cover relevant topics for those who teach in international and/or English-taught programmes, but there is neither an obligation to offer these topics nor a top-down obligation to take part in them – participation in didactic training is entirely voluntary.

Thirdly, the *Zentraler Evaluationsservice* (central evaluation service) carries out comprehensive course evaluations. All courses taught at the UFR must undergo a standardized procedure with questionnaires filled in by students either on paper or electronically at all faculties at a given point during the semester. The results of the evaluation – a quality control tool - are directly delivered to the individual teachers and the only other person allowed to review the results is the

respective Dean of Studies. Negative evaluation results may result in a conversation with the Dean of Studies and do not have any consequences on the teacher's status, contract or else. In the same manner, positive results will largely go unnoticed since most deans lack the time and resources to evaluate the details of all the results. While these three units have helped ascertain and promote the quality of teaching, little is done on a University policy level to address the quality of teaching in English-taught programmes.

With regard to EMI-specific quality assessment, programme accreditation by external agencies has been implemented with most EMI programmes.² However, programme accreditation focusses on assessing programme features such as the curriculum, syllabi and infrastructure, but does not consider actual teacher performance. If students raise concerns about their teachers' language competencies, the university's *Sprachlehrinstitut* (language teaching centre) and the *Freiburger Akademie für Universitäre Weiterbildung* (Freiburg academy for university continuing education) are recommended to teachers as a language support option. However, up until 2011 none of the language courses offered had been specifically geared towards English for teaching purposes and again, participation is entirely voluntary.

2.3 Specific support for EMI

In 2011, the UFR, together with 185 other universities, successfully won the bidding for a grant of around 6 million Euros over a period of almost 6 years, sponsored by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research³. This grant is called *Qualitätspakt Lehre* (quality pact for teaching) and has allowed for the implementation of seven measures to improve the quality of teaching at the UFR. One of these measures is the English medium instruction support unit (hereafter EMI team), structurally integrated at the university's language teaching centre and tasked with offering tailored support for EMI teaching staff.

In the first two years of the project, the EMI team primarily focused on providing classic language training and language coaching by native speaker trainers. However, after a number of needs analyses, field observations and informal conversations with teachers, coordinators, directors, deans, etc., it was clear that the focus needed to change. To begin with, a classic language training approach seemed to be inappropriate since many if not most of the EMI teachers whom the EMI team had contact to via workshops or classroom feedback already had very high proficiency levels in spoken academic English and would not benefit from general (spoken) language training. Secondly, many

² Programme accreditation is of course not restricted to English-taught programmes. In a recent development, the UFR has changed its strategy and is currently getting ready for a system accreditation approach as this will replace time-consuming individual programme accreditation. The new approach will work with randomized internal evaluations of all programmes and a thorough analysis of quality management of the entire institution.

³ This grant has been successfully renewed for the follow-up period from 2016 until 2020.

teachers with whom the EMI team had worked expressed concerns and difficulties regarding the interplay between language, interculturality and didactics when teaching in an international EMI programme (see also Gundermann 2014). Thus, appropriate training measures needed to be more specifically oriented towards English for teaching purposes and include intercultural training and didactic contents. Thirdly, EMI teaching staff already deal with the extra preparation burden of having to teach through English instead of their native language and thus have little to no extra time left for time-consuming training measures. Based on these three findings from the field and additional findings from research on EMI in other countries, the EMI team reorganized its training offers, with the focus shifting from training and feedback based on language skills per se towards training measures that incorporated EMI best-practice skills as found in the literature (Airey 2010; Hellekjær 2010; Suviniitty 2012; Björkman 2013, to name but a few) and recognized the special lingua franca situation in the EMI classroom. In other words, emphasis was placed on intelligible and accessible language for instructional purposes in interaction with non-native speaker interlocutors. To this end, workshops and courses were reorganized to also include didactic and intercultural content, and e-learning modules were created in order to cater for the needs of those teachers with too little time for face-to-face training measures.

Despite all these changes, one big lacuna remained: all EMI support measures were aimed at quality improvement, not at quality assessment. Thus, in 2014, the EMI team was tasked with developing a quality assessment procedure for EMI programmes to document the skills of all permanent and long-term EMI teaching staff and to provide tailored feedback. When deemed necessary, the EMI team subsequently provides suitable training measures to overcome weaknesses.

3. EMI quality assurance at the University of Freiburg

The EMI team began developing a quality assessment procedure that would complement the existing quality improvement measures for EMI. This EMI quality assessment – to our knowledge unique in the German higher education landscape – combines three key characteristics which will be outlined in the following subchapters.

