

# **International Programme and Provider Mobility: Innovations and Challenges**

**Presentation  
Toyo University Seminar  
March 6, 2019**

**Jane Knight PhD  
University of Toronto**

## **Introduction**

During the last two decades there has been an exponential increase in all forms of international academic mobility – student and scholar, programmes and providers, policies and regulations, and the universal exchange of knowledge, ideas, values and culture. The diversity in the modes and forms of mobility is unprecedented. This has brought new opportunities and innovation to international higher education and has also raised new issues and potential risks. At the same time, it has introduced a new lexicon to international academic mobility as more terms are being created to try to capture the evolution and many changes. All this points to the dynamism, responsiveness and innovation of the international higher education landscape; but it is also contributing to mass confusion and misunderstanding of the different forms of mobility.

To date there are four generic terms which are used in referring to international academic mobility. They are crossborder, transnational, offshore and borderless education. These terms are most often used interchangeably even though they mean different things to higher education actors and stakeholders. Their meanings differ both within and across countries and between different national, regional and international organizations. While this is a sign of the growing importance and recognition given to international academic mobility, it also signals that more attention has to be given to clarifying what the different terms mean and what type of mobility strategies are included. The challenge is to have clarity and a common understanding of the terms, without standardizing definitions or ignoring local context, policies and language orientation. International programme and provider mobility, is now becoming the accepted term as it erases the confusion caused by the use of the more generic terms.

International programmes and providers move across borders in diverse ways such as international branch campuses, franchise programmes, distance education, partnership programmes and joint universities. The common feature is that a sending country higher education institution (HEI) offers its programmes in a host country. The major focus is on academic programmes and providers moving to the students and not the students moving to the country of the foreign HEI/provider. A key issue at stake is distinguishing between international programme and provider mobility (IPPM) and international student and scholar mobility (ISSM).

### ***Implications of IPPM terminology chaos***

The implications of IPPM terminology chaos are many and significant. While it is important that each country uses terms that fit into the domestic higher education landscape, it is equally important that there is a shared understanding and use of TNE terms across countries. The lack of a common understanding of the terms raises serious issues related to appropriate quality assurance processes, qualification recognition procedures, registration of new providers or programmes, completion rates and the collection of programme level information and enrolment data.

The inconsistency in the use of terms also makes comparisons of TNE provision, data, policies and research within and across countries challenging and often inconclusive. It also means that generalization of research findings is difficult and the analysis of internationally comparable IPPM data questionable.

All of this points to a challenge that requires the attention of the many higher education and IPPM actors and stakeholders. Is it possible to develop a common set of terms which allows consistency and clarity of use within and across countries, but which respects the local context, linguistic differences and regulatory environment? Furthermore, is it possible to develop a framework to differentiate the various modes of IPPM by using a set of common criteria to describe each mode and distinguish one mode from another? The proposed common IPPM Classification Framework is an important step towards developing such a practical and analytical framework.

### **Growth in Scope, Scale and Importance of IPPM**

Not only has there been an exponential increase in the number of new programmes, there are new forms of partnerships and delivery modes emerging into the international higher education landscape. The last decade has seen a steady increase in the number of branch campuses and the development of internationally co-founded and joint institutions. Franchising arrangements are evolving from individually franchised programmes to the development of new private independent universities in a host country which primarily offer franchised academic programmes from different foreign providers. The number of twinning and franchise programmes is now being surpassed by the staggering increase in double and multiple degree programmes. Distance education is being revolutionized by the development of new technologies, the open access movement, and massive open online courses (MOOCs).

