



SEMINAR FOR BOLOGNA AND HIGHER EDUCATION REFORM EXPERTS:

Cross Border Education

READER

Universidad Autónoma Madrid

22 – 24 April 2013



CONTENT

Chapter 1: Messages from the organizers

- 1.1. Welcome**
- 1.2. About Madrid**
- 1.3. Greetings from UNICA – Brussels Education Services**
- 1.4. Speakers' short biographies**
- 1.5. About Professor Ricardo Amils**

Chapter 2: Cross Border Education – Selection of articles:

- 2.1. International Joint and Double Degree Programs, by Daniel Obst and Matthias Kuder**
- 2.2. Franchising – The McDonaldization of Higher Education, by Philip G Altbach**
- 2.3. The Globalisation of Higher Education, by Richard Yelland**

Chapter 3: Contributions from the Seminar Speakers

- 3.1. Keynote speeches**
- 3.2. Training Groups**

Chapter 4: Background documents

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author(s), and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

CHAPTER 1: MESSAGES FROM THE ORGANISERS

1.1. Welcome

Dear Colleagues,

We are very pleased to welcome you to the Seminar for Bologna and Higher Education Reform Experts: Cross-border Education Seminar, which will be held in Madrid on April 22-24 2013, under the Higher Education Reform Project, funded by the European Commission. On this occasion, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM) will host this event, which is co-organised by the European Commission, UNICA Network and Brussels Education Services.

This Seminar will be an excellent opportunity to analyse and reflect on the latest developments or initiatives in internationalisation, such as joint or double degrees, campuses abroad, electronic delivery of higher education and quality assurance, and the present challenges for higher education.

The organizing team at UAM wishes you a pleasant and productive stay.

1.2. About Madrid

It is a great pleasure to welcome you in Madrid, a modern and open city which offers visitors the richness of its heritage, the diversity and warmth of its people and a varied cultural life.

The open nature of the people, the different languages you can hear on the streets, the life full of energy and happiness 24 hours per day are the result of its long history.

Origin

Its history goes back to Prehistory. Traces from this period of time have been found in Ciempozuelos or near the Manzanares River. The Roman Empire left its vestiges in places like Complutum (the remote origin of Alcalá de Henares), Titulcia and Cadalso de los Vidrios. What about the Middle Ages? Like the Romans, the Visigoths focused their activity on Alcalá de Henares. Why not in Madrid? The reason is that the city of Madrid was born within the Muslim invasion of the Iberian Peninsula.

It is difficult to speak about Madrid before the arrival of Muslims. In 865, Muhammad I, son of Abderraman II, ordered to fortify the small village of Madrid. The city had to change its name, Madrid, for Magerit.

After more than 200 years, in 1083, King Alfonso VI, known as "The Brave", conquered the small village, helped by a teenager who climbed the city walls. This boy was nicknamed Gato and this is the reason why the people from Madrid are known as Gatos.

In 1202, the first Code of Laws, by which the city's municipal life was regulated, was given to Madrid. In 1309, King Fernando IV opened the Court in Madrid for the first time. From that year on, Madrid was the meeting point of the Castillian Court on different occasions. Until the reign of Alfonso XI (1312-1350) the city halls did not exist.

The Kings from the different dynasties were attracted by Madrid and they spent long times in the city. In this way, Madrid began to grow.

Pedro I and Enrique III, Kings of Castilla, were the first to arrive. In 1477, the Catholic King and Queen, Isabel and Fernando, arrived in Madrid. Some very important works of art were created in that period, such as the Bishop's chapel in the Church of Saint Andrew, the House of the Lujanes or the House of Cisneros in the Villa Square. During their reign, Madrid experienced a great growth. At the end of the 15th century, the city had 3,400 inhabitants.

Carlos I chose Madrid for short stays and, in 1561, Felipe II established his residence in the city of Madrid. Moreover, on the 13th September 1584, Felipe II saw his greatest dream fulfilled: the Monastery of San Lorenzo de El Escorial. At the end of the 16th century, the city had 40,000 inhabitants. In 1606, Madrid became definitively the seat of the Court of the Spanish kings during the reign of Felipe III.

Carlos III, who was the fourth Bourbon king of Spain, was inspired by the Enlightenment spirit, as well as by erudite despotism, with the aim of imposing his great fulfilments. He ordered the cleaning of the city as well as the reform of the streets, squares and avenues; industry, culture and the inhabitants of Madrid would benefit from his rule.

In a short time, new street lighting, a sewing system, paving and paper currency were established. Great urban works and reforms were designed and finished: the Puerta de Alcalá, the Paseo del Prado, the Botanic Garden, the Facultad de Medicina de San Carlos, the Post Office, and the Cibeles, Neptuno and Apolo fountains. Also, the Royal Palace was established as the residence of the Spanish kings.

The province of Madrid was born in the 18th century during the reign of the Bourbons in Spain. The arrival of the 19th century was synonym of trouble in Madrid, witnessing the insurrection against the Napoleonic troops on May 2, 1808; the Independence War started. After years of military confrontation, Fernando VII was restored, followed by the reign of Isabel II.. In 1833, the present limits of Madrid were established.