3.1 Naturalistic assessment conditions

Standardized language tests such as the IELTS or TOEFL (Test of Oral English Proficiency for Academic Staff) are carried out in a test environment, i.e. in a setting that has specifically been constructed for the purpose of testing. Yet, the benefit of controlled test settings, namely the elimination of interference factors with the aim to assure (more) objectivity, is detrimental to assessing teaching quality since it is the unforeseeable interaction between learners and

teachers which makes teaching a challenge.⁴ While test settings allow for teachers to be assessed on their monological performance skills and on their answers to prompts, they neglect other communicative skills for a real teaching context, like promoting discussion or reacting spontaneously to unpredictable questions or comments from students. Further, assessing teachers in a controlled test setting would require additional time from the teachers' already busy schedules. In light of these two factors, it was decided that an EMI quality assessment was best carried out in a naturalistic setting, i.e. through on-the-job observations in real EMI classes.

3.2 Pluriperspective feedback

While most language or teaching assessment is solely based on expert assessors' ratings (e.g. in the TOEPAS, see Kling & Dimova 2015), the EMI quality assurance procedure at UFR goes a step further and also includes the primary stakeholders involved in the EMI classroom: the students and the teachers. Students are involved by means of a questionnaire in which they judge elements of the teacher's performance and comment on their learning progress, e.g. by stating what particularly helped them to follow the lesson well. Instead of judging the teacher's language skills – which would be challenging for non-experts in linguistics and would not reflect their role as learners – students for example rate their own effort necessary to follow the teacher's pronunciation or the degree to which they felt involved and integrated in the lesson. The teachers also get a self-assessment questionnaire which contains the same items as the student questionnaire but with a tweak in perspective: the teacher rates his/her performance, e.g. to what degree he/she thought he/she spoke with an intelligible pronunciation or the degree to which he/she involved and integrated students in the lesson. In addition to these two sources of feedback, two EMI experts also give feedback on the teacher's performance with the help of a more detailed criteria catalogue (see subchapter 3.3.).⁵ All three sources of feedback are then triangulated and build the basis for in-depth individual formative feedback on the teacher's performance from three different perspectives. The benefit of including three different perspectives in the assessment is not merely to give stakeholders a voice but also to encourage and establish reflective practice on the part of the teacher and secondarily also on the part of students. Continuous reflections on processes (be they learning or teaching processes) are vital if formative feedback should be sustainable and effective (cf. Biggs & Tang 2011: 45f.).

⁴ Interaction here is of course not limited to verbal interaction, but can also include non- or para-verbal interaction in the classroom.

⁵ The degree of detail is higher in the expert feedback as the experts have the necessary linguistic and pedagogic expertise – as opposed to the vast majority of students and teachers who are (aspiring) experts in their fields but do not have detailed knowledge of language-related criteria like for instance the distinction between articulation and pronunciation.

3.3 EMI-specific assessment criteria

In order to define EMI-specific assessment criteria, we started our investigations by looking into language competence descriptors from a range of standardized language frameworks such as the CEFR, the IELTS, or tailored tests like the TOEPAS. Although the CEFR can be seen as a model whose elements can feed into frameworks for special purposes (Fulcher 2004), our experience from classroom observations has shown that CEFR descriptors alone fail to describe important competencies for EMI teachers operating in a learning environment largely comprised of second and foreign language users of English.

Furthermore, in line with current research on EMI (Pilkinton-Pihko 2013; Gundermann 2014; Studer 2015, 2016, to name but a few) it was decided that solely general language criteria are neither sufficient nor expedient for assessing teaching competencies in English. General language proficiency is just one side of the coin, since competent EMI teachers also need to have appropriate instructional skills. Thus, after analysing literature on language testing and EMI as well as engaging in discussions with colleagues⁶, several sets of criteria were iteratively piloted and benchmarked in real EMI classrooms with volunteer teachers. Upon conclusion of this phase, ten quality assessment criteria divided into two categories were established (cf. Table 1).