The growth in IPPM enrolments is vividly illustrated by a UK example. According to a 2016 report by Universities UK and British Council entitled the '*Scope and Scale of UK Higher Education – Transnational Education*' 52% of all international students who are enrolled in a UK qualification awarding programme take some or all of their programmes through IPPM provision. That means that just over half of total registered international students are not moving to a UK based institution for their full programmes; instead they are enrolled in a IPPM type programme offered by the UK HEI/provider in another country, usually their home or nearby neighbouring country. Thus, there are more UK international students studying in IPPM programmes outside the UK than in UK based HEIs/providers. For the large sending countries like the UK and Australia, this trend is expected to increase thereby highlighting the importance of IPPM for sending IPPM countries.

In terms of IPPM host countries, a similar increase in enrolments in IPPM is happening. For instance, in Mauritius, 40% of all their local students are enrolled in some type of IPPM- either distance education, international branch campuses, franchise, or partnership programmes. This has increased their gross enrolment ratio significantly.

## **Design of the IPPM Classification Framework**

### *Users*

The primary intended users of the Classification Framework include national or system level higher education agencies and government departments, quality assurance agencies and other professional and non-governmental organizations and agencies active in IPPM. Secondary users will be related national level governmental and non-governmental organizations such as immigration who are responsible for visa issues, trade and industry who may be involved in the registration of IPPM providers entering a host country. Of course, higher education institutions and providers will be users of the framework as they establish, operationalize, and monitor the quality and enrolments of IPPM.

### *Objectives*

Given the diversity of potential users for the Classification Framework, it is important to be clear about the objectives. The main objectives are

- to provide some clarity and common interpretations of the different modes and categories of IPPM. This requires the framework to be robust enough to ensure that the characteristics of each mode are clearly defined and distinct from other modes, but at the same time flexible enough to reflect the realities and different contexts of more than 100 countries involved in IPPM;
- to provide a foundation to help develop and systematize IPPM data collection and management within and across countries through a common understanding of terms;
- to allow cross country comparisons on IPPM and ensure that the comparative analysis is regularized and reliable by using common descriptions of the primary modes of IPPM; and
- to track national, regional and international trends and developments of IPPM through use of a common interpretation and use of IPPM terms

### *Assumptions*

The development of the framework is based on a number of key assumptions and two fundamental organizing principles. The following assumptions guide the development and use of the framework.

- The framework addresses programme and provider mobility only. It does not categorize or include the major types of International Student Mobility (ISM);
- The framework is intended to help countries and HEIs build a foundation of common terms and understanding of IPPM. It is not intended to be a top down imposed set of definitions, but instead a set of criteria and descriptions that help to clarify what is involved with each IPPM mode and to help differentiate one IPPM mode from another;
- It is applicable to both host and sending country HEIs/providers. Host countries are defined as those countries who are recipients of the IPPM, while sending countries are those who are providing the academic programmes in the host country. Both host and sending countries need to have a common interpretation and lexicon of IPPM terms in order to understand IPPM provision and negotiate the terms of both independent and collaborative IPPM;
- The framework is designed for early stage emerging IPPM countries as well as mature IPPM countries. In terms of policy development and the collection of data, it will likely be most useful to emerging IPPM countries who are at the early stages of being actively involved in

IPPM. The more mature IPPM countries which already have registration, quality assurance, and other relevant policies in place may find the classification helpful in revising or tweaking their policies and data collection systems, and also is comparing their trends and IPPM enrolment patterns with other countries;

- Academic oversight, quality monitoring, and external quality assurance are important processes in IPPM provision. Academic oversight and quality monitoring are considered to be the duties of the HEIs/providers responsible for designing and delivering the academic programmes. External quality assurance refers to the assessments done by national level Quality Assurance agencies of the respective host and sending countries; and
- Local context is of fundamental importance for IPPM in general, but especially for country level IPPM data collection systems. The adage that ‘one size/system does not fit all’, applies. The framework does not offer rigid standardized definitions of each IPPM mode. The framework respects local contextual differences by being generic enough to accommodate different country approaches to IPPM but is rigorous enough to differentiate between IPPM modes.