The 20th century was one of great conflicts and events. The regimes of Primo de Rivera and then of Francisco Franco, following a brief democratic experience and a civil war of fatal consequences in between, became the main characters of a restless half century in Spanish history. Democracy, political parties, parliamentary regime, monarchy and stability during the last third of the century became the symbols of a modern country that opened its doors to the world.

Madrid and its surrounding Autonomous Region were given a more cosmopolitan air at the end of the last century, aided by the increasing amount of tourists who visit us all the year round. Madrid continues to be the open city it has always been, welcoming immigrants from other Spanish regions, and its well-known nightlife has not lost any of its vitality. The modern Madrid grows farther north along Paseo de la Castellana, and the city's best artistic heritage is constantly restored. At the same time, the Autonomous Region's territories are integrated into this renewing process.





Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

With about 30.000 students, more than 2.500 professors and researchers and a staff of more than 1.000, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM) offers a comprehensive range of studies in its eight faculties. UAM is also proud of its strong research commitment that is reinforced by six university hospitals, ten National Research Council (CSIC) institutes, five of them jointly run, and two Madrid Advanced Institutes which are hosted by UAM. UAM and CSIC have recently forged a Campus de Excelencia Internacional alliance that aims to create a world class research environment in Biosciences, Nanoscience and Advanced Materials, Theoretical Physics and Mathematics.

UAM is widely recognized as one of the best Spanish universities in both national and international rankings. With 69 departments, it offers a wide range of study programs: 50 Degree courses, 70 official Masters and 45 PhD programmes.

UAM's three main values are excellence, leadership and commitment, to its students and society. UAM aims at excelling as a research University, not only in its leading areas but across all of its many strong disciplines. UAM wants its students to become well prepared professionals, but also alert, creative and innovative citizens in an open and globalised world. UAM also wants to be an active social agent and the cultural leader of its geographic area, and to project and transfer its research and knowledge to contribute to the wellbeing of the environment. Finally, UAM is strongly committed to a sustainable environment, works closely with cooperation NGOs all over the world, and is particularly proud of its efforts to integrate the handicapped and to promote gender equality.

UAM places a high value on international experience for its students and faculty. Since its foundation in 1969, it has entered into educational, scholarly and research collaborations with an increasing number of universities, research centres and government agencies worldwide. It is a globally networked university, with a remarkable leadership in collaborations with Latin America but also with strong links with institutions in other continents.

UAM is located in a privileged environment, offering excellent facilities and a high quality of life to the community. The Cantoblanco Campus, in the north of Madrid, is the main one and can be easily reached by public transport; the Health Sciences Campus is located in the city itself, near Hospital La Paz, and constitutes an excellent environment for the studies of Medicine and Nursery.

1.3. Greetings from UNICA – Brussels Education Services

Madrid (Universidad Autónoma) is hosting the last seminar in the series organized under the present Higher Education Reform Information Project III (renewal). Soon we will learn what the initiative will look like in the future and we hope there will be further opportunities for us to cooperate with the communities of Bologna and Tempus Higher Education Reform Experts.

We trust that over the last couple of years we have managed to establish a feeling of community among the participants in our seminars. The specific networking activities such as 'open space', 'buddy activities', 'round tables' and 'your time slot' along with the general social activities have greatly contributed to this process.

We hope that the successive seminar programmes were inspiring and that you have been able to make use of the reading material and other supporting documents and tools that were produced in the context of our contracts: e.g. the Higher Education Expert's Notebook, the Higher Education Expert's Personal Handbook, the USB Keys, the Postcards, 20 articles on HE reform, the 2013 calendar, etc.

As organisers we found it important to create a friendly and open environment in which all of us can take the floor and share our expertise and opinions with peers. Peer learning is indeed an essential cornerstone of the Higher Education Reform project.

We want to seize this opportunity to thank all of you who have actively contributed to our long list of successful events in Vienna, Madrid, Rome, Warsaw, Tallinn, Nicosia, Brussels, Oslo, Lisbon, Vilnius, Budapest... and Madrid.

We hope to stay in touch!

Best wishes,

UNICA – Brussels Education Services

1.4. Speakers' short biographies

Vincenzo Raimo

Vincenzo Raimo is Director of the International Office at the University of Nottingham, a position he has held since 2007. He has responsibility for supporting the implementation of the University's internationalisation strategy including areas such as international partnerships and transnational education, international scholarships, student mobility, international student support and international student recruitment. He was previously Head of International Student Recruitment at Nottingham and before that spent 3-years as Assistant to the University's Vice-Chancellor (Rector). Vincenzo has also worked at the universities of Lancaster and Sussex and as an English Teacher in Rome. He studied at the universities of Reading, Rome 'La Sapienza' and Leicester and is a member of the Chartered Institute of Marketing.

Rafael LLavori

Head of Unit for International and Institutional Relations of the National Agency for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Spain, ANECA. He is currently Board Member of the European

Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), since September 2009, where he coordinates international projects within the networks of QAAs such as the ENQA Working Group on Stakeholder Involvement in QA Processes.

