

PLENARY PANEL

Panelist: **Jane Knight** (Technologico Autonomo de Mexico (ITAM);
Comparative, International and Development Education Centre (CIDECE)
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto)

The New World of Crossborder Education: Concepts, Complexities and Challenges

1.0 INTRODUCTION

*‘Globalization is transforming the world
and internationalization is changing the world of higher education’*

The knowledge society, ICTs, and the market economy are increasing the demand for tertiary and continuing education. This is leading to increased crossborder education provision involving new types of education providers, new modes of delivery, new programs and qualifications, new partnerships and affiliation models, new national regulations and in general, a shift from academic cooperation and exchange to commercial trade.

A fascinating but very complex world of crossborder education is emerging. The purpose of this paper is to delve into some of the trends, issues, challenges and implications of these new developments. The objectives are: 1) to clarify the relationships between globalization, internationalization, crossborder education and trade of educational services; 2) to provide examples of the current types and models of program and provider mobility; 3) to try to develop a conceptual map of concepts, terms and issues related to crossborder education; The primary focus is on the movement of education programs and providers across borders, not the mobility of students. It is important to recognize that in crossborder education there are different perspectives and issues depending on whether one is a receiving (host) country or a sending (source) country; this paper aims to address both perspectives..

1.2 Terminology

A few words about terminology are necessary as the language of internationalization is changing and differs within and between countries. Even though one of the objectives of this paper is to make sense of the the myriad of new terms that are emerging, it is important to be clear at the outset how key concepts are interpreted and used.

Traditional higher education institutions are no longer the only deliverers of academic courses and programs. International conglomerates, media and IT companies, new partnerships of private and public bodies are increasingly engaged in the provision of education both domestically and internationally. The term education providers is now becoming a more common and inclusive term as it includes both traditional HEIs as well as organizations and

companies. This paper uses the term providers to mean all types of entities that are offering education programs and services. There is some criticism directed towards the use of the term ‘providers’ as it seems to be buying into the ‘marketization and corporatization’ agenda. This is a sign of the times and indeed, every attempt is made in this paper not to adopt the trade and commercial language of ‘suppliers, consumption abroad, commercial presence’ etc. There is great confusion in the sector about the meaning and use of the three terms ‘transnational, crossborder, and borderless’ education. The preferred term for this paper is crossborder education as it is the presence of national borders which is key to many of the regulatory, quality, academic and financial issues related to the new mobility of programs and providers.

2.0 Globalization, Internationalization and Crossborder Education: Realities and Relationships

2.1 Globalization: Changes and Challenges

There are many changes and new challenges in how the environment is impacting internationalization and how the growing international dimension of higher education is an agent of change itself. Globalization is probably the most pervasive and powerful driver of the changes in today’s environment. Globalization is a term and a phenomenon which is on the minds of policy makers, academics and professionals/practitioners no matter what the sector or discipline. Education is no exception. The role of education—particularly postsecondary education—as both agent and reactor to globalization is a critical area of debate and study. The discussion, in terms of the nature, causes, elements, consequences and future implications of globalization on education is prolific, rather controversial and very important. (Altbach, 2004; Breton and Lambert, 2003; Enders and Fulton, 2003; Marginson, 2001; Scott, 2000) However, for the purposes of this discussion, a neutral or non-ideological definition of globalization is purposely adopted, and secondly, globalization is positioned as a key environmental factor that has multiple effects—both positive and negative—on education.

It is important to note that the discussion does not center on the ‘globalization of education’ - rather, globalization is presented as a phenomenon impacting internationalization. In fact, substantial efforts have been made during this past decade to maintain the focus on the ‘internationalization of education’ and to avoid using the term ‘globalization of education’. This has had mixed results, but some success has been achieved in ensuring that these two terms are not seen as synonymous and are not used interchangeably.

Globalization is defined as the “ the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas . . . across borders. Globalization affects each country in a different way due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, culture and priorities. Globalization increases and reflects the growing connectivity and interdependence among nations” (Knight & de Wit, 1997, p. 6). This definition acknowledges that globalization is a multi-faceted process and can impact countries in vastly different ways; but it does not take a position as to whether this impact has positive and/or negative consequences.

There are a number of factors that are seen as fundamental aspects of globalization. These include the knowledge society, information and communication technologies, the market economy, trade liberalization and changes in governance structures. It can be debated whether these are catalysts for globalization or whether they are consequences of globalization, but for this discussion they are presented as elements or factors of globalization which have an enormous impact on the education sector.

