

THE INTERDEPENDENT PROCESSES OF CURRICULUM INTERNATIONALISATION AND TRANSFORMATION ACROSS THE PARTNER UNIVERSITIES OVER THE LIFETIME OF THE IKUDU PROJECTⁱ

Author: Katherine Wimpenny (Coventry University)

Contributors:

Bernard Smeenk (Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences)

Bianca Roseaux (University of Antwerp)

Carlo Citter (University of Siena)

Chevon Slambee (University of the Free State)

Divinia Jithoo (Durban University of Technology)

Eva Haug (Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences)

Eveke de Louw (The Hague University of Applied Sciences)

Gerda van Niekerk (University of Limpopo)

Jos Beelen (The Hague University of Applied Sciences)

Lynette Jacobs (University of the Free State)

Mashudu Muthivhi (University of Venda)

Nonceba Mbambo-Kekana (University of Limpopo)

Nontlanhla Ntakana (University of Venda)

Ntsoaki Malebo (Central University of Technology)

Piet Van Hove (University of Antwerp)

Reinout Klamer (The Hague University of Applied Sciences)

Renate Teuwsen (Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences)

Segun Obadire (University of Venda)

Valeria Baloyi (University of Venda)

Abstract

The fifth tangible deliverable the project was committed to was to do a study on progress on the interdependent processes of curriculum internationalisation and transformation at the partner universities over the first two years of the project will be published. This addresses several of the specific project objectives in examining and reflecting upon curriculum internationalisation and transformation at the Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the partner countries, by understanding and determining structural development status and needs. Also, context-specific internationalisation and transformation of curriculum practices across the consortium partners, as well as how the partner universities were conceptually connecting the concepts of Africanisation and Europeanisation with internationalisation and other relevant concepts. This chapter reports on the above over the timeline of the project. While iKudu has led to limited structural changes at institutions, it has brought many useful insights and contexts that will need to be taken forward. Important to note is that the iKudu project has contributed to individual shifts in those that were part of the project over the years, even at institutions where effects seems limited. The conversation and work must continue and will hopefully be done through the iKudu network.

Key words: Africanisation, Curriculum internationalisation, decolonisation, Europeanisation, transformation

Introduction

This study report details the interdependent processes of curriculum internationalisation and transformation at the partner universities over the lifetime of the iKudu project. This is a specific deliverable that was assigned to Working Group 1. This focus addresses several of the specific project objectives in examining and reflecting upon:

- Curriculum internationalisation and transformation at the Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the partner countries, by understanding and determining structural development status and needs.
- Context-specific internationalisation and transformation of the curriculum practices across the consortium partners.
- How the partner universities were conceptually connecting the concepts of Africanisation and Europeanisation with internationalisation and other relevant concepts.

Curriculum internationalisation is a mandatory requirement for all South African (SA) universities as per the *National Policy Framework for the Internationalisation of Higher Education in South Africa* (2020). Each university must develop its own policy and plan on internationalisation, with annual reporting targets for the South African Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET). For some universities this has required significant work to be done, not least as universities had to appreciate the concept of ‘internationalisation’ within their institutional context, including how curriculum internationalisation and transformation could be understood and practised. Further, the National Policy Framework came out as the COVID pandemic erupted, which coincided with the start of iKudu (our project partner ‘kick-off meeting’ at University of the Free State (UFS) was in December 1999. As a consequence, it would be a testing first two years. Nonetheless, innovation and creativity have been harnessed throughout, due to the consortium’s collective commitment to the project and its ambition, and through the progress shared throughout the international virtual collaboration, including the use of innovative online teaching and learning approaches, not least COIL virtual exchange.