## Two Organizing Principles of the Classification Framework

Two organizational principles are fundamental to the framework. The first principle addresses the nature of the relationship between a sending HEI/provider and the local host HEI/provider and the second principle relates to the mode of delivery at both the programme and provider level.

- ***First principle: independent versus collaborative IPPM provision***

The first principle organizes the framework into two vertical columns and makes the distinction between IPPM as a stand-alone or *independent activity* by the sending country HEI/provider *and a collaborative effort* between host and sending HEIs/providers.

Table 1: Independent *versus* Collaborative Programme and Provider Mobility

<b><i>Two Major Approaches to IPPM Provision</i></b>	
<b>Independent</b>	<b>Collaborative</b>
The foreign sending HEI/provider is primarily responsible for the design, delivery and external quality assurance of its academic programmes and qualifications being offered in another country.	A foreign sending HEI/provider and host country HEI/provider work together on the design, delivery and/or external quality assurance of the academic programmes.

The distinction between academic *collaborative* IPPM provision and *independent* IPPM provision is central to the framework. It has important implications for both host country and sending country regulations and policies related to registration, external quality assurance, awarding of qualifications, degree recognition, responsibility for the curriculum, and data management.

The *collaborative* IPPM programmes offer a number of benefits such as 1) opportunities for joint curriculum development and delivery to ensure that programmes are relevant to the local context, 2) possibilities for joint research on locally relevant topics, and 3) the potential for capacity building and

internationalization of both the local host and foreign sending institutions. On the other hand, *independent* IPPM provision normally provides a curriculum designed, delivered and quality assured according to the regulations and standards of the sending country. The qualification offered is from the foreign provider. For many students in host countries having a foreign based curriculum, pedagogy and qualification is the most attractive, and sought after feature of IPPM because it is more affordable than travelling abroad yet offers a foreign curriculum and pedagogy.

Many countries depend heavily on IPPM to provide increased access for higher education and a wider diversity of programme offer because the local higher education infrastructure is not able to meet the demand for full time or part-time higher education. It is important for host countries to know what percentage of higher education students are studying in local HEI provision *versus* what percentage are studying in IPPM programmes. Furthermore, it is critical to know whether the IPPM programmes are offered through collaborative relationships such as joint/double degree programmes or through stand-alone foreign providers such as franchise arrangements, international branch campuses or self-study distance education programmes because host country policies differ for independent versus collaborative IPPM programmes.

- ***Second Organizing Principle: six categories/modes of international programme and provider mobility***

The second principle relates to six distinct categories or modes of programme and provider mobility as identified on the 3 horizontal rows of the framework. The six categories represent different modes of international programme and provider delivery and are carefully aligned with the independent or collaborative approaches.

Table 2: Six categories of modes of programme and provider mobility

Row	Independent	Collaborative
1	Franchise programmes	Partnership programmes
2	International branch campus	Joint universities/colleges
3	Self-study distance education	Distance education with local academic partner

Row one differentiates *franchise programmes/ arrangements* which are primarily exported by a sending country from *partnership programmes* which are based on collaboration between host and sending country HEIs/providers

The second row distinguishes between an *international branch campus* which is essentially a satellite operation of a parent HEI in the sending country from an *international joint university* which is co-founded and co-developed by both sending and host countries HEIs.

The third row refers to distance education as a separate IPPM mode and distinguishes between *self-study distance education programmes* and *distance education with local academic partner*. The continuous growth and dynamic changes in the use of distance education technologies demands that the framework recognize distance/online education as a separate IPPM category unto itself. However, distance education is also a form of teaching and learning through face- to- face, online or blended approaches which are applicable to all modes of programme and provider mobility. The differentiation of distance education as a mode of IPPM or as a pedagogy used in all forms of IPPM is important to note.

Table 3 integrates the two organizing principles into one framework and provides a short description and set of commonly used terms for each of the six categories.