Linguistic Competencies for English-Medium Instruction	Communicative Competencies for English-Medium Instruction
L.1 Fluency	C.1 Cohesion
L.2 Articulation and Pronunciation	C.2 Prosody
L.3 Grammatical accuracy	C.3 Initiation and integration of student input
L.4 Lexical accuracy and range	C.4 Responses to student input
L.5 Code consistency	C.5 Intercultural transparency

Table 1: Overview of the assessment criteria in the EMI quality assessment

The category *Linguistic Competencies* comprises the five criteria fluency, articulation and pronunciation, grammar, lexical accuracy and range, and code consistency. The category *Communicative Competencies* includes the five criteria cohesion, prosodic variation, initiation and integration of student input, responding to student input, and intercultural transparency. Dividing the criteria into two categories gives teachers a more nuanced idea of their strengths and weaknesses in English-taught classes. On the one hand, linguistic criteria primarily focus on language skills proper while communicative criteria focus on a teacher's language use for instructional purposes in an EMI context. The

⁶ We would like to express our thanks here to Patrick Studer and Paul Kelly from the Language Competence Center at the Zurich University of Applied Sciences Winterthur, and to David Lorenz and David Tizón from the English Department at the University of Freiburg, for sharing their thoughts and helping shape our quality assurance procedure.

following benchmark descriptions in Table 2 provide an overview of how the criteria outlined in Table 1 are assessed in practice:⁷

<i>Linguistic competencies benchmark</i>	<i>Communicative competencies benchmark</i>
A certified lecturer speaks fluently with no or few instances of language-related hesitations, articulates and pronounces clearly with no or few instances where confusion might occur, and uses grammar accurately with minor inaccuracies. The lecturer's lexical choice is accurate and the lexical range is broad enough to explain subject-specific content and to compensate occasional lexical gaps, while avoiding opaque idiomaticity. He/she consistently uses English in speech and writing and any use of a language other than English is followed by an explanation or translation in English. The overall linguistic performance might occasionally require extra listener effort but does not impede comprehension.	A certified lecturer produces coherent speech through a range of cohesive devices to structure the session, speaks at an appropriate rate and uses prosodic variation (intonation, stress, pauses) to support communicative intention. During a session, he/she facilitates student input through questions, integrates student contributions into ongoing discourse, responds appropriately to student input and negotiates comprehension through adaptation of his/her (non- and para)verbal communication if necessary. Locally specific concepts and matters are contextualized and explained in advance for the multicultural classroom. The communicative performance stimulates student participation and facilitates comprehension.

Table 2: Benchmark descriptions of linguistic and communicative competencies in the EMI quality assessment

3.4 Assessment procedure and the EMI quality seal

The assessment procedure does by no means aim at singling out top performers or underachievers, but aims to reward teacher communities with a quality seal. In practice this means that EMI programme directors can encourage their teaching staff to strive for a quality seal for the programme (see Figure 1). The seal is awarded if at least 80 per cent of teaching staff have demonstrated the appropriate linguistic and communicative competencies for teaching in English.⁸ With a validity of five years, the seal can be used for marketing purposes, e.g. on EMI programme websites to inform prospective students about the teaching quality in English. After expiry, the seal can be renewed. In addition, the programme – usually represented by the programme director or committee – receives a printed and framed quality certificate signed by the vice-president for academic affairs, the head of the board of the language teaching centre and the EMI team who assessed the teachers in the programme.

⁷ For more detailed descriptions of the criteria, procedure and scoring scheme, see Dubow & Gundermann (2017).

⁸ The decision to award the seal if at least 80% of teachers are certified – instead of aiming for the full 100% - is merely pragmatic: Due to unforeseen staff turnover, parental or sickness leaves in the course of the assessment over usually one year, it would practically be impossible to reach 100%.



Figure 1: English Medium Instruction Quality Seal, awarded at the University of Freiburg

The in-situ implementation of the three key features of the EMI quality assurance procedure builds the basis of assessment. The EMI team individually arranges classroom visits with all participating teachers in the EMI programme under assessment. The EMI team video-records and assesses each teacher on the basis of the criteria mentioned in section 3.3. At the end of each observed lesson, students and teachers receive their respective questionnaires and evaluate the lesson. Within the next five to ten days, the EMI team triangulates the pluriperspective feedback sources and arranges a feedback meeting with the individual teacher, who then receives both qualitative feedback (based on student evaluation, expert feedback and teacher self-assessment) and quantitative feedback (scores based on student and expert feedback with a weighting of 1:2), and tailored instructional recommendations if appropriate. If the teacher has met the minimal quality threshold, he/she counts as certified and subsequently counts toward the 80% threshold of certified teaching staff in a programme. If a teacher has not met the minimal quality threshold, detailed improvement measures are suggested and offered (e.g. one-on-one coaching, participation in workshops or work with e-modules) and an appointment for re-assessment is scheduled for the next semester. The first assessment of an EMI programme in engineering started in the summer term 2015. As of the time of writing, four EMI Master's programmes have been successfully certified and awarded the EMI quality seal. The EMI team envisages assessing further EMI programmes at UFR in the coming years.

