

Cross-Border Higher Education for Capacity Development
World Bank/OECD/Nuffic Seminar
14-15 September 2006, The Hague

Summary report
by
Roberta Malee Bassett¹

Introduction:

Cross border higher education can be a vital component of capacity building in developing countries. Understanding the numerous mechanisms of cross border higher education and the equally varied venues for capacity building is especially important as stakeholders and scholars evaluate the utility of cross border higher education for multi-faceted development of individual nations.

The World Bank, OECD, and Nuffic sponsored an international workshop entitled Cross-Border Higher Education for Capacity Development, which took place over a two-day period from 14-15 September 2006. Bringing together near 40 experts in international higher education—including policymakers, stakeholders, scholars, and administrators—from developed and developing countries, the workshop sought:

...to foster an evidence-based dialogue on issues between the education, the development and the trade communities in developing and developed countries. It would aim at raising awareness of the potential opportunities and challenges of cross-border higher education, at sharing experience on good practice and offering policy recommendations to tackle these issues, and at advancing new ideas in the field.

As a result of these two days of discussions and debates, many key themes emerged to direct future efforts in understanding and leading effective responses to the challenges of cross-border higher education (CBHE). These keys finding will be outlined below and are followed by brief summaries of the presentations given at the workshop and findings of the breakout plenary sessions.

Key Findings:

The key findings from the major presentations and the subsequent discussant contributions, as well as the open commentary that followed each session, ranged from large policy considerations to campus-level concerns. A few basic ideas underpinned the entire discourse, including the principle that higher education is not a mere economic engine but is a broad contributor to improving the human condition, through knowledge generation and improving civic discourse

¹ Center for Higher Education Management and Policy at Southampton (CHEMPaS), University of Southampton, UK.

and participation (Opschoor); the importance of (re)defining ‘capacity building,’ as it changes over time and after different stages of development (Botero, Lemaitre), and recognizing that different countries have different capacities to address issues of CBHE provision (Lemaitre, Chilundo, Lwakabamba). Eight (8) key theme areas arose during these discussions, with some emerging as issues that ought to guide responses to CBHE from this point forward.

- *Quality Assurance (QA):*

The most prominent single theme to emerge during the workshop was that of quality assurance and how to institute effective mechanisms for institutionalizing confidence in the CBHE programs being expanding across the world. Recognition of QA issues ranged from specific statements about the importance of effective QA mechanisms from the inception of any new mode of higher education provision (Lwakabamba, Badsha); to the importance of helping smaller higher education systems institute QA mechanisms to suit their needs (Uvaliç-Trumbiç); and to broad idea about ensuring that those in the position to influence the development of national strategic plans on higher education or new quality assurance legislation that can impact higher education at all levels include mention of CBHE issues.

Representatives of a few nations (Malaysia, Colombia, and South Africa) specifically acknowledged the power of their legally binding QA processes for building up (or, in fact, hindering the expansion of unregulated) networks of CBHE without compromising on quality (Shahabudin, Botero, and Badsha, respectively). Still others acknowledge that well-developed QA mechanisms help foreign providers, by ensuring equal treatment of CBHE programs with domestically provided programs (Badrawi). Finally, the issue of incorporating or, even, embedding QA procedures within broader development plans and strategies seems particularly supported by multi-national organization representatives (Uvaliç-Trumbiç, Salmi, Schuller), who envision a scenario where inclusion of CBHE in legislation can bring about broad social change.

Other quality issues concerned ensuring that the CBHE being offered is of good quality and local relevance to the community it serves (Botero, Lwakabamba, Uvaliç-Trumbiç, Schuller, McBurnie, Knight, LeMaitre, Shahabudin, Badrawi, and Badsha). And, finally, representatives of the World Bank (Salmi, Hopper) stressed that for countries with the most fledgling appreciation of the burgeoning CBHE presence around the world, simple guiding questions and terminologies are necessary to build local capacity to engage in the more complex task of constructing frameworks for CBHE provision within their borders.