Table 3: Common IPPM Classification Framework

<b>Common IPPM Classification Framework</b>	
<i>Two Major Approaches to IPPM provision Independent and Collaborative</i>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Independent IPPM Provision</b></p> <p><i>The foreign sending HEI/provider is primarily responsible for the design, delivery and external quality assurance of its academic programmes and qualifications being offered in another country.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Collaborative IPPM provision</b></p> <p><i>A foreign sending HEI/provider and host country HEI/provider work together on the design, delivery and/or external quality assurance of the academic programmes.</i></p>
<i>Six Categories of IPPM</i>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1. Franchise Programmes</b></p> <p><b>Description:</b> The foreign sending HEI/provider has primary responsibility for the design, delivery and external quality assurance of academic programmes offered in host country. The qualification is awarded by the sending HEI. Face-to-face, distance and blended education can be used. <i>Commonly used terms: import/export, validation, foreign, non-local, International private programmes</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4. Partnership Programmes</b></p> <p><b>Description:</b> Academic programmes in a host country or host countries are jointly designed, delivered and quality assured through collaboration between host and sending country partners. The qualification/s can be awarded by either or both host and sending country HEIs in the form of single, joint or double/multiple degrees. Face-to-face, distance and blended education can be used. <i>Commonly used terms: joint/double/multiple degrees, twinning programmes.</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2. International Branch Campus</b></p> <p><b>Description:</b> A satellite bricks and mortar campus established by foreign sending HEI in host country. Sending parent institution provides curriculum, external quality assurance, and awards the qualification. Face-to-face, distance and blended education can be used. <i>Commonly used terms: satellite, private international, offshore campus, portal campus?</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4 International Joint University</b></p> <p><b>Description:</b> A HEI co-founded and established in host country involving both local and foreign sending HEI/ providers who collaborate on academic programme development and delivery. Qualifications can be awarded by either or both host and sending country HEIs. Face-to-face, distance and blended education can be used. <i>Commonly used terms: co-developed, binational, co-founded, multinational, joint ventures universities</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3. Self-study Distance Education</b></p> <p><b>Description:</b> Foreign sending distance education provider offers academic programmes directly to host country students. No local academic support available. Qualification, curriculum and external quality assurance offered by foreign sending HEI. <i>Commonly used terms: fully online education, open university, MOOCs, pure distance education</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>6. Distance Education with local academic partner</b></p> <p><b>Description:</b> A foreign distance education HEI/provider offers programmes to host country students in collaboration with a local academic partner. Curriculum can be jointly developed and the qualification awarded by foreign HEI or by both partners. External quality assurance provided by foreign sending HEI/provider or both partners. <i>Commonly used terms: online or distance</i></p>

The framework provides a brief description of each IPPM category/mode. They are intentionally not called definitions so as to respect local context and avoid the tendency to standardize the meaning of each mode of IPPM. The framework delineates and describes six different modes or categories of IPPM. Given the diversity of national contexts other commonly used terms are included.

To ensure that the differences (or similarities) among the six categories are clear and understood, there are three key criteria or questions which are used to help to delineate and differentiate the characteristics of each mode or category. The three fundamental questions are:

- Who awards the qualification?
- Who has primary responsibility for the academic curriculum?
- Who has primary responsibility for external quality assurance?

While there are always exceptions, the overall logic is that for *independent IPPM provision* the sending country has primary responsibility for the curriculum, the qualification awarded, and external quality assurance. While for *collaborative IPPM provision* both the host and sending countries share or have joint responsibility for one or all of these three aspects of IPPM programmes.

### **Elaboration of the six categories of IPPM**

This section provides a deeper understanding of each of the six mode categories and discusses some of the different terms used by countries around the world. It is worth repeating that the six mode categories need to be robust enough to distinguish one from another but also flexible enough to accommodate the different contexts, regulatory frameworks and linguistic orientations of IPPM active countries. The framework is not intended to be a top-down imposed structure of definitions, rather it is help countries gain clarity on how they interpret and use the terms related to IPPM activity in their local context.