Our efforts in iKudu have been focused on how South-North institutional review and responses are required to move beyond the rhetoric of openness, pluralism, tolerance, flexibility, and transparency, towards ways in which curriculum internationalisation and transformation are reflected in educational practice. What has been required is a continued critical questioning of the key terms in use across our educational contexts and in the wider international research discourse, not

least in reviewing diversity and inclusion agendas, but in challenging mindsets and practices for the improvement of sustainable, quality, learning and teaching.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union, the consortium is a collaboration among five South African universities, led by the University of the Free State (UFS), the Durban University of Technology (DUT), the University of Limpopo, (UL) the Central University of Technology (CUT), and the University of Venda (UNIVEN), with five European Universities (The Hague University of Applied Sciences (THUAS), the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences (AUAS), the University of Antwerp (UA, Belgium), the University of Siena (US, Italy) and Coventry University (CU, United Kingdom). The four-year project¹ has focused on offering space and action-orientated curriculum practices to question how collaborative online international learning (COIL) exchange can engage learners across our South-North institutions and beyond in internationalised and decolonised curricula.

In terms of 'data' informing this report, since the project started, the iKudu partners have engaged in institutional and cross-institutional dialogue in a continued attempt to share interdisciplinary. Briefly, this has included each university team initially conducting a local preliminary 'As-Is' analysis of their curriculum internationalisation approach in a narrative report, using an Appreciative Inquiry lens.² These reports were shared and discussed in online Working Group One (WG1) meetings,³ as well as in roundtable discussions amongst paired global South-North

¹ The project was extended by 18 months by agreement with the funders due to the Covid pandemic.

² Appreciative Inquiry (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005; Elliott et al., 2020) focusing on opportunities, appreciating strengths, understanding 'what works' rather than focus on the negative, with a momentum for change driven by collaborative/collective action.

³ The project had two main working groups (WGs): WG2 have focused on planning, developing, and implementing COIL virtual exchange projects within institutions. WG1, whose efforts are the focus of this report have focused on the Internationalisation of the Curriculum across the partner universities.

university colleagues. Additionally, workshops and discussions took place face to face in project partner meetings at the University of Sienna (US) in June 2022, and at a further project partner event at the Durban University of Technology (DUT) during September 2023. Finally, each institution completed a set of questions in an end-of-project survey open for 3 weeks (November–December 2023). This report brings together a reflective analysis of these data sets. Following this introduction and context setting, the report presents on two main themes, with subthemes, followed by a summarising conclusion in which the next steps for building interinstitutional and interdisciplinary knowledge are considered.

Institutions and individuals' engagement with the concepts of curriculum internationalisation and transformation

South African Universities

When considering the main drivers of internationalisation activities, it is evident most of the universities have an articulated vision and mission. At the UFS this embraces diversity, a common purpose and belonging, where the symbols and spaces, systems and daily practices all reflect a commitment to openness and engagement. Colleagues at the DUT shared that diversity, inclusion and equity are viewed as their key principles, with the acknowledgement of the historical links with Eurocentric hegemony. At the CUT it was noted how the needs from the world of work, as well as national and global imperatives are identified as curriculum drivers.

Colleagues across the SA partners have shared how COIL/VE is a smart and cost-effective way to internationalise the curriculum on the home campus. UNIVEN colleagues shared how from their perspective, internationalisation at home practices (I@H) – with emphasis on the purposeful international and intercultural dimensions in both the formal and the informal curriculum for all students (Beelen & Jones, 2015) – as part of inclusive Internationalisation, can only occur if there are deliberate programmes that infuse international dimensions into the curriculum, measured and infused into policies driven by senior leadership and then embraced by staff. It was acknowledged by several SA HEIs that inspired leadership is required



to integrate these necessary components, including a contextually appropriate internationalisation plan.

Moreover, several SA partners shared how an internationalised curriculum requires striking a balance between local (South African/African) and international knowledge systems. Central University of Technology (CUT) colleagues also shared that internationalising the curriculum should not be dominated by one source of knowledge, mainly from the global north, but on appreciating that approaches such as COIL can be used to imbed knowledge from the Global South in the curriculum. Current research conducted at the CUT focusing on indigenous knowledge was seen as a driver of curriculum by some, for example informing pharmaceutical knowledge, which is used to drive curriculum decolonisation. However, CUT colleagues did share that staff are still grappling with the concepts of curriculum internationalisation and transformation, as it means different things to different people.