- *Provision mechanisms and challenges:*

For many countries, the emergence of rapidly expanding private sectors of higher education, whether through local providers or CBHE, is challenging traditional approaches to regulating and monitoring local higher education (Lemaitre, Botero).

It is important to acknowledge the multiple forms of CBHE, with commercial provision as only one element of CBHE, and perhaps the least developed, as well. Other forms of CBHE include academic partnerships, development cooperation, and research collaboration.

Distance education has proven particularly challenging, as its provision crosses borders without any physical representation to be subject to domestic regulation. According to John Spinks (U21 Global), distance education offers, in fact, a higher quality education than many other more traditional forms of public and private higher education, including increased time spent communicating directly with faculty and fellow students and flexibility to accommodate student schedules most effectively. Others see the challenges of ensuring quality of distance learning through similar mechanisms as those that govern facilities based programs (Salmi).

Finally, the providers and receivers are likely to merge, as increasing numbers of countries host both sides of the CBHE equation. Many acknowledged and, in many cases, specifically encouraged the emerging South-South CBHE exchange (Lwakabamba, Bjarnson, Salmi, Badsha, Knight), while more broadly, the discussion included mention of exchange in all directions, North to North, North to South, South to North, as well as South to South.

• *Equity and access concerns:*

All who commented specifically on issues of equity and access acknowledged that thus far, CBHE has not served as a catalyst for increased access of low and middle-income students to higher education. In particular, several presenters noted the need to conduct further research specifically on whether CBHE helps or hinders broader access to higher education across social-economic strata (Salmi, Schuller, Lemaitre, Botero, and Badsha).

Another perspective on this issue came from representatives of two African nations (Chilundo, Mozambique, and Lwakabamba, Rwanda), who explained how CBHE was needed by their nations not simply as mechanisms for improved access in response to a high level of student demand. Instead, CBHE was providing the only real avenue for local access to higher education in environments where the traditional higher education sector was decimated by war and/or economic stagnation. Economic growth and sustainable development demand an educated cadre of leaders, and CBHE may have the most readily available capacity to provide access to higher education to those who, having chosen to remain locally, might otherwise not have any source for higher education studies.

• *Institution-level issues:*

Many presenters noted the need for transparency on the part of institutional providers, particularly with regard to their motivations and purposes for expanding their CBHE offerings into host countries (McBurnie, Schuller, Lemaitre), to counter local suspicions.

Staffing issues also arose as an area where host countries are highly distrustful and apprehensive of providers—in many cases, temporary or less rigorously selected staff are hired to serve a providers CBHE initiatives (Badsha), while with distance education, for example, programs are presented as “teacher” proof, as a way of guaranteeing course quality regardless of instructor. How to ensure quality of staff is another concern of a QA initiative for institutions.

Finally, a programmatic observation made by many of the government representatives present acknowledged that twinning and double degree programs are the most salient mechanisms for CBHE in developing countries (Lwakabama, Badrawi), allowing for local mechanism still to be used in monitoring quality and ensuring degree recognition, among other benefits.

•*The significance of Research:*

There was broad agreement among all attendees that the knowledge gap is expanding, with most research and development occurring in the developed world (Opschoor). Effective capacity building, therefore, requires investment in knowledge development, which, by extension, means investment in the research component higher education. Botero and Badsha specifically acknowledged the lack of research being offered and pursued by CBHE providers significantly diminished their utility within the local society, by severely limiting the intellectual contributions of the institutions.

•*The role of multinational organizations*

There was broad agreement that multinational organizations, like UNESCO, the World Bank, and the OECD, should work together to share knowledge and avoid duplication of resources and efforts and to maximize the potential benefits they can provide (Uvaliç-Trumbiç, Salmi). As different organizations have different strengths and weaknesses, they should be matched to those situations that would best benefit from their specific expertise. These multinational organizations are also in a position to clarify and improve upon the relationship between aid and trade in educational services (Knight).