3.5 Benefits and constraints of the EMI quality assessment

The EMI quality assessment at UFR comprises benefits and limitations, both of which are outlined in this section. One benefit lies in the broad applicability of the individualized qualitative feedback to different international classroom contexts, including teaching in languages other than English.

A further benefit voiced by teachers is the fact that it applies context-specific criteria, i.e. criteria covering not just language but teaching through English for a diverse and in most cases international student body. During feedback meetings, teaching staff have voiced appreciation for the fact that teaching skills - not just general language proficiency – were assessed.

In addition to feedback based on the context-specific criteria, the qualitative feedback also includes suggestions on didactics. For example, teachers may need to (re)formulate learning objectives at the beginning of a lesson. In addition, teachers receive recommendations on instructional strategies and methods to encourage and engage students in active learning in small and larger classes. Although the feedback refers to one lesson, strengths as well as didactic recommendations are transferable to other teaching scenarios and most often not only limited to teaching in English but also applicable to native language teaching, as various teachers reported in personal communication to the authors.

A further benefit is that the assessment encourages reflective practices – an important element in professional development – as a result of the lecturer's self-assessment being combined with student feedback on the quality of teaching. As a side-effect, teachers learn that in most cases students are generally content with the teacher's English and, if anything, they comment on features of the lesson such as the didactic structure and methods. This phenomenon contradicts typical teacher concerns about their language proficiency being inadequate (cf. Gundermann 2014: 107ff.), thus relieving many teachers and allowing them to dedicate more time and energy to the design and methodology of the lesson. In fact, several teachers have requested follow-up classroom observations to receive further feedback on their adapted design based on the recommendations.

Nevertheless, the outlined procedure also entails limitations. The first limitation concerns the compatibility of the procedure in different teaching formats. The assessment was originally designed for classic lecture settings, i.e. for teacher-centred classes. Student-centred learning formats such as seminars, problem-based learning or blended learning, all of which predispose students to theoretically take more ownership of the learning process with teachers acting more as guides or facilitators, would likely impact the criteria used and the items which the students feedback regarding quality of teaching in English.

A second limitation of the assessment lies in the considerable (wo)man hours required for the procedure. The 45 to 90 minute classroom visit is a small part of the assessment, and much more time is required to administrate the procedure. This includes communicating with teachers in a programme to schedule classroom visits, preparing questionnaires for automated processing, coordinating feedback meetings, and ensuring the 80% threshold of certified teaching staff in the programme is met for the five-year quality seal. Most importantly, substantial time is needed for thorough analyses of the video material, data triangulation with student feedback and teacher self-assessment, and EMI team discussions and preparations of feedback. On average, sixteen to twenty (wo)man hours divided between two assessors are necessary to certify a single teacher.

4. Implications for implementing EMI quality assurance in other contexts

Given the fact that more and more higher education institutions offer English-taught programmes, it is conceivable to implement the outlined EMI quality assessment in other contexts as well. The following three guiding questions should help for orientation and serve as recommendations for other institutions. Firstly, the feasibility of the procedure needs to be scrutinized: How much human resources are available to administer and perform the assessment? At UFR, the EMI quality assessment is carried out by two full-time staff members. While we have emphasized the substantial amount of (wo)man hours invested in assessing each teacher in a programme in order to maintain the high quality of the formative feedback, other institutions may have to take different approaches due to limited human resources. These resource-based decisions can subtract from the perceived scope of the feedback and from the procedure as a whole. Moreover, our procedure is designed in a way that teachers only need to invest little time in the assessment which was one of the preconditions in the UFR context. However, this design may not reflect other institutions' policies on quality assessment in internationalized higher education, thus rendering a design strength in one context as a weakness in another.

Secondly, the suitability of the procedure has to be examined: Which teaching formats and learning environments should be assessed? The procedure at the UFR has been tailored for its specific context, i.e. for graduate level education in English with highly diverse groups of students whose entry language level lies at the C1 level of the CEFR. None of these programmes includes language learning as part of the curriculum or innovative teaching formats such as blended or problem-based learning. Thus, teaching strategies specific to content and language integrated learning (CLIL) or to innovative formats are not considered in the existing assessment criteria catalogue. As a consequence, implementing the EMI quality assurance procedure at other higher education institutions requires thorough appropriation to fit the respective context.