**Core Elements/Factors** As noted in the previous section there are three core criteria or elements which are used to define and differentiate one mode from another. Other criteria and elements were given serious consideration but eventually eliminated as they were not strong enough to distinguish one category from another. These additional but excluded criteria focused on who delivers or teaches the programme, who is responsible for internal quality assurance, who applies for approval and registration.

#### **Mode 1: Franchise programmes**

A franchise arrangement can be described as a ‘programme which is offered by a foreign sending HEI to students in the host country. The foreign sending HEI/provider has primary responsibility for the curriculum design, external quality assurance of academic programmes and awards the qualification.’ In some cases, a local agent, provider or HEI may be involved by providing space and administrative support services and even some teaching, but the sending HEI/provider maintains ultimate responsibility for the curriculum, external quality assurance and awarding of the qualification. In a franchise programme face to face, distance and/or blended learning pedagogies can be used.

Franchise programmes will continue to evolve. While there is more growth in the partnership programme category of IPPM than in Franchise programmes, one can expect more innovation and fluidity in franchise arrangements resulting in the development of new enabling policies and regulatory frameworks by both host and sending countries.

There is one trend which may eventually result in a significant decrease in the scale of franchise programmes. This trend is the rapid and unprecedented increase in the offering of double or multiple degrees for any kind of academic programme which involves two or more international partners. Students are keen to register in a double degree or multiple programme as it means receiving two or more qualifications from two or more different HEIs while essentially completing the normal work load for one qualification. Institutions support double or multiple degree programmes as each partner claims the students as graduates of their institution which increases their graduation rates. Thus, we might see sending country HEI/providers offering franchise programmes linking up with host country HEIs to offer double degrees.

### ***Mode 2: International Branch Campus (IBC)***

An international branch campus is described as ‘a satellite bricks and mortar campus established by foreign sending HEI in a host country. The sending country parent institution provides curriculum, ensures external quality assurance, and awards the qualification’. In an international branch campus, face-to-face, distance and/or blended learning pedagogies can be used. This is a basic ‘bare bones’ description that can be applied to the majority of different models of IBCs.

However, there are a myriad of definitions of an International Branch campus because they are customized to the local host or sending country context, especially in terms of ownership, registration and quality assurance policies and regulations. Thus, other terms for IBCs from a sending country perspective include ‘satellite or offshore’ campus. While host countries commonly call them ‘foreign private institutions’ that normally require a host country approval through a registration and licensing procedure.

### ***Mode 3: Self- Study Distance Education***

Self-study distance education as a mode of IPPM involves ‘a foreign sending distance education HEI/provider that offers academic programmes directly to host country’s students’. Self-study is a fundamental part of the description as it means that no local academic partner is involved in designing the curriculum, ensuring quality and accreditation of programmes, or involved in the awarding of qualifications. These are the responsibilities of the foreign distance education HEI/provider. Self-study distance education is often difficult to track by the host country as the student enrolls directly with the foreign distance education provider. However, in some countries, higher education authorities require pure distance education providers to ensure that students register at a host country examination centre so that the enrolments of students can be tracked.

There is a much debate as to whether distance education should be included as a distinct mode category in the classification framework or be seen as a form of pedagogy common to all modes of IPPM. In reality, this is not an either/or question. Distance education is a form of pedagogy used in various IPPM modes as described in the framework. But, at the same time, there are distance education providers such as open universities which rely primarily on distance education as their means of delivery. Thus, these types of distance education providers need to be recognized as a separate mode or category of IPPM provision. Given the growth in the enrolments in Open universities in most regions of the world, and that they are the source of innovation and providing access to groups of students who previously did not have opportunities for higher education, it is important to have distance education classified as a distinct mode of IPPM.

Clearly there are cases when foreign distance education providers do collaborate with local providers or have locally available facilities for academic support and teaching. These types of situations would not be



classified as independent self-study distance education but would be included in the category which includes Distance Education with local academic partner.