•*Governance and oversight of CBHE*

A general consensus is that major issues regarding CBHE now involve the scope of CBHE, and the evolving forms that CBHE is taking around the world (Salmi). In response, governments need to establish thoughtful and effective strategic plans, policies, or, even laws, that addresses the specific complications of CBHE within an overall higher education plan (Chilundo, McBurnie, Botero, and others), in addition to maintaining ongoing dialogues with all relevant actors (providers and consumers), to ensure standards are being set and met. (McBurnie)

Besides consistent and transparent quality assurance mechanisms (explained above), other areas of governance that ought to be addressed include cross-border degree recognition; funding issues, including issues of student aid; basic licensing regulations, and well-defined requirements for community engagement (McBurnie, Schuller, Badsha). It is very important for host countries to have clear policies for how it wishes to deal with CBHE—with input from all concerned constituents, such as Depts. of Education; Science and Technology; Commerce; Trade, etc. (McBurnie).

•*Ideas for future research*

Ideas for future research focused on filling gaps in the dialogue on CBHE (Uvaliç-Trumbiç). Such gaps include generating empirical data about institutional quality and student outcomes, as

well as building comparative impact studies on the multiple modes of CBHE provision. In addition, future analysis and dialogue on CBHE should include recognition of the four (4) “Ps” of CBHE: people, programs, providers, and projects (Knight). According to many participants, evaluations of many of these programs exists, but have never been developed into further impact studies—something which would provide very useful data about whether CBHE is serving its students and its overall missions properly and successfully. And, finally, statistical evaluations for individual programs, regarding their outputs and the experiences of their students ,would provide important insights into the realities of CBHE provision today by allowing engaged actors to understand more broadly the differences among the full range of CBHE programs, and looking at flows, trends, and changes in patterns between countries and within regions.

Key Points from the major sessions:

Morning 1: Cross-Border HE (SVL, RH, MGG) and quality assurance

Stephan Vincent-Lancrin: Setting the context

The burgeoning trade context of international higher education led to broader concerns about quality and the capacity building aspects of cross-border higher education. Some of the objectives of this book being produced by the OECD and The World Bank include: raising awareness of cross-border higher education as it exists currently and with regard to its potential for both developed and developing countries, examining the capacity building mandate of cross-border higher education, and evaluating prospects for research into economic development and the impact of higher education.

It is important to note the major difference between export and import strategies of higher education, where exporters are, for example, seeking to generate revenue and, potentially, promote skilled migration, while importers tend to be seeking domestic capacity building. Unfortunately, there is little evidence that CBHE is an effective tool in building capacity for development. Commercial models of CBHE tend to rely on middle class enrollments, with access to the financial means to afford the fees, which leads to concerns about whether this model could genuinely work in developing countries. Perhaps, then, CBHE would be complemented by development assistance following capacity building principles.

Capacity building requires tertiary education, to develop human capital, which can spur growth in productivity, as well as more broadly social improvements such as greater participation in civil society, improvements in health and welfare, and innovation across social and economic lines. Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are essential to capacity building and require highly trained workers—workers that need to have gone through some forms of tertiary education.

Optimistic assessments view CBHE as providing for a rapid expansion of higher education capacity, as well as increasing the variety and relevance of tertiary education and, potentially, improving the quality of higher education, as spillover effects from greater participation in regional and international networks.

Another important consideration, however, are concerns about the challenges of student and program mobility. Student mobility issues include concerns about costs, relevance and quality of degrees and qualifications, inequity of access, and the damage of skilled migration through brain drain. Program mobility issues, on the other hand, involve quality of provision, lack of spillover into the local system of HE, the potential lack of cultural or domestic economic relevance, and the stability of the overall system with the addition of foreign provision.

Remaining questions that should be addressed through further examination include: what are the objective of CBHE (for providers and hosts), are different types of CBHE more suitable to some systems than others, what kinds of contractual agreements and/or government policies can be developed regarding CBHE providers to minimize risks and maximize benefits, and what are the most appropriate contexts for CBHE? Such regulations benefit systems in two ways: by protecting the ‘consumer’ interests of students and by directing CBHE into serving as a genuine development tool.