Chart One describes each of these five elements of globalization and notes some of the key implications for postsecondary education in general and the international dimension in particular. This chart presents highlights only, not a complete analysis. Its purpose is to illustrate several of the major environmental changes that are shaping the responses and actions of internationalization to globalization. It is important to note that these implications relate to all aspects of internationalization—the curriculum and teaching process, student and academic mobility, crossborder delivery of education programs, international development projects, study of foreign languages, commercial trade, staff development, and others. The chart below includes three columns, which are purposely not aligned because the impact of globalization is not linear. The elements of globalization listed in the first column have implications for many different aspects of higher education and in turn the international dimension.

Chart One: Implications of Globalization for Internationalization

Element of Globalization	Impact on higher Education	Implications for the international dimension of higher education
<p><i>Knowledge Society</i> Increasing importance attached to the production and use of knowledge as a wealth creator for nations</p>	<p>Growing emphasis on continuing education, lifelong learning and continual professional development creating a greater unmet demand for postsecondary education</p> <p>Need to develop new skills and knowledge resulting in new types of programs and qualifications</p> <p>Role of universities in research and knowledge production is changing and becoming more commercialized</p>	<p>New types of private and public providers delivering education and training programs across borders. For example, private media companies, networks of public/private institutions, corporate universities, multi-national companies.</p> <p>Programs more responsive to market demand. Specialized training programs being developed for niche market and for professional development purposes and distributed on worldwide basis.</p> <p>Increased international mobility</p>

<p><i>ICTS</i> new developments in information and communication technologies and systems</p> <p><i>Market Economy</i> Growth in number and influence of market based economies around the world</p> <p><i>Trade Liberalisation</i> new international and regional trade agreements developed to decrease barriers to trade</p> <p><i>Governance</i> Creation of new international and regional governance structures and systems</p>	<p>New delivery methods used for domestic and crossborder education, especially on-line and satellite based</p> <p>Greater commercialization and commodification of higher education and training at domestic and international levels</p> <p>Import and export of educational services and products increased as barriers removed</p> <p>The role of national level education actors both government and non-government is changing New regulatory and policy frameworks being considered at all levels</p>	<p>of students, academics, education and training programs, research, providers and projects. Mobility is physical and virtual.</p> <p>Innovative international delivery methods such as e-learning, franchises, satellite campuses require more attention given to accreditation of programs/providers and recognition of qualifications</p> <p>New concerns about appropriateness of curriculum and teaching materials in different cultures and countries and the potential for homogenization as well as new opportunities for hybridization</p> <p>Increasing emphasis on commercially oriented export and import of education programs and diminished importance to international development projects.</p> <p>New international/regional frameworks under consideration to complement national and regional policies and practices especially in the areas of quality assurance, accreditation, credit transfer, recognition of qualifications , mobility of students</p>
---	--	--

Knight 2004

This chart attempts to position globalization and internationalization as different but closely linked processes. It reinforces the notion that globalization is a rather generic process which impacts different sectors, of which higher education is just one. Examples of how the international dimension of education is implicated are provided in order to show that internationalization of higher education is seen as both a reaction to, but also, an agent of globalization.

Why is internationalization seen as being both a response to and a catalyst for globalization? The “response to” position is based on the fact that higher education needs to prepare students for living and working in a more connected, interdependent and globalized world, and secondly, that research and scholarship need to contribute to national and international issues. On the other hand, internationalization is seen as an agent of globalization, especially economic globalization or trade, because the market approach to higher education is becoming more active in the for-profit side of foreign student recruitment and commercial cross border delivery of education.

2.2 Internationalization: Evolution and Expansion

Only in the last two decades has the term internationalization been an important part of higher education vocabulary. Prior to this time, international development cooperation, international academic affairs and foreign students were the key concepts used to describe the kind of international activities that post secondary institutions engaged in. Beginning in the mid-eighties internationalization of higher education, interpreted in the broadest sense, started to increase in importance, scope and volume. Evidence of this includes

- the growing numbers of students, professors, and researchers participating in academic mobility schemes,
- the increase in the number of courses, programs and qualifications which focus on comparative and international themes,
- growing number of crossborder delivery of academic programs
- the development of new international networks and consortia,
- increase in campus based extra-curricular activities with an international or multi-cultural component
- the impetus given to recruitment of foreign students,
- the rise in number of joint or double degrees,
- the expansion of partnerships, franchises, offshore satellite campuses
- the establishment of new national organizations focused on international education
- new regional and national level government policies and programs supporting academic mobility and other internationalization initiatives

It is interesting to look at the way in which definitions/meanings of terms need to evolve to reflect new developments and also to help shape new policy and programs. Given the changes in rationales, providers, stakeholders and activities of internationalization, it is important to revisit the question of definition and ensure that the meaning reflects the complex realities of today and is able to guide and be relevant to new developments. It is increasingly clear that internationalization needs to be understood both at the national/system level as well as at the

institutional level. Therefore, a new definition is proposed which acknowledges both levels and the need to address the relationship and coherence between them.