At the UFS, instead of using the term ‘international curriculum transformation’, the focus is rather on curriculum renewal and epistemic diversity. Staff are encouraged to engage with a diversity of ideas and perspectives complementing their institutional ethos of excellence and achievement. Over the last few years, the UFS has seen a paradigm shift from teacher-centred, to student-centred, to learning-centred approaches, with learning as the focus, with both the lecturers and students as contributors to the learning, bringing with them their experiences and expertise.

It was important to note that curriculum 'transformation' was also defined in terms of accessibility to higher education for students and in how the curriculum responds to the different environments students find themselves in, considering the diverse SA contexts partner institutions reflect – from the urban, e.g. DUT and CUT, to the rural campuses of UFS Qwaqwa and the rural Universities of Limpopo (UL) and Venda (UNIVEN). Understanding international curriculum transformation thus, whilst always diffuse, was articulated as being more about systemic change than that of change in mindset and approach by individuals. The role language itself

plays was also of note across several partners reflections. Other concepts that are linked with curriculum internationalisation and transformation are decolonisation, Africanisation and Europeanisation, strengthening a contextual understanding of internationalisation endeavours.

Some colleagues representing the SA universities spoke of being besieged with crisis management and the pressure of responding to multiple daily challenges. Academics shared feelings bombarded with instruction to internationalise, decolonise, and ensure equity, diversity, and inclusion-compliant education. However, colleagues at the UFS reflected upon how such agendas should not be viewed as mutually exclusive, but rather seen as interdependent and overlapping. An important statement made by one of the UFS participants at the engagement session in Durban was, “inasmuch as we need to decolonise internationalisation, we need to internationalise decolonisation”, spotlighting the need for equity and inclusion in knowledge sharing and generation. Similarly, this statement also highlights the discrepancies and tensions surrounding the concept of decolonisation as part of internationalising the curriculum and the need to clarify the role language and context also play in how the iKudu consortium have worked to define key terms such as decolonisation.

European universities

Policies driving curriculum internationalisation and wider internationalisation practices exist across all the European partners, at national level, as well as the level of institutional plans. The Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences (AUAS) has included curriculum internationalisation across its institutional internationalisation policy plans. Three main drivers embrace the principles of the institutional strategy: digitalisation, sustainability and diversity and inclusion. While each Department (School/Faculty) identifies different graduate attributes and has different drivers, the three principles are recognised university wide.

THUAS has an institutional strategy and educational vision stipulating the need for all undergraduate programmes to have international/intercultural learning



outcomes. Their internationalisation policy supports a qualitative internationalisation approach with a clear role for the formal curriculum and for staff development.

CU internationalisation strategies have been in place for the past 10+ years. From 2015–2021, ‘internationalisation’ was a core strand of Coventry’s ‘DNA’, not least through its focus on graduate employability and development of global competencies and transferable skills. The current 2030 Strategy includes the following drivers: Collaboration – Diversity and Inclusion – Innovation – Integrity, and resourcing and delivering on COIL remain, as does “Being a Global University”.

UA has long opted for competence-based and student-centred education, considering their strategic themes (diversity and inclusion, sustainability, internationalisation, nexus education/research, employability, and entrepreneurship). Of note is how in each degree programme there is a specific Education Committee, which includes the teaching staff but also the students, and which is in charge of ensuring a balanced curriculum. Interestingly, at the University of Sienna (US), it was evident there is a sharp division between some courses that are more inclined to internationalisation and some that are less. This appears to be shaped from out of the disciplines, but also from the enthusiasm and CVs of the teachers. This is not so surprising, as it is acknowledged in the wider discourse how some academic disciplines are more ‘open’ to internationalisation than others are (e.g. Zadavec & Kočar, 2023). The major plus at US is the relatively high number of double degree programmes that opens several opportunities for students and teachers to engage in the enhancement of skills sets and wider knowledge (with possible study at partner universities) deepening community and peer connections and opening up multiple career options.