Thirdly, effective quality assurance demands sustainability: What human and financial resources are available to sustain long-term quality in programs? For instance, if an institution has a hiring policy in place that entails high staff mobility and turnover, assessments of EMI quality would have to be carried out more often to evaluate new incoming teachers. Furthermore, if degree programmes adapted their underlying instructional design after having undergone quality assessment, such a shift would likely require additional skills of teaching staff, like more facilitation of project-based learning. Consequently, criteria would have to be adjusted or added accordingly and teachers reassessed. In countries with noticeable and ongoing cuts in higher education (cf. Estermann & Pruvot 2011: 79ff.), the sustainability of the procedure might be difficult to guarantee.

The following table summarizes essential questions for implementing the EMI quality assurance procedure at other institutions (Table 3):

Feasibility	⇒ How much human resources are available to administer and perform the procedure?
Suitability	⇒ Which teaching formats and learning environments are to be assessed?
Sustainability	⇒ What human and financial resources are available to sustain long-term quality in programmes?

Table 3: Essential questions when considering implementation of EMI quality assessment

Despite the aforementioned caveats, implementing this EMI quality assurance procedure also provides two opportunities. Firstly, such a quality assessment has the potential to encourage intra-institutional friendly competition between English-taught programmes. Once a first programme has been quality assured, others might be more motivated to undergo quality assessment. In addition, assessment is a tool to earmark funding for training specific skills deemed weak during the quality assessment.

Furthermore, integrating student feedback in the assessment tells current students that quality is taken seriously in the program; moreover, recognizing quality in the programme projects the same message to prospective students, which in turn likely attracts more applicants and allows the institution to select brighter students in the admissions process. In the long run, the EMI-hosting institution becomes more attractive for researchers from abroad to work and teach in a quality-conscious environment. Anecdotal evidence from the UFR is indicative of this trend (personal communication with a programme coordinator) but more systematic qualitative research in the form of interviews would be necessary to find out about positive long-term effects of EMI assessment.

REFERENCES

- Airey, J. (2010). The Ability of Students to Explain Science Concepts in Two Languages. *Hermes Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 45, 35-49.
- Biggs, J. & Tang C. (2011). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. 4th edition. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill.
- Björkman, B. (2013). *English as an Academic Lingua Franca*. Developments in English as a Lingua Franca series. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- CEFR – Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Council of Europe. (last accessed 27 March 2018).
- Dubow, G. & Gundermann S. (2017). Certifying the linguistic and communicative competencies of teachers in English-medium instruction programmes. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 7(2), 475-487.

- Estermann, T. & Bennetot Pruvot E. (2011). *Financially Sustainable Universities II. European universities diversifying income streams*. Brussels: European University Association. (last accessed 27 March 2018)
- Fulcher, G. (2004). Deluded by artifices? The Common European Framework and harmonization. *Language Assessment Quarterly* 1(4), 253-266.
- Gundermann, S. (2014). *English-Medium Instruction: Modelling the Role of the Native Speaker in a Lingua Franca Context*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Freiburg.
- Hellekjær, G. O. (2010). Lecture Comprehension in English-Medium Higher Education. *Hermes Journal of Language and Communication Studies* 45, 11-34.
- HRK – Hochschulrektorenkonferenz / German Rectors' Conference (2009). *National Code of Conduct for German Universities Regarding International Students*. (last accessed 27 March 2018).
- IELTS – International English Language Testing Service. British Council. (last accessed 27 March 2018)
- Kling, J. & Stenius Stæhr L. (2012). *The development of the Test of Oral English Proficiency for Academic Staff (TOEPAS)*. Centre for Internationalisation and Parallel Language Use (CIP), University of Copenhagen. (last accessed 27 March 2018).
- Pilkinton-Pihko, D. (2013). *English-medium instruction: Seeking assessment criteria for spoken professional English*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki. (last accessed 27 March 2018).
- Smit, U. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in higher education: a longitudinal study of classroom discourse*. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter.
- Studer, P. (2015). Coping with English: students' perceptions of their teachers' linguistic competence in undergraduate science teaching. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 183-201.
- Studer, P. (2016). Lecturers' communicative strategies in English-medium instruction: the importance of classroom interaction. In P. Studer (ed.), *Communicative competence and didactic challenges: a case study of English- medium instruction in third-level education in Switzerland*, (pp. 7-20). Working Papers in Applied Linguistics 6. Winterthur: University of Applied Sciences.
- Suviniitty, J. (2012). *Lectures in English as a Lingua Franca: Interactional Features*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki. (last accessed 27 March 2018).
- Wächter, B. & Maiworm F. (2007). *English-Taught Programmes in European Higher Education. The Picture in 2007*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Wächter, B. & Maiworm F. (2014). *English-Taught Programmes in European Higher Education. The State of Play in 2014*. Bonn: Lemmens.