Rick Hopper (Quality Assurance):

Tertiary education institutions are drivers of the knowledge economy, but are often saddled with limited resources. As such, there has been an increase attention being paid to quality concerns and the ideals of maximizing the potential returns on the investment of the limited resources available. Pressures on quality assurance have come from the confluence of a myriad of factors: increased need for highly skilled labor, demographic pressures on higher education, compression of public expenditures on higher education, the mobility of skilled labor, and promotion of greater cross-border cooperation (such as Bologna), and the increasing relevance of cross-border higher education provision.

Quality assurance as a structured process is growing across the world. The number of formal agencies dealing with QA has grown dramatically in the past 15 years, with INQAAHE membership increasing from 18 members in 1991 to 80 members in 2005. With the vast heterogeneity of study programs and country contexts facing CBHE, QA mechanisms have to be flexible and able to evolve, while the most effective QA modes are converging into some universal practices. Audits, accreditation, evaluations, self-assessments, peer reviews, etc. are all QA practices that are present around the world.

In developing countries, there is a need to continue to build capacity for quality assurance that is appropriate and sustainable to the different contexts each country may be facing. Issues of weak and fragile economies, limited resources for QA, already overstretched human resources, and the challenges involved in post-conflict development are just some of the challenges that must be addressed while assessing the QA potential for a nation’s tertiary education system.

Essential elements for building QA capacity are open dialogue and consensus building, promoting ‘cultures of quality.’ In looking toward sustainable capacity, countries should seek to develop their ability to harness indigenous capacity not only in the ability to cope with the current state of affairs but also to manage the evolution and growth of local capacity building.

Finally, the sequencing of QA development is important. In a phased strategy, the systems build from responding to the present, examining basic needs, planning for the long term, and setting structures in place to manage the planned evolution. QA must involve tertiary institutions, emphasizing self-assessments and cultures of quality as well as cost effective mechanisms that are sustainable. From here, the focus would be on human resource capacity building, encouraging partnerships and regional synergies, in support of building systems that promote both indigenous and CB higher education. Linkages to resource allocation and cultures of quality should be used as stimulants (not stifling agents) in advancing the QA agenda.

Massimo Geloso-Grosso: GATS and CBHE

There has been limited progress to date regarding the GATS and cross-border higher education. Key concerns have included regulatory autonomy, with liberalization as a domestic policy issue that could affect regulatory conduct in some areas, such as higher education. Benefits of the GATS for free trade in higher education services could include: increased access to higher education opportunities; increased transparency in systems; more predictable systems of operation (perhaps making the systems more attractive for foreign investments, leading to and increase in capital investments and localized expertise).

There are different concerns for countries with no education commitments from those who have made commitments in education. With no commitments, the articles of the GATS do not bind countries to follow the many regulatory directives. With commitments, however, a nation's obligations for opening its higher education system do increase, particularly with regard to issues of market access and national treatment. Indeed, a main concern regarding higher education within the GATS is that of national treatment, or the requirement that an institution from a trading partner country be treated in the same manner as that of a national institution, perhaps resulting in financial and other benefits being extended to foreign services and suppliers.

With regard to CBHE, the GATS would, ideally, expand the market access for providers to the benefit of education consumers in under-served systems. As long as the regulations in place are applied equally and in a fashion that is no more than necessarily burdensome, providers from any trading partner would be able to enter the system and access the local student base. And, progressive liberalization should promote the breakdown of unnecessary barriers to entry that may be currently limiting the potential expansion of CBHE in countries around the world.

Morning--Session 2: Different perspectives on programme and institution mobility

Grant McBurnie (Monash University, Australia)

Different kinds of CBHE:

--distance education: most commonly delivered without face-to-face interaction, low risk/low involvement; standardized curriculum

--partner supported delivery/including twinning: include public and private partnerships, commercial arms of host institutions, for profit companies, professional associations, and governments

--full branch campus: usually offer the highest quality CBHE, with permanent faculty, research potential, etc.