The challenging part of developing a definition is the need for it to be generic enough to apply to many different countries, cultures and education systems. While it is not necessarily the intention to develop a universal definition, it is imperative that it be appropriate for use in a broad range of contexts and for comparative purposes across countries/ regions of the world. With this in mind, it is important to ensure that a definition does not specify the rationales, benefits, outcomes, actors, activities, and stakeholders of internationalization as they vary enormously across nations and also from institution to institution. What is critical is that the international dimension relates to all aspects of education and the role that it plays in society. The following working definition is proposed:

Internationalization at the national/sector/ institutional levels is defined as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education.” (Knight 2003, p.2)

This is intentionally a neutral definition of internationalization. Many would argue that the process of internationalization should be described in terms of promoting cooperation, and solidarity among nations, improving quality and relevance of higher education or contributing to the advancement of research for international issues. While these are noble intentions and internationalization can contribute to these goals, a definition needs to be objective enough that it can be used to describe a phenomenon which is in fact, universal, but which has different purposes and outcomes, depending on the actor or stakeholder. Therefore, it is important to explain why specific terms and concepts have been carefully chosen for the proposed working definition of internationalization.

The term ‘process’ is deliberately used to convey that internationalization is an on going and continuing effort. The term process denotes an evolutionary or developmental quality to the concept. The concept of ‘integration’ is specifically used to denote the process of infusing or embedding the international and intercultural dimension into policies and programs in order to ensure that the international dimension remains central- not marginal- and sustainable. The concepts of ‘purpose, function and delivery’ have been carefully chosen and are meant to be used together. Purpose refers to the overall role and objectives of higher education for a country or mission of an institution. Function refers to the primary elements or tasks that characterize a national post-secondary system or individual institution. Usually these include teaching, research and service/outreach to society. Delivery is a narrower concept and refers to the offering of education courses and programs either domestically or in other countries. This includes delivery by traditional higher education institutions but also by new providers such as multi-national companies who are often more interested in the global delivery of their programs and services than the international or intercultural dimension of a campus or research and service functions.

Another interesting development in the internationalization vocabulary is the growing use of two new terms which reflect two related but, different streams or components of internationalization (Knight 2003a) The first is ‘internationalization at home’ (Nilsson, 1999) which refers to the

international and intercultural dimension of curriculum, the teaching/learning process, research, extra-curricular activities, in fact a host of activities which help students develop international understanding and intercultural skills without ever leaving the campus. The second component is ‘internationalization abroad’ that is crossborder education which involves students, teachers, scholars, programs, courses, curriculum, projects moving between countries and culture, in short, across borders.

2.3 Crossborder Education: Innovation and Complexities

In the past decade, the interest and growth in international academic mobility has exploded. It involves the movement of students, teachers, institution/provider, program and/or curriculum and of course knowledge, across borders. This increased mobility is reflected in the introduction of new terminology to try to describe or characterize this delivery of education internationally. Transnational education is a term that has been used by UNESCO and the Council of Europe in the “Code of Practice on Transnational Education”, which they have developed. The term is defined to mean all types of higher education study where the learners are located in a country different from the one where an awarding institution is based (UNESCO/ Council of Europe, 2001). Transnational is also used in Australia to describe the delivery of programs off shore and is differentiated from international student mobility. As the international movement of programs and providers increases there is a proliferation of new terms and concepts, thus causing more confusion in terms of language and meaning, especially whether one is referring to private, public, for-profit, non-profit, corporate, state providers.