There continue to be major issues related to self-study distance education in terms of qualifications and quality assurance. For instance, providers of MOOCs who are often well-known reputable universities, are not offering their own qualifications but involve third party entities that translate and certify the MOOCs into credits which can then be accepted as prior learning credits for advanced admission into local HEIs. More recently, MOOC providers are offering students an alumnus card which entitles them to an institutional email address and a discount for further courses. This alumnus card is popular as it is perceived to be a proxy for a qualification even though that is not the case.

#### ***Mode 4: Partnership Programmes***

Partnership programmes are described as ‘academic programmes which are jointly designed, delivered and/or externally quality assured through collaboration between partner HEIs/providers in host and sending countries. In these types of programmes the qualifications can be awarded by one, both or multiple partner HEIs.’ Partnership programmes can include face-to-face, distance and/or blended learning pedagogies.

Commonly used terms for the types of collaborative arrangements in the partnership programme mode are single, joint, double, multiple or twinning programmes. Again, the policies and regulations of the partners dictate the nature of the partnership programme and how many qualifications are offered. There are countries where a joint degree is illegal and thus either a single qualification or double/multiple qualifications are awarded depending on the number of partners. Conversely, there are countries where double/multiple degrees are illegal because of the double counting of the same workload/credits for two or more qualifications.

Partnership programmes represent the majority of IPPM activity in terms of actual numbers of programmes but not enrolments. While partnership programmes can be labelled as the fastest growing category, it can also be described as the ‘messiest category’ given the multiple interpretations and descriptions of double/ multiple degree and twinning programmes and the issues related to the recognition and integrity of double/multiple degrees.

#### ***Mode 5. International Joint University (IJU)***

International joint universities are a rather recent and quite innovative development. A joint university is described as ‘a HEI co-founded and established in host country involving both local and foreign sending HEI/ providers who collaborate on academic programme development and delivery. Qualifications can be awarded by either or both host and sending country HEIs.’ An international joint university can include face-to-face, distance and blended learning approaches.

Other terms used by countries to label these new joint universities are binational, multi-national, international, joint venture, co-founded universities.

Important to note is that a joint university is a newly established entity in the host country. It is not an international branch campus of a sending HEI/provider. The newly created joint university can be a public or private university and is guided and regulated by host country policies and regulations. In terms of programme offerings, the international joint university has several options. It can develop and offer its own academic programmes and qualifications. It can also offer the programmes and qualifications of its founding local and foreign partners either through joint or double degree programme arrangements. Quality assurance at the programme level is normally done by the host country QA agency and by all

partners for joint, double, multiple degree programmes. This arrangement can be quite burdensome administratively as there could be quality audits by all partner institutions.

Examples of joint universities include the multiple binational universities established by Germany. Each model is different, but they usually include a consortium of German universities who help to establish a new joint university in the host country. They include the German Cairo University, German-Jordanian University, and the Vietnamese German University among others. In China, there are a number of newly established joint universities such as the University of Xian Jiaotong-Liverpool University. This is a legally registered Chinese University co-founded by Xian Jiaotong University and Liverpool University. It is not an International Branch campus of Liverpool University which it is often mistakenly believed to be.

#### ***Mode 6: Distance Education with a local academic partner***

Distance Education with local partner academic collaboration is not a popular mode of IPPM but can be described as ‘a foreign distance education HEI/provider that offers programmes to host country students in partnership with a local academic HEI partner’. Curriculum can be jointly developed, and the qualification awarded by foreign HEI or by both partners. External quality assurance is provided by foreign sending HEI/provider or both partners.

In general, this type of collaboration involves the local partner offering some face-to-face tutorial support, or access to a local host country HEI library, laboratory and counselling services. A more recent trend is that distance education providers are building brick and mortar campuses and offering students the choice of distance education courses or face-to-face courses. This is not the same as blended learning where both face to face and distance are offered in the same course. An example of this kind of arrangement is the Arab Open University in Oman.