COIL at CU has been an approach within I@H since 2010. Yet, at the sharing of practices in Durban some CU colleagues sensed other HEIs are experiencing more spotlight (attention/focus) and resources to support their internationalisation activities. Perhaps an explanation is that at CU, internationalisation is now viewed as ‘part of everything we do’, and has been for some time, and therefore should not

need to be focused on separately, but should be embedded as core practice. Perhaps another explanation is also how the dialogue at Coventry has turned more towards how the curriculum addresses the SDGs, Education for Sustainability, Global Citizenship, Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) agendas, social justice and so on. It does seem such terms and concepts are occurring as forms of expressing internationalisation. At THUAS too, Global Citizenship was mentioned the most and a term staff in the institution can grasp as part of the fact that THUAS is in an international city, the students' future jobs are in an international context, and staff educate their students to be global citizens. Of note also is how both CU and THUAS have global learning research centres/groups, which have been an important driver within the institutions to examine and question comparative curriculum internationalisation and transformation practices.

It was highlighted how the term 'curriculum transformation' is not commonly used at the AUAS. THUAS also reflected there are differences in how their institution versus individuals engage with the topic. At a personal level it was suggested how transformational learning (c.f. Mezirow 1991, 1995, 1996) is considered more for individuals, particularly students. However, staff seem not so open to their own transformation, or rather perhaps the institution does not seem to address a need for this in staff themselves. Regarding staff development processes, at CU there is an individual appraisal review strategy in place in which internationalisation is included as an organisational goal underpinned by the university capability framework (<https://gpod.orgdev.coventry.domains/capability-framework>). Staff may select this theme as a focus for continued professional development, but unlike previous reviews, there is no mandatory focus to select internationalisation now.

At the AUAS, COIL was specifically mentioned as one of the methods or interventions to scale up the internationalisation efforts and reach all students, requiring an investment in staff development, the interrelatedness and connection of COIL and curriculum internationalisation, the importance to connect multiple stakeholders and to involve educational developers in the process.

Global South-North Similarities

For all colleagues the round-table discussions, partner meetings and sharing of practices was very revealing and informative in how colleagues' curriculum internationalisation practices are progressing, including the adoption of COIL/VE, which some SA and European universities (e.g. UL, UA) had not previously engaged in. As well as appreciating a diversity of practices on the move, there were also no shortage of similarities expressed across partners, not least in how COIL is/can be a useful way of internationalising the curriculum because, when designing and facilitating COILs, we can draw examples from our African and European and wider perspective/contexts that offer rich opportunities for curriculum experiences to be influenced. The majority of partners' responses also included how contextual understanding of decolonial issues can be addressed by internationalisation of the curriculum through COIL.

Agreement was also evident concerning the concepts of 'transformation' and as part of curriculum internationalisation, as terms that colleagues are still grappling with, not least as they mean different things to different people (as stated by CUT and THUAS colleagues). Although always diffuse, there tended to be agreement that SA partners are more focused on understanding transformational change at a systemic level, whereas European partners' focus tends to be more on students or staff; in other words, transformation at an individual level.

It was interesting also how CU and the UL shared how some senior leadership feel that significant progress is already made regarding the key concepts and practices as discussed here, whereas academics and students' views may likely differ.

Relationships between key concepts

As previously acknowledged, there has been a keen focus in iKudu in defining key terms from the discourse driving the priorities of our project, e.g. internationalisation of the curriculum, curriculum transformation; internationalisation at home; COIL/VE; decolonisation; inclusivity, etc. and, rather than being viewed as mutually exclusive, we have been striving to appreciate such

concepts as interdependent and overlapping. At the same time, we acknowledged the subjectivity of knowledge and also of the understanding of different terminologies, instead of forcing a single definition or description. Therefore we engaged with the concepts in various ways over a period of time, to develop an understanding of how the different concepts relate and are influenced by one another. In the following section we report on how colleagues viewed and made sense of using ways to bridge concepts.

COIL and pluriform perspectives

All colleagues appreciated the focus on decentring western dominance to embrace and celebrate more pluriform (knowledge taking many forms – written, visual/artistic, oral) and pluriverse perspectives (the acknowledgement of many world views/conceptions of the world), with efforts acknowledged across all partners to include increased perspectives within the curriculum. It was acknowledged that COIL partnerships offer an opportunity for these perspectives to be included with rich opportunities to include unheard voices. Indeed, colleagues reiterated that as students engage in COIL, they themselves bring curriculum content through the lens of their local context while also valuing the knowledge they encounter through the exchange with peers. There was acknowledgement that such perspectives are not always easy to appreciate, but that students learn to feel comfortable while being uncomfortable.