The term Borderless Education first appeared in an Australian report by Cunningham et al (2000) and was followed by a similar type of study in the United Kingdom. Basically, the term borderless education refers to the blurring of conceptual, disciplinary and geographic borders traditionally inherent in higher education (CVCP 2000). It is interesting to juxtapose the concepts of borderless education and crossborder education. The former term acknowledges the disappearance of borders while the latter term actually emphasizes the existence of borders. Both approaches reflect the reality of today. In this period of unprecedented growth in distance and e-learning education, geographic borders seem to be of little consequence. Yet, on the other hand, we can detect a growing importance of borders when the focus turns to regulatory responsibility, especially related to quality assurance, funding and accreditation. Crossborder seems to be emerging as the more widely used generic term and refers to the movement of education – whether it be people, programs, providers or projects- across a jurisdictional or national border

2.4 Trade in Educational Services

It is therefore clear that crossborder education is a term which educators are using to capture a wide range of education activities that are part of international academic linkages and agreements, international development/aid projects and international commercial trade initiatives. ‘Trade in education services’ is usually interpreted by educators as a subset of crossborder education, and for the most part is described as those activities that have a commercial or for-profit nature or purpose to them. This interpretation is much narrower than one used by economists or the trade sector. From their perspective, even if a crossborder

education activity is seen to be non-commercial in purpose - for instance the exchange of students or professors for a semester - there is still export value in a country's balance of payments from accommodation, living, travel expenses and therefore there are commercial implications (Larsen and Vincent-Lancrin, 2002).

It is not an easy task to have a clear and shared interpretation of what trade in education services really means across the two sectors. It may be dangerous to oversimplify how the different sectors perceive and use the term 'trade in education services' but the clear message is that more effort is needed to help the two sectors understand the different approaches to using and defining trade in education services. It is equally important to have clarity and assurance as to which international crossborder education activities would fall under the purview of international/regional trade agreements and be labelled as trade.

3.0 New Developments in Program and Provider Mobility around the World

3.1 New Initiatives

The Global Student Mobility 2025 Report (2002) prepared by IDP Education Australia predicts that the demand for international education will increase from 1.8 million international students in 2000 to 7.2 million international students in 2025. By all accounts these are staggering figures and present enormous challenges and opportunities. It is not known what proportion of the demand will be met by student mobility but, it is clear that there will be exponential growth in the movement of programs and institutions/ providers across national borders. New types of providers, new forms of delivery and new models of collaboration are being developed in order to take education programs to students in their home countries.

During the last five years the movement of education programs and providers across national boundaries has been a hotbed of activity and innovation. For instance, did you know that since 2002¹ -

That Phoenix University has become the largest private university in the US (owned and operated by the Apollo Group company) and is now present or delivering courses in Puerto Rico, Netherlands, Mexico and Canada. Other Apollo companies are offering courses in Brazil, India and China.

¹ According to the Breaking News Service of the Observatory of Borderless Higher Education – www.obhe.ac.uk

That the Netherlands Business School (UniversiteitNijenrode) has recently opened a branch campus in Nigeria

That in 2002, Australian universities had over 97,000 students enrolled in 1569 crossborder programs. (This is in addition to the foreign students at Australian based institutions)

That three Canadian universities are formally working with Al-Ahram Organization (a large private conglomerate) to establish the Al-Ahram Canadian University in Egypt.

That the reknown International Institute of Informatin Technology from India is establishing a teaching centre in Moscow to offer its Masters and Phd programs.

That Dubai has developed a ‘Knowledge Village” in the Dubai Technology and Media Free Zone and to date the London School of Economics, India’s Manipal Academy of Higher Education and the University of Wollongong from Australia are offering courses through franchising agreements and branch campuses.

That Laureate Education (formerly Sylvan Learning Systems) has purchased whole or part of private higher education institutions in Chile, Mexico, Panama and Costa Rica and owns universities in Spain, Switzerland, and France.

That the University of Westminster (UK) is the key foreign academic partner in the new private Kingdom University of Bahrain and plays a similar advisory/provision role with new institutions in Nigeria, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan.

That as of June 2003, Hong Kong had 858 degree level programs from 11 different countries operating in SAR and Singapore had 522 degree level programs from 12 foreign countries

That Harvard University is developing two branch campus initiatives in Cyprus and United Arab Emirates and that Jinan University will be the first Chinese university to open a branch campus oustide China - in Thailand.

That Germany invested 14 million Euros in 2004/2004 academic year to encourage German Universities to operate abroad and to increase foreign student enrolment in Germany

That in 2004, Japan approved two ‘higher learning zones’ and two professional development firms have established HEIs- Tokyo Legal Mind University and the Graduate School of Digital Hollywood.