The African Virtual University (AVU), headquartered in Kenya is an innovative experiment involving a network of over 50 Academic partners in more than 25 countries in Africa who collaborate with the AVU. The institution (AVU) develops the curriculum with specialists and offers open access to all of its curriculum which can then be adopted or adapted for use by the academic partner country.

#### **Use of Classification Framework for policy development and data collection systems**

It is worth repeating that the purpose of the Common IPPM Classification Framework for IPPM is to develop a common understanding of terms and categories within and between countries. Countries have different approaches and levels of IPPM involvement and must be able to use the framework to meet their particular needs and circumstances. Thus, the framework is not a top-down imposed structure but rather a foundation and guideline to help countries have clarity on the different modes of IPPM provision.

Consequently, the use of the common IPPM framework for policy development and data collection will vary from country to country, depending on the prevalent IPPM modes, as well as how the data will be used for planning, policy analysis and development of regulatory processes. It is important to emphasize that the use of the IPPM Classification Framework will vary, but not the actual content. Countries, especially host countries are at different stages in establishing IPPM data collection systems and will develop their capacity over several phases. To allow for an incremental approach to data collection, the framework must be flexible and have different entry points, but still have rigorous descriptions of the six modes.

How a country uses the framework and definitions will depend on a number of factors, such as 1) whether the majority of IPPM is collaborative or independent; 2) what is the most popular IPPM mode; and 3) how data is used for the development of new regulations and policies, analysis of enrolment data, monitoring quality assurance, or discerning IPPM trends. There is a wide variety of information that can be collected to assist a host or sending country in analysing IPPM provision trends and develop appropriate policies and regulations.

Examples of types of information that could be collected by host countries using the IPPM Classification Framework include:

- The degree to which IPPM provision is collaborative between local and foreign providers and how much is provided exclusively by foreign sending country HEIs and providers. This is valuable information for host and sending country higher education long-term enrolment planning and policy development as there are different benefits and risks attached to the independent or collaborative approach to IPPM;
- Within the collaborative category, how much of the IPPM curriculum is imported/exported and how much is jointly developed? This is useful information in terms of capacity building of local host HEIs and for determining how relevant programmes and curriculum are to the local environment;
- For each IPPM mode, programme information on discipline, level (undergraduate, master's, PhD), qualification(s) offered, tuition fees, duration, internships and study abroad opportunities etc. This is useful information in determining the overlap of IPPM programmes with those provided by local HEIs;
- For each IPPM mode, information on enrolment data by programme, gender, level of programme, part-time or full-time study etc. This is helpful in assessing whether IPPM does increase access to education and for which categories of student;
- For each independent IPPM: source country of provider, type of provider, QAA procedures and tuition fees. This information is useful for determining priority of foreign IPPM countries and for developing QAA procedures;
- For each collaborative IPPM: local HEIs involved, source country of partner, number of qualifications being offered (joint, double, multiple), etc. This information is useful for determining what kind of local HEIs are active in IPPM collaborative activities and which are the prevalent foreign IPPM countries and HEI partners involved. This will help to evaluate IPPM provision and, if appropriate, develop a more strategic approach to choices of countries, counterpart HEIs, registration processes, and quality assurance policies; and
- Tracking the number of students who move to a third country (not the country of the foreign HEI/provider) to take an IPPM program. This is important information for immigration planning purposes.

The type of information that can be collected is extensive and needs to be customized to the needs and priorities of the host or sending country. These examples show the breadth of information and how it can be used. There are parallels for using the framework at the institutional level. HEIs will benefit from collecting information on the modes and enrolments of their incoming and outgoing IPPM activities. At the same time, the framework provides the foundation to monitor international trends in IPPM and also to undertake cross-country analysis on key issues and challenges as well as enrolments.