As part of his activities in the Agency, he plays an active part in the definition of technical instruments to advance on the mutual understanding of accreditation procedures and processes at the international context in Europe, where he co-chaired the Working Group of the European Consortium of Accreditation (ECA) on Accreditation of Joint-programmes (2006-2010), Latin American, coordinating the CINTAS project of RIACES for capacity building and training of technical staff of QAAs; and the Mediterranean Area such as the project to set up the Lebanese quality assurance agency.

Among other responsibilities, he was appointed member of the Technical Working Group for the Definition and Implementation of the Spanish National Qualification Framework, MECES (2007-2009) co-ordinated by the Ministry of Education of Spain.

Andrew McCoshan

Dr Andrew McCoshan is an independent consultant, an Associate with the UK Higher Education Academy, and until recently a Visiting Research Fellow with the UK Commission for Employment and Skills. Until March 2011 he was a Director of the Ecorys Group, in which capacity he was responsible for the Group's work with the European Commission in education and training. He has carried out numerous studies covering post-secondary education. His HE track record includes the current evaluation of the Higher Education Academy's Green Academy programme, the evaluation of the EU-US and EU-Canada External Cooperation Agreements, a study of best practices in cooperation programmes in higher education with the US, Canada and other industrialised countries, two studies of Erasmus, and the independent assessment of the Bologna process. Andrew was educated at the University of Cambridge and the London School of Economics (LSE).

Matthias Kuder

Matthias Kuder works with the Centre for International Cooperation at Freie Universität Berlin, a unit focusing on strategic internationalization. His tasks include the development of strategic partnerships with universities abroad and he heads FUB's global liaison offices network, with representations in New York, Brussels, Moscow, Sao Paulo, Beijing, New Delhi and Cairo. Kuder is co-author of the international survey report 'Joint and Double Degree Programs in the Global Context' (2011), and co-editor of the book 'Joint and Double Degree Programs: An Emerging Trend for Transatlantic Exchange' (2010). In 2012, he was appointed as member of the Center for International Partnerships in Higher Education Advisory Group at the Institute of International Education, New York. Before joining Freie Universität, Kuder worked as consultant with Lemmens Media specializing in services for higher education institutions. He also served with the Science and Technology Section of the Canadian Embassy in Berlin. Kuder studied at Bonn, Toronto and Berlin, and holds a Master's degree in North American Studies and Political Science.

Thomas Buerman

Thomas Buerman holds a Ph. D.-degree in History from Ghent University and is since 2011 the project manager of Ghent University Korea. Thomas Buerman is charged with the day-to-day management of the project, including among other things financial management, communicating with Korean partners as the Korean Ministry for Education, Science and Technology, drawing up the educational programs and setting-up the branch campus organization.

Timothy Read

Timothy Read holds a Ph.D. in Cognitive Science from the University of Birmingham, School of Computer Science (UK) and a First Class Honours degree in Computer Science from the University of The West of England, Faculty of Computer Science and Mathematics (Bristol, UK). After working as an Associate lecturer (2000 – 2002) and as a Junior Lecturer (2002 – 2003) at UNED, he is now working as a Senior lecturer at the same institution. Moreover since 2012 he is the Director of the UNED Abierta (Open UNED: UNED's new OER and OEP programme, the object of which is the mainstreaming of open educational resources and practices in distance education in Spanish). He is also member of the editorial board for the academic Journal 'Cognición' (run by the Latin American Foundation for Distance Education).

Jack Barokas

Jack Barokas is currently the head of Digital Media Services in the TAU IT department, providing distance learning services. He founded and managed a small private company which provided maintenance services for audio-visual appliances over a period of 20 years until 1999. In 1999 he started working at Tel Aviv University Computing Division as personal computer and network expert. In the course of this work, his expertise in audio-visual equipment was integrated with on the job experience gained in computing and digital media. Two years ago he graduated with a BA degree on Learning Technologies and Instructional design at HIT Israel. He recently led a large distance-eLearning project in which some Face2Face courses at the TAU School of Medicine replaced with fully online courses. He provided Educational Digital Media services to EU projects such as Nano2Life, NanoEL, NanoSkills and Qnano. Jack is also part of the Israel TEMPUS Higher Education Reform Experts team of Israel.

1.5. About Professor Ricardo Amils

Ricardo Amils, a renowned microbiologist, will deliver a closing keynote

Ricardo Amils is Full Professor of Microbiology at Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. A reputed scientist, he is a member of the Centro de Biología Molecular Severo Ochoa (UAM-CSIC), Senior Scientist at the Centro de Astrobiología (INTA-CSIC), Interdisciplinary Scientist of the Mars Express Mission and Member of the Solar System Exploration working Group of the European Space Agency. He is also a member of the Sociedad Española de Microbiología, the American Society of Microbiology, the Society for the Study of the Origin of Life and the European Astrobiology Association (EANA). Among other distinctions, he has received the Group Achievement NASA Award for his participation in the Mars Analog Research and Technology Experiment (2006) and the Torre de Nerva Award (2007).