These are only a few examples of hundreds of new initiatives that have developed in the last five years. They involve higher education providers (including institutions and companies) delivering their courses and programs to students in their home countries. It is convincing evidence that it is no longer just the students who are moving across borders; and, that even though in colonial times there has been significant mobility of institutions, we have now entered a new era of crossborder education.

3.2 Typologies for Crossborder Providers and Mobility

Given the increase in demand for higher education, there are new providers, new delivery methods and new types of programs. These new providers include media companies such as Pearson (UK), Thomson (Canada), multinational companies such as Apollo (USA), Informatics (Singapore) and Aptech (India), corporate universities such as those run by Motorola and Toyota, and networks of universities, professional associations and organizations. Generally, these new commercial providers are mainly occupied with teaching/training or providing services and do not focus on research per se. They can complement, cooperate, compete or simply coexist with the traditional public and private higher education institutions whose mandate is traditionally the trinity of teaching, research and service. However, it is not just for-profit companies that are becoming increasingly interested in commercial crossborder initiatives. Conventional higher education institutions, both private and public, are also seeking opportunities for commercial delivery of education programs in other countries as illustrated in the previous section. The majority of these are bona fide institutions that comply with domestic and foreign regulations (where they exist), but there is also an increase in rogue or low quality providers who are not recognized by bona fide accreditation/licensing bodies. In addition, there is a worrisome increase in the number of “degree mills” operating around the world. These are often no more than web based companies that are selling certificates based on ‘life experiences’ and are not delivering education programs at all.

The expansion in numbers and types of entities that are providing education courses and programs across borders is causing some confusion and chaos. This also applies to the modes of crossborder program mobility and provider mobility. This general state of flux may well indicate progress and innovation but it also begs for some kind of classification system or typology in order to make sense of the new ‘playing field’ of crossborder education.

The following section present a first attempt at developing three distinct typologies for the different types of providers, the different means of program mobility and the various ways that providers are moving across borders. A key factor underlying these typologies is that the type of provider is purposely separated from the mode of mobility. To date, much of the discussion about program and provider mobility has consciously or unconsciously linked the type of provider with a certain mode of delivery. This is one of the reasons for the state of confusion and therefore, a generic classification system for crossborder providers is proposed. A second typology on the different modes of program mobility is presented. It is important to emphasize that the different forms of program mobility can apply to any or all of the providers. A third typology focuses on the ways that providers move across borders. This typology rests on the assumption that the movement of ‘individual or a set of programs’ needs to be differentiated

from the movement and presence of ‘providers’. Again, the third typology is applicable to the full range of providers.

Typology of Providers

The term provider is used as a generic term to include all types of higher education institutions as well as companies and networks involved in crossborder education. It is an attempt to conceptually map the diversity of actors and to separate the type of provider from the form of crossborder delivery. The key factors used to describe each category of provider and to distinguish one category from another are the following:

- Recognized by a bona fide national licensing/accrediting body
- Part of the national ‘home’ higher education system
- Public, private or religious.
- Non-profit or for-profit

The proposed typology is purposely rather generic and does not provide specific details on the characteristics of each category of provider. The typology is oriented to international academic provision but may have some relevance for domestic delivery as well. There seems to be a continual flow of announcements about new providers and new forms of partnerships between providers. It is an evolving field that needs to be monitored and this is why the typology is a work in progress.

Chart Two: Typology of Crossborder/International Providers

Category	Status	Orientation	Notes
<i>Recognized HEIs</i>	Can be public, private or religious institutions. Usually part of home national education system and recognized by national bona fide licensing/ accrediting body	Can be non-profit or profit oriented	Known as traditional type of HEI focusing on teaching, research and service
Non-recognized HEIs	Usually private and not formally part of national education system Includes HEIs that provide a course of study but are not recognized by national bona fide licensing/ accreditation body. If the non-recognized HEIs are of	Usually profit oriented	‘Diploma mills’ sell degrees but do not provide programs of study and are related to crossborder education but are not a true provider. ‘Rogue providers’ are often accredited by

	low quality they are often referred to as 'rogue' providers		agencies that are selling accreditations (accreditation mills) or by self-accrediting groups or companies.
<i>Commercial Company HEIs</i>	<p>Can be publicly traded company (see Global Education Index of OBHE) or privately owned.</p> <p>Includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Companies that establish HEIs that may or may not be 'recognized' by bona fide licensing/ accrediting bodies and 2. Companies that focus more on the provision of services. <p>Uusually not part of 'home' national education system</p>	Profit oriented	<p>Known as type of "new or alternative provider"</p> <p>Can include variety of companies (ie media, IT, publishing) who provide education programs and support services. Can complement , cooperate, compete or co-exist with more traditional HEIs</p>

