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Govt to allow foreign institutions to open universities in Thailand

The Australian
New entry barriers in Asia

Australia’s offshore higher education market faces decline as universities in China, Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia reposition themselves to compete for local students, analysis suggests.

BBC News
Glasgow Caledonian University New York campus wins degree status
DEFINITION

“an entity that is owned, at least in part, by a foreign higher education provider; operated in the name of the foreign education provider; and provides an entire academic program, substantially on site, leading to a degree awarded by the foreign education provider.”
**Distance learning sites:** Locations where instruction is not conducted onsite

**Subsidiary locations:** Locations founded or owned by a foreign entity that is not a degree granting institution

**Partnership Operation:** Campus is co-founded/established by local and foreign universities, with joint design/delivery of programs and services

**Multi-state institutions:** Campuses in different countries with no home campus

**New Institution:** Foreign backed but controlled/operated in name of new institution, with the degree awarded by the new institution
Parsons goes to Paris (1920s)
Johns Hopkins opens in Italy
Florida State heads to Panama
Today
Not just a US phenomenon
Quick Facts

- 263 IBCs known to be in operation in 2017
- 33 Countries exporting IBCs to 76 Countries
- Flow of campuses in Multi-Directional
- 42 IBCs are known to have been closed
- 22 New IBCs are reported to be in development
- 180,000 Students Enrolled in IBCs
International Branch Campuses, 2000-2017*
Home Countries

- IBCs come from 33 different home countries
- 18% increase from 28 home countries at the end of 2010.
- The top five home countries, in terms of number of IBCs, are the United States, the United Kingdom, Russia, France, and Australia.
- Together, they account for 181 branch campuses, or 73% of total IBCs.
- Around half of IBCs in development are planned by institutions based in the US and UK.
Global IBC provision (Home Countries), 2015
Global IBC provision (Home Countries), 2015
## Ratio of IBCs to Higher Education Institutions by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Nationally recognized HEIs*</th>
<th>IBCs</th>
<th>Ratio of IBCs to HEIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>c.4,200</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Host Countries

- IBCs are hosted by 76 countries
- 10% increase from 69 countries at the end of 2010
- The top five host countries are China (32), the United Arab Emirates (31), Singapore (12), Malaysia (12), and Qatar (11)
- Together they host 98 IBCs, or 39% of the world’s total
- China has overtaken UAE as the top host country
- The number of IBCs continues to increase, with concentrated growth in China, Malaysia, Mauritius and South Korea from 2011-2015 and slowed growth in UAE
Global IBC provision (Host Countries), 2015
Global IBC provision (Host Countries), 2015
### Ratio of IBCs to Higher Education Institutions by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Nationally recognized HEIs*</th>
<th>IBCs</th>
<th>Ratio of IBCs to HEIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Reasons for Having an IBC

- Internationalization
- Revenue
- Status Enhancement
- Existing Connections
Why They Don’t Do It

• Does not fit with the mission of the institution.
• Too expensive / Too risky
• There is not a clear and financially sustainable business model.
• Lack of buy-in from the home institution.
• Concern that failure could damage the institution’s reputation.
• Uncertainty about how to operate in a foreign country.
• Do not want to dilute the institution’s brand.
• Academic freedom concerns.
• Champion leaves the institution or loses interest.
### Types of IBCs, with Program Number as a Marker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of IBC</th>
<th>Number of IBCs</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1 (1-5 programs)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2 (6-19 programs)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3 (20+ programs)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of academic programs per IBC varies, though most have 5 or fewer. Masters programs in professional areas are the most common.
We do not see any clear linkages between age of an institution and the number of students.
Majority of IBCs engage in little research, though that is changing. IBCs are effective ways to increase international research collaborations.
Top 4 IBC Host Countries (Share of national publication volume)
Research Quality – Citation Impact

Quality - citation impact (FWCI)

- QatarIBC
- Qatar
- ChinaIBC
- Malaysia IBC
- UAEIBC
- UAE
- China
- Malaysia

International Collaborations (Nottingham)
Traditional Accountability is Premised on:

- Sovereignty of nations
- Immobility of Institutions
- National responsibility for quality assurance
- Shared sense of what is quality
- Single relationship between institution and nation/accreditor
This “relationship” influences:

- Governance preferences
- Access
- Public subsidy,
- Research output,
- Cost to students,
- Hiring practices,
- Level of academic freedom guiding institutional development.
As we consider CBHE, a number of questions arise:

• What happens when a university designed to serve the needs of one country decides to start providing educational opportunities in another country?

• How does one regulate a joint degree program offered by universities in two different countries?

• When does a foreign institution need permission to offer its educational programming in a different country, and who should grant it?
This “new” relationship looks like:
This “new” relationship looks like:
This “new” relationship looks like:
Option 1: No Accountability
Option 2: One-Sided Accountability
Option 2: One-Sided Accountability
Option 3: Dual(duelling) Accountability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Country</th>
<th>Host Country</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Quadrant 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IBCs in this quadrant largely exist outside of any existing government accountability framework.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quadrant 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IBCs in this quadrant are subject to accountability by the host country, but not the home country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Quadrant 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IBCs in this quadrant are subject to accountability by the home country, but not the host country.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quadrant 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IBCs in the quadrant must balance the accountability expectations of both the home and host countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tensions Develop

• What programs will be offered at the IBC?
• What does the governance of the IBC look like?
• How is quality assessed – input, output, throughput?
• Is the curriculum localized (or not)?
• How are students selected? Who determines admissions?
• To what extent is academic freedom recognized?
The Third Dimension: Institutions

- Selecting the correct academic programs
  - Difference between what employers and students want

- Understanding the local culture
  - Language is used in different ways in different countries

- Global brand recognition does not translate in local brand recognition

- Over charging in the marketplace (compete locally, not globally)

- Aged “bureaucracy” does not understand the young “start up”
The Third Dimension: Institutions

• Selecting the correct academic programs
  • Difference between what employers and students want

• Understanding the local culture
  • Language is used in different ways in different countries

• Global brand recognition does not translate in local brand recognition

• Over charging in the marketplace (compete locally, not globally)

• Aged “bureaucracy” does not understand the young “start up”
Key Considerations

- Quality means different things to different people (competing frameworks).
- IBCs tend to move developed to developing – what risks are their to the developing systems that should be considered?
- Local QA may have requirements that are contradictory to the foreign QA.
- IBCs tend to be market driven; but QA can interfere with this.
- While home campuses tend to be permanent, IBCs can be temporary and moveable.
Conclusions

- IBCs are a growing and diverse set of institutions
- CBHE Quality Assurance is more complex than Traditional Quality Assurance
- Governments need to decide their involvement in CBHE QA
- Decide how CBHE “fits” within the nation’s educational strategy.
- QA is a responsibility of both the government and the institution.
Resources


- **Kinser, K. & Lane, J.E. (2013).** Five Reasons (Other Than Poor Quality) Quality Assurance in Cross Border Higher Education is Problematic. *International Higher Education*.