He is an international expert in astrobiology and the study of extremophiles. His research includes the functional evolution of ribosomes, the total reconstitution of ribosomes, biomining, bioremediation, specific metal sequestering and microbial ecology and molecular biology of extreme environments.

CHAPTER 2: CROSS BORDER EDUCATION - SELECTION OF ARTICLES

International Joint- and Double-Degree Programs

Daniel Obst (Institute of International Education)

Matthias Kuder (Freie Universität Berlin)

While the international exchange of students continues to occur predominantly through traditional, study-abroad programs, a growing number of higher education institutions have also begun to establish joint- and double-degree programs. This development, which largely started in Europe in the 1990s, has become an important global trend—prompting higher education institutions, governments, and funding and accreditation agencies worldwide to consider strategies and policies with regard to cross-border collaborative degree programs.

In response to this burgeoning trend, the Institute of International Education and Freie Universität Berlin conducted an international survey in spring 2011. The survey addressed itself to higher education institutions that offer joint- and double-degree programs, receiving responses from 245 institutions in 28 countries. The subsequent report, *Joint and Double Degree Programs in the Global Context*, presents the findings from a global perspective, as well as country-specific trends for the 6 countries with the highest number of responding institutions: Australia, France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

HOW MANY ARE THERE AND WHAT ARE THE TRENDS?

First, the bad news: The survey cannot provide accurate information on the total number of existing joint- or double-degree programs. Just as it is impossible to determine the exact number of standard-degree programs, so it is with collaborative-degree endeavors. However, the available data suggest that such programs are growing: 95 percent of the 245 responding higher education institutions plan to expand their current portfolios of joint- or double-degree programs in the future. This figure is remarkable, given that many institutions reported having difficulties with the development of their existing joint- or double-degree programs. About one-third of all survey participants confirmed that they canceled some of their programs in the past, for a variety of reasons— including, lack of student interest, lack of funding, and unsustainability. Survey participants identified the latter two as the most pressing challenges in developing and maintaining joint- and double-degree programs.

Most higher education professionals involved in collaborative-degree programs emphasize the uniqueness of each program, seconding the claim that “one-size-fits-all” approaches are ill-fated. Nevertheless, based on the survey responses, it is possible to discern what constitutes a “mainstream” collaborative-degree program: A double degree master’s program in business management or engineering that is taught in English, includes a partner institution from a European country, has a student enrollment rate of 25 or less, and was initiated between 2001 and 2009. According to the outlook of survey participants, such programs will remain common, in the near future.

The majority of respondents who plan to develop more collaborative-degree programs aim to do so for double-degree programs, at the master’s level. The most favored disciplines continue to be business management or engineering. However, there is a marked difference in terms of regional

distribution. While higher education institutions from European countries dominate the list of existing collaborative-degree programs, it is expected that in the future such programs will become more diverse, with the United States and China becoming increasingly involved—along with higher education institutions in Asia (India, in particular), South America (Brazil, in particular), and Canada and Australia.

JOINT VS. DOUBLE DEGREES

What is the difference between a joint- and a double-degree program? Definitions of international collaborative-degree programs often differ between institutions, countries, or continents. For the survey, we chose a general definition: a collaborative-degree program is one that is offered by two or more institutions in different countries and features a jointly developed and integrated curriculum, as well as a clear agreement on credit recognition. The line between joint and double was drawn according to the degree-awarding praxis. In joint-degree programs, students receive a degree certificate issued jointly by the host institutions; in double-degree programs, students were given degree certificates, issued separately by each of the institutions involved in the program.

The survey results highlight other characteristics that differentiate joint from double-degree programs. While the latter are much more common—with 84 percent of survey participants offering double-degree programs—joint-degree programs seem to represent a more integrated and complex form of cooperation. Roughly, 72 percent of the reported joint-degree programs are stand-alone programs; that is, they were built exclusively as joint ventures with foreign universities. In contrast, many double-degree programs are established as an additional track to an already existing degree program.

Another indicator is student selection and enrollment. The majority of the reported joint degree programs features the joint selection of students, whereas for double-degree programs universities often select students separately, though based on jointly agreed on criteria. In joint-degree programs, students tend to be enrolled at both (or more) cooperating institutions for the entire degree period, which is not necessarily the case for double-degree programs.

INSTITUTIONAL EXPECTATIONS AND A LACK OF STRATEGY

Institutional motivations for the development of collaborative-degree programs varied, with the highest scores attributed to (1) broadening educational offerings, (2) strengthening research collaboration, (3) advancing internationalization, and (4) raising the international visibility/prestige of the institution. The least important motivations were increasing revenue and offering courses from partner institutions that do not exist at the home institution. Given that most joint- and double-degree programs enroll small numbers of students, the former is not surprising. Interestingly, the latter, which proponents of collaborative-degree programs often refer to in the context of “synergies” and “resource pooling,” seems to play a marginal role.