Motivations and concerns for providers:

--motivators: prestige, academic benefits, financial rewards
--concerns: risk to reputation, financial costs, legal issues, sovereignty, and physical well-being
--particularly noteworthy are problems in areas that are/were war zones, have weak governments and/or the rule of law, and face language barriers

Practical issues for providers:

--what and how to offer (curriculum, teaching, research)
--financial concerns: costs for travel, salaries, infrastructure
--resources: from provider, government, and agencies

Concerns for host country regulations:

--responding to demand (CBHE can absorb demand by expanding provision)
--ensuring CBHE provides local enrichment (quality and complementarity)
--export preparation: CBHE attracts foreign students to the host country, provides prestige

Future types of CBHE provision:

--distance education: mass or niche opportunities
--partner supported delivery: likely squeezed out in the enrichment phase of CBHE development
--branch campuses: remain prestigious and develop multiple sources of revenue/financing
--expanding Diaspora of language, religion, culture, etc. through CBHE
--movement from developed-developed; developed to developing; developing to developed; developing to developing: all likely CBHE relationships

NOTE: Universities are very good at doing “education.” They are not as good at doing business/finance in their own interests. This is a major challenge to effective, efficient, and sustainable CBHE in the future.

Svava Bjarnson (OBHE, ACU)

Emerging trends in CBHE

--rise in francophone Africa activities: France and Canada being joined by US and India as providers; primary disciplines are business, teacher training, and medical-related studies; economically diverse funding sources; evidence of growing south-south provision (tech universities of India to Africa; Mediterranean Virtual University)
--Sino-Foreign activities: over 1,300 Sino-foreign joint programs; leading provider countries Australia, USA, Hong Kong; 69% enrolled in MA/MS/MSc programs; 29 in BA/BS; business related programs most popular
--Latin American activities: CBHE appeared between US and Latin America as early as 1957; active regional, cooperative provision; diversification of types of institutional partnerships—public/private/corporate, etc.
--increased mechanisms for QA and regulation

Important: Emerging models for CBHE host countries:

- bankroll model (Qatar, Singapore)
- economic hub model (Mauritius, UAE)
- education hub model (Malaysia, Thailand)
- capacity model (China, Hong Kong)
- ‘control’ model: South Africa
- minimal regulation/random initiatives model: most countries

Regulatory frameworks move from no regulations at all, to highly restrictive mechanism

Emerging trends:

- increased govt. awareness and resultant policy development
- developing countries increasingly sources for CBHE, not just receivers
- institutions more aware of costs and risks of CBHE and will seek partnerships with HEIs and government.

Plenary Session 1—Identifying good practices to regulate educational programmes and institutions:

1a. Conditions supporting restriction of CBHE?

None, except in cases of ethical concerns or security risks. Important awareness, however, regarding the spirit in which the CBHE is being developed, to ensure broad capacity building goals of the receiver countries

1b. When should CBHE be encouraged?

- right ‘spirit’ of providers’ reasons for wanted to operate CB
- benefits of strategic capacity building
- higher level education opportunities than solely provided locally (particularly PhD/Master’s)
- opportunities for partnerships
- internationalization; global awareness
- generate business opportunities

- Motivation for providers is important: is this a partnership between equals or are the potential programs no supported by local capacity needs? Maintaining the balance between supply and demand crucial

1c. What tools can be used to encourage CBHE? What tools should be avoided?

- Land grants
- Tax breaks
- Deregulation (transparency of fair regulations)
- recognition of degrees and credentials

Understanding motivations:

- skilled migration
- brand enhancement/prestige
- capacity building

How to match motivations (provider and receiver)?

--government to government conversations

--regional dialogue

--quality assurance agencies promoting open dialogue and transparency in a regulatory framework

--use carrots and sticks: make acceptable concessions and necessary demands on providers, to ensure local needs being met

Ideas about quality assurance requirements:

--more stringent in country

--academic will necessary to ensure reflective nature of domestic provision

--professional bodies already operate internationally and can provide good practices

New provider needs:

--to be more cognizant and active in anticipating and developing curricula meeting the stated needs of the govt. and local economy

--government to government dialogue, to clarify expectations, at the intl., regional, and, perhaps, local levels

--direct government or multinational organization support for programs addressing well-articulated strategies, to minimize the pressures on institutions for capacity building

Important to distinguish licensing from quality assurance:

- Licensing: basic requirements, government led, implies common, baseline standards, and is mandatory

- QA: protects the name "university," considers the contributions being made the country objectives, should stay focused on quality, use of home country quality assurance or accreditation, same standards as the home country for degree recognition

International QA: recognition of foreign accreditors and accreditation decisions; develop a register of internationally authorized accreditors

2a. What, if anything, makes it difficult for cross-border provision to serve local interests of receiving countries?