## Conclusion

This discussion focused on the principles, structure and use of the proposed IPPM Classification Framework. The Classification Framework is designed for different higher education actors and stakeholders. These include higher education policy makers at national, regional and international levels, quality assurance agencies, national governmental and non-governmental higher education organizations, higher education institutions and providers, scholars, and others who have a vested interest in ensuring that the different modes of programme and provider mobility are carefully monitored, quality assured, and contribute in positive ways to the needs and interests of both host and sending countries.

Permission from the British Council has been given to adapt this text from Knight, J and J. McNamara (2017) Transnational Education: A Classification Framework and Data Collection Guidelines for International Program and Provider Mobility. British Council and DAAD. [www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/tne\\_classification\\_framework-final.pdf](http://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/tne_classification_framework-final.pdf)

### ***Jane Knight PhD***

*Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada*

*Distinguished visiting professor at the Ali Mazrui Centre for Studies in Higher Education, University of Johannesburg, South Africa*

[Jane.knight@utoronto.ca](mailto:Jane.knight@utoronto.ca)

## For Reference and Further Reading

Garrett, R., K. Kinser, J. Lane & R. Merola (2016). International Branch Campuses: Trends and Developments. OBHE and C-BERT Publication.

[http://www.obhe.ac.uk/documents/view\\_details?id=1035](http://www.obhe.ac.uk/documents/view_details?id=1035)

Ilieva, J. & M. Peake (2016). The Shape of Global Higher Education: National Policies Framework for International Engagement. British Council, UK,

[https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/f310\\_IPPM\\_international\\_higher\\_education\\_report\\_final\\_v2\\_web.pdf](https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/f310_IPPM_international_higher_education_report_final_v2_web.pdf)

Knight, J. (2016). Transnational Education Remodeled: Toward a Common IPPM Framework and Definitions Journal of Studies in International Education. 20, 1, 34-47

Knight, J. (2015). International universities: Misunderstandings and emerging models? Journal of Studies in International Education 19.2: 107-121.

Knight, J and J. McNamara (2017). Transnational Education: A Classification Framework and Data Collection Guidelines for International Program and Provider Mobility. British Council and DAAD.

[www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/tne\\_classification\\_framework-final.pdf](http://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/tne_classification_framework-final.pdf)

Kosmützky, Anna, & Rahul Putty. (2015). Transcending borders and traversing boundaries: A systematic review of the literature on transnational, offshore, cross-border, and borderless higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 1-26.

Kuder, M., Lemmens, N., & Obst, D. I. (Eds.). (2013). *Global perspectives on international joint and double degree programs*. New York, NY: The Institute for International Education.

McNamara J. & J. Knight (2015). Transnational Education Data Collection Systems: Awareness, Action, Analysis. British Council and DAAD. <https://www.britishcouncil.org/education/ihe/knowledge-centre/transnational-education/IPPM-education-data-collection-systems>

McNamara J. & J. Knight (2014). Impacts of Transnational Education on Host Countries. British Council and DAAD. <https://www.britishcouncil.org/education/ihe/knowledge-centre/transnational-education/impacts-transnational>

McNamara J., J. Knight & R. Fernandez-Chung, (2013). The shape of Things to Come 2: The evolution of transnational education. British Council <https://www.britishcouncil.org/education/ihe/knowledge-centre/transnational-education/the-shape-of-things-to-come-2>.

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. (2014). *Strengthening the quality assurance of UK transnational education: Consultation report*. Gloucester, UK: The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/IPPM-consultation-report-May14.pdf>

Rüland, D. & S. Kammüller (2016). Terminology counts: Towards a mutual basis for transnational education statistics. Going Global Publication. British Council. 23-31

Stella, A., & Bhushan, S. (2011). Quality assurance of transnational higher education: The experiences of Australia and India. India, Delhi: National University of Educational Planning and Administration.