While 91 percent of respondents indicated that the development of collaborative degree programs was an integral part of their institution’s internationalization efforts, this is not necessarily mirrored in their respective institutional policies. According to the responses, a large number of universities either lack a clear strategy for developing joint and double-degree programs or have yet to implement it. Fewer than half of the responding institutions have created particular marketing and recruitment initiatives, despite the fact that the majority of them aim to attract top international students for their joint- or double-degree programs. While two-thirds of the responding institutions have policies for addressing the issue of double counting of credits, their comments suggest that these policies are implemented on departmental, as opposed to institutional levels.

Overall, the survey indicates that strategies and internal regulations for collaborative-degree programs are not sufficiently developed, yet, at many higher education institutions. The most frequently mentioned challenges (funding and sustainability) might in fact be direct consequences of these institutional shortcomings. While most joint- and double-degree programs spring from existing partnerships and are nourished by individual faculty engagement, institutions are well advised to include top-down elements, with clear institutional policies and guidelines—in order to avoid uncontrolled growth and, most importantly, to ensure quality standards

'INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION – NUMBER 66 WINTER 2012 Pages 5-7'

Franchising—The McDonaldization of Higher Education

Philip G. Altbach, Center for International HE at Boston College

Almost 20 percent of students studying for a British first academic degree are not residing in the United Kingdom but rather pursuing their degree at one of Britain's 13 branch campuses or, much more likely, at a foreign institution that has franchised a British degree. More than 400 franchise arrangements were reported in 2008. The UK institution provides the curriculum, learning materials, quality assurance and, most important, the right to award a British degree.

Universities in other countries are also involved in franchising; Australia and the United States are examples. There are even multinational franchising and twinning operations; for example, a British university and an Indian institute offer degrees in Oman. At a branch, the home institution is, at least to some extent, "on the ground" overseas and guides hands-on direction for teaching and local supervision. Franchising is the provision of the curriculum and a degree without direct involvement. Franchising is exactly what McDonald's does. The McDonald's corporation sells the right to "brand" its products so long as the franchisee adheres to strict standards and policies. Thus, a Big Mac tastes the same in Chicago or Shanghai. "Inputs" (potatoes, meat, the "special sauce") are carefully monitored. Business practices are stipulated, and the "brand image" closely monitored and protected. There is modest latitude for local adaptation.

For example, a Big Mac in Riyadh is halal, and one can find a McPork in Bucharest. The purpose of the entire enterprise is to earn profits for the franchisee and for the corporation. One difference between McDonalds and a higher education franchise is that a McDonald's franchise requires a significant investment by the franchisee— in facilities, equipment, and the like. In many cases, an education franchise just needs to rent space with little additional investment from either side. More worrisome, an easy exit is possible for either party with the possibility of leaving students in the lurch. Franchising is yet another example of the commodification of higher education, and the entire purpose of the operation is to make money.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH IT?

If one accepts that nonprofit higher education institutions at home should operate as profit-making businesses overseas, nothing is fundamentally wrong. But a number of questions must be raised. Concerns have been expressed by quality-assurance agencies and in the British media that several universities— generally those at the lower end of the pecking order—have been caught offering substandard products overseas or at least not adequately monitoring the degree programs offered in their names, thus sullyng the reputation of British higher education. It is very hard to adequately monitor what is being done in the name of an institution far away.

In a recent article in the *Guardian*, a senior administrator at the University of Nottingham, which has several branch campuses in Asia, notes that—in franchise or twinning arrangements—the

overseas partner may have the UK curriculum; but it may not be taught with the same ethos that characterizes the home campus. An emphasis on interactive learning or critical thinking, for example, may be missing. In other words, the form but not necessarily the substance of education may be provided by the franchisee. Adequate quality assurance is not easy. Home evaluators may not be aware of conditions overseas; and in any case, the logistics are difficult and often expensive.

All of this also begs the question as to whether the curriculum offered for most specializations in the United Kingdom or in other developed countries will be appropriate for the needs of developing or middle-income countries. Yet, the essence of the franchise arrangement is that the “product” offered should be the same as at the home institution. While no one has researched who are the franchise providers in developing and middle-income countries, they seem to be a variety of agencies. Some are private universities and other educational institutions. Some are property developers or other business interests, wishing to enter the lucrative higher education market or add an education facility to a new shopping mall or condominium complex. There may well be nothing wrong with these sponsors, but it balances the educational mission against other business interests.

Higher education franchising seems to be a growing phenomenon. As with all commercial investment in higher education, there are significant possibilities for problems. So far the franchisers seem to be working on the McDonalds principle. It would be interesting to ask why no one is looking at the educational equivalent of Intercontinental Hotels—aiming at a higher-end market segment—as a better model. (This article has also appeared in *Times Higher Education*, London.)

‘INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION – NUMBER 66 WINTER 2012 Pages 5-7’

The Globalisation of Higher Education

Richard Yelland

OECD Directorate for Education

Higher education is growing rapidly, and becoming a veritable global sector in its own right. That means challenges for educators, students and policy makers.