<p><i>Corporate HEIs</i></p> <p>May be difficult to identify home country</p>	<p>Not Part of home national education system</p> <p>Usually part of major international corporation and outside of national education system. Not usually recognized by national bona fide licensing/ accreditation body</p>	<p>Not relevant</p>	<p>Known as type of ‘new or alternative provider’</p> <p>Often collaborate with traditional HEIs especially for degree awarding power</p>
<p><i>Affiliations/Networks</i></p>	<p>Can be combination of public/public or public/private or private/private organizations and HEIs</p> <p>The affiliations/networks may or may not be part of home national education system; and they may or may not be recognized by national bona fide licensing/accreditation body. However some of the individual partners may be.</p>	<p>Usually profit oriented in purpose</p>	<p>Known as type of “new or alternative provider”</p>
<p><i>Virtual HEIs</i></p>	<p>Includes HEIs that are 100% virtual</p> <p>May or may not be part of home national education system and may or may not be recognized by national bona fide licensing/ accrediting body.</p>	<p>Usually profit oriented if delivering crossborder</p>	<p>Difficult for receiving national education system to monitor or regulate international virtual HEIs due to distance delivery methods</p>
<p><i>Footnotes</i></p>	<p><i>Home country means country of origin or sending/ source country.</i></p> <p><i>Host country means receiving country.</i></p>	<p>.</p>	

Knight 2005

The description and classification of the different types of new crossborder providers is rather challenging. The tendency is to use the factors inherent to traditional HEIs and apply them to new providers. This may change over time.

One of the more central issues is who recognizes and gives the provider the power to award the qualifications in the ‘home or sending country’ and/or in the ‘host or receiving country’. However, as previously pointed out some of the ‘new providers’ are not part of, or are not recognized by, a ‘home’ national education system. Another challenge in developing a typology is that the terms ‘public, private and religious’ are interpreted and used in different ways among

countries (and sometimes within countries as well). The emergence of new trade regulations applying to education services usually means that all commercial crossborder providers are considered to be private by host/receiving country regardless of their status at home. This adds yet another complicating dimension to the task. Furthermore, the definition of the terms profit and non-profit also varies among countries. It is interesting to follow the changes in national regulatory systems for crossborder education (especially in China, India, Malaysia, Japan) in terms of these issues, and especially how profit and non-profit education entities and services are defined

Typology of Program Mobility

Crossborder mobility of programs can be described as ‘the movement of individual education/training courses and programs across national borders through face to face, distance or a combination of these modes. Credits towards a qualification can be awarded by the sending foreign country provider or by an affiliated domestic partner or jointly.’ Program mobility can involve the delivery of individual courses and programs of a comprehensive HEI , thus the crossborder profile of an institution/provider may be different from the home profile. On the other hand, program mobility can also involve the only program or course offered by a provider. Franchising, twinning, double/joint and other articulation models are the more popular methods of crossborder program mobility.

Chart Three: Typology of Crossborder Program Mobility Modes

Category	Description	<i>Comments</i>
Franchise	An arrangement whereby a provider in the source country A authorizes a provider in another country B to deliver their course/program/service in country B or other countries. The qualification is awarded by provider in Country A	Arrangements for teaching, management, assessment, profit-sharing, awarding of credit/qualification etc are customized for each franchise arrangement
Twinning	A situation whereby a provider in source country A collaborates with a provider located in country B to develop an articulation system allowing students to take course credits in country B and/or source country A. Only one qualification is awarded by provider in source country A.	Arrangements for twinning programs and awarding of degree usually comply with national regulations of the provider in the source country A.
Double/Joint Degree	An arrangement whereby providers in different countries collaborate to offer a program for which a student receives a qualification from each provider or a joint award from the collaborating providers.	Arrangements for program provision and criteria for awarding the qualifications are customized for each collaborative initiative in accordance with national

		regulations.
Articulation	Various types of articulation arrangements between providers in different countries permit students to gain credit for courses/programs offered/delivered by collaborating providers.	Allows students to gain credit for work done with a provider other than the provider awarding the qualification
Validation	Validation arrangements between providers in different countries which allow Provider B in receiving country to award the qualification of Provider A in source country.	In some cases, the source country provider may not offer these courses or awards themselves.
Virtual/Distance	Arrangements where providers deliver courses/program to students in different countries through distance and on line modes. May include some face to face support for students through domestic study or support centres	

Knight 2005

It is clear that a key factor in program mobility is ‘who’ awards the course credits or ultimate credential for the program. As the movement of programs proliferates, there will undoubtedly be further changes to national, regional and even international regulatory frameworks. The question of ‘who grants the credits/awards’ will be augmented by ‘who recognizes the provider’ and whether or not the program has been ‘accredited or quality assured’ by a bona fide body. Of critical importance is whether the qualification is recognized for employment or further study in the receiving country and in other countries as well. The perceived legitimacy, recognition and ultimate mobility of the qualification are fundamental issues yet to be resolved.