--Information issues: lack of open information between providers and local authorities, lack of broad and complete information about the host country and its existing higher education system, lack of information on the receiving country side regarding the providers—capacity, motivations, etc.

--Need to develop cooperative frameworks

--Capacity building is more closely linked to academic cooperation than to commercial exchange

2b. Are there minimal requirements one should ask foreign providers to meet? Should they be mandatory or based on incentives?

--Incentives—such as student aid (loans, scholarships). In some countries, however, student aid is restricted only to public higher education and/or accredited institutions/programs. Student aid could be required for QA approval, to force foreign providers to give aid to students

2c. Should there be a dual regulatory system?

--Not for licensing—there should be one set of basic requirements for domestic and foreign providers.

--At the QA level, some difference may make sense but still with common standards shared by domestic and foreign providers

2d. How to maximize knowledge transfers?

--clarity about responsibilities of providers (to students as well as to academic partners)

--further development of exchanges and academic partnerships

2e. Should (local) student aid be extended to foreign provision

--Yes, as long as the provider has been recognized as comparable to local providers

2f. Are there cases where transparent and consistent quality assurance standards should not be the same for local and foreign providers?

--No.

2g. Can it be appropriate not to acknowledge foreign degrees or qualifications awarded at home

--Yes, under circumstance where foreign provider has not met local licensing/accreditation standards. Standards must be transparent, so no surprises about non-recognition.

Can it be appropriate not to acknowledge degrees awarded abroad by domestic institutions?

--No, as long as the domestic institution is accredited and recognized at home, its international programs should be equally recognized

2h. Should institutions with varied academic arrangements (degree-granting or not, for profit or non-profit, etc.) have different regulatory frameworks?

Yes, in the case of degree-granting institutions having stricter frameworks, say, than non degree granting. In other cases, operational ambiguity may require regulations or, at a minimum, oversight that local providers, may not have to undergo.

Recommendation: must start with strong regulations then see where they can be released. Regulations needed for development cooperation, commercial trade interests, and academic opportunities—may not all be the same, as different forms of CBHE may call for different standards, guidelines, etc.

Regulations: What/When to regulate?

--In cases of social risk: when provision does not lead to local capacity building, does not meet the needs of local environment, institutional priorities differ from local priorities.

Plenary Session 2: From good to effective practices

FOR PROVIDERS:

Good practices for students:

- robust QA arrangements on sending and receiving sides
- complete and timely information
- access to facilities and services
- good financial practice
- sustainability—to ensure progress to completion, even if the provider pulls out
- opportunities to interact with anchor campus or provider (exchanges, etc.)

Good practices for institutions:

- proper business strategies
- extensive due diligence to understand the opportunity
- overseas activities must complement host campus activities and goals
- senior-level support
- project management commensurate with level of risk and exposure being invested
- clarity of responsibilities and chains of command
- possible consortia of similar institutions, to spread the risk and benefits

Good practices for home countries/institutions (for capacity building)

- promote/demand engagement in high level research and academic activities
- promote/demand engagement with the local community

Pitfalls:

- reputational risk
- lack of information about receiving country: proper planning and market analysis are essential
- danger of instability (rules changing, new regulations,)
- financial risks: particularly if host institution over-extended itself to develop overseas initiatives
- loss of staff to overseas campus could weaken provision at home campus—mitigated if staff continue research/teachings while abroad
- ambiguity in staffing frameworks
- capacity building puts them out of business

Self-regulation and Quality control:

- internal, self-developed systems must be in place
- QA agencies should be encouraged to extend their mandates into CBHE
- clarity and simplicity of language of all regulations, to ensure understanding regardless of home cultural context
- coordinated efforts of international QA on programs that involve multiple country initiatives
- involve international professional bodies in accreditation

Financing Dimensions:

- institutions must prepare fully for the financial risks/rewards of extending their efforts intl. (cost of delivery, student enrollment projections, etc.)