COIL and I@H/IoC

It was evident how both SA and European partners viewed COIL as part of IoC and I@H by enabling local students to engage with international content and collaborate with their peers across borders. The AUAS mentioned how their university has a large following/commitment to COIL from their Strategic Plan and Internationalisation Strategy to the level of programmes and individual lecturers. iKudu played a role in this development process, showing more lecturers that students do not need to travel in order to have an international experience. Even where partners do not have a well-embedded COIL programme, it is evident COIL

was useful as a ‘conversation starter’ for internationalisation of the home curriculum.

COIL and Inclusive education

COIL was viewed as an excellent way to realise inclusive internationalisation, and ideally COIL would be part of the compulsory curriculum for every student.

A shared understanding of what we mean by inclusive internationalisation was explained as ‘not leaving anyone behind’. Yet it was noted that partners see how colleagues across universities are implementing I@H and IoC in diverse ways for inclusive internationalisation to occur. For example, there are deliberate programmes that infuse international dimensions into the curriculum. Several partner universities also have strong backing from senior leadership, but this is not the case everywhere. That said, most partners articulated how Vice-Chancellors and departmental heads are required to commit resources and strategy for staff to then follow for the benefit of students, with each department integrating an internationalisation dimension which is tracked and infused by policy.

It was noted how access and inclusion in the online space for COIL exchange is something iKudu colleagues have researched and published on (Wimpenny et al., 2024) and how it cannot be assumed/taken for granted. A current, part iKudu-inspired project (involving CU and the UFS with a Brazil partner) is focused on appreciating female voices in global South-North COILs.

COIL-Multi/Inter/Transdisciplinary

It was noted how COIL can build bridges, not only between cultures of different countries, but also cultures of different academic disciplines and that interdisciplinary COIL exchanges are encouraged. It was argued how COIL/VE can be enriched when used to develop graduate attributes such as critical thinking and problem solving when the work is conducted in more than one discipline (Haug & Jacobs, 2023). The iKudu project has offered multi-/inter- and transdisciplinary ways of conducted COILs with very interesting opportunities and outcomes realised.

Even when not engaging multiple disciplines it was felt that COIL work can transcend the disciplinary boundaries towards transdisciplinary outcomes. It was also appreciated that the understanding of the concepts are still not fully recognised and the terms are used interchangeable; e.g. one can mean 'multi', but say 'trans'. Sometimes the terms are used too easily, for instance just assuming that a COIL is transdisciplinary by nature.

Internationalisation and decolonisation

Colleagues generally agreed that a curriculum should include pluriform perspectives. Colleagues reflected upon how internationalisation and decolonisation are both about including pluriform and pluriverse perspectives, but that decolonisation calls for broader internationalisation that includes perspectives that have traditionally been excluded not only in the South African context, but in the international knowledge domain. It was also acknowledged that whilst there is persistent focus on decolonising the curriculum, this is not systematically happening yet. Colleagues also remarked upon how it is important to recognise the need to approach internationalisation and decolonisation of the curriculum not only from a global citizen approach, ensuring that our students are globally competent and locally relevant, but also from a social justice approach. When we talk about the issue of decolonisation and, for that matter, Africanisation, we try to bring in voices that were marginalised in the past. Yet there is also the act of how to incorporate the diverse experiences of students in ways that students understand them. It was noted how iKudu has opened up the perspective of the Global South for students and staff from the Global North, but more – that understanding ourselves and one another grows from working together, and appreciating ourselves and the other. With local cases as examples and local solutions getting equal recognition, a step towards decolonisation is made. Such experiences have served to help inform COIL practices with wider international colleagues that the consortium universities partner with (e.g. Indonesia was mentioned).