If higher education were an industry, it would be one of the world’s biggest and most dynamic. Take these numbers for the UK, for instance. The total revenue earned by universities there amounted to £23.4 billion (US\$43 billion) in 2007/08, according to a report by Universities UK. This was comparable in gross output terms to the printing and publishing industry, and considerably larger than the pharmaceuticals industry.

Or take Australia, where education is one of the country’s largest exports. Some estimates have put the value as high as Aus\$17.2 billion in 2008-09, or about 1.4% of GDP, with growth of over 20% from the previous financial year. The global leader is of course the US, where higher education is estimated to employ 3.4 million people, or some 3% of the entire US service sector. Education is ultimately about students, and the number of students enrolled in higher education has grown steadily and strongly over the past 50 years. In fact, data from OECD’s *Education at a Glance* shows that 30% of adults in OECD countries now have a tertiary qualification. International student numbers in the OECD have trebled in the past 20 years to more than 3.7 million, and that number can be expected to continue to grow rapidly.

The reasons for this growth are obvious: graduates earn more, have more satisfying jobs and live longer than those who don't graduate from higher education. This is as true for women, who now comprise the majority of tertiary students in OECD countries, as for men.

Developed economies rely on skilled labour to drive productivity and economic growth, as well as create a more confident and more affluent middle class. And the economic benefits of higher education flow not only to individuals, but also to society (see "Higher education's crisis dividend" in OECD Observer No. 287).

As higher education has grown and expanded, it has also become more international. OECD data show that the number of students attending institutions outside their country of origin tripled between 1985 and 2008, and it is expected that this trend will continue. It is, however, a very asymmetrical market, dominated by some strong providers, mostly in Englishspeaking countries. The United States hosts the largest number of international tertiary students, while the proportion of such students is highest in Australia. It is a volatile market, as well, where public perceptions can be quickly swayed by relatively minor incidents. For example, the US market share has been declining since 2000, while the Russian Federation has doubled its market share during the same period, and many Asia-Pacific countries are now entering the field, as well.

Just as university education has become more global, so it has become more competitive. Yet, are educational establishments—those whose role it is to "produce" or supply education—able to compete and do their job? Look at it another way. Suppose you are running a business and are fortunate enough to have good brand recognition and tens of thousands of customers trying to buy your product. You might choose to remain exclusive and raise the price of your product, or you might want to increase production to meet demand. But if your business is running a university, you might well find that your government won't allow you to do either of these things. Indeed, it might not even allow you to charge for your product at all—even while some of your competitors in other countries benefit from public subsidies, may charge fees and receive strong support for their efforts to "export" their product. In addition, government policy on immigration or institutional funding can influence your appeal to new students.

The challenges to those who are responsible for strategic planning in universities and other higher education institutions are clearly considerable. The OECD's Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE), will present some pointers and ideas, based on focus groups it is now running, at the OECD's higher education conference in Paris, September 2012. But if those who are responsible for the "supply side" of higher education are struggling to keep up with developments, spare a thought for the students and prospective students who make up the "demand side". Many countries offer various scholarships and other kinds of financial assistance, while others let students fend for themselves financially. In addition, the quality and relevance of higher education programmes and institutions are far from obvious for prospecting students, even when hunting for courses within their own country. At the international level, students can fall prey to misleading—and sometimes fraudulent—advertising; often, their only guides are institutional rankings, which are largely based on research outcomes (see "League tables that rank" in OECD Observer No. 287). As a result, these students might not have all the information they need to make a well-informed choice about something that will have a significant impact on the rest of their lives.

Some efforts to help them are at hand. The OECD and UNESCO, for instance, have worked together to develop guidelines on quality in cross-border higher education. First published in 2005, the non-binding guidelines invite governments to establish comprehensive systems of quality assurance and accreditation for cross-border higher education. They also call on institutions and providers of higher education to ensure that the programmes that they deliver, across borders and in their home country, are of comparable quality, and suggest that students

become active partners at international, national and institutional levels in developing, monitoring and maintaining the quality of higher education. Do we even know what this demand side is demanding? Surveys, such as the Australian Survey of Student Engagement or the National Survey of Student Engagement in the United States, have collected information about how students learn and what they expect from higher education. They provide institutions with detailed reports on how students spend their time and what they gain from attending college and university.

But not all students are 18 years old, and universities also have to be able to provide a service to lifelong learners and older students seeking to refresh, upgrade or complement their knowledge and skills. This is becoming increasingly important as the global economy retrenches and labourmarket demands shift. At the moment, while policy makers are struggling to decide whether to treat higher education as a business or as a public service, some of our traditional models are evolving fast. Fees are being introduced in many countries, while the focus on quality and transparency that has been gathering pace over the past two decades will only become more intense.

And there will be a new drive for efficiency and productivity in higher education as public and private resources shrink and competition becomes more fierce. Students are becoming customers, seeing good higher education as something to pay for as a way to a better career. The notion of “free” tertiary education is becoming harder for governments to defend, either in theory or in practice. The governance and regulatory arrangements that apply to higher education will continue to come under ever closer scrutiny.