Given that several modes for program mobility involve partnerships there are questions about who owns the intellectual property rights to course design and materials. What are the legal and moral roles and responsibilities of the participating partners in terms of academic, staffing, recruitment, evaluation, financial, and administrative matters. While the movement of programs across borders has been taking place for many years, it is clear that the new types of providers, partnerships, awards and delivery modes are challenging national and international policies and regulatory frameworks and that there are more questions than answers at the present time.

Typology of Provider Mobility

Crossborder mobility of provider can be described as ‘the physical or virtual movement of an education provider across a national border to establish a presence to provide education/training

programs and/or services to students and other clients.’ The difference between program and provider mobility is one of scope and volume in terms of programs/services offered and the local presence (and investment) by the foreign provider. Credits and qualifications are awarded by the foreign provider (through foreign, local or self-accreditation methods) or by an affiliated domestic partner or jointly. Forms of crossborder provider mobility include branch campuses, mergers with or acquisitions of domestic providers, independent institutions, study and support centres plus other types of innovative affiliations. A distinguishing feature between program and provider mobility is that with provider mobility the learner is not necessarily located in a different country than the awarding institution.

Chart Four: Typology of Crossborder Provider Mobility Modes

Category	Description	Examples
Branch Campus	Provider in country A establishes a satellite campus in Country B to deliver courses and programs to students in Country B. (may also include Country A students taking a semester/courses abroad). The qualification awarded is from provider in Country A	Monash University from Australia has established Branch campuses in Malaysia and South Africa. University of Indianapolis has a branch campus in Athens
Independent Institution	Foreign Provider A (a traditional university, a commercial company or alliance/network) establishes in Country B a stand alone HEI to offer courses /programs and awards.	The German University in Cairo, Phoenix Universities in Canada and Puerto Rico (Apollo Group).
Acquisition/Merger	Foreign Provider A purchases a part of or 100% of local HEI in Country B.	Laureate (formerly Sylvan Learning Systems) has merged with and/or purchased local HEIs in Chile, Mexico and other LA countries.
Study Centre/ Teaching Site	Foreign Provider A establishes study centres in Country B to support students taking their courses/programs. Study centres can be independent or in collaboration with local providers in Country B.	Texas A&M has ‘university centre’ in Mexico City. Troy University (US) has MBA teaching site in Bangkok
Affiliation/Networks	Different types of ‘public and private’, ‘traditional and new’ providers from various countries collaborate through innovative types of partnerships to establish networks/institutions to deliver courses and programs in local and foreign countries through distance or face to face modes	Partnership between the Caparo Group and Carnegie Mellon University to establish campus in India. Netherlands Business School branch campus in Nigeria in partnership with African Leadership Forum (NGO)

Virtual University	Provider that delivers credit courses and degree programs to students in different countries through distance education modes and that generally does not have face to face support services for students	International Virtual University, Hibernia College, Arab Open University
--------------------	---	--

Knight 2005

The typologies of crossborder providers and the different means and arrangements for providing education across national boundaries illustrate the diversity of actors, types of provision, delivery methods and of course rationales, driving the whole enterprise of crossborder education. When one reflects on the major issues and implications of this scenario it is easy to become overwhelmed with the number, variety and complex relationships among the issues and challenges. This section focuses primarily on the issues that relate to recognition of providers, programs and credits/qualifications at national and international levels. This does not diminish the importance of academic and administrative implications for individual providers and especially traditional higher education institutions.