- host country financial and regulatory environments must be acknowledged and incorporated in any plan (repatriation of profits, for-profit status recognition, etc.)
- Intl. Agencies should fund national strategies and not individual programs or providers
- institutions should be aware of any financial incentives (disincentives) of operating in the host country.

FOR RECEIVERS:

Government:

- should have clear policy/strategy of expectations of foreign providers (e.g., policies related to access, equity, quality, relevance, and funding)
- should support CBHE as it related to their nation-building agenda
- should look to CBHE as a mechanism for filling a gap in the opportunities offered domestically
- should build its policies in relation to its domestic research goals and with regard to community engagement
- all relevant government agencies (education, trade, commerce, science and technology) should be consulted as policies regarding CBHE and capacity building are developed
- government policies and regulations must be backed by proper implementation mechanisms, including regulatory frameworks, licensing, and QA mechanisms, and the financial resources needed to analyze individual situations and uncover inappropriate/underdeveloped programs.
- governments can use incentives (tax breaks, land grants, access to student aid, access to training) to attract specific providers or educational opportunities
- governments can also impose conditions on providers to encourage ensuring that CBHE meets their domestic needs. Such conditions include: providing scholarships, demanding site development in specific locations (often not urban), and the right to use generated benefits for developing international program.
- QA is desirable but must be adapted to needs of local community, particularly if it is post-conflict, very poor, and/or very small.
- should utilize current tools available, including data from UNESCO/OECD, as well as the UNESCO toolkit, available from newsstands.

Institutions:

- important to know the rules and regulations of local higher education system
- understanding the capacity of partner higher education institutions (HEIs), to provide evidence of their resources and strengths
- useful to know the host country's QA mechanisms
- need to exercise due diligence before entering a partnership: experience of provider institution, specific program strengths, degree granting time frames and transferability and cross-border degree recognition
- potential for new model: triangle or cascade arrangements, in which an institutions in an anchor country or a strong university in the host country acts in conjunction with both providers and receivers.
- focus continually on **capacity development**: role of QA authorities, role of regional and sub-regional networks
- issues for capacity development include : which international partnerships to pursue and which technologies to use (face to face, online, etc.), bringing students to home institutions for an

international experience; financial negotiations and arrangements, and developing a tool that feeds information to national/regional/ or sub regional actors regarding capacity building,
--evolving approaches to higher education partnerships have seen individual institutions resolute in pursuing their own interests, with diminished interests in international collaborations
--financial incentives for partnerships to counter diminished interest
--positive benefits of incentives include forcing government to be explicit about the development they're pursuing, while benefiting both sides

Future research:

- potential of regional collaboration
- outcomes from less expensive CBHE providers
- impact of partnerships on different types of institutions, programs and/or arrangements
- examination of on-line learning quality
- incentives proven to lead to effective partnerships
- different financial arrangements
- on-going examinations of the GATS and other relevant trade and foreign policy concerns

Acknowledgement: there are significant differences in the bargaining power of countries, with the least amount of control and/or regulation happening among countries emerging from conflict or severely low-income countries. Countries with emerging economies or more highly developed higher education systems tend to have greater capacity for directing the expansion of CBHE within their borders.

Assorted concluding thoughts from the presenters:

Grant McBurnie (Australia)

3 big dangers of poor CBHE (in an overly market-based approach):

- Potential to diminish local capacity by, for example, displacing education resources away from the actual needs of the receiver country and, instead, focusing resources on the commercial plans of the providers.
- Exploitation of developing countries by industrial countries
- Potential for adversarial relationships between host countries and provider countries / institutions

Jamil Salmi (The World Bank)

- Would like to see a multi-donor approach to higher education along the lines of the recent development of the Fast Track initiative of Education for All.