CHAPTER 3: CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE SEMINAR SPEAKERS

3.1. Keynote Speeches

Vincenzo Raimo: Do transactional education developments take us beyond the rhetoric of internationalisation?

The presentation hopes to give an insight to the development of internationalisation strategies through UK eyes (what does internationalisation mean to UK universities and what can continental partners learn from the UK's successes and failures?) before looking in more detail at the rationale for transnational education, some of its different forms, market and partner selection for TNE developments end with an insight to The University of Nottingham's award winning strategic approach (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/higher-education-network/2013/feb/26/international-strategy-winner-nottingham-university>) Franchising, Validation and Branch Campuses in the EU: mapping provision, regulation and quality assurance.

Selected recent references on the topic:

- ✓ 2009 Colin Grant, Losing our Chains: Contexts and Ethics of University Internationalisation (<http://www.lfhe.ac.uk/en/research-resources/publications/index.cfm/ST%20-%202009>)
- ✓ "Developing Strategic International Partnerships – Models for initiating and sustaining innovative institutional linkages" Edited by Susan Buck Sutton and Daniel Obst includes our chapter "Mobilizing your institutional Strategic international partnerships" Helen Foster and Ian Jones.
- ✓ 2012 The International Unit International Partnerships: A Legal Guide for UK Universities 2012
<http://www.international.ac.uk/resources/International%20Partnerships.A%20Legal%20Guide%20for%20UK%20Universities.FINAL.pdf>
- ✓ 2010 Universities UK (UUK) (2010) The Growth of private and for-profit higher education providers in the UK
www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/publications/documents/privateprovidersmar10.pdf
- ✓ Council of Validating Universities (CVU) (2012) CVU Handbook for Practitioners: Managing Quality and Standards in Collaborative Provision www.cvu.ac.uk/about
- ✓ 2012 Association of Colleges (2012) HE in FE Guide www.aoc.co.uk/en/policy-and-advice/higher-education
- ✓ QAA's Concerns procedure www.qaa.ac.uk/complaints/concerns/pages/default.aspx, and in particular published outcomes of investigations www.qaa.ac.uk/complaints/concerns/pages/concerns-reports.aspx

Rafael Llavori: Quality Assurance and Cross Border Education: from the quality of the deliverer to the quality assurance of the provision. A view from the QA networks

The presentation deals with the lack of a comprehensive picture on how and by whom cross-border provision is quality assured or accredited, what methods are used, and what kind of collaboration exists between institutions and agencies in the host and provider countries for this purpose. Indeed, there is a potential quality assurance "divide", which could be bridged with the contribution of the quality assurance networks. The solution should not be to reinforce quality

assurance procedures and standards but to explore trust and recognition by means of using general shared criteria at the regional level.

Andrew McCoshan: Franchising, Validation and Branch Campuses in the EU: mapping provision, regulation and quality assurance

This presentation reports on the findings of a study on the provision of franchising, validation and branch campuses in Higher Education across borders in the EU conducted on behalf of the European Commission by a consortium led by the Bertelsmann Stiftung, including Ecorys, ESMU and Horváth & Partners, in partnership with CHE Consult. Using data gathered through online surveys and interviews with relevant national authorities and quality bodies, the study maps the intensity and spread of these forms of cross-border higher education (CBHE), the regulatory frameworks currently being used in Member States, and stakeholders' perceptions of the risks and benefits of CBHE as well as issues of quality.

The study shows that the pattern of current CBHE activity is quite scattered and fragmented, with private institutions playing an important role especially in receiving CBHE. It also shows that Member States cover a broad spectrum in terms of the controls they place on the ability of foreign providers to operate on their territory. However, most countries with some form of regulation rely substantially upon the accreditation processes of other countries as a means of trying to safeguard the quality of CBHE which they receive. At the same time, the findings reveal that the relationship between regulation and the incidence of CBHE is weak and that there is little to suggest that current regulatory frameworks are founded on evidence-based policy-making. The study also highlights the striking contrast between regulation of incoming CBHE and exported CBHE, with, on the whole, very little regulation by Member States of their higher education institutions' activities beyond their own borders. It concludes that there is scope to develop alternative measures to controlling CBHE based on driving up quality rather than restricting the ability to operate.

3.2 Training Groups

Matthias Kuder: Global Perspectives on International Joint and Double Degree Programs

The number of higher education institutions offering collaborative degree programs with partner institutions abroad is growing rapidly. First propelled by efforts of European Union and policies set out by its individual member countries, the development of joint and double degree programs has been increasingly gaining momentum also in other parts of the world in recent years. According to the results of the third Global Survey Report conducted by the International Association of Universities in 2010, joint and double degree programs enjoy a high and further growing priority on most universities' internationalization agendas. This presentation thus aims at discussing current trends and future developments in the field of collaborative degree programs, featuring the results of a study conducted by the Institute of International Education and Freie Universität Berlin in 2011, as well as using other complementary sources. Issues such as most common characteristics and models of collaborative programs will be presented, alongside information pertaining to the motivation of individual institutions for establishing collaborative programs as well as the impact such programs may have on them. The session's goal is also to identify challenges for developing joint and double degree programs. Particular attention will be given to findings about program sustainability, an often neglected topic, and factors affecting it. Notwithstanding the growing popularity of joint and double degree programs and their

prominence in institutional internationalization strategies, current findings suggest that a large proportion of such programs are still developed with no or little institutional strategic guidance.