At the current time, there are five macro issues that are receiving the most attention and which have different dimensions and consequences for the various types of providers. These issues are interrelated and all are influenced by regulations of the sending and the receiving country. The first issue is the licensing or registering of institutions/providers who are delivering across borders courses/programs and hence qualifications. Are they recognized and part of the home national system and also recognized/licensed in the receiving country? The second issue focuses on the quality of the courses/programs being offered and the quality of the academic experience of the student. The third issue follows on the same theme and focuses on the role of accreditation and the more recent trends of internationalization and commercialization of accreditation for worldwide status and profile, rather than for standards. The fourth issue addresses the recognition of the actual award or qualification being offered for purposes of employment and further study. This point relates directly to the importance of student/employer and public being aware of the quality and validity of the programs and awards provided. The fifth issue focuses on the challenge and need for a review of the policy and regulatory environments in which program and provider mobility is operating.

3.3 Concluding Remarks

This paper started with the phrase 'Globalization is transforming the world and internationalization is changing the world of higher education'. To end the paper, it may be more appropriate to say 'Globalization is transforming the world and crossborder mobility of programs and providers is *challenging* the world of higher education'. The purpose of this paper has been to explore the scope and practice of delivering education across national borders. There is ample evidence that demand for higher education in the next twenty years will outstrip the capacity of some countries to meet the domestic need. Students moving to other countries to pursue their studies will continue and remain an important part of the international dimension of the higher

education landscape. But student mobility will not be able to satisfy the enormous appetite for higher education from densely populated countries wanting to build human capacity to fully participate in the knowledge society. Hence the emergence and growing importance of crossborder education programs and providers.

A scan of trends, issues and new developments in program and provider mobility shows a diversity of new types of education providers, new delivery modes, innovative forms of public/private and local/foreign partnerships. New courses and programs are being designed and delivered in response to local conditions and global challenges, and new qualifications/awards are being conferred. The growth in the volume, scope and dimensions of crossborder education has the potential to provide increased access, and to promote innovation and responsiveness of higher education, but it also brings new challenges and unexpected consequences. There are the realities that unrecognised and rogue crossborder providers are active; that much of the latest crossborder education provision is being driven by commercial interests and gain; and that mechanisms to recognize qualifications and ensure quality of the academic course/program are still not in place in many countries. These present major challenges to the education sector. It is important to acknowledge the huge potential of crossborder education but not at the expense of academic quality and integrity.

* This paper is adapted from J. Knight (2005) *Crossborder Education: Programs and Providers on the Move*. Research Monograph. Canadian Bureau for International Education. Ottawa, Canada.

References and Bibliography

Altbach, P. (2001) "Higher Education and the WTO: globalization run amok." in *International Education*, Boston, USA.

Cunningham, S. et al (2000) *The Business of Borderless Education*, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, Canberra, Australia.

CVCP (2000). *The Business of Borderless Education: UK Perspectives*. Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals. London, United Kingdom.

Davis, D. et al (eds) (2000) *Transnational Education: Providers, Partners and Policy. A research study*. IDP Brisbane, Australia

ESIB (2002) *European Student Handbook on Transnational Education*. The National Unions of Students in Europe. Brussels, Belgium

Garret, R. (2004) "Transnational Delivery by UK Higher Education. Part 2: Innovations and competitive advantage". Observatory on borderless higher Education, London. UK

Knight, J. (2005) *Crossborder Education: Programs and Providers on the Move*. Research Monograph. Canadian Bureau for International Education. Ottawa, Canada.

Knight, J. (2004a) “ Internationalization Remodeled: Rationales, Strategies and Approaches” in *Journal for Studies in International Education*. Vol 8 No 1

Knight, J. (2004b) “Crossborder Education: The Complexities of Globalization, Internationalization and Trade” Chapter Five in *Internationalization and Quality Assurance*. SAUVCA, Pretoria, Africa.

Knight J. and H. de Wit. (eds) (1997). *Internationalization of higher education in Asia Pacific countries*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

OBHE (2002-2004) Breaking News Stories from 2002-2004. Observatory on Borderless Higher Education. London, UK.

OECD (2004), "Internationalization and Trade of Higher Education – Challenges and Opportunities. Organization for Economic and Community Development. Paris, France.

Scott, P. (2000). “Globalisation and higher education: Challenges for the 21st century” in *Journal Of Studies in International Education*. Vol 4. No.1.

UNESCO (2002) *Globalization and the Market in Higher Education : Quality, Accreditation and Qualifications*. UNESCO./ Economica. Paris France

UNESCO/OECD (2004) Annex on “Guidelines for Quality Provision in Cross-border Higher Education” UNESCO and OECD. Paris, France

UNESCO/OECD (2004) Draft Proposal for “Proposed Next Steps for an International Information Tool on Recognized Higher Education Institutions”. UNESCO and OECD. Paris, France.