Africanisation and Europeanisation

It was clear that Africanisation was clearly articulated by SA partners as closely linked to decolonisation, but specifically focused on emphasising Africanness, African knowledge and African epistemes, and how it does not seek to exclude other knowledges, but rather wants to take its rightful place. It was interesting that Europeanisation was not so easy a concept to articulate from what is discussed within the field of internationalisation of higher education in the European context. What is the character of Europe now? European colleagues admitted these are terms that need further analysis and defining, and arguably are not particularly well understood or widely used.

Pluriform perspectives & decolonisation

There was agreement in that using internationalisation/decolonisation offers the broad basis for pluriform perspectives, providing opportunity for multidisciplinary perspectives and approaches in its curriculum designs, moving away from the hegemony of the global North. It was also acknowledged how pluriform perspectives and decolonisation also start with how to make staff aware of how to deal with students' different backgrounds and perspectives, and that pluriform perspectives are a way to open the charged discussion on decolonisation.

Transformation & decolonisation

It seemed these concepts raised quite different reflections from colleagues who felt unable to answer what transformation really meant for their institution. Responses ranged from how decolonisation was viewed as a form of transformation, to changing the identity of the institution, to a European partner explaining a specific team was tasked to explicitly link transformation to decolonisation, albeit with a limited lifespan, with the efforts and resources developed now handled to Academic Development to refer to and use/build upon. As such, across cases, further evaluation of these terms and the impact of such work to address them are required, as well as their follow-on trajectory.

IoC/I@H & global citizenship education

Colleagues here spoke about how IoC and I@H are overlapping concepts and processes of embedding international and intercultural dimensions into curricula and using pedagogies that leverage inclusivity in diverse ways. Global citizenship education was articulated as equipping students with the competences and agency to address 'g/local' challenges and to contribute to building a more just and sustainable world. When considering how to achieve those aims, IoC/I@H interventions and processes can be used for intentional curriculum design bringing in internationalised and interculturalized content, interactions, and engagement with different contexts. IoC and I@H can be important tools for global citizenship education, but there needs to be an intentional educational approach in respect of this. It was, in general terms, agreement that an international curriculum broadens the notion of citizenship and inclusion for students.

Internationalisation & equality/equity, diversity, inclusion (EDI)

This is a theme of value across the partners, with colleagues sharing how the values of an internationalised curriculum should relate to inclusion and diversity agendas, and how this is to be found in institutional policy. However, it was not always evident how colleagues could evidence that such practices take place. At CU it may seem that EDI and internationalisation are viewed as two separate things with not much crossover. A valuable example from the AUAS was offered, is how the university strives to create dialogue between students from Russia and Ukraine, and from Israel and Gaza who are all studying at the university. The AUAS offer training to lecturers on not being afraid to address sensitive topics and to help maintain equality amongst the diverse student groups.

Curriculum Transformation & Involving I@H/IoC

Responses here included how the goals of Curriculum Transformation as linked to I@H/IoC may be similar, but the roads towards the goals can differ per study programme. I@H and IoC are viewed as essential aspects of curriculum transformation. An acknowledgement was that there is not a one-size-fits-all

approach as mentioned by the UFS, where it was noted that governance structures ensure room for their diverse people with different ideas and different routes to achieving transformation through curriculum internationalisation. It was also noted how challenges exist in the curriculum in the South African context through I@H and IoC, as related to the inclusion of perspectives from regions in the global South. It also seems that each concept has power to influence the other – for example, one participant in the survey reflected that “once the value of I@H is understood, and the value that it has, it changes the mindset of the stakeholders.”

Decolonisation & Africanisation

It was evident from the partner responses that these concepts relate, and that Africanisation may go hand in hand with decolonisation. Indeed, the terms have been used interchangeably at SA universities. Through decolonising processes, missing narratives, knowledges and approaches can be identified, which through Africanisation can be brought back into academia and curricula. It was also apparent that Africanisation was appreciated to be focused mainly on African perspectives, while decolonisation focuses on knowledge from the global south, not only Africa.

Ways in which the experience of the local community is embraced were also felt by SA partners to be important to contextualise the curriculum. This was voiced less so from the European partners. It is interesting to understand how these concepts currently have a direct impact on curriculums. There may be pockets of good practice that are not circulated well for wider appreciation.