Thomas Buerman: International branch campuses: key challenges, contextual factors and practical issues

The international branch campus (IBC, here understood as a “brick-and-mortar” unit of an HEI in another country) has emerged as a prominent feature of the international higher education landscape. Not surprisingly IBCs have surfaced in scholarly literature and have sprung up as topics at workshops and sessions organized at international higher education conferences like EAIE, NAFSA or APAIE. For the moment though most contributions regarding IBC’s have been semantic discussions in which different transnational models were defined and from which typologies emerged. This presentation wants to contribute to the discussion on the practical undertaking of starting a “brick-and-mortar” unit of an HEI in another country.

Drawing upon my experience as a project manager of a branch campus project I will address in this presentation the key challenges confronting managers at international branch campuses (curriculum, staff and research potentials, etc.) as well as the contextual factors that support or hinder their establishment and operation (location, financial support, facilities, etc.).

Timothy Read: The role of Open Education in moving education beyond the classroom and closed online campus to global audiences

Through this presentation Timothy Read tries to provide answers to some important topics which are high in the agenda of higher education institutions and open education practices:

- What education will be like in 2025
- How to engage a global audience in meaningful interaction and lifelong learning
- What will the long tail effect change the way in which online learning is undertaken

Next, he concentrates in the involvement and use of Open and Distance Learning (ODL) and Open Education Resources (OER)/Open Educational Practice (OEP) in the concrete example of the UNED (Spanish Open University), an institution with over 260.000 students. Some final remarks address the topic of the Open UNED, business models and sustainability in the current EU context.

CHAPTER 4: BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Please note that the following documents can all be found on the Madrid Seminar website:
<http://madrid2012.bolognaexperts.net>

- Cross Border Education in general:

- 'Cross-Border Higher Education: Two Models' by Amy Stambach, published in 'International Higher Education' number 66, Winter 2012
- Guidelines for Quality Provision in Cross-border Higher Education, OECD, 2005
- 'Higher Education Crossing Borders: A Guide to the Implications of the General Agreement on Trade Services (GATS) for Cross Border Education', by Jane Knight, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation & Commonwealth of Learning, 2006.
- Feasibility study on impact of cross-border quality assurance, Don F Westerheijden, CHEPS (Center for Higher Education on Policy Studies), 2010
- Impact of QA on Cross-Border HE case studies, CHEPS, 2010
- 'Erasmus Mundus: Erasmus Mundus Quality Assessment Project', Quality Handbook, December 2010, Ecorys
- 'Globalization of higher education and cross-border student mobility', by NV Varghese, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization & International Institute for Educational Planning, 2008

- Joint/double programmes:

- 'Joint and Double Degree Programs in the Global Context: Report on an International Survey', by Daniel Obst, Matthias Kuder and Clare Banks, Institute of International Education, 2011
- 'Doubts and Dilemmas with Double Degree Programs', Jane Knight, University of Toronto, July 2011
- 'Double Degrees and Joint Degrees as a Tool for Global Cooperation in Higher Education', Christian Tauch, German Rectors' Conference, 2012
- 'International Joint-and Double-Degree Programs' by Daniel Ost and Matthias Kuder, published in 'International Higher Education', number 66 Winter 2012
- 'Practical Approaches to the Management of Joint Programmes: Results from the JOI.CON Training Project', Lifelong Learning project, Dec 2012.

- 'JOIMAN – How to manage Joint Study Programmes (Guidelines and Good Practices from the JOIMAN Network)', JOIMAN Network has been financed by the EC under the LLP
- 'Guide to developing and running Joint programmes at Bachelor and Master's level – a Template', JOIMAN project, document produced by the University of Bergen and Lund University

- Branch Campuses:

- 'Franchising – The McDonaldization of Higher Education', by Philip G Altbach, published in 'International Higher Education', number 66 Winter 2012

- 'How Well are International Branch Campuses Serving Students?', by Stephen Wilkins and Melodena S Balakrishnan, published in 'International Higher Education', number 66 Winter 2012

- 'Five Models of International Branch Campus Facility Ownership', by Jason E Lane and Kevin Kinser, published by 'International Higher Education', number 70, Winter 2012

- New methodologies:

- 'Guidelines for organizing networked curricula – NetCu Handbook', European Association of Distance Teaching Universities (EADTU), 2012

- 'NetCu Compendium of Showcases', European Association of Distance Teaching Universities (EADTU), 2012

- 'Innovating Pedagogy 2012 – Exploring new forms of teaching, learning and assessment, to guide educators and policy makers', Open University Innovation Report 1, 2012