Summary and Conclusion

This reflective report has detailed the interdependent processes of curriculum internationalisation and transformation at the partner universities over the lifetime of the iKudu project. In particular, the interpretations of key concepts such as curriculum internationalisation and transformation at the partner universities have been examined in order to appreciate and understand institutional through to personal practices, perspectives and needs better. Importantly, the context-specific

internationalisation and transformation of the curriculum practices across the SA and European consortium partners have been considered in terms of overlap and distinguishing features. This relates not least to how the partner universities are conceptually connecting the concepts of Africanisation and Europeanisation with internationalisation and other relevant concepts.

Whilst institutional policy statements may say a lot, and could mean a lot to some, this does not necessarily lead to curriculum development in practice (for all). There has been a lot to reflect upon, considering the multiple perspectives and scope addressed in our four-year project.

Certainly, it seems iKudu came at an interesting time for many partners and not the least considering the global pandemic. As such, there is a sense of practice always on the move, as well as periods of instability. iKudu has helped to provide some important space for reflection, discussion, and stability during the project lifetime. It is evident iKudu has provided important levers universities have used to engage in dialogue (again) with senior leadership and academics 'on the ground'. Momentum has certainly been offered from the project to partners in helping to keep conversations.

What is clear is how a lot have been achieved, and much is yet still to be done in terms of top-down and bottom up practices. That said, the delegations present in Durban with colleagues from diverse Departments/Schools/Centres/etc. demonstrate the institutional commitments to curriculum internationalisation and transformation, and within that COIL.

Some level of progress has been made by all partners across very diverse/different institutions. As new staff continue to arrive at our universities, advocacy for this programme is important as part of new Staff Induction (to the new academics) and in sustaining the COILs through recruiting new academics to the programme.

iKudu has had a large impact on the partners' research into COIL and I@H. For example, published COIL research (see Chapter 6 for a synthesis of the published

project outputs) has enabled colleagues to engage better in dialogue with the university to reinforce why, for example, I@H and COIL are valuable and necessary activities to resource and develop/sustain.

It was acknowledged that institutions do not change fast. Changes can often be piecemeal at any moment in time. But change does happen with persistence. Over the four-year period since the iKudu kick-off, certain terminology, including COIL, I@H and IoC are becoming part of the "jargon" used at the partner institutions where it was not, even if a lot is still needed.

Whilst the Erasmus funding fundamentally is focused on staff capacity building, students have been our ultimate focus in how they experience the curriculum and especially the COIL exchanges. It has thus been important and interesting to reflect on how the concepts are understood and experienced with students, which has been the focus of the analysis of WG2 and is reported on in Chapters 10 and 11.

iKudu has led to limited structural changes, but has brought many useful insights and contexts which will need to be taken forward. The iKudu project has contributed to individual shifts amongst those that joined the iKudu journey. The conversations and the work must still continue for curriculum internationalisation to flourish.

References

- 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.
<http://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0>
- Cooperrider, D., & Whitney, D. (2005). *Appreciative inquiry: A positive revolution in change*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Haug, E., & Jacobs, L. (2023). The design of collaborative online internationalised learning (COIL)". In F. Hunter, R. Ammigan, H. de Wit, J. Gregersen-Hermans, E. Jones, & Murphy, A.C. (Eds.), *Internationalisation in higher education: Responding to new opportunities and challenges. Ten years of research by the Centre for Higher Education*

Internationalisation (CHEI). (pp. 143-156). Milano: EDUCatt.

<https://libri.educatt.online/books/CHEI/ebook-CHEI.pdf>

Wimpenny, K., Jacobs, L., Dawson, M., & Hagenmeier, C. (2024). The potential of collaborative online international learning as a border thinking third space for global citizenship education. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 16(1):29-42. <https://doi.org/10.14324/IJDEGL.16.1.03>

Zadravec, K.A., & Kočar, S. (2023). The impact of academic disciplines on a constructively aligned internationalised curriculum. *Higher Education*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01008-w>

ⁱ Disclaimer: The author has the opportunity to develop and publish this report into a full paper on condition of appropriate attribution to the project and the funders.